

# The impact of standards and qualifications on the further education sector

March 2010



Skills for Learning Professionals

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 The standards included in the research .....	8
1.2 The qualifications included in the research .....	9
1.3 Purpose of this report .....	11
<b>2 Methodology .....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 The fieldwork .....	12
<b>3 Research findings .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Sample characteristics; survey .....	15
3.2 Awareness and use of the standards; .....	16
3.3 Benefits and effectiveness of the standards .....	20
3.4 Standards; a WBL context .....	22
3.5 Standards; an FEC context .....	24
3.6 Standards; an ACL context .....	24
3.7 Awareness and use of the qualifications .....	26
3.7 Benefits and effectiveness of the qualifications .....	28
3.9 Qualifications; a WBL context .....	29
3.10 Qualifications; an FEC context .....	30
3.11 Qualifications; an ACL context .....	30
3.12 Attitudinal statements .....	31
3.13 Stakeholder interviews .....	32
<b>4 Issues to address .....</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1 The standards .....	34
4.2 The relationship between standards and qualifications .....	34
4.3 The teaching qualifications .....	36
4.4 Market need .....	38
4.5 Strategic leadership .....	38
4.6 Financial 'impact' .....	40
4.7 Perceptions .....	40
4.8 Standardisation .....	41
<b>5 Conclusions .....</b>	<b>42</b>
5.1 Strengths and weaknesses of the standards .....	42
5.2 Uses of the standards .....	43
5.3 Strengths and weaknesses of the qualifications .....	43
5.4 Uses of the qualifications .....	45
5.5 Issues to address .....	45
<b>6 Recommendations .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>7 Appendices .....</b>	<b>51</b>
Appendix A – Impact Assessment Framework (approved January 2010) .....	51
Appendix B – The research survey .....	53
Appendix C – Regulations .....	61

## Executive Summary

Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK) has coordinated the development of a number of new standards and qualifications relevant to the further education (FE) sector since 2007. This report provides key findings from research conducted between the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2010 and the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2010, to assess the impact of the standards and qualifications developed by LLUK since 2007 on managers and practitioners in FE Colleges<sup>1</sup>, work-based learning (WBL) and adult and community learning (ACL) providers..

The aims of the research were to:

- identify strengths and weaknesses of the standards and qualifications
- explore the use of the standards and qualifications by practitioners and employers
- identify any issues to be addressed related to awareness and utilisation of the standards and qualifications.

The consultants devised a brand new 'impact evaluation framework' designed specifically for the purpose of this project that consisted of three thematic areas - i) Performance ii) Outcomes iii) Development - to assess the impact of standards and qualifications on the FE sector. The research included:

- an on-line survey
- focus group discussions
- depth interviews with stakeholders, and
- literature review.

A total of 160 survey responses were analysed comprising 74 practitioners (46%) and 86 (56%) organisational respondents<sup>2</sup>. The sample included responses from 78 (49%) WBL providers, 33 (21%) FE institutions, 26 (16%) ACL providers, and, 23 (14%) 'other' responses, and comprised a decent spatial distribution of occupation / job role and organisational size. A national and regional focus group was facilitated by the consultants (consisting of WBL employers and stakeholders) and 12 stakeholder interviews were conducted during the course of the fieldwork (including key industry bodies, awarding organisations and membership organisations).

Originally, the survey was intended to be for England-only organisations or practitioners. The promotion of the online survey on the LLUK website gave rise however to responses from organisations in Scotland and Wales who had clearly made a decision that the subject matter of the survey was relevant to them. It was decided that these responses should in fact be included in the results contained in this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> Including 6th form colleges

<sup>2</sup> Providing a response from an organisational perspective/employers' perspective

## Performance of standards and qualifications

Evidence from this research confirms a wide range of uses of standards, for example, for workforce development purposes (recruitment, training), performance appraisal and quality assurance. Respondents to the survey indicate there is a high level of awareness (92% of the sample) of the *Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector (Professional standards)* with 73% of those aware going on to use the standards. Awareness and usage of the other standards included within the research is much lower: NOS for Learning Support Staff – 61% awareness, 35% usage; NOS for Learner Involvement – 54% awareness, 27% usage; NOS for Community Learning and Development – 49% awareness, 10% usage.

There is high level of awareness and use of the teaching qualifications (PTLLS/CTLLS/DTLLS); 93%-95% awareness and nearly 20,000 learners in total achieving the qualifications in 2008/9. The achievement of other qualifications included within this study is much lower with some qualifications at the time of writing indicating minimal if no achievement. It should also be noted that respondents indicate a high level of awareness (82%) of the NOS for Learning and Development and the volume of learners achieving assessor and verifier qualifications was also high (more than 13,000 learners achieving assessor qualifications and 3,000 verifier qualifications achievements in 2008/9).

The research has highlighted that there are significant 'drivers' associated with the teaching and assessor/verifier qualifications – legislation and funding requirements – and these may have a significant influence on their performance. Overall, further education college respondents were more likely than work-based learning, who in turn were more likely than adult and community learning respondents to have an awareness of all the standards included within the research. Furthermore, practitioners were slightly more likely to have an awareness of the standards than organisational respondents.

## Outcomes of standards and qualifications

The views expressed by respondents to the research indicate there are some related benefits to the standards and qualifications regardless of them being different products with a range of purposes. The findings of this sample of respondents from the FE sector suggest there are a number of strengths of standards:

- **Professionalisation (and recognition)** - many respondents to the research believe the standards have enabled better skills and knowledge development and a higher level of professionalism across the FE sector
- **Benchmarking** – across the range of fieldwork, the introduction of the *Professional standards* (particularly), has created a relevant benchmark across the FE sector
- **Monitoring and assessment of performance** – respondents suggest the standards included within the research allow for a more consistent monitoring and assessment of staff performance and the standards can be used as part of the appraisal process
- **Improved role awareness** – respondents express a greater understanding of the demands of the 'teaching' role, due to the *Professional standards*.

Data for all the qualifications was limited and the benefits of the qualifications expressed in this study focus on the teaching qualifications. In general, the introduction of the teaching qualifications has been welcomed within the FE sector and is seen as contributing to the professionalisation of the sector as a whole. Respondents to the survey indicate the following benefits of the qualifications:

- **Professionalisation** – by having a recognised group of qualifications specifically for the FE sector
- **Recognition and benchmarking** – valuing the skills of practitioners and employers within the FE sector using a consistent set of qualifications
- **Improving practice** – increased awareness and application of teaching methods within the FE sector; motivating practitioners to use new methods.

One of the most encouraging findings of the survey results was the opinion expressed by 79% of the 160 respondents that the standards and qualifications developed since 2007 have contributed to creating a higher skilled and more professional workforce in general.

### Future development of standards and qualifications

The research has highlighted a number of positive messages indicating that the standards and qualifications (specifically in relation to teaching) are performing well and providing benefits to practitioners and employers within the FE sector. However, this research project, a 'snapshot' of the FE sector, has generated a number of issues that require attention:

- **Barriers** - There are some noticeable barriers to take-up of the qualifications and usage of the standards within certain FE sector providers, mainly WBL and ACL. Relevance to role appears to be a key factor in using any standards or qualifications by practitioners and/or employers (especially within WBL and ACL respondents). Some respondents comment that the content of the NOS are not relevant (or they perceive the functions are covered by other standards) or the title of standards or qualifications does not engage them e.g. NOS for Learning Support Staff suggests an individual whereas for some contexts, supporting learners may only be one part of their role. There are some perceptual barriers – employers and practitioners referring to the teaching qualifications being '*academic*' and not relevant to the WBL role (specifically). Opinion as to how suitable the teaching qualifications are to WBL and ACL roles is mixed. Feedback received within this sample of respondents indicates that some WBL employers and corresponding stakeholders perceive the teaching qualifications as more suited to the FE college environment where there are clear and distinct roles e.g. lecturers (teachers) and support staff.
- **Delivery modes of the teaching qualifications** – Stakeholders and WBL employers (specifically) suggest that the current modes of delivery of the teaching qualifications are not suited to some practitioners within the FE sector. Generally, college and university providers are delivering the qualifications in formal learning environments, in group settings and classroom-based. Stakeholders (membership and industry organisations) suggest this is not reflective of the 'context' in which WBL and ACL practitioners and employers operate as much of their practice is on a 1:1 basis and in

a work-related environment – ‘*on the shop floor*’. Furthermore, the micro-teaching component is also considered a less-than flexible approach to assessment and the delivery of teaching qualifications and acknowledgement that work-based teaching environments can generate appropriate evidence for the qualifications is called for.

- **Structure of the teaching qualifications** – Stakeholders and some employers (particularly WBL) suggest the current structure of the teaching qualifications does not allow achievement in small ‘*bite-sized*’ chunks. WBL employers (and supported by related stakeholders) would welcome a more ‘*modular-based*’ approach to the qualification describing the current structure as containing units that are ‘*too big*’; the suggestions are that the total volume of learning is to some extent appropriate, dependent on teaching role, but the building blocks that constitute the current qualifications are too big for gradual and progressive achievement for some practitioners within the FE sector. Furthermore, respondents from the WBL sample suggest that key aspects pertinent to the WBL community are not overtly available within the current teaching provision e.g. coaching and mentoring, instruction, demonstration and presentation skills. Focus group delegates and stakeholders suggest that the current teaching qualifications are not maximising the potential of the QCF<sup>3</sup> and the ability to build qualifications using a series of ‘building blocks’ (units of assessment) to enable different pathways (specialisms) to be accommodated.
- **Teaching practice** - The teaching practice demands of the CTLLS and DTLLS qualifications are considered prohibitive and not inclusive of differing learning environments within the FE sector; predominantly voiced by WBL respondents and the corresponding stakeholders. Respondents within the WBL and ACL contexts specifically suggest that the inclusion of 1:1 teaching and work-based teaching should be acceptable forms of teaching practice for evidence generation. Furthermore, there are views that teaching within a ‘funded’ environment is creating a barrier to generating the required teaching practice component as not all practitioners operate in such environments to the volume required for the qualifications.
- **Strategic leadership** – Stakeholders particularly are seeking ‘*strategic leadership*’ for the sector to address the issues highlighted in this research and to establish a coherent framework of standards and qualifications for the FE sector; a key strategic requirement. Currently, based on this snapshot of research, practitioners and stakeholders comment that it is confusing as to which standards to use and there is a need to simplify the landscape of standards and qualifications for the FE sector. WBL respondents specifically relate to confusion over how applicable the *Professional standards*, NOS for Learning and Development and NOS for Learning Delivery are to their community and that the addition of the teaching qualifications is placing additional demand on practitioners and employers.

## Conclusions

Awareness of the six suites of NOS and professional standards examined in this study vary significantly amongst this sample of respondents ranging from 49% to 92%. The ‘standards’ commanding the highest levels of awareness, the *Professional standards*, command the

---

<sup>3</sup> Qualifications and Credit Framework

highest conversion ratios to usage by this sample of respondents as well *i.e.* awareness levels of 92% and usage by 3 in 4 people who are aware..

Awareness of the qualifications included in this study varies significantly from 16% to 95% with the teaching qualifications (PTLLS, CTLLS and DTLLS) being particularly well known and well used by this sample of respondents. It should be noted that there are variances within the different contexts (FEC, WBL, ACL) within the FE sector and this should be considered for future actions.

The quantitative data presented as a result of this survey suggests that the standards and qualifications are in fact effective and beneficial to those that are aware of and used them (though of course the results at standard and qualification specific level vary from product to product). However, attitudinal statements suggest that there is a need to focus on marketing and promotional activity that will raise awareness (and correlating use) of these standards and qualifications in future. Different approaches appear appropriate at sector and perspective level in terms of tailoring communications to these audiences in future.

There are some issues that have been identified that require some attention and these should be considered as part of a programme of strategic action in the future. Based on the findings of the research, the consultants have proposed five recommendations for action to be considered by LLUK and its partner organisations. These recommendations are proposals to address the issues highlighted in this study and to disseminate the positive findings of the research to the FE sector and stakeholders. The six recommendations for action are summarised below:

1. To implement a promotions and awareness-raising campaign to advocate the benefits of standards and qualifications and to share good practice
2. To conduct further research to establish targets for the monitoring of future impact of standards and qualifications
3. To conduct a review of the teaching qualifications to address issues relating to their structure, delivery methods and contextualisation
4. To conduct further exploration of standards and qualifications usage where results from this research suggest low usage and take-up
5. To provide support mechanisms (e.g. mentoring) for teachers and the teacher educator workforce.

# 1 Introduction

Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK) has coordinated the development of a number of new standards and qualifications relevant to the further education (FE) sector since 2007. In January 2010, LLUK commissioned independent consultants (WA Consultancy) to conduct research to assess the impact of the standards and qualifications on FE Colleges<sup>4</sup>, work-based learning (WBL) and adult and community learning (ACL) employers and practitioners. The aims of the research were to:

- identify strengths and weaknesses of the standards and qualifications
- explore the use of the standards and qualifications by practitioners and employers
- identify any issues to be addressed related to awareness and utilisation of the standards and qualifications.

## 1.1 The standards included in the research

The six standards included within the research were:

- Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector
- NOS for Community Learning and Development
- NOS for Learner Involvement
- NOS for Learning Support Staff
- NOS for Learning Delivery
- NOS for Learning and Development.

In 2003, Ofsted reported on FE teacher training at the time and noted three areas of concern:

- Lack of consistent support given to trainees in the teaching institutions
- A lack of systematic mentoring in the workplace, and
- Trainees' progress was being inhibited by insufficient observation and feedback on their teaching.

***“The history of teacher training in FE in England is set within the context of the haphazard nature of the growth of FE colleges and their relative neglect, in comparison to schools by successive governments<sup>5</sup>”***

The Government's response to the Ofsted report was outlined in *Equipping our teachers for the future: Reforming initial teacher training for the learning and skills sector* (DfES, 2004). LLUK were given the opportunity to lead this England-only initiative as part of their initial work in 2005 as a newly emerging Sector Skills Council. In September 2007, the government introduced new regulations to reform the training and qualifications of teachers, tutors, trainers and instructors in the FE sector in England based on the publication of the new *Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector* (the *Professional standards*).

---

<sup>4</sup> Including sixth form colleges

<sup>5</sup> Source: Huddleston P and Unwin L (2007), *Setting the policy context*, Teaching and learning in further education, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, London, Routledge



The other standards included within the project were National Occupational Standards or NOS<sup>6</sup>, which define the competences that apply to job roles or occupations in the form of statements of performance, knowledge and the evidence required to confirm competence. They cover the key activities undertaken within the occupation in question under all the circumstances the job holder is likely to encounter.

NOS can be used (in summary) to:

- describe good practice in particular areas of work
- set out a statement of competence which bring together the skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to do the work
- provide managers with a tool for a wide variety of workforce management and quality control
- offer a framework for training and development
- form the basis of qualifications.<sup>7</sup>

**Table 1: Date of publication of the National Occupational Standards<sup>8</sup>**

National Occupational Standards	Created
NOS for Community Learning and Development	October 2007
NOS for Learner Involvement	July 2009
NOS for Learning Support Staff	July 2008
NOS for Learning Delivery	Submitted for approval
NOS for Learning and Development	Submitted for approval

The NOS included in this research were published at different times since 2007 – see Table 1 above. Three of the suites had been approved by the UKCES<sup>9</sup> at the time of conducting the research and two of the suites were in the final stages of approval during the fieldwork. It should be noted that the NOS for Learning and Development were approved in March 2010 however this was after completion of the fieldwork for this project.

## 1.2 The qualifications included in the research

A list of 27 qualifications were included structured into three groups to aid the fieldwork activity. The first group contained the teaching qualifications introduced in 2007<sup>10</sup>, the second group contained qualifications for teachers of specialist skills for life subject areas (English [literacy and ESOL] and Maths [numeracy]) and the third group included a range of ‘other’ vocational provision.

<sup>6</sup> NOS are developed UK-wide

<sup>7</sup> Source: NOS Directory, March 2010

<sup>8</sup> Source: NOS Directory, March 2010

<sup>9</sup> UK Commission for Employment and Skills

<sup>10</sup> The Level 3 PTLLS qualification was available from 2006

### Figure 1: The three groups of qualifications included in the research

#### 1. Initial Teaching Qualifications for teachers in the FE Sector

- Level 3 and 4: Award in Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (PTLLS)
- Level 3 and 4: Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (CTLLS)
- Level 5: Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (DTLLS)

#### 2. Qualifications for teachers of English (literacy and ESOL) and Maths (numeracy)

- Level 5: Additional Diploma in Teaching English (Literacy)
- Level 5: Additional Diploma in Teaching English (ESOL)
- Level 5: Additional Diploma in Teaching Mathematics (Numeracy)
- Level 5: Diploma in Teaching English (Literacy) in the Lifelong Learning Sector
- Level 5: Diploma in Teaching English (ESOL) in the Lifelong Learning Sector
- Level 5: Diploma in Teaching Mathematics (Numeracy) in the Lifelong Learning Sector

### Figure 1: The three groups of qualification included in the research (continued)

#### 3. 'Other' qualifications

- Level 2 and 3: Award in Preparing to Support Learning
  - Level 3: Award in Delivering e-Testing
  - Level 3: Certificate in Learning Support
  - Level 5 Certificate for 14-19 Diploma Practitioners<sup>11</sup>
- 
- Level 4 and 5: Award in FE Orientation
  - Level 3: Award for teachers in understanding learners and their literacy, language, numeracy and ICT needs (lifelong learning)
  - Level 5 Awards in developing embedded approaches to literacy, language, and numeracy for teachers in the lifelong learning sector (and pathways)
  - Level 2, 3, 4 and 5: Award in Family Learning.

*Note: The qualifications below the dotted line are where there is no record of these qualifications on the National Database of Accredited Qualifications (confirmed by Ofqual). We have retained these qualifications within the report as this information could not be confirmed until after the fieldwork was completed and respondents had commented on some of the qualifications.*

The qualifications included within the research have a range of lifespans as some were accredited in 2006/7 (the teaching qualifications) whereas others (specifically in group 3) are very recent qualifications, mostly accredited in 2009.

<sup>11</sup> This title has been amended from the provided title

### 1.3 Purpose of this report

The purpose of this report is to describe the fieldwork conducted by the consultants, to detail the overall findings of the research, to outline any issues that require some attention (based on the qualitative findings of the research) and to propose recommendations for action.

Two interim reports of qualitative and quantitative research findings provide underpinning evidence for the content of this report. Readers of this report who wish to have access to these should contact LLUK's research team at [research@lluk.org](mailto:research@lluk.org)

## 2 Methodology

To conduct the research for the entire project, a new 'impact evaluation framework' was designed by the consultants, in collaboration with the client, and was used to identify information to enable effective reporting back to the client – see Appendix A. The framework consisted of three thematic areas:

- Performance
- Outcomes<sup>12</sup>
- Development.

The framework enabled the consultants to develop the tools to be used as part of the fieldwork for the research and also structured the interim reports submitted in early March.

### 2.1 Methodology

The research included

- An on-line survey
- focus group discussions
- depth interviews with stakeholders, and
- literature review.

The sample of respondents to this research was not designed to be, nor should be regarded as, representative of the wider further education sector. The original research objective was to engage at least 150 respondents across the three groups (further education colleges, work based learning and adult and community learning) using a range of research interventions. The sample therefore should be regarded as a 'snapshot' only and results should not be used as a proxy for extrapolating opinions across the wider groups described.

One of the areas explored was respondents' level of awareness of a variety of standards and qualifications developed since 2007. This particular research theme is perhaps compromised to some extent by the fact that the majority of respondents (80%) to the survey took part in a major review of the NOS for Learning and Development throughout 2009. One would expect therefore, that many of these respondents were to some extent more likely to be aware of at very least that suite of standards and the related qualifications as well as the other standards included within the research. Thus, it was not a randomly selected sample that participated in the research. This fact should be borne in mind when thinking of using these results as a baseline against which to measure in any future longitudinal studies LLUK may decide to commission.

---

<sup>12</sup> This theme originated as an 'impact' theme – to measure benefits and change; for the purpose of this final report, we have used the 'outcomes' terminology to differentiate between the theme and the overall impact framework.

### 2.1.1 The on-line survey

The survey (see Appendix B) was administered between the 1<sup>st</sup> February and the 19<sup>th</sup> February 2010 and designed for completion by 'practitioners'<sup>13</sup> and 'organisational respondents'<sup>14</sup> employed in Further Education College<sup>15</sup> (FEC), Work Based Learning (WBL) and Adult and Community Learning (ACL) organisations – defined as the FE sector. The survey aimed to capture opinions about the standards and qualifications highlighted in sections 1.1. and 1.2 and hoped to determine what sort of impact these standards and qualifications were having on the type of organisations and practitioners for whom they were intended.

Respondents to the survey could answer from one of two perspectives:

- As an individual 'practitioner' e.g. someone for whom the standards and qualifications apply to e.g. a teacher, tutor or trainer
- As an 'organisational respondent' – someone who was responding on behalf of their organisation/offering an employers' perspective.

The survey was aligned to the impact evaluation framework and each question was carefully agreed with LLUK to ensure we were capturing intelligence that would lead to a much greater understanding of standards and qualifications in the ways proposed, and that would ultimately allow our client to consider mechanisms for further assessing impact in the future.

### 2.1.2 Focus group discussions

A series of focus groups was planned around the English regions with support from the LLUK's regional sector engagement advisors. Two focus groups were facilitated by the consultants:

1. WBL Panel (9<sup>th</sup> February 2010) – a national forum of WBL providers (n=7) contributing to the strategic activities of LLUK
2. NW Provider Network (23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010) – a regional forum (n=4) of WBL providers (representatives from the five sub-regions).

### 2.1.3 Depth interviews with stakeholders

To supplement the qualitative aspect of the research, the consultants conducted depth telephone interviews with a range of key stakeholder organisations. The consultants compiled a list of key organisations that should be engaged in the work and in agreement with the client, conducted 12 interviews with the following organisations:

- Association of Learning Providers (Director level)
- Association of Colleges (Director level)
- NIACE (Director level)
- Institute for Learning (Director level (x2) – conference call)

---

<sup>13</sup> Someone for whom the standards and/or qualifications are applicable to e.g. teachers, tutors, trainers.

<sup>14</sup> Someone who was responding on behalf of their organisation/offering an employers' perspective.

<sup>15</sup> Including sixth form colleges

- SVUK (Project Manager)
- Edexcel (Chief Examiner)
- City and Guilds (Product Manager)
- OCR (Team Leader)
- Trinity College (Chief Examiner)
- Agored Cymru (CEO)
- HUDDCETT (Director of Post Compulsory Education and Training)
- ACETT (Chair).

#### **2.1.4 Literature review**

The literature review included search of the academic literature, grey literature (policy and seminal documents from Government agencies) and further search of related research outputs from key stakeholder organisations – Centres for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETTs), and analysis to highlight some issues to be explored in the research.

## 3 Research findings

### 3.1 Sample characteristics; survey

The survey generated a return of 160 responses via a mixture of telephone interviews (n=127) and on-line survey self-completion responses (n=33). The survey findings were extensive and the consultants were able to elicit quantitative and qualitative data from the responses; this data informed the two interim reports.

**Table 2: Organisation classification by group**

Which of the following best describes your organisation?	No.	%
Work Based Learning provider	78	49%
Further Education College (inc. V11th Form College)	33	21%
Adult and Community Learning provider	26	16%
Other	23	14%
Total	160	100%
Base: 160		

Twenty three respondents to the survey could not classify themselves as just one of the stated groups (FEC, WBL or ACL) and instead described their organisation in 'other' ways including:

- organisations / consultancies that were involved in more than one of the groups described
- membership organisations
- local authorities
- careers services
- police services
- statutory organisations
- stakeholder organisations - awarding organisation and youth-related services (e.g. Connexions, youth offending or youth service organisations).

The survey respondents also comprised a decent spatial distribution of responses from across the English regions ranging from 23% of respondents from the South East, 14% South West, 13% Yorkshire and Humber with the remaining regions contributing 11%-4% of responses (12 responses [ $<8\%$ ] were received from Scotland and Wales).

There was an almost equal spread of respondent types - practitioner (46%) and organisational respondent (54%). Within the FEC and WBL groups, slightly more practitioners responded than organisational respondents with nearly three-quarters of the ACL group answering from an organisational perspective. Over a half (57%) of respondents in the 'other' domain answered from the perspective of organisational respondents.

The range of primary job roles was spread across 10 pre-determined roles (plus 'other') with Learning Development/Training Manager and Senior Manager being the highest respondents from the surveyed sample as a whole (16% and 14% respectively). The sample of respondents to the survey come from mainly medium (200-499 staff) to large sized organisations (>500 staff); WBL respondents had a greater proportion of SME (<200). The workforce size ranged from 1 to 20,000 employees (e.g. micro/sole traders to large corporations/public organisations).

### 3.2 Awareness and use of the standards;

The survey provides evidence that there are very high levels of awareness for the *Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector (Professional standards)* across the FE sector (92%); high levels of awareness of the NOS for *Learning and Development* (82%)<sup>16</sup>; moderate awareness levels for the NOS for *Learning Delivery* (63%) and NOS for *Learning Support Staff* (61%); and lower levels of awareness for the NOS for *Learner Involvement* (54%) and NOS for *Community Learning and Development* (49%).

Awareness levels for each of the sets of standards differs slightly, but further analysis suggests that overall respondents from FEC (71%) were more likely than WBL respondents (69%), who in turn were more likely than ACL sector respondents (56%), to have an awareness of all of the standards being examined. Furthermore, practitioners (70%) were more likely than organisational respondents (64%) to have that same holistic awareness of these standards. Awareness levels by respondents from the different groups and perspectives (practitioners and organisational respondents) fluctuated particularly for the NOS for *Learning Delivery* whilst awareness levels were extremely consistent across all sectors for the *Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector*.

This research suggests that the standards are used in a variety of ways by practitioners and organisational respondents:

- linked to the associated qualifications
- for recruitment activity
- writing job descriptions
- to create training plans
- assessing and monitoring staff
- quality assurance of provision
- to provide a quality learning experience
- for 'general' use in job roles - '*we use them in our day-to-day work*'.

Respondents with a workforce development role<sup>17</sup>, not unexpectedly, were more likely to cite usage of the standards for workforce development (recruitment, training, monitoring) compared to practitioners, and this usage was particularly high in the ACL sector. By

---

<sup>16</sup> **NB.** the principle source of respondent to this survey was a consultation database developed as a direct result of the review of these standards in 2009 and is therefore likely to be positively skewed so should be interpreted with extreme caution

<sup>17</sup> This may include learning and development/training managers, HR, quality or line managers



contrast, those who used the standards for up-skilling learners were in most cases practitioners.

The following three tables (overleaf) provide an overview of awareness and use of the standards for each of the groups (FEC, WBL, ACL) within the FE sector and furthermore present a 'conversion' value for awareness to usage. The conversion values indicate that the *Professional standards* have a high level of conversion *i.e.* between 70%-100% of respondents use the standards if aware of them, whereas, for the other standards (except the NOS for Learning and Development and Learning Delivery – usage not measured), conversion rates are considerably less, ranging from 5%-56%. The NOS for Community Learning and Development and the NOS for Learner Involvement within the FEC group attract a 5% and 10% conversion rate respectively whereas the NOS for Learning Support Staff within the ACL respondents attract a 56% conversion rate.

**Table 3: Work Based Learning profile: awareness and use of standards**

Standards	Total sample aware %	WBL sample only %	Compared to 'all sector' average awareness	Awareness to usage conversion ratio total sample	Awareness to usage conversion ratio WBL sample only	Compared to 'all sector' average conversion
Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector	92%	91%	↓	73% or 3:4	73% or 3:4	↔
NOS for Learning and Development	82%	90%	↑			
NOS for Learning Delivery	63%	71%	↑			
NOS for Learning Support Staff	61%	58%	↓	35% or 1:3	33% or 1:3	↔
NOS for Learner Involvement	54%	59%	↑	27% or 1:4	33% or 1:3	↑
NOS for Community Learning and Development	49%	46%	↓	10% or 1:10	8% or 1:12	↓

*Note: Number of WBL respondents = 78 – equivalent to 49% of the total survey sample*

**Table 4: Further Education College profile: awareness and use of standards**

Standards	Total sample aware %	FEC sample only %	Compared to 'all sector' average awareness	Awareness to usage conversion ratio total sample	Awareness to usage conversion ratio FEC sample only	Compared to 'all sector' average conversion
Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector	92%	91%	↓	73% or 3:4	70% or 7:10	↓
NOS for Learning and Development	82%	76%	↓			
NOS for Learning Delivery	63%	64%	↑			
NOS for Learning Support Staff	61%	73%	↑	35% or 1:3	25% or 1:4	↓
NOS for Learner Involvement	54%	61%	↑	27% or 1:4	10% or 1:10	↓
NOS for Community Learning and Development	49%	61%	↑	10% or 1:10	5% or 1:20	↓

*Note: Number of FEC respondents = 33 – equivalent to 21% of the total survey sample*

Table 5: Adult and Community Learning profile: awareness and use of standards

Standards	Total sample aware %	FEC sample only %	Compared to 'all sector' average awareness	Awareness to usage conversion ratio total sample	Awareness to usage conversion ratio FEC sample only	Compared to 'all sector' average conversion
Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector	92%	96%	↑	73% or 3:4	100% or 1:1	↑
NOS for Learning and Development	82%	62%	↓			
NOS for Learning Delivery	63%	35%	↓			
NOS for Learning Support Staff	61%	62%	↑	35% or 1:3	56% or 3:5	↑
NOS for Learner Involvement	54%	39%	↓	27% or 1:4	40% or 2:5	↑
NOS for Community Learning and Development	49%	42%	↓	10% or 1:10	18% or 1:5	↑

Note: Number of FEC respondents = 26 – equivalent to 16% of the total survey sample

### In summary

The WBL respondents are generally quite aware of most of the standards presented and conversion rates to usage are in-line with or slightly above 'all sector' averages; with the exception of the NOS for Community Learning and Development

The FEC respondents have the highest overall 'awareness', in general, of the various standards presented. The data also suggests that conversion rates from awareness to usage are lower than 'all sector' averages; notably the NOS for Learner Involvement and NOS for Community Learning and Development (**NB.** small sample)

The ACL respondents have the lowest overall awareness of the standards presented suggesting a need to promote them more effectively for this group within the FE sector; however, they also show the highest conversion rates from awareness to usage across the standards (**NB.** small sample).

### 3.3 Benefits and effectiveness of the standards

Overall, the main benefits of using the standards (ten pre-determined responses [plus 'other'] were provided) include:

- helping practitioners / staff develop knowledge and skills for their role
- helping users provide an improved experience for learners *i.e.* by using the standards as a 'good practice' guide and applying that practice in their work
- contributing to practitioners' / staff's own sense of professionalism in the lifelong learning sector
- helping practitioners / staff improve the quality of teaching / practice they provide
- helping practitioners / staff with career development / continuing professional development planning and progression

**NB** Please note though that the top benefits are different if each standard is analysed individually.

The data collated through the survey and the focus group activity suggests that for those individuals who had used the standards, they had on the whole experienced positive benefits. The impact of the standards on users is therefore regarded as very good (with each benefit being recorded by no fewer than 69% and as many as 85% of respondents), however, it must be noted that the overall number of users for three of the four standards being examined were quite modest.

By applying a scoring calculation we found the overall benefit of each set of standards to differ. The highest benefit was recorded for the *Professional standards* (86% overall benefit score / sample 107 users<sup>18</sup>); followed by the NOS for Community Learning and Development (80% overall benefit score / sample 8 users); then NOS for Learning Support Staff (66% overall benefit score / sample 34 users); and finally the NOS for Learner Involvement (63% overall benefit score / sample 23 users)<sup>19</sup>. There are slight distinctions in the benefits experienced by the four groups of respondents and the two perspectives however, overall, users of the standards, whether practitioners or organisational respondents, indicate an even distribution of benefits.

The *Professional standards* were by far the most useful to practitioners and/or organisations. More than half of survey respondents explain why the *Professional standards* are 'most useful'; of the other standards (NOS), less than 5% of respondents were able to describe their 'usefulness'. A number of benefits as to the 'usefulness' of the *Professional standards* can be identified from the fieldwork conducted:

---

<sup>18</sup> This calculation is the sum of responses made to each of the ten benefit options expressed as a percentage of the total number of responses that could have been made for each benefit option *e.g.* for the *Professional standards* there were 107 users. If every single one of these users had reported benefit for each of the ten options presented a total of 1,070 responses could have been possible. In actuality, a total of 915 responses across these ten options were observed. 915 as a % of 1,070 is 86% which we are using as a score for the purpose of this report commentary

<sup>19</sup> NOS for Learning and Development and Learning Delivery were not questioned in this aspect of the survey.

- **Professionalisation (and recognition)** - many respondents to the research believe the standards have enabled better skills and knowledge development and a higher level of professionalism across the FE sector. This is a particularly prevalent view among individual practitioners, and more notably, WBL and ACL respondents believe that the standards have provided a greater recognition of the skills of *'trainers/instructors'* and *'adult teachers'*.
- **Benchmarking** – across the range of fieldwork, the introduction of the *Professional standards* (particularly), has created a relevant benchmark across the FE sector (including the FE College, WBL and ACL communities). Respondents were keen to stress that the *Professional standards* have set a 'benchmark' for new and existing staff to work towards; comments specifically received from the FE college grouping.
- **Monitoring and assessment of performance** – respondents operating at organisational level suggest the standards included within the research allow for a more consistent monitoring and assessment of staff performance and the standards can be used as part of the appraisal process (this point was particularly evident from WBL practitioners attending the focus groups).
- **Improved role awareness** – respondents express a greater understanding of the demands of the 'teaching' role, due to the *Professional standards*. However, this is not an overtly expressed benefit from the WBL respondents.

A key factor in whether standards are used relates to how relevant the standards are to job roles. If the standards have a lack of relevance to the job role, the standards are not used, ; s a perception dominated by practitioners rather than organisational representatives.

It was notable within the qualitative research for this project that a sample of respondents from the WBL group viewed the *Professional standards* as having a lesser relevance to their role; a view that can be explained to some extent by reference to the term 'teachers'. For some WBL organisations and practitioners, this collective term is not considered wholly appropriate for the WBL workforce.

### **Teachers vs Instructors/Trainers**

Through their own admittance, the WBL providers engaged in the focus groups suggested that their workforce is largely made up of assessors and trainers / instructors and not 'teachers'. The collective term of 'teachers' - incorporating tutors, trainers and instructors - is met with some negativity and providers suggest that the use of the term demonstrates a lack of understanding and appreciation of the WBL practitioner's role.

***We are instructors ... not teachers.***

The perception from the providers engaged in the focus groups was that 'teachers' operate in a more formal learning environment, that is classroom-based, and most commonly in a 'college' environment. WBL is often delivered '*on the shop floor*' but using the same skills-sets.

***I train people who dig holes in the road. They're not very interested in Bloom's taxonomy!***

Some WBL providers suggest that the PTLLS/CTLLS/DTLLS qualifications have the potential to change the job roles of WBL practitioners (to a more formal classroom based role) which is not viewed at this time as a positive change. Certainly for some sectors - engineering, manufacturing/processing industries, health and social care – work-based learning *i.e.* '*on the shop floor*' learning, is a positive mode of delivery as it allows learners to practice in the work environment and 'instruction' can be provided in the workplace.

The research has highlighted that the NOS for Learning and Development are highly relevant to WBL practitioners and organisations. These suites of standards include the assessor and verifier (quality assurance) functions, critical to WBL operations and the delivery of work-related provision; and are '*attached to the NVQ Code of Practice and awarding organisational requirements*'. This, for some within the WBL community has rendered some of the NOS in this research as '*unnecessary*' or '*unwelcome*'.

***It's not clear which standards we should use ... we use the assessor [Learning and Development] standards.***

### **3.4 Standards: a Work Based Learning context**

Usage of the standards examined in the survey varied from 3 to 52 WBL respondents (out of a total of 74 WBL respondents in the survey sample), and each of these users was asked if they had derived any of up to ten benefits prompted by the survey:

- *NOS for Community Learning and Development* - only 3 WBL respondents (out of a total sample of 8 users in the entire sample) had used these standards. For five of the ten benefits listed the WBL users rated them more highly than the 'all user' sample average scores for these particular standards; four of the benefits were rated lower; and one benefit achieved the 'all user sample' average score. The most noticeable benefits for these NOS for the WBL respondents were: contributing to their / staff's own sense of professionalism as a practitioner in the lifelong learning sector; helping

with career development / continuing professional development planning and progression; and helping them undertake a self assessment of their competences against their job role.

- *NOS for Learner Involvement* - 15 WBL respondents (out of a total sample of 23 users in the entire sample) had used these standards. All ten benefits listed were rated more highly by WBL users than the 'all user' sample average scores suggesting good levels of benefit from these NOS when used by the WBL sector. The most strikingly positive benefits for these NOS for WBL respondents were: helping them gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement, and, contributing to their / staff's own sense of professionalism as a practitioner in the lifelong learning sector.
- *NOS for Learning Support Staff* – 15 WBL respondents (out of a total sample of 34 users in the entire sample) had used these standards. Six of the benefits were rated lower by WBL users than the 'all user' sample scores for these NOS suggesting a lower level of benefit overall for these NOS compared to others included in the survey. Four benefits were rated higher than the 'all user' sample average scores the most notable benefit being helping them gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement.
- *Professional standards* - 52 WBL respondents (out of a total sample of 107 users in the entire sample) had used these standards. Eight of the ten benefits listed the WBL users were rated more highly by them compared to the 'all user' sample and the other two benefits either equalled the average score or were just under that average. This suggests an overall picture of good levels of benefit for these standards from the WBL sector, with the most notable benefits including: helping improve their / staff performance and impacting positively on their practice, and, helping them gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement.

The top benefits overall for this group of WBL respondents can be calculated in two ways. In terms of volume of response (popularity) the top benefits of using these standards for WBL respondents appear to be (when calculated across all standards):

- contributing to their / staff's own sense of professionalism as a practitioner in the lifelong learning sector, and
- helping them / staff ultimately provide an improved experience for learners *i.e.* by using the standards as a 'good practice' guide and applying that practice in their work.

In terms of major variance compared to the other users of these standards in the FEC, ACL or 'other' groups, the most significantly different benefit for WBL sector respondents appears to be helping them / staff gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement.

### 3.5 Standards: a Further Education College context

Usage of the standards examined in this survey varied from 1 to 21 further education college respondents (out of a total of 33 in the survey sample), and each of these users was asked if they had derived any of up to ten benefits that were prompted by the survey:

- *NOS for Community Learning and Development (CLD) and Learner Involvement (LI)* - only 1 respondent (out of a total sample of 8 users) had used the CLD standards and only 2 respondents (out of a total sample of 23 users) had used the LI standards. Given the low number of users for these standards, we have not undertaken an analysis of benefits derived.
- *NOS for Learning Support Staff* - only 6 respondents (out of a total sample of 34 users in the entire sample) had used these standards. Again, with the sample so small we have not undertaken further analysis of benefits derived.
- *Professional standards* – 21 respondents (out of a total sample of 107 users in the entire sample) had used these standards. The data suggests that this group in particular derives high levels of benefit from the use of these standards with seven of the ten benefits listed being rated by FEC respondents more highly than compared to the 'all user' sample. The most notable benefits were:
  - Helping them / staff develop their knowledge and skills for their role
  - Helping them / staff with career development / continuing professional development planning and progression
  - Helping them / staff improve the quality of teaching / practice they provide
  - Helping them / staff undertake a self assessment of competences against your their job role.

Interestingly, by quite some margin, the lowest scoring benefit for FEC respondents from using these standards has been to help them gain credit or recognition for their achievements (from employer or peers) – much lower than for example the proportion of WBL users reporting this benefit from use of these particular standards.

The top benefits overall for this group of FEC respondents can be calculated in two ways. In terms of volume of response (popularity) the top benefits of using these standards for FE respondents (calculated across all standards) appears to be:

- Helping them / staff develop their knowledge and skills for their role
- Helping them / staff improve the quality of teaching / practice they provide.

### 3.6 Standards: an Adult and Community Learning context

Usage of the standards examined in this survey varied from 2 to 25 ACL respondents (out of a total of 26 in the survey sample), and each of these users was asked if they had derived any of up to ten benefits that were prompted by the survey:

- *NOS for Community Learning and Development (CLD) and Learner Involvement (LI)* – only 2 ACL respondents (out of a total sample of 8 users) had used the CLD



standards and only 4 ACL sector respondents (out of a total sample of 23 users) had used the LI standards.

- *NOS for Learning Support Staff* – 9 ACL sector respondents (out of a total sample of 34 users in the entire sample) had used these standards. Data suggests that ACL users of these NOS have derived decent levels of benefit particularly in respect of:
  - Helping them / staff develop their knowledge and skills for their role
  - Helping them gain credit or recognition for their achievements (from employer or peers)
  - Helping them / staff to identify / select qualifications that relate to their work needs / job role.
  
- *Professional standards* – 25 ACL sector respondents (*i.e.* all but one of the ACL total sample to this survey) had used these standards. The data suggests that whilst benefits are derived by users their overall scores are generally less than the ‘all sector’ sample scores for each benefit and certainly less positive, for example, than benefit scores from the WBL or FEC respondents. The most notable benefits nevertheless were:
  - Helping them / staff develop their knowledge and skills for their role
  - Helping them / staff with career development / continuing professional development planning and progression
  - Helping them / staff improve the quality of teaching / practice they provide
  - Helping them / staff undertake a self assessment of competences against your their job role.

Interestingly, by quite some margin, the lowest scoring benefit for ACL respondents from using these standards has been helping them / staff gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement. Lower scorings for benefits are also observed for the extent to which use of these standards by ACL respondents leads to more recognition from their employer / peers or indeed the extent to which their usage leads to improved staff performance or practice. This is an interesting set of data as it suggests on the one hand very good take up of the *Professional standards* by the ACL sector, but lower levels of overall benefit derived from their use compared to other sectors also using these standards.

In terms of volume of response (popularity) the top benefits of using these standards for ACL respondents (calculated across all standards) appears to be:

- Helping them / staff develop their knowledge and skills for their role
- Helping them / staff improve the quality of teaching / practice they provide
- Helping them / staff to identify / select qualifications that relate to their work needs / job role.

### 3.7 Awareness and use of the qualifications

The research clearly indicates that the teaching qualifications (PTLLS/CTLLS/DTLLS) are the most well known qualifications within this sample (93%-95% awareness levels); group two qualifications are known by just over half of this sample of respondents (53%-57% awareness levels); whilst group three qualifications are less well known with awareness levels spread between a range of 16% and 40% within this sample.

Awareness levels of the qualification groupings appear evenly distributed by group and perspective if analysed as a homogenous group. In fact, we find that ACL respondents (62%) have an awareness of 'all qualification groupings' followed closely by FEC respondents (59%) and WBL respondents (59%). Furthermore, organisational respondents (59%) were slightly more likely than practitioners (55%) to have that same holistic awareness of these qualification groupings. However, we do advise caution in the interpretation of these headline results as they mask far more important differences in the levels of awareness at individual qualification level by respondents depending on their group and perspective. This is particularly true of awareness level for group three qualifications which fluctuate quite dramatically by group.

#### **Driver of change**

An identified driver of change is that the teaching qualifications are associated with legislation and therefore contractually, providers have to meet the requirements stipulated in LSC contracts – *"we have to do them"*.

#### ***Meets Ofsted's requirements.***

The legislation applies across the FE sector however there is some negativity to the requirements from the WBL community and ACL group (albeit a small sample of this research). These views are supported by the associated stakeholder organisations who declare that for their membership/partners, the current teaching qualifications are not wholly applicable to their workforce and have not considered the differing context of learning from that found within the college environment.

Mixed views have been expressed during the research (primarily from the focus groups and the stakeholder interviews) about legislative requirements and appropriateness of the qualifications. WBL providers suggest that it is a welcome initiative to professionalise the sector (for recognition purposes) and for formal qualifications to be available however, for some organisations, this is seen as an additional burden owing to the 'impacts' of time and money on organisations.

When exploring the extent to which awareness can be converted into usage we found that:

- For group one qualifications, conversion (of awareness to usage) ranges from 38% (Level 3 Certificate in teaching in the lifelong learning sector [CTLLS]) to 63% (Level 3 Award in preparing to teach in the lifelong learning sector [PTLLS]). Conversion ratios therefore range from 2:5 to 3:5 (*i.e.* two to three out of every five respondents with an awareness of these qualifications have gone on to use them).

- For group two qualifications, conversion ranges from 11% (Level 5 Additional Diploma in teaching English [ESOL]) to 18% (Level 5 Additional Diploma in teaching English [literacy] and the Level 5 Additional Diploma in teaching mathematics [Numeracy]). Conversion ratios therefore range from 1:10 to 1:5 for this grouping of qualifications.
- For group three qualifications, conversion ranges from 3% (quite a number fall into this range of conversion) to 18% (Level 3 Certificate in learning support). Conversion ratios therefore range from 'nil' to 1:5 for this grouping of qualifications.

Thus, the highest awareness to usage conversion statistics are in evidence for the teaching qualifications (the PTLLS, CTLLS and DTLLs qualifications), whilst the lowest conversion statistics are found for those within the group 3 qualifications.

It should be noted that qualification 'conversion' from awareness to usage may not be a wholly representative statistic as conversion to use is not always a natural step for the individual to make, or applicable. Managers may have an awareness of qualifications owing to their role however usage of qualifications may not be appropriate. Similarly, practitioners may have a broad awareness of qualifications in the 'field' but they may have no desire or need to complete the qualification. This sample of respondents included practitioners and managers (and other related roles) and thus, the data should only be interpreted as an indication of conversion based on this sample of respondents and not necessarily representative of the FE sector as a whole. A more focussed piece of research could identify more accurate conversion rates where defined markets for qualifications can be determined and an appropriate sample accessed.

### **Assessor and verifier qualifications**

The WBL community (specifically) place great value in the assessor and verifier qualifications linked to the *NOS for Learning and Development*. These qualifications were not included within this research due to the recent review and consultation, however, the focus groups and the stakeholder interviews suggest that these qualifications are essential for the FE sector as they are required to deliver NVQs and are associated with the NVQ Code of Practice.

***We've used L&D standards. We do A and V and some individual units.  
We've only applied for PTLLS and CTLLS but only because people are  
being pushed through it.***

To give an indication of volume for these qualifications, more than 13,000 practitioners achieved the assessor (A1 and A2) qualifications in 2008/9, and over 3,000 practitioners achieved the verifier (V1 and V2) qualifications in 2008/9.

**Source:** Ofqual 2009 – as part of the review of *Learning and Development* qualifications.

Despite the limitations to the data received for this research, the teacher training qualifications are by far the more accessed and achieved qualifications, not unexpected, whereas the category 2 qualifications are for specialist teachers of literacy and numeracy. Although not necessarily an accurate picture, the lack of data for the category 3 qualifications suggests that the market is either new and/or small.

What is not able to be determined at this juncture is the proportion of take-up of qualifications from the different groups. Data has not been collected in terms of whether a learner is from an FEC, WBL or ACL context. Therefore, how to determine if the new qualifications have had an impact is difficult to establish. It is notable that the market for assessor and verifier qualifications remains large (albeit on a slight decline year on year) and anecdotal evidence suggests that these qualifications are used predominantly within the WBL (specifically) and FEC contexts. NVQs in Learning and Development, the predecessors to the teaching qualifications, were much lower than the current teacher volumes (data from Ofqual suggests achievement at Level 3 was marginally above 1000 per year with Level 4 and 5 NVQs at much lower levels). Of the vocationally-related provision, only one qualification performed at a significant volume (in excess of 5000 learners) – all other previous provision is at a much lesser level. Thus, there is an indication that the number of learners achieving teaching qualifications has increased (but this requires accurate assessment) however, for the specialist teaching qualifications (literacy and numeracy) and the other group 3 qualifications, much more detailed analysis is recommended.

### 3.7 Benefits and effectiveness of the qualifications

From those engaged in all the research interventions, there has been a welcoming of the teaching qualifications for the FE sector as it has contributed to the professionalisation of the industry. Respondents comment on the teaching qualifications further promoting a ‘*standardisation*’ and consistency of practice across the sector and providing a ‘*good benchmark*’ for employers.

Specific benefits of the teaching qualifications articulated in this research include:

- **The professionalisation of the industry** – by having a recognised group of qualifications specifically for the FE sector
- **Improved recognition (standardisation)** – specifically for WBL and ACL communities who have previously commented that their profession is undervalued (not equivalent to practitioners within the FE college environment)
- **A relevant benchmark** – a consistent level of qualification is available to a wide sector workforce
- **Improving understanding** – specifically benefitting the WBL community as the teaching qualifications have ‘*improved the pedagogy [within training] ... and their understanding of pedagogy*’
- **Improving practice** – existing practitioners suggest that the teaching qualifications are benefitting their practice – ‘*Helping me improve and develop my practice*’ ... ‘*different delivery styles – not just talk and chalk ... interactive and hands-on*’
- ‘**Revitalising staff**’ – improved knowledge and application of new techniques is proving to be a motivating factor.

Respondents were asked to rate qualification effectiveness as ‘outstanding’, ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’<sup>20</sup>. If viewed as a homogenous product the qualifications included in this research are rated as 59% good, 19% satisfactory, 15% outstanding and 8% unsatisfactory. However, there are variations to this data when viewing each of the three groups of qualifications (see quantitative report – Table 19), moreover, the number of users

<sup>20</sup> This particular scale was chosen because it aligns with the ‘impact’ guidance contained within the UKCES Scorecard which seeks to help Sector Skills Councils measure their performance and impact as organisations

of the qualifications is low for groups 2 and 3 and thus the only meaningful data that could be extracted from this aspect of the survey would relate to the teaching qualifications:

- For group one qualifications, the range of effectiveness (rated good or outstanding by up to 96 users) was **64%** (Levels 3 and 4 Certificate in teaching in the lifelong learning sector [CTLLS]) to **75%** (Level 4 Award in preparing to teach in the lifelong learning sector [PTLLS]).

### 3.9 Qualifications: a Work Based Learning context

Detailed data analysis suggests some key findings as follows from the WBL respondents in respect of awareness, usage, effectiveness and benefits of qualifications considered in the survey:

- The WBL respondents scored an overall score of 59% awareness of 'all qualifications'<sup>21</sup> in the survey; not significantly different to the overall awareness levels expressed by the FEC (59%) or ACL (62%) respondents
- The WBL respondents had particularly good levels of awareness of the teaching qualifications, but again not markedly different compared to other groups
- Approximately half of the WBL respondents had consistently heard of the nine qualifications described for teachers of English (literacy and ESOL) and Maths (numeracy). This is lower proportionally than awareness amongst the FEC and ACL respondents
- Less than 1 in 5 WBL respondents had heard of some of the 'other' qualifications and awareness of all these qualifications was generally lower than for FEC and ACL respondents, but, awareness of this group of qualifications was generally low across all contexts
- The awareness of the 'other' qualifications fluctuates significantly per individual qualification – the highest levels being recorded by WBL respondents for the Levels 2 and 3 Awards in preparing to support learning
- Group 1 qualifications – especially the Level 3 and 4 PTLLS - are used much more than group 2 or 3 qualifications by WBL respondents with users for the latter two groupings being too low to warrant detailed analysis
- The Level 3 and 4 PTLLS are both seen as effective ('good' or 'outstanding') by >70% of WBL users; the majority of the remainder finding them satisfactory
- Despite being slightly less well used, the Level 3 and level 4 CTLLS qualifications are also rated effective by two thirds of users; the majority of the remainder finding them satisfactory
- The Level 5 DTLLS qualification is rated effective by 70% of WBL users.

---

<sup>21</sup> The twenty seven qualifications when analysed as a homogenous grouping

### 3.10 Qualifications: a Further Education College context

Detailed data analysis suggests some key findings as follows from the FEC respondents in respect of awareness, usage, effectiveness and benefits of qualifications considered in the survey:

- The FEC respondents scored an overall score of 59% awareness of 'all qualifications<sup>22</sup>' in the survey not significantly different to the overall awareness levels expressed by the WBL (59%) or ACL (62%) respondents
- The FEC respondents had very good levels of awareness of the teaching qualifications, but again not markedly different compared to other groups
- Approximately 60% of the FEC respondents had consistently heard of the nine qualifications described for teachers of English (literacy and ESOL) and Maths (numeracy). This is proportionally higher than awareness amongst the WBL sector but slightly lower than awareness of these qualifications by the ACL sector
- Less than 1 in 5 FEC respondents, but as many as 1 in 3 respondents had heard of some of the 'other' qualifications *i.e.* awareness fluctuated significantly per individual qualification
- Group 1 qualifications – especially the Level 3 and 4 PTLLS - are used much more than group 2 or 3 qualifications by FEC respondents with users for the latter two groupings being too low to warrant detailed analysis
- Out of the teaching qualifications, the Level 3 CTLLS is the least well used qualification by FEC respondents
- All the teaching qualifications are rated effective ('good' or 'outstanding') by FEC users in ascending order as follows: Level 3 PTLLS (90%); Level 3 CTLLS (82%); Level 4 CTLLS (80%); Level 5 DTLLS (80%); and Level 4 PTLLS (74%).

### 3.11 Qualifications: an Adult and Community Learning context

Detailed data analysis suggests some key findings as follows from the ACL respondents in respect of awareness, usage, effectiveness and benefits of qualifications considered in the survey:

- The sector scored an overall score of 62% awareness of 'all qualifications<sup>23</sup>' in the survey slightly higher than (but not significantly different) to the overall awareness levels expressed by the WBL (59%) and FE (62%) respondents
- The ACL respondents had very good levels of awareness of the teaching qualifications, but again not markedly different compared to other groups










<sup>22</sup> The twenty seven qualifications when analysed as a homogenous grouping

<sup>23</sup> The twenty seven qualifications when analysed as a homogenous grouping










- Approximately 65% of the ACL respondents had consistently heard of the nine qualifications described for teachers of English (literacy and ESOL) and Maths (numeracy). This is proportionally higher than awareness amongst the WBL and FE respondents
- Less than 1 in 10, but as many as 1 in 2 ACL respondents had heard of some of the 'other' qualifications *i.e.* awareness fluctuated significantly per individual qualification – the highest level of awareness in evidence for the Level 3 Certificate in learning support
- Group 1 qualifications – especially the Level 3 and 4 PTLLS - are used much more than group 2 or 3 qualifications by ACL respondents with users for the latter two groupings being too low to warrant detailed analysis
- Out of the teaching qualifications, the Level 3 PTLLS is the most used qualification by the ACL respondents followed by Level 4 PTLLS, then Level 5 DTLLS, Level 4 CTLLS and finally Level 3 CTLLS qualifications
- All the teaching qualifications are rated effective ('good' or 'outstanding') by ACL users in ascending order as follows: Level 5 DTLLS (73%); Level 4 PTLLS (68%); Level 3 CTLLS; (58%); Level 3 PTLLS; and attracting least effective ratings were the Level 4 CTLLS. It should be noted, that whilst still overall the ratings from the ACL users could be regarded as broadly effective, overall they were less favourable than effectiveness ratings observed amongst respondents from the WBL and FEC sample.

### 3.12 Attitudinal statements

Six attitudinal statements were included in the survey that aimed to identify high-level impacts of standards and qualifications; the attitudinal statements were aligned with the impact evaluation framework designed for this research and LLUK macro-performance measures in development.

To what extent would you agree with the following statements in relation to the standards and qualifications included in this survey?	All sector % <sup>24</sup>	WBL	FEC	ACL
The standards are well promoted to organisations like mine and the benefits of using them are clear	49%	50% 	55% 	42% 
The qualifications are well promoted to organisations like mine and the benefits of using them are clear	52%	50% 	64% 	58% 
These standards and qualifications are well known by and supported by my employer / membership organisation	69%	71% 	76% 	65% 

<sup>24</sup> Aggregated percentage of those respondents (n=160) that strongly agreed or agreed with this statement

To what extent would you agree with the following statements in relation to the standards and qualifications included in this survey?	All sector % <sup>25</sup>	WBL	FEC	ACL
The standards and qualifications have contributed to creating a higher skilled and more professional workforce in general	79%	73% 	94% 	85% 
These standards and qualifications are up to date and reflective of the roles for whom they are intended in the lifelong learning sector	64%	60% 	76% 	65% 
These standards and qualifications are equally effective and applicable to someone working in the Further Education or Work Based Learning or Adult and Community Learning sectors	58%	62% 	58% 	54% 

These statements, by design, were meant to be high-level and therefore have limitations in terms of being able to identify opinions by specific sets of standards or qualifications, but they do appear to suggest a key issue around a need for raising awareness of particularly the standards, but also the qualifications more effectively to organisations in order to encourage a greater opportunity to then adopt them, use them and ultimately derive benefit.

Areas that LLUK will no doubt be interested to learn more about from respondents are reasons for disagreement about the statements presented. For example, four in ten believe the standards are not sufficiently promoted; over a third feel the qualifications are insufficiently promoted; nearly a fifth of respondents suggest that the standards and qualifications (they are not explicit in this survey about which ones precisely) are perhaps not up to date or reflective of their roles; and just under a third of respondents are clear that the standards and qualifications (if treated as a homogenous group) are not necessarily equally applicable to the FEC, WBL and ACL groups.

### 3.13 Stakeholder interviews

The following section provides a summary of the interviews conducted with key stakeholders with a focus on the strengths and weakness of the standards and qualifications considered in this research study; it should be noted, however, that the majority of the feedback and discussion with stakeholders centred on the teaching standards and qualifications.

- **A review of the teaching qualifications** – stakeholders were keen to suggest a need for a formal review of the teaching qualifications to evolve the current qualifications, their structure and content, the progression routes and to address the issues identified as barriers within the FE sector.
- **Innovative delivery of teaching qualifications** – specifically in relation to the ACL and WBL constituencies, stakeholders suggest a need to review the delivery of the teaching qualifications to reflect the environments in which some practitioners work (

<sup>25</sup> Aggregated percentage of those respondents (n=160) that strongly agreed or agreed with this statement



e.g. 1:1 and workplace teaching experience – not in groups and classroom-based). Furthermore, requirements for the teaching qualifications could be revised and made more flexible to allow those within WBL and ACL environments to produce evidence based on their learning environments and practice.

- **Associate teacher role** – there are some reservations from stakeholders about the relevance of the associate teacher role. For some stakeholders, the role is not well described or understood, based on member feedback, and practitioners view the QTLS route as their main option and the ATLS as not of a *'recognisable'* status. Current data relating to the Professional Formation process – the post-qualification process leading to ATLS and QTLS – indicates that there is some *'reluctance or barrier or misunderstanding about the associate teacher role'*. To date, 670 practitioners have achieved the QTLS status and only 22 the ATLS.
- **Mentoring** – The CETTs<sup>26</sup> network identifies that mentoring programmes for teachers is a valuable support mechanism and one that should continue to be invested in. Furthermore, the network is turning its attention to supporting the teacher educator workforce - *'Who is training the trainers?'* The network of CETTs within England is exploring this concept by introducing on-line communities and CPD opportunities for teacher educators to share good practice. For the network of CETTs, they indicate that there is a potential that this workforce may not receive the relevant support to maintain the high standards and quality of provision expected and thus, new interventions are being implemented.
- **Strategic leadership for the sector** – a number of stakeholders refer for the need to have 'strong' leadership from LLUK – *'strategic leadership'* - and clarity of message, to ensure that future standards and qualifications meet the needs of the FE sector. Furthermore, stakeholders express some concern and 'frustration' that issues raised as part of standards and qualifications development are not being dealt with yet they are impacting on the sector, specifically practitioners and employers.

---

<sup>26</sup> Centres for Excellence in Teacher Training

## 4 Issues to address

The following section outlines the issues highlighted during the research:

### 4.1 The standards

Many respondents (particularly within WBL) feel fully engaged with the standards included in this research however, the attitudinal statements suggest there is a need to increase awareness of standards relevant to the FE sector workforce. We are able to highlight particular issues in relation to the NOS for Learner Involvement and NOS for Community Learning and Development. Awareness levels and usage are the lowest within the standards included in the research and the conversion rates *i.e.* from awareness to usage, are particularly low. Very low numbers of respondents report any specific benefits to their usage. Given the agenda for learner-centred education and the 'learner voice', LLUK may be particularly concerned about this lack of engagement (particularly within the FEC group) identified within this study.

Relevance to role, based on this snapshot of research, is a key factor in the use of standards. There is a perception among some of the respondents to the survey that some of the standards as they stand, are not directly relevant to the roles in which people are working on a day to day basis. This is particularly notable among ACL respondents, and it is a view shared by a number of WBL respondents.

A finding of the research that may raise concerns for LLUK, as an employer-led organisation, relates to how employers view standards. WBL respondents, particularly, state that there is nothing that might encourage them to make greater use of the standards in their job role in future. Not because they are already fully engaged, but, often because of a perception of the standards' irrelevance.

***Working with employers ... they aren't relevant. I wouldn't make more use than I already do.***

Some respondents indicate that usage of the standards does not bring sufficient benefits; wider policy changes to make usage of the standards becoming compulsory may increase usage of the standards however this conversely suggests that practitioners/employers would not make further use of the standards on a voluntary basis.

### 4.2 The relationship between standards and qualifications

Based on the qualitative feedback of the surveys (telephone interviews), the most common use of standards was as a derivative for identifying with, promoting, undertaking and / or delivering appropriate qualifications. Indeed, throughout the survey there was a fair amount of ambiguity or at very least, a general lack of clarity from respondents as to whether they were actually referring to the standards as opposed to the actual qualifications. Respondents to the survey and delegates at the focus groups appear to more readily associate with the qualifications rather than the related standards.

***'We use the standards for our assessors'** – this response was from a focus group employer who upon further discussion meant that they use the assessor qualifications to confirm that their assessors are 'competent' to conduct the job role.*

Two professional market researchers administering the telephone interviews (for the survey) agreed that *'there was a certain lack of distinction between the standards and the qualifications, for example, people saying they did not get involved in professional standards for teachers and then saying they were doing PTLLS'*. This interchange of the terms 'standards' and 'qualifications' was evident in the focus groups and was also evident in previous research conducted by the consultants<sup>27</sup>.

This issue in itself is an interesting insight suggesting that to simply be aware of standards is not the same as actually understanding what the standards describe or indeed their many possible applications for individual practitioners and / or organisations (employers) in the FE sector.

For some time, NOS have been directly related to qualifications (particularly NVQs and Occupational Qualifications such as assessor and verifier qualifications) and this is commonly what employers and practitioners relate to. It is this that we believe may be a contributory factor to the interchange of terms evidenced within this research. NOS are undergoing some reform and qualifications in England and Wales are also evolving due to the requirements of the QCF. Thus, an understanding of the differences between, and the uses of the two distinctly different products – NOS and qualifications – is evidently needed if this sample is to be reflective of the FE sector.

Standards have many applications and can cut across a very wide workforce however, qualifications tend to have a finite market, and from this evidence, relevance to role is key. The range of applications of the standards is vast, and there are examples of good practice, however, employers may not see the diverse usage of the standards as well as stakeholders e.g. sector skills councils and Government agencies.

An issue that has been raised within the research is that qualifications are costly, public subsidy is reducing, and in most cases, not applicable to the qualifications included within this research for the majority of learners, therefore decisions on the use of qualifications becomes a commercial matter for employers and practitioners. Furthermore, if the qualification is not deemed relevant to the role and will not bring net benefits, then this sample would indicate that the use of qualifications is challenged. Some of the negative feedback received during this study emanates from employers 'begrudgingly' having to engage with the teaching qualifications because the legislation requires them to do – they feel like they are being imposed. This is particularly pertinent for the WBL sample as for many years, they have been operating with a workforce that has been considered competent and qualified to provide work-based learning opportunities yet since 2007, additional requirements of the workforce are now being added, at a financial and human resource level.

---

<sup>27</sup> The consultants conducted the recent review of the NOS for Learning and Development and this interchange of terms was often heard at focus groups and consultation events.

### 4.3 The teaching qualifications

**Teaching in context** – WBL respondents report that the new qualifications (and standards) imply that the environment for learning is more formal (classroom-based) ... *‘moving it away from the shop floor’*. WBL employers contributing to the focus groups comment that many of their practitioners are not formally trained in ‘teaching’ (but are occupationally competent) nor have a graduate background and therefore this style of delivery (formal, classroom based) is not suited to some practitioners; it creates a barrier for the learner (the practitioner). Conversely, the ‘formality’ of the new qualifications may also have a negative impact on some programmes where WBL providers are engaged in 1:1 support and vocational training.

***The requirements of the qualifications need to account for practitioners who work on a 1:1 basis.***

The focus groups and some of the stakeholder interviews suggest that the new teaching qualifications have undermined previously valued qualifications that applied to ‘trainers’ and ‘instructors’ within the WBL community. Previously, practitioners were able to achieve smaller units linked to specific aspects of teaching and learning, for example, instructional techniques or coaching and mentoring, yet the new qualifications do not appear to have this ‘bite-sized’ approach to learning.

***The old 740 was a good qualification ...***

For some WBL practitioners, there is a perception that these essential components are *‘lost’* within the new teaching qualifications and that they are not meeting the market’s needs. Indeed, interviews with stakeholders suggests that the new qualifications are not being delivered in a flexible and innovative manner to meet all the FE sectors needs and therefore some of the sector, specifically the WBL and ACL communities, are disengaging from the process.

**Personalised delivery model’** – WBL organisations would welcome a more *‘personalised delivery model’*. A mix and match modular approach to the qualifications with a range of optional pathways linked to core aspects. This would include teaching functions but have more pathways for specific skills and knowledge e.g. instruction, coaching and mentoring, assessing. The current teaching qualifications, in their opinion, do not offer this level of focus for practitioners to gain relevant skills and they do not utilise the flexibility of the QCF to its potential (building programmes around bite-size chunks of learning that easily accessible that can be achieved in the workplace). Stakeholders related to the WBL and ACL communities suggest that there is a need to have a wider range of pathways within the qualifications to cater for specific roles. The current qualifications are *‘too big’* and centres are not being innovative in their delivery to enable this modular type approach. A further suggestion was that the teaching qualifications could extend to developing leadership skills within the WBL community (*‘strategic leadership’*); an area that is considered important but currently WBL organisations report a skills gap.

WBL providers suggest that if centres could have more flexibility on how practitioners can generate the evidence for the qualifications, e.g. via 1:1 situations and delivery in the workplace (*‘on the shop floor’*), then the new qualifications would be more suited to WBL practitioners and employers.

**Structure of the teaching qualifications** - Stakeholders reflect their memberships' and partners' views. A common issue that has arisen is that the current qualifications are 'too big'. This is in respect to the units of assessment being too large (for example, 90 learning hours and 150 learning hours [9 and 15 credits respectively]). Stakeholders suggest that the structure of the qualification could be revised to allow for achievement of more 'modular' based concepts – enabling practitioners to achieve learning in smaller steps. Furthermore, our research highlighted that many practitioners begin the process at the PTLLS stage and then 'jump' to the DTLLS qualification. For some, this step from a level 3 to a level 5 qualification is much too large a step for their learning; suggestions were for a more gradual progression of learning based on individual needs and requirements.

The teaching qualifications are not a sequential framework of qualifications – completing Level 3 PTLLS, to Level 4 CTLLS to then complete Level 5. However, some stakeholders interviewed suggest that this could be a weakness in its design as learners are not progressively developing their skills through the different levels of qualifications and consolidating their learning and practice. Stakeholders explain that learners tend to miss out the CTLLS phase (albeit incorporated into the DTLLS qualification) and this relates to the 'jumping' reference.

It is understood (by the stakeholders) that this would not have a necessary impact on the legislation attached to the teaching standards and qualifications, but it would allow for the qualifications to be reviewed. Stakeholders express concern that some constituencies within the FE sector (WBL and ACL) are not catered for by the teaching qualifications and that a review would allow for this to be addressed; this research being part of the evidence-base for reform.

Stakeholders welcome the recent proposal to include the newly revised assessor qualifications as part of the optional suite of units of assessment for the CTLLS and DTLLS qualifications. This initiative would address the concerns from WBL practitioners; the assessor qualifications can also be achieved independently as well as part of the teaching qualifications therefore retaining flexibility for practitioners.

***Ideally, a review is what's needed.***

Awarding organisations need to re-accredit the current provision before August 2010 and, stakeholders indicate that the review is needed to address the wider issues highlighted in this research (*i.e.* adapting the qualifications to meet the needs of the WBL and ACL constituencies). Furthermore, stakeholders also suggest that the current qualifications are 'too big'; the structure of the qualification could be revised to allow for achievement of more 'modular' based concepts – enabling practitioners to achieve learning in smaller steps.

***If something isn't fit for purpose ... maybe a change is needed,  
for the sake of the sector.***

Some stakeholders interviewed describe the 'framework' of teaching qualifications as non-progressive and suggest that practitioners have to 'jump' from Level 3 to Level 5 qualifications as part of the pathway to becoming a teacher; contradicting the values of teaching as being learner-centred and a supportive system, allowing time to consolidate learning.

**Micro-teaching** - The use of micro-teaching is considered relevant where this can be used effectively however some stakeholders express that this creates an obstacle for some parts of the sector (WBL particularly). Furthermore, reliance on it as a method of assessment should not be the only method of assessing performance of practitioners. An alternative solution was to use micro teaching as one method to develop confidence in new practitioners and then *'everything else should hang from that'* rather than having the micro teaching element as the summative component of assessment *'at the very end of the programme'*.

#### 4.4 Market need

For both standards and qualifications, there is a requirement to demonstrate a market need. This does not necessarily mean a 'large' market as volume may not be a determining factor. The findings of this research indicate that some of the qualifications tested are not at this time, 'hitting' the market and engaging employers; some awarding organisations are not experiencing the volume of learners anticipated at the development stage.

Standards have a wide range of uses and therefore their promotion to the FE sector requires, based on this evidence, further investment. Newness to market can explain low usage of standards however, if there was a demand from employers, we may have seen more awareness and usage for some of the NOS included within the study.

#### 4.5 Strategic leadership

##### **"Driven by legislation"**

Of one of the stakeholder interviews conducted, a very pertinent point was described in relation to how the FE sector operates. The interviewee suggested that the impact of legislation attached to the sector's qualifications is *'dictating behaviour'*. In essence, practitioners, specifically within the WBL sector have to fulfil two requirements:

- One requirement is attached to contractual funding for provision – this 'dictates' the need to achieve the teaching qualifications.
- The other requirement relates to the delivery of qualifications (and the NVQ Code of Practice) – this 'dictates' the need to achieve the assessor and verifier qualifications.

The view of the interviewee was that this is creating an additional burden on WBL practitioners (specifically) and that the current system of qualification delivery is not flexible enough to meet practitioners needs. The interviewee was keen to stress that there was not a desire to challenge or change the legislation but there was a need to review how the qualifications were delivered and whether the qualifications could be structured to make more effective use of the flexibilities of the QCF.

Stakeholders involved in this research have stated that they are looking for some '*strategic leadership*' (from LLUK) to address the issues highlighted in this research. Some stakeholders express '*frustration*' that issues are not being addressed within the sector, recognising that these may be challenging issues, but there is a need to explore them and challenge issues to ensure the FE sector continues to provide a high quality of service. There remains a concern (from some stakeholders) that the 'picture' of the standards is confusing for practitioners and employers within the FE sector.

***Why is there not one set of standards for practitioners to refer to ... there are three sets that could be used [the Professional standards, Learning and Development and Learning Delivery].***

Although not a major part of the survey for this research (owing to their recent review), WBL providers engaged in the focus groups and some of the stakeholders interviewed consider the *NOS for Learning and Development* and the assessor and verifier qualifications as more applicable to the WBL community and the new professional standards are more college related. Respondents express concern that it is not clear which standards apply to what practitioners; even when it is understood, it is bureaucratic and duplicative.

Furthermore, some stakeholders have strong views about the applicability and relevance of the *Professional standards* to the whole FE sector:

***The Professional standards are outputs for initial teacher training ... and not occupational standards that describe the requirements of job roles.***

One respondent commented:

***I question the wisdom of having standards ... they would be better being guidance.***

Relating to the need for more innovative delivery, stakeholders comment that the teaching qualifications are very open to varied interpretations and there is a need for more guidance and steer within the sector to support awarding organisations and providers.

***The qualifications themselves are okay ... it's the delivery models and requirements of the qualifications that require attention.***

These comments were not offered by the stakeholders as destructive criticism. They have been shared as part of this research to encourage the need for some leadership on behalf of a wide sector (and in collaboration and partnership with key stakeholders). For the stakeholders, the following quotes summarises the collective feeling about standards and qualifications for the FE sector:

***We have been looking for an overarching framework of standards and qualifications for providers to fit into ... we don't have it and the sector is confused.***

***The qualifications need to reflect the different contexts that exist within the sector.***

***The qualifications and the delivery models need to 'fit around' the whole sectors needs ... and allow for contextualisation.***

## 4.6 Financial 'impact'

Many practitioners in the WBL community need to have an assessor qualification **and** the relevant teaching qualification to comply with LSC contractual requirements. This has brought additional costs to employers (and practitioners) and is also time intensive as WBL providers comment that their staff (practitioners) now have to attend colleges/universities for the delivery of the teaching qualifications. This requires practitioners to be away from the 'day job' of delivering the contracted training and therefore WBL providers are experiencing challenges to their capacity to deliver provision. Previous provision allowed practitioners to learn within the workplace and minimal time was necessary to attend the local college - 'often, tutors came to the workplace'. Furthermore, this impact also reiterated the point that much of the learning for the teaching qualifications was conducted in a formal group setting and this was not necessarily appropriate for the WBL environment.

***Cost. Quite a lot of people want to do PTLLS and they can't afford it – small businesses. Also, precluded by rules saying they have to work in certain sectors.***

Funding to universities for the delivery of the PTLLS/CTLLS/DTLLS qualifications has been reduced and this has increased the costs of the programmes (ultimately to learners/employers). The qualifications are becoming more expensive for WBL providers to offer and deliver as this funding subsidy is reduced.

Providers (WBL) at the focus groups comment that the group 2 qualifications (literacy and numeracy) can have an impact on terms and conditions (salary requests) as they have experienced school teachers transferring to this market and 'commanding' a higher salary than normally offered; it was also noted that practitioners use the level (Level 5) of the qualifications in group 2 to negotiate higher salaries/payments.

## 4.7 Perceptions

Accurate or otherwise, but the research has highlighted (from stakeholders and the focus groups) that there are some very strong opinions about the suitability of the teaching qualifications to the whole FE sector; specifically the WBL and ACL groups. Attitudinal statements in the survey (~one third) also suggest that some of the standards are not equally applicable across the three defined groups. Some WBL organisations and practitioners do consider the teaching qualifications as 'academic' and not reflective of the WBL community (specifically). There is a 'stigma' associated with the new qualifications in that previous qualifications in the FE sector are not as relevant and/or equal. This is developing perceptions that previous provision is not good enough and has little parity – 'snobbery about academia'.

***Don't reinforce the class system through the reform programme – making it academic will only reinforce the prejudices that exist across the FE sector.***

The stakeholder interviews reveal a deeper understanding of the perceptions as they relate to how the differing contexts operate. Some stakeholders suggest that the teaching



qualifications are more easily implemented within the FE college sector because practitioners have defined roles and it is clear who the qualifications apply to. Within the WBL group (and the ACL), practitioners have multiple roles and may not consider the primary role to be that of a teacher (often sessional and instructor based) yet the qualifications are applicable according to the legislation. This is creating some negativity as practitioners and employers in the WBL and ACL groups do not consider themselves in a 'full' or even 'associate' teaching role. Within the ACL group, practitioners are often specialists in their field and the teaching qualifications are considered an excessive burden for the role they fulfil. For example, one stakeholder described how an adult education teacher may have delivered pottery classes or upholstery classes for 25-30 years. The notion of taking a formal qualification to continue delivering this provision, in their words ... *'we'll just lose them'*.

## 4.8 Standardisation

A number of respondents to the survey refer to the qualifications introducing standardisation across the entire FE sector. This is generally welcomed however, it is apparent that this term is being mixed with that of benchmarking and the two terms are therefore difficult to interpret. For some aspects of the FE sector, especially within the ACL and parts of the WBL community, this standardisation has not been received as positively – collectively bringing the three groups (FEC, WBL and ACL) together under one 'standard' is not considered appropriate. The research highlights numerous references that the qualifications are not reflective of the needs within WBL and ACL and that the current provision is not sufficient – for example, lacking provision that develops the skills to assess competence in the workplace. Some practitioners within the WBL and ACL communities do not consider themselves 'teachers' therefore this 'standardisation' issue requires further exploration.

Furthermore, this links to the contextualisation of the qualifications to meet practitioner's environments. The evidence within this study suggests that the standardisation is more geared to suiting the FE college environment and not reflective of the range of environments found within the ACL and WBL situations. The qualifications are well known and usage is evident across the sector however, for some within the ACL and WBL communities, the standardisation has created an FE college focus and not reflective of the needs of practitioners and employers within their contexts.

## 5 Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the evidence generated from this 'snapshot' research activity and are focussed on the three research aims:

1. To identify strengths and weaknesses of the standards and qualifications
2. Explore the use of the standards and qualifications by practitioners and employers
3. Identify any issues to be addressed related to awareness and utilisation of the standards and qualifications.

It should be noted that our conclusions will distinguish between standards and qualifications, where appropriate, as the two products have different purposes and applications albeit they are inextricably linked.

### 5.1 Strengths and weaknesses of the standards

Our findings from the research suggest that the FE sector, inclusive of FEC, WBL and ACL practitioners and employers, identify a number of strengths of the standards included within the survey. Respondents suggest that standards are particularly useful for the following purposes:

- **Professionalisation (and recognition)** - many respondents to the research believe the standards have enabled better skills and knowledge development and a higher level of professionalism across the FE sector
- **Benchmarking** – across the range of fieldwork, the introduction of the *Professional standards* (particularly), has created a relevant benchmark across the FE sector
- **Monitoring and assessment of performance** – employers suggest the standards included within the research allow for a more consistent monitoring and assessment of staff performance and the standards can be used as part of the appraisal process
- **Improved role awareness** – respondents express a greater understanding of the demands of the 'teaching' role, due to the *Professional standards*.

Specific benefits of the standards highlighted by respondents (as an homogenous group) include:

- Helping practitioners/staff develop knowledge and skills for their role
- Helping users provide an improved experience for learners *i.e.* by using the standards as a 'good practice' guide and applying that practice in their work
- Contributing to practitioners'/staffs' own sense of professionalism in the lifelong learning sector
- Helping practitioners/staff improve the quality of teaching/practice they provide

- Helping practitioners/staff with career development/continuing professional development planning and progression.

The research has highlighted that awareness of the standards is varied with high levels of awareness (across the sample) of the *Professional standards* and NOS for Learning and Development (92% and 82% respectively) down to low levels of awareness – NOS for Learner Involvement (54%) and NOS for Community Learning and Development (49%). FEC respondents were more likely than WBL who in turn were more likely than ACL respondents to have an awareness of all the standards included within the research. Furthermore, practitioners were slightly more likely to have an awareness of the standards than organisational respondents.

Based on these results, not all the FE sector has an awareness of some of the standards yet they may be applicable to their practice. This does suggest that an awareness-raising intervention may be required to increase the levels of awareness of some of the standards across the FE sector. A key factor identified with the research is the perceived relevance of the standards. Practitioners and employers suggest that if standards are not considered relevant to their practice, the standards are not used (despite having awareness of them).

## 5.2 Uses of the standards

Standards have a wide application and respondents to this research confirmed a range of uses within their practice, for example:

- linked to the associated qualifications
- for recruitment activity
- writing job descriptions
- to create training plans
- assessing and monitoring staff
- quality assurance of provision
- to provide a quality learning experience
- for 'general' use in job roles.

An interesting statistic that can be reported from this research is that of conversion *i.e.* how many practitioners and employers actually use the standards if they are aware of them. The data collected in this research shows a high conversion statistic for the *Professional standards* (73% conversion from awareness to use) whereas data for the other standards indicate a much lower level (~one-third or less). It should be noted that if standards are not (perceived) relevant, they would not be used by practitioners or employers (even if aware of them).

## 5.3 Strengths and weaknesses of the qualifications

Based on the views expressed in this research, the introduction of the teaching qualifications has been welcomed and is contributing to the professionalisation of the industry as a whole. A number of benefits of the qualifications included within this research include:

- **The professionalisation of the industry** – by having a recognised group of qualifications specifically for the FE sector
- **Recognition and benchmarking** – valuing the skills of practitioners and employers within the FE sector using a consistent set of qualifications
- **Improving practice** – increased awareness and application of teaching methods within the FE sector; motivating practitioners to use new methods.

Data collected relating to the effectiveness of the qualifications offered suggests that learners are generally satisfied with the provision. Two-thirds to three-quarters of respondents rate the teaching qualifications as good or outstanding. Slightly higher levels of satisfaction were recorded for the specialist teaching qualifications and a wide range (20%-100%) of satisfaction was recorded for the group 3 qualifications however the sample sizes are particularly small.

One of the most encouraging findings of the survey results was the opinion expressed by 79% of the 160 respondents that the standards and qualifications developed since 2007 have contributed to creating a higher skilled and more professional workforce in general – one of the most important impacts that LLUK hoped would accrue as a result of the use of standards and qualifications in the FE sector.

The weaknesses associated with the qualifications included within this research centre around the teaching qualifications. Based on the feedback received in the focus groups and from the stakeholder interviews, there have been highlighted a number of issues relating to the delivery of the teaching qualifications, specifically to WBL and ACL practitioners. The methods of delivery are primarily (reported) as being delivered in group settings within a FE college (or university) environment; different to the environments utilised by WBL practitioners specifically. The weakness identified resonates around the flexibility of the providers to allow learning to take place in other environments *'within the workplace'*. Furthermore, many WBL and ACL practitioners operate on a 1:1 basis and this does not appear to be adopted within the current provision as a mechanism for teaching as provision is delivered and assessed within group environments.

Employers, practitioners and stakeholders do question the *'overuse'* of the micro teaching methods as a summative assessment method and not offering alternative methods to confirm performance/competence. Again, this issue was reported primarily by WBL respondents as they would like to see more variety of assessment used to generate evidence for the teaching qualifications e.g. instruction practice in the workplace, 1:1 teaching methods (in the workplace) and also less reliance on written assignments and *'more doing'*.

Stakeholders and employers (mainly WBL respondents within the focus groups) suggest that the current teaching qualifications are *'too big'*. The current structure of the qualifications (in terms of credit value) does not enable learners to acquire small units of learning (achievement) and furthermore, the focus on specific methods used within WBL, for example coaching and mentoring techniques, instruction and demonstration, appear *'lost'* within the current teaching qualifications (implicit rather than explicit).

## 5.4 Uses of the qualifications

Awareness and use of the qualifications included in this study is dominated by references to the teaching qualifications (PTLLS/CTLLS/DTLLS); 93%-95% awareness and nearly 20,000 learners achieving the qualifications (Levels 3-5). Furthermore, qualitative data collected from all the research interventions indicate for the WBL community specifically, the assessor and verifier qualifications (from the *Learning and Development* suite) are highly valued; 82% awareness and high volume of qualification take-up (more than 13,000 learners achieving assessor qualifications and 3,000 verifier qualifications achievements).

There are significant 'drivers' associated with these two sets of qualifications – legislation and funding requirements. For any practitioners involved in the delivery of Government funded provision (via the LSC), the teaching qualifications are a requirement for engagement. Similarly, practitioners and providers engaged in the delivery of NVQs (and WBL provision) are required to use the assessor and verifier qualifications for the purposes of quality assurance (linked to the NVQ Code of Practice and awarding organisation's requirements).

Conversion statistics for awareness of the qualifications to use of the qualifications reveal that the teaching qualifications have the highest rate of conversion (~40%-60%) whereas the specialist teaching qualifications and the group 3 qualifications have conversion rates of less than 20%.

## 5.5 Issues to address

The research has highlighted a number of positive messages indicating that the standards and qualifications (specifically in relation to teaching) are performing well and providing benefits to practitioners and employers within the FE sector. However, the research has generated a number of issues that require attention and these focus on the teaching qualifications:

- **Barriers** - There are some noticeable barriers to take-up of the qualifications and usage of the standards within certain FE sector communities; mainly WBL and ACL. Relevance to role appears to be a key factor in using any standards or qualifications; if perceived as not relevant, practitioners and employers tend not to engage. Some barriers are perceptual – '*academic*' qualifications and not relevant to the WBL role, whereas, some barriers relate to how suitable the teaching qualifications are to WBL and ACL roles. WBL employers and stakeholders specifically perceive the teaching qualifications as more suited to the FE college environment where there are clear and distinct roles e.g. lecturers (teachers) and support staff.

For some within the FE sector, there is some confusion about the distinction between standards and qualifications and therefore the diverse applications of standards may not be fully understood. Furthermore, the applicability of qualifications for practitioners and employers perhaps requires further exploration to understand which parts of the FE sector is the focussed market for some qualifications.

- **Delivery modes of the teaching qualifications** – Stakeholders and WBL employers suggest that the current modes of delivery of the teaching qualifications are not suited to some practitioners within the FE sector. Generally, college and university providers are delivering the qualifications in formal learning environments, in group settings and classroom-based. Stakeholders specifically suggest this is not reflective of the ‘context’ in which WBL and ACL practitioners and employers operate and this requires attention. Furthermore, the micro-teaching component is also considered a less-than flexible approach to assessment and the delivery of qualifications and more acceptance that work-based teaching environments can generate appropriate evidence for the qualifications.
- **Structure of the teaching qualifications** – Stakeholders and some employers (particularly WBL) suggest the current structure of the teaching qualifications does not allow achievement in small ‘bite-sized’ chunks. WBL employers (and supported by related stakeholders) would welcome a more ‘modular-based’ approach to the qualification describing the current structure as containing units that are ‘too big’ and not including key aspects pertinent to the WBL community e.g. coaching and mentoring, instruction and demonstration and presentation skills. Focus group delegates and stakeholders suggest that the current teaching qualifications are not maximising the potential of the QCF<sup>28</sup> and the ability to build qualifications using a series of ‘building blocks’ (units of assessment).
- **Teaching practice** - The teaching practice demands of the CTLLS and DTLLS qualifications are considered prohibitive and not inclusive of differing learning environments within the FE sector; predominantly voiced by WBL respondents and the stakeholders. Respondents within the WBL and ACL contexts specifically suggest that the inclusion of 1:1 teaching and work-based teaching should be acceptable forms of teaching practice and furthermore, teaching within a ‘funded’ environment is creating a barrier to generating the required teaching practice component.
- **Strategic leadership** – Stakeholders particularly are seeking ‘strategic leadership’ for the sector to address the issues highlighted in this research and to establish a coherent framework of standards and qualifications for the FE sector; a key strategic requirement. Currently, based on this snapshot of research, practitioners and stakeholders comment that it is confusing as to which standards to use (WBL respondents specifically relate to the *Professional standards, NOS for Learning and Development* and *NOS for Learning Delivery*) and greater clarity is required.

This strategic leadership may also provide two other distinct roles – as an appropriate mechanism to address issues relating to funding for qualifications; a lobbying role is required to work with funding organisations to represent the employers within the FE sector. And, to implement a clear communications strategy to the FE sector (and wider sector audience) to promote standards and qualifications, to address perceptions that may not be accurate and to provide a central point for accurate information about standards and qualifications in the future.

---

<sup>28</sup> Qualifications and Credit Framework

## 6 Recommendations

The following section proposes some recommendations for action based on the findings of this research. The structure of this section is to provide a key action (the recommendation) with a qualifying statement that articulates why the recommendation is being made. Some of the recommendations address a number of issues identified within the research as this may avoid duplication of work and enable effective management of actions in the future.

---

### **Recommendation** – Promotion and awareness-raising

LLUK to work with key stakeholders (e.g. ALP, AoC, NIACE, IfL) to deliver a clear and consistent communications campaign that advocates the range of benefits of using standards and qualifications.

Only 49% of FE sector respondents in this research felt that the standards were promoted sufficiently to organisations like theirs, and 52% felt that qualifications were sufficiently well promoted. Nor were the benefits or understanding of the distinctions between standards and qualifications sufficiently clear within this research suggesting a clear mandate for more effective marketing and communications activity in future.

The intention of this recommendation would be to address some of the barriers indicated within the research, for example, lack of relevance to role, perception that the teaching qualifications are 'academic' and more relevant to FE college staff, standardisation across the FE sector and how the different contexts can be embraced.

This recommendation could also provide an outlet to share some of the many positive messages received as part of this research and to share good practice across the sector. Case studies of standards use and the benefits of the qualifications would help LLUK engage with its direct representative workforce and also with other sectors that do not sit within the LLUK 'footprint' but use some of the standards and qualifications (particularly the teaching-related ones). We would also recommend that part of the communication strategy would involve tailored promotional materials for differing audiences to share the findings of this research.

### **Recommendation** – Establish targets for monitoring of impact

LLUK to work with key stakeholders (as above) and awarding organisations to establish short, medium and long-term targets for standards and qualifications to develop an understanding of the market and assess impact over time.

To assess if any product has had an impact requires a series of measures to understand awareness, usage, understanding, benefits and change in practice. At this time, there is no expectation or indication of what a positive impact would be with regards standards and qualifications. Furthermore, owing to the diversity of the FE sector, it is suggested that where possible, data is recorded for each of the contexts (FEC, WBL, ACL) to understand any inter-sector differences (as has been indicated in this research).

As a point of learning for future studies it may be worth trying to develop wider contact database sources / survey distribution networks in order to engage with a greater sample of practitioners and employers within the FE sector (e.g. community and learning development practitioners, learning support practitioners and coaches / mentors who did not feature in great volume in this particular snapshot sample).

**Recommendation** – To conduct a review of the teaching qualifications

LLUK to work with awarding organisations, providers and key stakeholders to conduct a formal review of the teaching qualifications.

The teaching qualifications were introduced in 2007 with a remit to aid the professionalisation of the FE sector. The current qualifications are due for re-accreditation on the QCF therefore awarding organisations will be conducting their own reviews to ensure they can continue to meet the market demand; evidence from this research suggests that the teaching qualifications have a high volume market at Level 3 PTLLS and Level 4 CTLLS with potential for Level 5 DTLLS to grow as teachers progress.

It is our proposal that a broader review is conducted, involving all key stakeholders, as there are some wider issues to address based on this research and on previous research conducted within the review of the NOS for Learning and Development<sup>29</sup>.

The review could address a number of issues highlighted in this research:

- To explore new and more innovative methods of delivering the qualifications to accommodate WBL and ACL practitioners specifically; to embrace 1:1 teaching methods, workplace learning environments and the effective use of micro-teaching methods.
- To consider the structure of the qualifications to allow for more bite-sized achievement and utilising the QCF mechanisms to provide flexible and bespoke qualifications that meet the needs of the diverse workforce within the FE sector.
- To review the teaching practice requirements of the qualifications to establish if other opportunities can be used to generate evidence of good teaching practice, for example, 1:1 teaching/instructing, workplace learning environments (*'on the shop floor'*) and non-funded<sup>30</sup> learning opportunities.

<sup>29</sup> Research conducted for LLUK by the consultants in a previous project during March 2009-March 2010.

<sup>30</sup> Currently, the broad understanding is that teaching practice has to be conducted within a (mainly) LSC funded learning environment; practitioners, specifically within the WBL and ACL communities may not have access to this type of environment on a regular basis but may still perform teaching functions within other forums.



This recommendation is not intended to challenge the current legislation for teaching qualifications in the FE sector, this has been warmly received, however, dialogue is recommended with Government departments and agencies to ensure that any review is respectful of the existing legislation and funding requirements.

**Recommendation** – To further develop strategic actions for the sector

LLUK to work with its partners and key stakeholders within education (specifically the FE sector) to provide an effective ‘voice’ for the FE sector, to work with partners on developing new products (standards and qualifications) that are required within the FE sector and to provide a clear mechanism of action to address challenges and issues evident within the FE sector.

Stakeholders and employers within the FE sector are calling for ‘strategic leadership’ for the sector to establish a simple and coherent framework of standards and qualifications that are ‘fit for purpose’ within the FE sector. This recommendation would address the issue of ‘confusion’ within the FE sector - which standards and qualifications are appropriate - to avoid divisive developments that split-up the sectors differing contexts (e.g. the use of the NOS for Learning and Development and NOS for Learning Delivery, and, the new qualifications for assessors and verifiers).

Employers express concern that public subsidy for some of the qualifications, but specifically the teaching qualifications, is reducing and causing further tension on existing demands within the sector. Employers and stakeholders are looking to LLUK to provide leadership for the sector and to challenge Government to consider how it can support the FE workforce through a balanced approach of employer-learner contribution matched with some public subsidy.

This research also offers an opportunity for LLUK to ‘trail-blaze’ within the Alliance of Sector Skills Councils and to lead a forum that may explore a more consistent measure of ‘impact’ across SSCs that could contribute to the sharing of good practice, data and intelligence with regards the performance of standards and qualifications in the future.

**Recommendation** – Exploration of standards and qualifications usage

LLUK to share the findings of this research and to establish any need to further explore some of the low usage and take-up of some of the NOS and qualifications within this research.

It is evident from this research that there is a good awareness of some of the standards and usage, particularly the *Professional standards*. However, the use of the NOS for Learner Involvement and NOS for Community Learning and Development, specifically within the FEC sample, received particularly low levels of engagement (conversion from awareness to usage). We air some caution with this recommendation as the sample size is small, however, given the nature of these standards and their applicability to the FE sector as a whole, these findings may warrant further investigation.

Similarly, the current data suggests that some qualifications may not be performing as anticipated – low take-up, limited availability based on market need, lack of relevance to roles within the FE sector. For some qualifications, they are new to the market and the data collected does not indicate registrations therefore there may be cohorts of learners within the education system but achievement may not have been gained at this time.

What is perhaps pertinent to this recommendation is the need to be very clear about what the market is, supported by robust market intelligence to inform commercial decisions and for future development of standards and qualifications to be based on a clear market need. Furthermore, and reiterating previous points, the need to have context-specific intelligence will provide information that can help implementation of standards and qualifications and market penetration.

**Recommendation** – Providing support to teachers and the teacher educator workforce

The CETTs identify that mentoring can be a valuable resource to support new teachers within the FE sector. The establishment of a resourced mentoring programme to support trainee teachers is considered as one mechanism to support teachers.

There are expressions from stakeholders that the teacher educator workforce (practitioners delivering the qualifications) should be supported – *‘having the potential to be forgotten’*. Partners would welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with LLUK and other stakeholders to provide a support network and resources for this emerging community of practitioners.

The CETTs network has invested resources into providing mentoring systems to support teachers and researching best practice; the general view is that this type of support mechanism for teachers is valued. The integration of mentoring into the workplace requires investment by employers and Lucas and Unwin (2009)<sup>31</sup> comment that initial teacher education needs to be much more closely integrated within colleges’ broader workforce development strategies. Their research indicates a need for much greater attention to be paid to the way in which workplace practices and the organisation of teachers’ roles and responsibilities might need to change in order to accommodate their professional development.

***... there is a significant gap between the rhetoric of gaining teaching qualifications through a work-based route and the reality experienced by many in-service trainees. Consideration of the role of the workplace as the context for teacher training and professional development is currently absent from the reform process.***

Some of the CETTs are establishing ‘teacher educator communities’ to offer a network of interactive support via a range of mediums and forums. This aspect of support has been identified by the CETTs having explored issues relating to supporting new teachers into the FE sector yet the workforce delivering the (teaching) qualifications receives minimal support and guidance.

<sup>31</sup> Lucas N and Unwin L (2009) *Developing teacher expertise at work: in-service trainee teachers in colleges of further education in England*, Journal of Further and Higher Education, Vol. 33, No 4, 423-433

## 7 Appendices

### Appendix A – Impact Assessment Framework (approved January 2010)

Evaluation Theme	Helps us understand	Success Measure
<b>Performance of standards and qualifications</b>		
<b>Awareness</b>	How well known the S&Q are amongst practitioners	S&Q that are well known amongst the target audience
<b>Engagement in design and development</b>	Extent to which intended audience help shape S&Q to meet needs	S&Q that are well used because they have been developed through consultation with the target audience
<b>Usage / Non-Usage</b>	The practical application of S&Q by users and reasons for non-usage (by sub-sector / constituency / agreed spatial level e.g. region)	Evidence of practical use of S&Q by the users for whom they are intended
In evaluating the performance of S&Q any primary survey work with users / non-users would need to be complemented by 'baseline' or other performance data made available from LLUK e.g. uptake and achievement of standards / qualifications where available for each one		
<b>Outcomes of standards and qualifications</b>		
<b>Benefits for the individual practitioner / employee (e.g. teacher)</b>	The benefits of using S&Q as perceived by practitioners	Impacts realised for practitioners in the way intended – <b>see Annex overleaf</b>
<b>Benefits for the employer organisation</b>	The benefits of using or supporting S&Q as perceived by employers	Impacts realised for employers in the way intended i.e. achievement of LLUK's strategic objective to produce NOS and qualifications that meet employers' needs
<b>Benefits for the learner in receipt of service from the practitioner / employee (e.g. the student taught by the teacher)<sup>32</sup></b>	The benefits to learners of S&Q being used by employers and practitioners in their work	Impacts realised for learners in the way intended e.g. better completion and success rates
<b>Strategic impacts</b>	Extent to which intended impacts are being achieved i.e. mapped against LLUK strategic objectives and 'macro' measures of performance	<i>E.g.</i> more mobile lifelong learning workforce; better teaching; higher skilled workforce; more career choices; more motivated workforce; simplified skills system
<b>Additionality</b>	Any evidence that unexpected benefits have been derived through use of S&Q	Benefits not anticipated / intended / considered in the macro or micro measures of success for S&Q
<b>Development of Standards and Qualifications</b>		
<b>Strengths and weaknesses</b>	The positive and negative aspects of the S&Q	S&Q that are highly regarded and recognised for their effectiveness and relevance to the job roles for which they were intended

<sup>32</sup> The Impact project commissioned to WA Consultancy will not provide an opportunity to research this specific learner audience

<b>Barriers to take up</b>	Factors that impact on whether S&Q are adopted / undertaken by the sector	Evidence that the S&Q are accessible and that any barriers are addressed
<b>Continuous Improvement and learning lessons</b>	Practical suggestions that may lead to improved S&Q performance and impact	Beneficiaries continuously engaged to shape and improve S&Q to reflect changing sector needs in future

### Framework Annex: Suggested S&Q impact ('micro') measures for practitioners

Ideally the standards should have an impact in the following ways on individuals in the sector (e.g. teachers)	Ideally the qualifications should have an impact in the following ways on individuals in the sector (e.g. teachers)
Help them to undertake a self assessment of their competences against their job role	Help them refresh, keep up to date and / or fill an identified gap in their skills, knowledge and understanding useful to their job role
Help them develop their knowledge and skills for their job role	Help them develop brand new skills, knowledge or understanding that has enabled them to apply that learning in new, additional or different ways in their job role
Help them improve their performance and impact positively on their practice	Help them formally recognise and record their competence as a practitioner building on any previous learning they may have completed
Help them gain credit or recognition for their achievements (from their employer or peers)	Help them gain credit or recognition for their achievements (from their employer or peers)
Help them improve the quality of teaching / practice they provide	Have them improve the quality of teaching / practice they provide
Help them with their career development / continuing professional development planning and progression	Help them with career development / continuing professional development planning and progression
Help them to identify / select qualifications that relate to their work needs / job role	Provide them with something that is transferable i.e. the qualification has a value and regard not only in their current job but within the wider sector perhaps for their future
Help them ultimately provide an improved experience for learners i.e. by using the Standards as a 'good practice' guide and applying that practice in their work	Help them ultimately provide an improved experience for learners i.e. the application of learning from the qualification in teaching, training etc
Help them gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement	Help them gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement
Contribute to their own sense of professionalism as a practitioner in the lifelong learning sector	Contribute to their own sense of professionalism as a practitioner in the lifelong learning sector
	Contribute to their desire to do further learning and perhaps further (higher / different) qualifications in future
<i>Other benefits and impacts may be described and these would be regarded as 'additional impacts'</i>	<i>Other benefits and impacts may be described and these would be regarded as 'additional impacts'</i>

## Appendix B – The research survey

### Impact of standards and qualifications survey 2010

#### Introduction

This survey has been designed for completion by practitioners working in Further Education Institutions, Work Based Learning provider and Adult and Community Learning provider organisations. It aims to capture your views about a range of standards and qualifications that Lifelong Learning UK has developed since 2007. The survey hopes to determine what sort of impact these standards and qualifications are having on the type of organisations (employers) and practitioners (employees) for whom they are intended. The survey can be completed from one of two perspectives depending on your role:

1. As an individual ‘practitioner’ e.g. a teacher/tutor/trainer who might use the standards and qualifications described
  2. As someone in your organisation with responsibility for staff who might use the standards and qualifications described.
- The survey may take between 10 and 30 minutes to complete.
  - All data is being collected in strictest confidence by an independent market research organisation and as such no personal data or responses you provide will be passed on to any third party without your express permission.
  - The survey period is 1<sup>st</sup> February to 19<sup>th</sup> February 2010.
  - If you would prefer one of the research team to contact you by telephone instead of completing this survey online please contact [chris@skyblueresearch.co.uk](mailto:chris@skyblueresearch.co.uk) with your contact information and a preferred interview date and time for interview.

#### Section 1: Contact Information and Classification

1.1	Your Name			
1.2	Your Job Title			
1.3	Your Organisation			
1.4	Your Address			
1.5	Post Code			
1.6	Your Telephone			
1.7	Your Email			
1.8	Main location of your organisation	<input type="checkbox"/> North East	<input type="checkbox"/> North West	<input type="checkbox"/> Yorkshire and the Humber
		<input type="checkbox"/> East Midlands	<input type="checkbox"/> West Midlands	<input type="checkbox"/> East of England
		<input type="checkbox"/> London	<input type="checkbox"/> South East	<input type="checkbox"/> South West
1.9	Total size of workforce employed by your organisation (all staff)			

1.7	Which of the following best describes your organisation (please tick <u>one</u> only)		
i.	Further Education Institution (FE College or Sixth Form College)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ii.	Work Based Learning Provider	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iii.	Adult and Community Learning Provider	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iv.	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	
v.	If other, please describe:		

1.8 Which of the following best describes your <b>primary job role</b> (please tick <u>one</u> only)					
i.	Teacher (includes teacher, tutor, trainer, lecturer)	<input type="checkbox"/>	ii.	Associate Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii.	Assessor	<input type="checkbox"/>	iv.	Coach / Mentor	<input type="checkbox"/>
v.	Programme / Course Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>	vi.	Senior Manager / Director	<input type="checkbox"/>
vii.	Head of Department / Faculty / Curriculum Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>	viii.	Quality Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
ix.	Community and Learning Development Practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	x.	Learning Support Practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>
xi.	Learning Development / Training Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>	xii.	Training / Freelance consultant	<input type="checkbox"/>
xiii.	Other, please state:	<input type="checkbox"/>			

## Section 2: Views about standards

### Question 2.1:

Please complete the table below for each of the standards described as fully and honestly as you can.

- If you are aware of and use one or more of the standards described please complete question 2.1 in full and then continue to questions 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.6
- If you are aware of any of the standards listed but do not use any of them please go to question 2.5
- If you are unaware of any of the standards listed please go to question 2.6

Qu.	Standards	Awareness Prior to this survey had you heard of these standards? <i>Please tick if yes</i>	Usage Prior to this survey have you used these standards in your job? <i>Please tick if yes</i>	Example of usage Can you please provide <u>one</u> <u>example</u> of how you have used these standards in your job / organisation?
2.1.1	Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.2	NOS* for Learning Support Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.3	NOS for Community Learning and Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.4	NOS for Learner Involvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.1.5	NOS for Learning Delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>		
2.1.6	NOS for Learning and Development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

\* NOS - National Occupational Standards

### Question 2.2:

- Please answer this question only if you have used one or more of the standards previously described.
- All other respondents please go to question 2.5.

For each standard you have used please tell us whether they have had any of the benefits described in the table for you as an individual or for staff in your organisation (*tick all boxes that apply if yes*).

Qu.	Benefits from usage of standards...	Professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector	NOS for Learning Support Staff	NOS for Community Learning and Development	NOS for Learner Involvement
2.2.1	Have helped you undertake a self assessment of your competences / your staff's competences against your own / their job role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.2	Have helped you / your staff develop your / their knowledge and skills for your/ their role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.3	Have helped you improve your / staff performance and impacted positively on your / their practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.4	Have helped you gain credit or recognition for your achievements (from employer or peers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.5	Have helped you / your staff improve the quality of teaching / practice you / they provide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.6	Have helped you / your staff with career development / continuing professional development planning and progression	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.7	Have helped you / your staff to identify / select qualifications that relate to your / staff work needs / job role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.8	Have helped you / your staff ultimately provide an improved experience for learners i.e. by using the Standards as a 'good practice' guide and applying that practice in their work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.9	Have helped you / your staff gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.10	Have contributed to your / staff's own sense of professionalism as a practitioner in the lifelong learning sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2.11	Other benefit not listed above:				

Question 2.3: Please select ONE of the standards that you have used and find to be most useful to you / your staff in their job role and describe in your own words, why it is particularly useful and what its main impact is on you / your staff.

Which standard is most useful to you / your staff?	Why it is most useful and what impact it has

Question 2.4: Please select ONE of the standards that you have used that is perhaps not as effective or as useful to you as you would have liked. Please describe in your own words, why it is not as useful as it could be and why it has little impact on you / your staff.

- Once you have completed this question please go to question 2.6

Which standard is least useful to you / your staff?	Why it is least useful and of limited impact

Question 2.5:

Why have you / your staff not chosen to use any of the standards you are aware of *i.e.* are there any barriers to you using them?

---

Question 2.6: What might encourage you / your staff to make greater use of the standards in your / their job role in future?

---

### Section 3: Views about Qualifications

Question 3.1:

Please complete the table below for each of the qualifications described as fully and honestly as you can.

- If you are aware of and use one or more of the qualifications described please complete question 3.1 in full and then continue to questions 3.2a., 3.2b, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6
- If you are aware of any of the qualifications listed but do not use any of them please go to question 3.5
- If you are unaware of any of the qualifications listed please go to question 3.6

	Qualification Title	Prior to this survey had you heard of these qualifications?	At the time of this survey have you or your staff undertaken / undertaking these qualifications	If you / your staff have undertaken these qualifications how would you rate their effectiveness <i>i.e.</i> relevance to your / their job role			
				Un-satisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Out-standing
		<i>Please tick if yes</i>	<i>Please tick if yes</i>				
<b>GROUP ONE: Initial Teaching Qualifications for teachers in the FE Sector</b>							
3.1.1	Level 3: Award in Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (PTLLS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.2	Level 4: Award in Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (PTLLS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.3	Level 3: Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (CTLLS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.4	Level 4: Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (CTLLS) available at levels 3 and 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.5	Level 5: Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (DTLLS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>GROUP TWO: Qualifications for teachers of English (literacy and ESOL) and Maths (numeracy)</b>							
3.1.6	Level 5: Additional Diploma in Teaching English (Literacy)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.7	Level 5: Additional Diploma in Teaching English (ESOL)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.8	Level 5: Additional Diploma in Teaching Mathematics (Numeracy)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.9	Level 5: Diploma in Teaching English (Literacy) in the Lifelong Learning Sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.10	Level 5: Diploma in Teaching English (ESOL) in the Lifelong Learning Sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.11	Level 5: Diploma in Teaching Mathematics (Numeracy) in the Lifelong Learning Sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



3.1.12	Level 5: Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (English Literacy)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.13	Level 5: Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (English ESOL)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.14	Level 5: Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (Numeracy)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>GROUP THREE: Other related qualifications</b>							
3.1.15	Level 2: Award in Preparing to Support Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.16	Level 3: Award in Preparing to Support Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.17	Level 3: Award for teachers in understanding learners and their literacy, language, numeracy and ICT needs (lifelong learning)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.18	Level 3: Award in Delivering e-Testing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.19	Level 3: Certificate in Learning Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.20	Level 4: Award in FE Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.21	Level 5: Award in FE Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.22	Level 5 Awards in developing embedded approaches to literacy, language, and numeracy for teachers in the lifelong learning sector (and pathways) available at Level 5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.23	Level 5 Certificate for teachers of the 14-19 Diplomas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.24	Level 2: Award in Family Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.25	Level 3: Award in Family Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.26	Level 4: Award in Family Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.27	Level 5: Award in Family Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 3.2a: Please answer this question only if you / your staff have used one or more of the qualifications previously described. For each qualification you / your staff have used please tell us whether they have had any of the benefits described in the table (*tick all boxes that apply if yes*).

- All other respondents please go to question 3.5

Qu.	Benefits from usage of Standards...	GROUP ONE: Any of the listed Initial Teaching Qualifications for teachers in the FE Sector	GROUP TWO: Any of the listed qualifications for teachers of English (literacy and ESOL) and Maths (numeracy)	GROUP THREE: Any of the listed related qualifications
3.2.1	Have helped you / your staff refresh, keep up to date and / or fill an identified gap in your / their skills, knowledge and understanding useful to your / their job role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.2	Have helped you / your staff develop brand new skills, knowledge or understanding that has enabled you / them to apply that learning in new, additional or different ways in your / their job role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.3	Have helped you / your staff formally recognise and record your competence as a practitioner building on any previous learning you / they may have completed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.4	Have helped you / your staff gain credit or recognition for your / their achievements (from employer or peers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.5	Have helped you / your staff improve the quality of teaching / practice you / they provide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.6	Have helped you / your staff with career development /	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	continuing professional development planning and progression			
3.2.7	Have provided you / your staff with something that is transferable i.e. the qualification has a value and regard not only in your / their current job but within the wider sector perhaps for your / their future	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.8	Have helped you / your staff ultimately provide an improved experience for learners i.e. the application of learning from the qualification in teaching, training etc	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.9	Have helped you / your staff gain greater job satisfaction through improved personal achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.10	Have contributed to your / staff's own sense of professionalism as a practitioner in the lifelong learning sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.11	Have contributed to your / staff's desire to do further learning and perhaps further (higher / different) qualifications in future	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2.12	Other benefit not listed above:			

Question 3.2b: Space for any additional explanatory comments about your responses in the table above e.g. your comments may have been about very specific qualifications from the groupings provided that may be helpful for us to understand

Question 3.3: Please select ONE qualification that you / your staff have undertaken and have found to be most useful to you / them in your / their job role and describe in your own words, why it has been particularly useful and what impact it has had on you/ your staff

Which qualification has been most useful to you / your staff?	Why it has been most useful and what impact it has had

Question 3.4: Please select ONE qualification that you / your staff have undertaken that was perhaps not as effective or as useful to you / they would have liked. Please describe in your own words, why it was not as useful as it could have been and why it has had little impact on you / your staff

Which qualification was least useful to you / your staff?	Why it was least useful and of limited impact

Question 3.5:

Why have you / your staff not chosen to use any of the qualifications you are aware of *i.e.* are there any barriers to you using them?

Question 3.6: What might encourage you / your staff to make greater use of the qualifications in your / their job role in future?

#### Section 4: Developing these standards and qualifications

4.1 Are there any ways in which standards and qualifications you / your staff have used could be further improved to meet your / their needs?

4.2 To what extent would you agree with the following statements in relation to the standards and qualifications included in this survey?

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion / Can't say
4.2.1	The standards are well promoted to organisations like mine and the benefits of using them are clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2.2	The qualifications are well promoted to organisations like mine and the benefits of using them are clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2.3	The standards and qualifications have contributed to creating a higher skilled and more professional workforce in general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2.4	These standards and qualifications are up to date and reflective of the roles for whom they are intended in the lifelong learning sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2.5	These standards and qualifications are equally effective and applicable to someone working in the Further Education or Work Based Learning or Adult and Community Learning sectors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2.6	These standards and qualifications are well known by and supported by my employer / membership organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.3 Is there anything else you would like to say about the impact of these standards or qualifications that will help us in our evaluation of their effectiveness in the Further Education, Work Based Learning or Adult and Community Learning sectors?

---

## Section 5: Permissions

5.1 Please may we have permission as independent researchers to contact you again about this project should the need arise?

Yes  No

5.2 Please may we have permission to pass on your contact details (not survey responses) to Lifelong Learning UK in order to receive useful information and mailings from them in future aimed at practitioners such as yourself?

Yes  No

## Appendix C – Regulations

### Statutory Instruments

2007 No. 2264

Education, England

The Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007

*Made: 27th July 2007*

*Laid before Parliament: 7th August 2007*

*Coming into force: 1st September 2007*

The Secretary of State for Innovation, Universities and Skills makes the following Regulations in exercise of the powers conferred by sections 136(a) and (c), 145 and 210(7) of the Education Act 2002(1):

#### **Citation, commencement and application**

1.—(1) These Regulations may be cited as the Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007 and come into force on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2007.

(2) These Regulations apply only in relation to England.

#### **Interpretation**

2.—(1) In these Regulations—

“the 2001 Regulations” means the Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2001(2);

“ATLS status” means associate teacher learning and skills status awarded by the IfL;

“associate teaching role” means a teaching role that carries significantly less than the full range of teaching responsibilities ordinarily carried out in a full teaching role (whether on a full-time, part-time, fractional, fixed term, temporary or agency basis) and does not require the teacher to demonstrate an extensive range of knowledge, understanding and application of curriculum development, curriculum innovation or curriculum delivery strategies;

“certificated illness or injury” means illness or injury certified by a registered medical practitioner;

“employed” means employed under a contract of employment or a contract for services;

“ERA 1996”(3) means the Employment Rights Act 1996;

“full teaching role” means a teaching role that carries the full range of teaching responsibilities (whether on a full-time, part-time, fractional, fixed term, temporary or agency basis) and requires the teacher to demonstrate an extensive range of knowledge, understanding and application of curriculum development, curriculum innovation or curriculum delivery strategies;

“induction period” means an induction period served pursuant to regulations made under section 19 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998(4);

“IfL” means the private company limited by guarantee registered at Companies House under the name The Institute for Learning (Post Compulsory Education and Training);

“LLUK” means the private company limited by guarantee registered at Companies House under the name Lifelong Learning UK, which is the Sector Skills Council responsible for the professional development of all those working in the further education sector;

“Preparing to Teach Award” means the Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector

Award approved by the Secretary of State;

“process of professional formation” means the post-qualification process by which a teacher demonstrates through professional practice—

(a) the ability to use effectively the skills and knowledge acquired whilst training to be a teacher; and

(b) the capacity to meet the occupational standards required of a teacher;

“QTLS status” means qualified teacher learning and skills status awarded by the IfL;

“QTS” means qualified teacher status awarded by the General Teaching Council for England;

“sixth form college” means a further education institution principally concerned with the provision of full-time education suitable to the requirements of persons who have not attained the age of 19 years; and

teacher” means a person who provides education at a further education institution under a contract of employment or a contract for services, other than a person who is employed by the institution on an occasional basis to provide updating on current commercial, industrial or professional practice; and “teach” and “teaching” are to be construed accordingly.

(2) A reference in any provision of these Regulations to “equivalent” in relation to any qualification or award is a reference to—

(a) any other qualification or award which the Secretary of State is satisfied is of equivalent or higher standard than the qualification or award specified in that provision; and is approved by him for the purposes of these Regulations;

(b) a relevant qualification obtained in an EEA State or Switzerland recognised in accordance with the provisions of Council Directive [92/51/EEC\(5\)](#) and Directive [2005/36/EC\(6\)](#); or

(c) evidence which demonstrates, to the satisfaction of LLUK, that the person has the necessary skills or experience or both to teach.

(3) Where any provision in these Regulations allows a person to be employed in a particular role for a specified period of time, that period commences when the person is employed in such a role for the first time.

(4) Where any provision in these Regulations allows a person to be employed in a teaching role for a specified period of time, that period is extended to take account of any period when the person is absent from work—

(a) in exercise of—

(i) her right to maternity leave conferred by section 71 or 73 of the ERA 1996([7](#)) or her contract of employment and has the right to return to work by virtue of either of those sections or her contract of employment;

(ii) the right to parental leave conferred by section 76 of the ERA 1996;

(iii) the right to paternity leave conferred by section 80A, 80AA, 80B or 80BB of the ERA 1996([8](#)); or

(iv) the right to adoption leave conferred by section 75A or 75B of the ERA 1996([9](#));

(b) because of her pregnancy; or

(c) because of certificated illness or injury, where the total period of absence from work exceeds 3 months in any period of 12 months.

### Scope

**3.**—(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), these Regulations apply to any person employed as a teacher on or after 1<sup>st</sup> September 2001.

(2) These Regulations do not apply to any person employed as a teacher—

(a) to teach on courses of higher education only;

(b) before 1<sup>st</sup> September 2007 who holds QTS;

(c) solely in a sixth form college who holds QTS; or

(d) who obtained an appropriate qualification under the 2001 Regulations before 1<sup>st</sup>

September 2007.

(3) These Regulations do not apply until 1<sup>st</sup> September 2008 to any person employed as a teacher who enrolled on a course before 1<sup>st</sup> September 2007 to obtain an appropriate qualification under the 2001 Regulations with a view to obtaining that qualification by 31<sup>st</sup> August 2008.

(4) With effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2008, these Regulations shall not apply to any person referred to in paragraph (3) who obtains the qualification referred to in that paragraph by 31<sup>st</sup> August 2008.

(5) With effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2008, regulations 4 and 6 shall not apply to any person referred to in paragraph (3) who does not obtain the qualification referred to in that paragraph by 31<sup>st</sup> August 2008.

(6) Regulations 4 and 6 do not apply to any other person employed as a teacher before 1<sup>st</sup> September 2007.

#### **Teachers to hold appropriate award**

**4.—**(1) Subject to paragraph (2), no person may teach in a further education institution unless that person holds a Preparing to Teach Award or its equivalent.

(2) A person who does not hold an award referred to in paragraph (1) may be employed in a teaching role for a period not exceeding 1 year, commencing on the date that person takes up such a post for the first time, on condition that that person is provided throughout that period with professional support by a qualified person.

(3) In paragraph (2)—

“professional support” means support which includes mentoring and direction in the processes and practice of teaching, including lesson planning and course development; and  
“qualified person” means a person who satisfies the qualifications requirements in the 2001 Regulations or in these Regulations or is exempt from such requirements under either set of Regulations.

#### **Teachers in full teaching roles to hold appropriate qualifications and QTLS**

**5.—**(1) Subject to the following paragraphs, no person may be employed in a full teaching role unless that person—

(a) holds the Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector at Level 5 or above approved by the Secretary of State, or its equivalent; and

(b) holds a specialist’s subject qualification approved by the Secretary of State, where the Secretary of State has decided that such a qualification is necessary, or its equivalent.

(c) has completed such programme to the satisfaction of the IfL or has obtained such award as may be approved by the Secretary of State, for the purposes of demonstrating that a person has the necessary literacy, numeracy and information and communications technology skills to teach;

(d) has completed, to the satisfaction of the IfL, a process of professional formation; and

(e) holds QTLS status.

(2) A person who holds QTS may be employed in a full teaching role if he—

(a) has completed, to the satisfaction of the IfL, a process of professional formation;

(b) has completed, to the satisfaction of the IfL, a training course designed to familiarise him with the role of a teacher in a further education institution; and

(c) holds QTLS status.

(3) A person who holds QTS and has satisfactorily completed an induction period in a further education institution may be employed in a full teaching role if he—

(a) has completed, to the satisfaction of the IfL, a training course designed to familiarise a person with the role of a teacher in a further education institution; and

(b) holds QTLS status.

(4) A person who does not comply with paragraph (1), (2) or (3) may be employed in a full teaching role for a period not exceeding—

- (a) 2 years, where the person holds QTS; or
- (b) 5 years in any other case.

#### **Teachers in associate teaching roles to hold appropriate qualifications and ATLS**

**6.**—(1) Subject to the following paragraphs, no person may be employed in an associate teaching role unless that person—

- (a) holds a Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector at Level 3 or 4 approved by the Secretary of State, or its equivalent;
- (b) holds a specialist's subject qualification approved by the Secretary of State, where the Secretary of State has decided that such a qualification is necessary, or its equivalent;
- (c) has completed such programme to the satisfaction of the IfL or has obtained such award as may be approved by the Secretary of State, for the purposes of demonstrating that a person has the necessary literacy, numeracy and information and communications technology skills to teach;
- (d) has completed, to the satisfaction of the IfL, a process of professional formation; and
- (e) holds ATLS status.

(2) A person who holds QTS may be employed in an associate teaching role if he—

- (a) has completed, to the satisfaction of the IfL, a process of professional formation;
- (b) has completed, to the satisfaction of the IfL, a training course designed to familiarise a person with the role of a teacher in a further education institution; and
- (c) holds ATLS status.

(3) A person who holds QTS and who has satisfactorily completed an induction period in a further education institution may be employed in an associate teaching role if he—

- (a) has completed, to the satisfaction of the IfL, a training course designed to familiarise a person with the role of a teacher in a further education institution; and
- (b) holds ATLS status.

(4) A person who does not comply with paragraph (1), (2) or (3) may be employed in an associate teaching role for a period not exceeding—

- (a) 2 years, where the person holds QTS; or
- (b) 5 years in any other case.

#### **Revocations and transitional provision**

**7.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the 2001 Regulations are revoked([10](#)).

(2) The 2001 Regulations continue to apply until 31<sup>st</sup> August 2008 to any relevant teacher, as defined in those Regulations, who became a relevant teacher on or after 1<sup>st</sup> September 2001 and before 1<sup>st</sup> September 2007 and enrolled on a course to obtain a suitable qualification under those Regulations before 1<sup>st</sup> September 2007, with a view to obtaining that qualification by 31<sup>st</sup> August 2008.

*Bill Rammell*

Minister of State

Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills

27 July 2007

(1)

[2002 c.32](#). Section 145 was amended by paragraph 24 of Schedule 14 to the Education Act [2005 \(c. 18\)](#). [Back \[1\]](#)

(2)

S.I. 2001/1209. [Back \[2\]](#)



(3)

1996 c.18. Part VIII was substituted by Part I of Schedule 4 to the Employment Relations Act 1999 (c. 26). [Back \[3\]](#)

(4)

1998 c.30. At the time of making these Regulations the relevant Regulations are S.I. 2001/2897 as last amended by S.I. 2007/172. [Back \[4\]](#)

(5)

OJ L 209, 24.7.1992, p24. This Directive as amended has been implemented by the European Communities (Recognition of Professional Qualifications) (Second General System) Regulations 2002 (S.I. 2002/2934), as amended by S.I. 2004/1771, 2004/2033, 2005/882, 2006/1718, 2006/3214 and 2007/289. These Regulations apply to a range of professions including further education teachers, for which the Secretary of State is the designated authority. [Back \[5\]](#)

(6)

OJ L 255, 30.9.2005, p22, also implemented by S.I. 2002/2934 as amended. [Back \[6\]](#)

(7)

Sections 71 and 73 were both amended by section 17 of the Employment Act 2002 (c.22) and further amended by paragraphs 31 and 32 of Schedule 1 to the Work and Families Act 2006 (c.18) respectively. [Back \[7\]](#)

(8)

Sections 80A and 80B were inserted by section 1 of 2002 c.22 and sections 80AA and 80BB (which have not, at the time of making these Regulations, been commenced, were inserted by sections 3 and 4 respectively of 2006 c.18. [Back \[8\]](#)

(9)

Sections 75A and 75B were inserted by section 3 of 2002 c. 22 and amended by paragraphs 33 and 34 of Schedule 1 to 2006 c. 18 respectively. [Back \[9\]](#)

(10)

S.I. 2001/1209. [Back \[10\]](#)

Amended by correction slip on 01 August 2007