

**CONSULTATION ON REVOCATION  
OF THE FURTHER EDUCATION  
WORKFORCE REGULATIONS**

Government Response

AUGUST 2012

# Contents

<b>Contents</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Consultation on Revocation of the Further Education Workforce Regulations: Summary of responses and Government response to consultation</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Foreword by the Minister of State for Further Education, Skills and Lifelong Learning</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Executive Summary and Government Response</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Background .....	6
Who responded to the consultation? .....	7
What did the consultation tell us? .....	7
What were the major views raised?.....	8
How will the Government respond and what will happen now? .....	8
<b>3. Summary of responses to questions</b> .....	<b>9</b>
1. Do you agree that the Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007 should be revoked from 1 September 2012? .....	10
2. Do you agree that the Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) Regulations 2007 should be revoked from 1 September 2012?.....	11
3. Do you think there will be any unintended consequences or implications by revoking these regulations? .....	13
4. What do you consider to be the minimum level of qualification needed to teach in Further Education? .....	13
5. What do you consider to be the most effective means of maintaining a professionalised workforce? .....	14
6. Do you consider that any minimum expectations for training and qualifications should be stipulated as a condition of public funding? .....	15
4. Next steps .....	16

# **Consultation on Revocation of the Further Education Workforce Regulations: Summary of responses and Government response to consultation**

# 1. Foreword by the Minister of State for Further Education, Skills and Lifelong Learning

We know that the quality of the service offered by the Further Education (FE) sector depends on the skills of its leaders, teachers and support staff. Equally, few would disagree that there are already high levels of professionalism amongst FE teachers. However, it has become apparent that the regulatory regime set up to govern 'professionalism' in Further Education which emerged over the previous decade has serious limitations in its scope, enforceability and support from the sector.

In response to these concerns and issues I announced, in November 2011, an independent review of professionalism in FE. Lord Lingfield accepted my invitation to lead this important work, chairing a panel of experts drawn from the sector to consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of current arrangements to regulate and facilitate the professionalism of the FE workforce, and to make recommendations on how these should be changed or improved.

Lord Lingfield and his expert panel were set a demanding task, commissioned to produce initial recommendations on this complex issue by the end of March. Their interim report, published 27 March, and the product of in-depth consultation with the sector, concluded that the existing regulatory framework was no longer fit for purpose. They therefore recommended the revocation of the 2007 Further Education workforce regulations with effect from September 2012. In response to this proposal we launched a consultation to run from 10 April to 4 June.

In response to that consultation we received in excess of a thousand responses from across the sector representing the views of a wide range of people – from large organisations to individuals, representative organisations of both employees and employers. It is clear that the issues raised in this consultation have excited interest from across the sector and it is equally clear that a great deal of consideration, time and discussion has gone into these responses. In a sense this reflection on one's own practice and commitment to the interests of the whole sector lies at the heart of what professionalism is all about.

We consulted with a view to revoking the regulations in the belief that regulatory compulsion had not proved an effective means of fostering professionalism and that, in line with our reforms to bring greater freedoms and flexibilities to the sector, colleges and providers should be given greater discretion on qualifications and CPD, but with a baseline set by funding arrangements; so providers could be freed from regulation but with public interest more appropriately safeguarded through contractual requirements.

However, the consultation shows that, amongst those who responded, there is some concern about the revocation of the regulations and the impact that this would have on providers and staff and their ability to serve their learners, communities and business. This concern is particularly acute with regard to the qualifications regulations, though it is also significant in respect of the Continuing Professional Development and Registration regulations. In response to this we have reconsidered our original proposals for full deregulation from September 2012. We remain convinced that the Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) Regulations (2007) have proved unworkable and

consequently should be revoked as planned, with effect from September 2012. However, I see value in a more staged approach to the Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations (2007). Elements of this regulation are dependent on the IfL registration and these elements will be removed with effect from September 2012, but those parts of the regulations that set a core requirement for minimum qualifications will be retained for the 2012/13 academic year.

This will allow time for a more considered, sector-led approach to be developed taking account of the final report from Lord Lingfield which is due in September. In particular, following recent discussions I have held with members of the Further Education and Skills Ministerial Advisory Panel, I believe there is an appetite for a modern Guild approach in the sector, alongside the development of a 'Chartered status' for colleges and training providers which recognises high standards of quality and so becomes a tool to enhance FE's collective reputation.

I envisage a Guild as providing the means for the sector to take forward outcomes from Lord Lingfield's final report, as well as outcomes later in the year from the LSIS review of teaching qualifications and from the Commission on Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning led by Frank McLoughlin.

There is much still to be worked through. It is crucial that the Guild is truly of the sector, by the sector and for the sector. I have therefore recently issued a prospectus to invite outline proposals and bring together sector interests for the employer led partnership needed to develop a full proposal for an FE Guild.

I believe this sector-led approach will ultimately be a more effective way of promoting professionalism than top-down government diktat or more baseline regulation. At the same time I have listened to the responses to this consultation, and to the numerous people from the sector to whom I have spoken individually, and I agree that we should not remove the core regulatory requirements for teaching qualifications before a firmer foundation is in place for this alternative approach.

John Hayes MP  
Minister of State for Further Education, Skills and Lifelong Learning

## 2. Executive Summary and Government Response

The Government is committed to raising the status of vocational education and training, and recognises the importance of a professional teaching and training workforce if the skills needed across the economy are to be delivered effectively. In the Further Education (FE) and Skills system reform plan, *New Challenges, New Chances* (December 2011) the Government set out its support for a professional workforce providing excellent teaching and learning across the sector.

### Background

The current regulatory and institutional framework for the FE and Skills workforce was developed on the basis of plans set out by the previous Government, initially in *Equipping Our Teachers for the Future* in 2004 and then refined in *Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances* in 2006.

Following these publications the Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007 and the Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) Regulations 2007 ("the 2007 Regulations") both came into force on 1 September 2007, made under the Education Act 2002(1). These set requirements for teachers to hold or acquire within a specified period of time recognised qualifications; to complete a period of professional formation leading to Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS) status; to complete at least 30 hours of continuing professional development each year and provide an annual record to the Institute for Learning (IfL); and to be registered with IfL and maintain that registration continuously. The 2007 Regulations also specify requirements for Associate Teacher Learning and Skills status for those in an associate teaching role. The regulations have important limitations in their scope, for example not applying directly to work-based providers, or to teachers in FE colleges who teach only on courses of higher education. They also refer to a range of organisations that have ceased to exist.

In direct response to concerns raised about the current arrangements for achieving a professionalised workforce, in particular the role and payment of registration fees for the IfL, John Hayes MP, Minister of State for Further Education, Skills and Lifelong Learning, announced an independent review of professionalism in the sector. The review, undertaken by an independent panel of experts chaired by Lord Lingfield, began work in January 2012 and has been looking at the current arrangements to regulate and facilitate the professionalism of the FE and skills workforce, as well as focusing on the contributions of the IfL and other partners.

The independent review presented its Interim Report to Ministers in March 2012. The review panel's view was that statutory compulsion was not an effective or appropriate means of ensuring professionalism amongst teachers and lecturers who have been successfully practising as lecturers, and in their core profession, for a number of years. One of the panel's key recommendations stated that 'the 2007 Regulations are no longer fit-for-purpose, nor are they so well-founded that amendment will deal adequately with their shortcomings' and recommended that they should be revoked with effect from 1 September 2012, with largely discretionary advice to employers on appropriate qualifications for staff and continuous

professional developments replacing statutory requirements. As well as facilitating professionalism in FE and freeing individuals and providers from unnecessary regulation the panel foresaw a number of secondary benefits from these changes, not least that they will bring arrangements for the training of FE lecturers into closer alignment with the higher education sector.

The Government welcomed the interim report and expressed agreement with the independent review that wherever it is sensible to do so colleges and providers, as employers, should be given the freedom, and the responsibility, to decide what arrangements are most appropriate for ensuring the quality of teaching delivered in their organisations and for the development of their staff. As a result the Government announced its intention to revoke both sets of 2007 regulations subject to a public consultation, which was launched on 10 April 2012.

This consultation closed on 4 June.

## **Who responded to the consultation?**

The consultation received 1,063 responses in total from a broad range of respondents including: colleges; universities; HE/FE partnerships; training providers; social enterprises/charities; representative organisations; and trade unions. The vast majority (670 (63%)) were from individuals. Most used the “Survey Monkey” automated survey, but 126 provided fuller submissions, including key representative organisations and unions. A list of respondents can be found as part of the analysis on page 9.

## **What did the consultation tell us?**

The simple numerical results show clear majorities of those who responded in favour of retaining both sets of workforce regulations and of stipulating minimum expectations for training and qualifications as a condition of funding. However, once the responses from the major representative organisations in the sector are considered separately from those of individuals a more complex picture emerges. It should also be noted that the results will have been influenced by campaigning and the number of individual responses represents less than 1% of the total teaching workforce, whereas more than 40% have not complied with the requirement to register with the Institute for Learning.

Overall 74% of respondents were in favour of retaining the Qualifications regulations and most but not all of the representative organisations supported the core requirements for minimum qualifications being retained at least until new regulations have been drafted or a clear alternative approach developed with the sector.

Support for retaining the CPD and Registration regulations, at 62% was clearly lower than for the other key aspects, and most representative organisations agreed that these regulations should be revoked though this is not a view shared by all the main teacher unions or by the Institute for Learning itself.

## What were the major views raised?

There were widespread concerns about unintended consequences that could arise if all the regulations are revoked without substantial and clear alternative arrangements to replace them. A major view was that this could damage the quality and reputation of the sector and lower the status of FE teachers and lecturers. However, the major representative organisations did not support continued mandatory registration with the Institute for Learning.

## How will the Government respond and what will happen now?

The Government acknowledges that some important concerns have been raised in responses to the consultation. We also continue to recognise the argument put forward in Lord Lingfield's interim report that a system of regulatory compulsion has not proved to be a successful means of achieving a professional workforce, and that colleges and providers, as employers, should be given the freedom, and the responsibility, to decide what arrangements are most appropriate for their organisations and their staff. It is also clear that the existing regulations have failed to achieve their objective of full qualification of the workforce and have proved unworkable, as more than 40% have not complied with the requirement to register with the Institute for Learning (IfL).

We therefore intend to take a more staged approach to deregulation. It remains clear that the Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) Regulations (2007) are unworkable and a source of conflict. Consequently they will be revoked with effect from September 2012. However, we see value in retaining for the time being some core requirements in the Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations (2007). Elements that are dependent on mandatory IfL registration will be removed from September 2012, but those parts of the regulations that set core requirements for minimum qualifications will be retained for the 2012/13 academic year. It will also be necessary to ensure that those who hold QTLS status or are in the process of working towards QTLS are not disadvantaged by these changes nor the existing equivalence with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) put in jeopardy.

Our intention is that the position should then be reviewed again, taking account of the final report on professionalism from the panel chaired by Lord Lingfield, the outcomes of the review of teaching qualifications to be undertaken by the Learning and Skills Improvement Service and any workforce development implications from the Commission on Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning. During this time we will work with and support the sector to develop a firmer foundation for self-regulation of professionalism based on developing the concept of an FE Guild. A prospectus seeking proposals from the sector on how an FE Guild could be developed based on an employer-led partnership, drawing in employee representative bodies and other key sector interests, has been issued recently. A major objective of developing an FE Guild, in conjunction with a "chartered status" scheme for colleges and providers, is to continue raising the status and reputation of the sector and those who work with it, using an approach that is not dependent on Government regulation.

# 3. Summary of responses to questions

The table below sets out the total of all responses to the closed questions.

Question	Yes	No	Not Sure
1	212 (20%)	785 (74%)	66 (6%)
2	305 (29%)	657 (62%)	89 (8%)
3	855 (80%)	111 (10%)	94 (9%)
6	847 (79%)	87 (8%)	124 (12%)

A separate analysis of key partners showed a different response to that of individuals:

The organisations we have considered for this analysis are: The 157 Group, AELP, AoC, ATL, City & Guilds, FAB, IfL, LSIS, NATECLA, NIACE, the TUC, UCET, and UCU. All of these not only answered the questions but offered us thoughtful and helpful considered responses to the overall issue of a professional workforce.

2. A summary of their responses is:

Question	Yes	No	Not Sure	Did not reply
1	15%	38%	15%	31%
2	38%	38%	8%	15%
3	100%			
6	62%	8%	8%	13%

# 1. Do you agree that the Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007 should be revoked from 1 September 2012?

## Views

The majority of respondents feel that this regulation is necessary. Representative organisations also predominantly take the view that to remove it completely, at this stage, would have detrimental effects if there is not a clearly agreed alternative approach. Concerns were expressed that this could undermine efforts to professionalise the sector since the introduction of the regulation in 2007. Respondents also feel that regulation of teaching qualifications provides a very important assurance for the public, taxpayers and students that the lecturers in colleges are qualified to teach, and are concerned about equivalence with school teachers.

On the other hand, there were views that FE and Skills providers, as employers, should be given the freedom and the responsibility, to decide what arrangements are most appropriate for ensuring the quality of teaching. Some respondents feel that regulation and compulsion should be replaced with discretionary advice to employers and that there are sufficient statutory arrangements in place through, for example, employment legislation and the requirements for staff performance management and learner safeguarding set out in Ofsted's *Common Inspection Framework*, to ensure at least a threshold level of professional competence.

The majority, however, take the view that this regulation should not be revoked unless effective mechanisms are put in place to ensure that teaching staff are appropriately qualified for their professional role. Respondents feel that there is a need to maintain the progress that has been achieved towards a more professionalised workforce and that the sector needs a professional body.

There is also concern that if this regulation is revoked, then so too would be QTLS, at least in its current form and that the welcome closer alignment between the sectors will be undone if teaching qualifications in FE became optional. There were particular concerns raised about the potential removal of the associate teacher status. Respondents feel that the criticism that this grade has been unclear and not really owned or embraced by the sector, does not negate the fact that there are an ever increasing number of posts which fit broadly within this category with different roles and functions to a full lecturer role.

In addition there are fears that revocation would introduce fundamental inequity of 14-18 year olds being taught by qualified teachers in schools and unqualified teachers in FE.

Quotes from responses:

- *I have taught PTLLS, CTLLS and DTLLS since 2008, and agree with the findings of the review that they are over-complicated and unsuitable for many of those working successfully in the sector (individual.)*

- *Revocation of the Regulations will put Teaching in the FE sector back at least 15 years. They need amending not revocation. The Regulations clearly need amending (removal of ATLS and requirement to register with IFL). But, teachers in FE need to be part of a regulated profession with the appropriate training, qualification and status that shows they are fit professionals to teach ever more challenging young people in the 21st century (individual.)*
- *There should be a mandatory requirement for teachers in FE to hold a full teaching qualification to maintain parity with school teachers. High quality teaching is about more than just teaching, individuals need to engage with underlying theory in order for them to become autonomous reflective practitioners (FE college.)*
- *“AoC has strongly supported the Government’s efforts to free further education and Sixth Form Colleges from bureaucratic burdens through the ‘freedoms and flexibility’ agenda. We agree that the current regulations on teaching qualifications are not fit for purpose and that they should be revoked. ...However, on balance we think regulation is necessary in this instance. We do not agree with the proposed timetable of abolition of existing regulations by September 2012 and ask that the existing regulations be left in place giving time for BIS to work with AoC, and others, in writing new regulations which meet the professional needs of the College sector. AoC believes new regulations are required in order to maintain a professionalised workforce. We are keen to work with the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) to ensure such regulations meet the needs of individual Colleges and the College sector. However, if the Government decides not to bring in new regulations we would be able to assist in developing voluntary professional codes of practice.”*
- *AELP agrees that the Further Education Teachers’ Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007 should be revoked from 1 September 2012 and that FE and Skills **providers, as employers should be given the freedom, and the responsibility**, to decide what arrangements are most appropriate for ensuring the quality of teaching delivered in their organisations and for the development of their staff.”*

## 2. Do you agree that the Further Education Teachers’ Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) Regulations 2007 should be revoked from 1 September 2012?

### Views

Support for retaining this regulation at 62% is clearly lower than other key aspects. Responses indicate that this view is on the basis that colleges have robust continuous professional development arrangements in place, measured through self assessment and on student success rates. It is not felt necessary to legislate for CPD practice and indications are that the regulation has become devalued because it could not be effectively monitored and Principals were unwilling to sack valued staff who would not join IfL and pay registration fees.

There is support for an independent professional body for the FE sector but there is also support for IfL to become a voluntary professional body and clear views were expressed that legislation should not interfere in its private relationship with members.

The consensus of opinion suggests the current regulation is complex and lacks clarity especially in the vocational and skills arena. It is felt that employers in the FE and Skills sector have always by inclination advocated the benefits of a qualified and competent workforce, not least because it is in the mutual interests of providers to ensure their staff comply with the minimum prior qualifications often required by awarding organisations and in terms of the teaching, learning and assessment quality requirements expected from OfSTED.

There is also support for LSIS to take a greater role in respect to supporting professionalism including CPD and a role for LSIS to 'kite mark' institutional CPD.

Quotes from responses:

- *It is important for people to reflect and evaluate, but the compulsory nature and format of the IFL requirements have meant that many colleagues have felt they were jumping through hoops (individual.)*
- *It might be useful to amend what it required and how it is organised and recorded but it surely has to be right that everyone delivering learning has to continue to develop themselves and demonstrate that this is carried out. They need to keep up to date in their subject area, in their ability to facilitate learning and in their skills to assess the outcomes of learning. All these areas require CPD (individual.)*
- *"The additional requirements relating to CPD and registration with the IFL have been burdensome and have provided no tangible benefit. Registration has been difficult to police, and teachers' views on the value to them of the IFL have been clearly reflected in their reaction to being required to pay for their membership." (College principal)*
- *"Teachers in FE NEED to be sufficiently qualified BUT the removal of IFL membership needs to be removed as there is / was NO obvious benefit and an unnecessary cost." (individual)*
- *Continuous professional development is critical in the teaching profession. As in industry the speed of change is not going to slow down and to stand still is to guarantee failure. I do consider this to be the responsibility the employing Institution. However, this requires managers to understand the full cycle of performance management and to be able to identify the improvements and developments of each individual. From my experience, this is the area that needs to be improved. Whilst there have been issues raised about the IFL registration being voluntary or not and the related fees, the importance of an independent professional body should not be underestimated (individual.)*
- *AELP agrees with the recommendation of the Independent panel that the Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) regulations 2007 should be revoked from 1 September 2012. The consensus of opinion suggests the current Regulations are complex and lack clarity especially in the vocational and skills arena where assessing occupational competence outweighs general teaching in many contexts.*

### 3. Do you think there will be any unintended consequences or implications by revoking these regulations?

#### Views

The vast majority of responses (80%) express some concern and fear a real risk to reputation if regulations are revoked without anything substantial and clear put in their place. Concerns were wide-ranging but the key concerns were that complete revocation could lead to: less well trained lecturers resulting in poorer learner outcomes and less ability to respond to the needs of local industries; lower status for FE lecturers, especially in comparison with school teachers, and reputational damage to the FE sector; and a dilution of the sector's existing professionalism.

There is also concern that complete removal of the regulations could lead to a lack of coherence between one college and another in how they view the qualification of staff they recruit. This could lead to problems for staff moving from one college to another.

Quotes from responses:

- *It is possible that the standard of teaching and training will slide back to where it was in the 1990s where people knew their subject area but had no idea how to deliver learning (individual.)*
- *There is so much research out there to suggest that people coming into teaching from trades and professions will retain the attitudes and culture of the previous profession if they are not given the opportunity to take on the values, attitudes and behaviours of professional teachers. Teacher training is a necessary and obvious way of achieving this change...This country needs a well qualified and effectively taught workforce to get us out of the economic mess we are in. The countries that succeed in the world attach importance to vocational training (e.g. Germany) (individual.)*

### 4. What do you consider to be the minimum level of qualification needed to teach in Further Education?

#### Views

There were a wide range of views, comments and suggestions. Most feel that PTLLS is a suitable induction qualification, and may also be the most appropriate qualification for staff teaching a craft or professional skills on a part-time basis. There were, however, views that this qualification needs to be properly updated and change by responding to a separate sector consultation.

Significant numbers feel that there will be different qualification requirements depending on what is taught. For example it would be appropriate for lecturers who teach exclusively HE courses to adhere to HE professional standards whereas teaching staff who teach literacy, numeracy and ESOL may well continue to need as specialist qualification. In addition it is suggested that lecturers who are involved in teaching 16-18 year olds GCSE maths and English may not necessarily need to take an additional qualification.

The majority feel that those employed full time should obtain a Level 5 qualification within a reasonable time, for their own development and to maximise their progression, but ultimately because this is a guarantee of quality for students. The view is that the minimum level of qualification needed to teach in FE should be set, as now, at Level 5 to ensure that all newly appointed teachers have had the preparation, training and development to deliver high quality learning programmes. It is suggested that for those who might intend to work in schools sometime in the future, a PGCE or Certificate of Education being at Level 5 would tie in with the DfE's moves to create an equivalency between school teacher qualifications and those in FE.

There is support for ensuring that new lecturers can achieve competence at Level 2 in maths and English. There is also support for a minimum 30 hours annual staff development and that basic teaching qualifications could be a minimum expectation for those who deliver learning whether this is via group sessions, coaching, or one to one support (providing that the course/qualification content accommodates a range of such modes of delivery).

Quotes from responses:

- *There needs to be some form of introductory qualification that ensures that practitioners have a very basic understanding of facilitating learning. This role is currently well covered by PTLLS. Then over a period of time practitioners need to achieve a full teaching qualification that is orientated to the type of teaching/training that they carry out - for example whether it is classroom based or delivered in the workplace. While the achievement of DTLLS may be too great a commitment for some teacher/trainers there does need to be a challenging and robust qualification to ensure they understand what they are doing when facilitating learning and that they have the skills to do it well (individual.)*
- *The minimum level could be a PTLLS-type qualification which does give a broad-based underpinning to teaching in the sector. We have used this as our minimum standard for new tutors and it has ensured there is a clear understanding of what we expect for teaching adults in the classroom (individual.)*

## **5. What do you consider to be the most effective means of maintaining a professionalised workforce?**

### **Views**

There were wide ranging views, comments and suggestions. Most clearly believe some regulations are required in order to maintain a professionalised workforce. There are suggestions that funding agreements should include an expectation that 'colleges and providers will maintain a suitably qualified workforce' and that this should remain while a Voluntary Professional Code of Practice for Providers (recognised by OfSTED) is developed.

Representative organisations feel that LSIS is best placed to support professionalism in the FE and Skills sector and should assume full responsibility for supporting professionalism on behalf of the sector from September 2012.

Quotes from responses:

- *A clear vision and strategy from Government that outlines the qualifications required across the teaching provision in the UK. Commitment from senior management in the employing institution to CPD and performance management (individual.)*
- *For the further education sector many people may have dual professional alliances for example a builder may also be affiliated to the Chartered Institute of Building in addition to their second profession of teaching. The sector needs to recognise the importance of vocational teachers and trainers maintaining up to date professional knowledge of their industrial practise in addition to providing professional development of the skills of being a teacher. It would be helpful to have a national body representative of all teachers despite the employment status of the individual that can then be split into different membership categories yet recognise professional status of the individual (individual.)*
- *Some form of professional registration with a suitable professional body seems essential (individual.)*

## **6. Do you consider that any minimum expectations for training and qualifications should be stipulated as a condition of public funding?**

### **Views**

The majority of individuals, and some Unions, answered 'yes' to this question (79%) and are clearly in favour of this being a contractual requirement. There are, however, concerns, primarily from employer representative organisations, around it being unclear how such a condition would be policed or whether it would be desirable for funding bodies to take on this role. There are also views indicating that policy makers and funding agencies should be more concerned about the flow of state funding and success rates than imposing bureaucratic conditions on providers.

Quotes from responses:

- *The government needs to ensure that as organisations (given the new freedoms in FE) seek value-for-money, the result is not a 'de-professionalised' sector. Some clarification of (at least) minimum expectations against which the whole sector will be measured is essential. A set of standards is essential, not only for teacher training but for individuals and organisations to aspire to, achieve and exceed (individual.)*
- *I believe that a minimum qualification level for tutors and trainers should be enforced as a condition of public funding and is a sensible way to ensure that the work force remains trained to a suitable level (individual.)*
- *This would put an expectation on training providers to ensure their staff are qualified I am sure also that there is a clear indication in the latest figures from Ofsted that indicate, at least to me, that there is a clear correlation between the standard of attainment in providers and the proportion of trained staff. It might be a coincidence but over the last year or so the results of private skills training providers in my area have improved dramatically as the number of their staff with qualifications increases (other.)*

- *“The minimum expectations should reflect a national minimum qualification requirement for entry in to FE professional roles and require accountability with regards to supporting CPD of employees, inclusive of training review procedures and inclusion in public reporting duties.” (TUC)*

## **4. Next steps**

The Government will proceed immediately with the laying of regulations before Parliament to revoke partially the regulations governing teaching qualifications and in their entirety those that govern CPD and registration with the IfL.

A prospectus for the development of an FE Guild has recently been launched, which invites the sector to submit outline proposals for taking this work forward. Ministers expect the final report from Lord Lingfield on professionalism to be published in September.

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. Visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence), write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This publication is also available on our website at [www.bis.gov.uk](http://www.bis.gov.uk)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to:

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills  
1 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0ET  
Tel: 020 7215 5000

If you require this publication in an alternative format, email [enquiries@bis.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@bis.gsi.gov.uk), or call 020 7215 5000.

**URN 12/970**