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Executive Summary

The review of the Professional Standards for Teachers and Trainers in England commenced in October 2013, with the consultation taking place between January 7th and February 18th 2014. In that brief period, 75 people took part in in-depth interviews, some 250 engaged in workshops, focus groups, and other interviews, and 622 took the time to complete a detailed online survey.

In all, therefore, the consultation attracted around 950 distinct contributions from an extremely wide variety of professionals.

By far the majority of those consulted approve of the professional standards and agree with the approach taken. A majority also said that they intend to use them in the future. In addition to an overall positive picture, the consultation emphasises some important sector issues for consideration when communicating the final version of the professional standards and promoting their take-up and use.

Background and context

The first of four priority tasks for the Education and Training Foundation (the Foundation), which was established in August 2013, is a review of the 2007 professional standards developed by LLUK (the former Sector Skills Council for the Lifelong Learning sector). The Foundation’s delivery plan explains the background to, and formation of, their priorities up to April 2014.

The 2013-14 review of the professional standards is set against a very different landscape than that of 2007 as a result of the review conducted by an independent panel, chaired by Lord Lingfield in 2012, on professionalism in further education. There were a number of changes recommended in the Lingfield review, including a revocation of the 2007 workforce regulations and the simplifying and renaming of the PTLLs, CTLLS, and DTLLS qualifications. New education and training qualifications, led by LSIS, were developed with supporting guidance in early 2013. The 2007 professional standards were not reviewed at the same time.

The review of the professional standards and aims of the consultation

The Review has been conducted in three Phases. Pye Tait Consulting were commissioned to help with the development of, consultation on, and the accompanying guidance for the professional standards.

3 PTLL: Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector; CTLLS: Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning sector; DTLLS: Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector
4 The former Learning & Skills Improvement Service which closed in August 2013
Phase 1, launched in October 2013, saw the Foundation’s Project Steering Group and Practitioner Group working closely with teachers, trainers, their employers and sector stakeholders to shape the review of the professional standards.

Phase 2 involved a major consultation on revised (draft) professional standards which was undertaken between early January and mid-February 2014. The aim of the consultation was to acquire the views and input of individuals and organisations in the wider sector as to the Standards’ fitness for purpose and appropriateness (subject to the underlying principles which have been laid out in the following section).

Phase 3, from the end of February to mid-April 2014 was designed to analyse and review the feedback, and finalise the Standards and Guidance. The final element of this Phase is the launch of the 2014 Professional Standards and Guidance by the Foundation.

The Overall Approach

As a result of extensive research work undertaken in Phase 1, a detailed approach was formed and followed for the development of the revised draft professional standards.

These were taken out to consultation and the background and purpose outlined in a “Consultation Document” as follows:

The overall purpose of the revised professional standards is to support teachers and trainers to maintain and improve standards of teaching, and outcomes for learners. The revised professional standards are intended to:

- set out clear expectations of effective practice in education and training against which teachers and trainers can compare, affirm and celebrate their own practice;
- enable teachers and trainers to identify areas for their own professional development in a consistent and systematic way;
- provide a national reference point that organisations can use to support the development of their staff and so improve learning experiences and outcomes for learners;
- support initial teacher training and staff development and enhance their teaching.

It was also made clear to participants that the (draft) professional standards are non-specific, inclusive and aspirational and are not intended to be objectively measurable.

- The intention has been to keep the content of the professional standards themselves as simple and direct as possible and to use the Guidance document for expansion and illustration.
• The audience for the professional standards remains largely that specified by LLUK and introduced in 2007 – i.e. teachers, trainers and tutors in what was then defined (by LLUK) as the lifelong learning sector.

The consultation document further clarified other relevant factors such as audience, terminology used, how they stand in terms of links to the 2013 education and training qualifications and the specification used to structure the professional standards.

The consultation and survey were promoted by four main means:

• the Foundation’s website;
• by members of the Project Steering Group and Practitioner group through emails and websites to their own networks of organisations, contacts and workplaces;
• contacts originally alerted to the work by Pye Tait Consulting in December 2013; and,
• partner organisations (ACETT, AELP5, IfL and HOLEX).

The online survey achieved a total of 622 responses from all parts of the sector; the top 3 proportions comprising colleges (further education/specialist): 35%; commercial/private training providers: 16%; and adult and community learning: 15%. Around 12% of the responses were delivered on behalf of organisations with the remainder being from individuals.

The excellent response was due in no small part to the efforts of the partner organisations.

Response to the Consultation

The following summary of the response to the consultation is given under broad headings corresponding to the research questions.

Approach and Purposes of the Professional Standards

• There is very positive support (91%) for the approach taken and for professional standards that support teachers and trainers to maintain and improve standards of teaching, and outcomes for learners;

• Equally the events and interviews point to significant support for the approach and purposes. Concerns regarding the value and purpose of having professional standards in a de-regulated sector will need to be addressed in supporting material accompanying the final professional standards;

• The fact that the professional standards are intended for teachers at all stages of their careers was positively received by the majority of participants. Trainee teachers responding to the survey and attending a focus group were largely positive. Their main concern surrounded the uses of the standards and a plea to keep them concise, but, on the whole, feedback was

---

5 AELP assisted the review as sub-contractor to Pye Tait with the consultation and guidance material.
encouraging in the sense that they could see the standards reflected in their Initial Teacher Education (ITE) courses;

- The total feedback surrounding the question of the purpose(s) of the professional standards indicates a strong endorsement for professional standards which recognise the importance of teacher/trainer responsibility for, and ownership of, their own professional learning.

Despite this, a strong message emerged at the events, mainly from FE Colleges and HE Institutions (but not exclusively) that the ‘purposes’ of these professional standards are not yet clear to teachers and trainers and their institutions.

As the final professional standards are used more widely, questions as to use - particularly by Ofsted, will possibly warrant further clarification by the Foundation, either in future marketing and promotional material or in the accompanying guidance material as FAQs or both.

There is a need for professional standards to achieve a number of objectives but particularly to improve outcomes for learners especially in a deregulated workforce context.

The consultation illustrated strong sector support for professional standards and equally strong support for the style and approach demonstrated in the draft (with, however, a majority wanting them to be simpler and supported by Guidance).

The professional standards are widely seen as potentially providing a benchmark to which all can aspire - from trainees to established and experienced teachers.

Do the standards reflect the breadth of the audience as described?

A majority of survey respondents (4 out of 5) believe that the professional standards reflect the breadth of audience as described in the consultation document as:

- teachers and trainers of post-16 learners in the following contexts in England: colleges (excluding sixth form colleges), the community, commercial and charitable organisations, industry, the armed and uniformed services, prisons/ offender learning, and other public sector organisations;
- their employers.

A small number of initial teacher educators were less content. Their responses highlight perceived shortcomings, particularly in the knowledge section in the professional standards in relation to the teaching of English, maths and of specialist learning for learners with difficulties and disabilities.

Comments from the survey and events suggest the need for English and maths teaching by all teachers should be strengthened, that is remove any implication in the standards that the responsibility for this can be passed to others.
A small number of survey respondents, but a larger number of event attendees, requested that the professional standards focus more on the learner.

As the basis of the standards is for generic standards applying to all teachers in the FE and Skills sector, a recommendation will be made to the Foundation to consider developing contextualised case studies, at a later stage, to demonstrate how different groups of teachers are taking forward the professional standards with different learner types.

More than half of those interviewed during the in-depth telephone interviews believe the standards do successfully cater for the sector’s varied learner audience, but would welcome amplification of this in the Guidance.

**Defining the audience: A question of ‘age’**

The consultation document explained about using the variable “age of the learner (post-16)” as a means of differentiating the audience for the revised professional standards. However there are limitations to this approach, following the *Raising of the Participation Age* and because learners aged 14+ are now able to attend FE colleges on a full-time basis or attend FE colleges and other providers on a part-time basis.

However, by retaining the age distinction, the Foundation was aiming to highlight that one of the distinctive features of working as a teacher or trainer in this sector is the diverse, and often older, age profile of the learners.

Whilst there is some concern surrounding the teaching of learners aged 14 to 16, the majority of survey respondents (73%) like ‘age’ being used as a distinguishing metric for these standards.

The generic nature of the professional standards has been well received. This approach was followed because of the wide variations across the sector in contexts and learner types and ages. It was widely felt that, no matter what age or social or ethnic background the learner comes from, the role for the teacher and trainer is to adapt to, and meet those, specific needs; a fundamental foundation of the standards.

Therefore, the use of age does not seem to be a ‘vital’ distinguishing factor as it is only one of a number of equally important factors, such as ethnicity, social, gender and culture and even geography, which can impact on teaching and learning. Consequently focusing on one factor such as age might invite further unnecessary complications given the intention that the professional standards should be universally applicable across the FE and Skills sector.

It is therefore recommended that age is not overtly stipulated in any descriptor or promotional material about the professional standards but is addressed in the Guidance.
Is there a rationale for developing the standards for the FE and Skills sector?

A central consideration for respondents surrounded the fundamental need for standards specifically designed for FE and Skills Teachers and Trainers as set against the existence of other, arguably relevant, standards such as the Department for Education (DfE) Teachers’ Standards and those professional standards for higher education.

This question prompted a diverse set of responses which fell into two broad camps based on respondents’ differing standpoints. The first group, around 85%, argued that a single set of standards is essential for the FE and Skills sector, a small proportion of whom went even further and suggested a need for one set of standards for all who teach regardless of setting.

The other group, of around 15%, proposed that the diversity of the “FE and Skills sector” necessitates more than one set of standards i.e. that one set of standards cannot be applied across the breadth of the FE and Skills sector.

Suggestions for using other standards instead of these professional standards came from a few survey respondents and the issue was raised at around half of all the partner events, and by a few interviewees. These suggestions were twofold - that further work could be done to the FE and Skills sector professional standards to streamline or condense them to reflect the DfE Teacher standards approach, or an alternative being to adopt the DfE teaching standards, in their current form and in their entirety, to help with cohesion. This latter possibility was mentioned by relatively few people, however.

The consultation showed strong support - in all forms: the survey, the interviews and workshops - for the next version of the professional standards being condensed even further in the current version, not just for the purpose of being aligned to the school teaching standards approach, but also to enable them to be more memorable and easy to access for teachers and trainers and to place greater emphasis on the learner and the learning process.

Linking the professional standards and the 2013 education and training qualifications

In support of a question as to how well the professional standards reflect the new 2013 education and training qualifications, mapping work was undertaken by an experienced member of the team, involved in the development of the new 2013 qualifications, at an early stage of the consultation.

It mapped the draft professional standards to the Level 4 Certificate and Level 5 Diploma in education and training qualifications and also to the Common Inspection Framework (CIF). The research revealed that there is close harmony between the qualifications, CIF and the draft professional standards.

Just under half of the survey respondents rated their own familiarity with the new 2013 education and training qualifications as six or more out of ten (where the rating of ten is ‘extremely familiar’). Of all survey respondents over 78% feel the professional standards reflect the requirements of the new 2013 qualifications.
At some point additional Guidance would be welcome on explicit or implicit links to frameworks and qualifications that many professionals in the sector possess, are undertaking, or are making use of (such as the CIF).

Further mapping work may be required to align the work to the final version of the professional standards and a request was made to also include mapping between the professional standards and the Level 3 Award in Education and Training.

**Improvements suggested to the structure, layout and design of the professional standards**

During Phase 1 of the research, other standards and applicable frameworks were considered in order to inform the review of the professional standards. The version that went out to consultation drew upon this research and on a number of other professional standards including those used in Scotland and the DfE Teaching Standards for teachers in schools.

The approach used in the USA, of having five core propositions for which extensive Guidance has been produced, was another important input into the design. The characteristics and succinctness of those standards enable them to be memorable and user-friendly for users.

Just under 95% of survey respondents responded to the question ‘to what extent do you agree that the following sections require improvement?’

Just under 86% of survey respondents “strongly agree” or “tend to agree” that the standards follow a logical structure and order that is easy to navigate.

Slightly less than this (83%) “strongly agree” or “tend to agree” that the terminology and language used is appropriate and easy to understand.

Some 52% “strongly agree” or “tend to agree” that the standards style, colour scheme and font is engaging.

The concept behind the core propositions was strongly approved by survey respondents and, where this topic of succinctness was discussed at events, by a majority of event attendees. This provides further support for the next iteration of the professional standards to be shorter and more succinct in themselves and to make use of explanatory guidance to illustrate purposes and potential uses.

A large number of improvements were proposed but most point to improving the circular diagram which is presented in the report, making the standards more concise and succinct, and possibly combining either 2 of the 3 sections (values, knowledge and skills) or statements to reduce repetition/duplication.

The majority of respondents, however, think that there is no requirement for changes to the layout, terminology and language, or presentation. Many commented that they found the draft standards

---

user friendly and easy to read and some felt it may be worthwhile to consider putting the standards through the Plain English (crystal mark) exercise to aid accessibility (however, this comment was made in reference to the consultation draft of the professional standards).

Respondents pointed to perceived “gaps”; for example, for those delivering specialist learning to learners with learning difficulties and disabilities (SLDD), or in a work-based learning environment. However, as has been discussed earlier, such considerations could be addressed through the Guidance material rather than in the professional standards which have been developed specifically to be generic.

The most common suggested improvement to the layout was about the circular diagram. Some recommended using a more traditional Venn diagram approach, whilst others suggested circles in the centre, rather than the bottom, thus making “values” more central to illustrate that values are at the heart of the FE and skills teaching profession. Some were concerned the size of the circles indicated an inherent hierarchy of importance among the three sections.

Much of the event feedback on the detail of the draft standards was about improving the wording, reducing the length and number of clauses in the statements with the main overarching suggestion being to streamline or condense the standards by, for example, combining Section B (Professional knowledge and understanding) and Section C (Professional skills) and/or some of Section A with Section C (where there is apparent duplication).

Simpler and more direct language and a more concise set of standards were the most common requests with many respondents requesting a “one-page” approach for memorability and impact as well as potentially being more effective at encouraging use than a lengthy and wordy document.

**Will the professional standards be used in the future, and in what ways?**

Over 85% of survey respondents said they would use the new standards.

There was also very high support for using the standards for personal development, professional development of others, within organisations to improve teaching, and lastly within organisations for the purposes of appraisals, performance management and so on.

The consultation document explained how it is anticipated that Ofsted will use these professional standards, in the same way that the DfE Teachers standards are currently being used, in their inspection arrangements and inspection of initial teacher education.

A theme threading through the events suggests that the Foundation will need to consider ways of ensuring that the standards are used not only by teachers but that managers are encouraged to buy into the aspirational values and the application of the standards in a variety of potential uses.

The relatively small number of employer responses within the consultation suggests more work might be necessary on promoting the professional standards to businesses.

Numerous uses of the professional standards were discussed by survey respondents and attendees including CPD and staff development, during teacher training, or in staff appraisals and quality
management, in teacher recruitment for interview questions, to form job descriptions, and as a national ‘benchmark’ of professional values and behaviour.

The respondents, interviewees, and attendees suggested a wide range of uses for the professional standards, and the sheer variety and scope of those suggestions would seem to underline the wisdom of the generic, over-arching approach, and the succinct nature of the proposed final standards.

**Additional commentary on the professional standards**

Respondents to the survey were given the opportunity, at the end of the form, to provide any additional comments they might wish.

Of the 15% that chose to provide some additional commentary, there was significant positive feedback. People seem pleased there has been a consultation on the professional standards and are happy with its approach as well as the fact that a wide range of practitioners were consulted.

There were some concerns suggesting the professional standards were either too wordy or too vague.

A few individual respondents, and several organisational responses, pointed to perceived gaps in the standards, such as professional behaviour/ethics, employability skills, learner behaviour management and addressing specialist teaching such as for those who teach English and maths or those who teach learners with learning difficulties or disabilities.

The succinct nature of the DfE teaching standards and the concept behind the core propositions was liked by many of the event attendees who felt more could be done to shorten these draft professional standards.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings from the consultation process, the following recommendations are made. They have been divided into “strategic recommendations - of over-arching applicability and intent”, and “standards-specific recommendations” relating to the standards themselves.

These recommendations drawn from the research were discussed, accepted and agreed by the Project Steering and Practitioner Groups as the basis for the way forward.

**Strategic Recommendations:**

1. The Foundation and sector stakeholders should support the introduction of the new professional standards by clearly communicating the purposes and value of these professional standards and address the ongoing confusion about their use.

2. Any marketing or communications materials developed to support the launch of the
professional standards should present the benefits of this approach, and clarify how they will be used by key stakeholders, such as Ofsted. The Foundation should develop key messages to be incorporated in any marketing or communications materials.

3. The Foundation and sector stakeholders should consider developing, for the launch or thereafter, promotional materials that may incorporate a postcard and/or poster to raise awareness of the professional standards.

4. The Foundation should work closely with employers in the sector to raise awareness, and encourage use, of the professional standards.

Standards-specific Recommendations:

With respect to the standards themselves we would recommend that the Foundation:

5. Aim for a reduced set of statements ideally combining sub-sections and closely-related statements where possible to ensure that the final professional standards are no longer in length than the current (consultation) form and preferably shorter.

6. Simplify the diagram and consider using a column layout or similar to move towards a one page presentation.

7. Incorporate those features of the DfE Teaching Standards mentioned most often in events; for example: an introductory Preamble, headings with a succinct set of statements to underpin them, and an overall condensed set of standards.

8. Continue with the intended use of the Guidance to exemplify how the standards may be used for the different purposes, across different settings and for different types of learners.

9. Consider adding strategic findings from the mapping work across the education and training qualifications and the standards to the Guidance.

10. Consider undertaking further mapping between Level 3 and the professional standards.

11. Explain in the Guidance how the standards link to the qualifications while emphasising the point that the standards are not intended to inform the development of qualifications.
1. Introduction

One of the key areas of activity within the delivery plan for the Education and Training Foundation (the Foundation) is to review the current professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector. The professional standards were developed by the sector skills council for the lifelong learning sector, LLUK, and introduced in 2007. They were not updated when the initial teacher training qualifications were reviewed by LSIS in 2012/13.

At the heart of the review is engagement with and through the FE and Skills sector, engaging with employers and practitioners to cover the wide variety of teaching and training roles undertaken in training providers, colleges, the wider community and industry.

The consultation formed an important tool to gather the views of the sector on the draft professional standards and a key activity to help shape the final professional standards in readiness for their launch in April 2014.

The aim of the consultation, therefore, has been to support the development of the professional standards for teachers and trainers by engaging with the sector through a number of consultative activities designed to inform the further development of the professional standards.

1.1 Phased approach to the review of the professional standards

The review was designed over three phases:

- Phase 1 ran from October to December 2013. The Foundation worked closely with teachers, trainers, their employers and sector stakeholders through the Project Steering Group and Practitioner Group to shape the approach to the review.
  - The Foundation commissioned Pye Tait Consulting to develop the revised professional standards, manage the consultation and develop initial guidance.
  - Research into practice in other sectors and countries was carried out to inform the thinking about the purpose of, and audience for, the revised professional standards and their design.

- Phase 2 ran from 7 January to 18 February 2014. During this phase, feedback was collected from the wider sector on the draft professional standards. To ensure teachers, trainers and employers from all parts of the sector had the opportunity to contribute to the review, a variety of approaches were used: an online survey sited at www.pyetait.com/etfstandards, regional
workshops (arranged by ACETT, HOLEX, and the Institute for Learning), in-depth interviews and follow-on focus groups/additional interviews (see section 2 for further detail).

- Phase 3, from the end of February to mid-April 2014 was designed to analyse and review the feedback, and finalise the Standards and Guidance. The final element of this Phase is the launch of the 2014 Professional Standards and Guidance by the Foundation. The standards are to be accompanied by guidance illustrating how the professional standards can be used by teachers, trainers and their employers.

### 1.2 Key activities of Phase 1

The approach taken for the review of the professional standards was as a result of three main activities. These were:

1. **A review of other teaching standards used in the UK**: this included standards used in other nations of the UK, including those for teachers in the school sector and Higher Education in order to review approaches to the design of such standards.

   These professional standards were examined for key characteristics, design features and approach to the standards – for example if they are designed for teachers at all stages of their careers, the structures they may use and any use of diagrams.

2. **An important piece of research commissioned by the Foundation that examined standards in other sectors in the UK and teaching standards in other countries**.

   The research conducted for the Foundation identified standards of differing lengths, layout and presentation, context in terms of regulation/non-regulation, as well as what might be considered best practice with regard to consultation activities. The USA presented an interesting example of very succinct standards developed as five core propositions: these state that teachers -

   - Are committed to students and their learning;
   - Know their subjects and how to teach them;
   - Are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning;
   - Think systematically about practice and learn from experience; and
   - Are members of learning communities.

   Notable, too, was the finding that the majority of these other standards are used within a regulatory context in contrast to the situation within England. The report researched and developed by RCU\(^\text{10}\) was supported by a summary table that made comparisons across the UK nations’ teaching standards in terms of values, knowledge and skills.

3. **Stakeholder and practitioner interviews conducted by the Foundation.** These interviews provided opportunities to ask the views of sector stakeholders and a sample of practitioners on the LLUK 2007 standards and explored their expectations of the new standards.

The findings from the interviews undertaken by the Foundation, the review of other professional standards along with the RCU research and other relevant reports, such as that led by the Commission for Adult Teaching and Learning (CAVTL)\(^\text{11}\), were discussed at the Project Steering groups and Practitioner group meetings in November and December 2013.

The Foundation explained the rationale for the research, conclusions and approach for the revised professional standards as follows:

*We see the context within which this review is taking place as an opportunity to move beyond professional standards focused on minimum levels of competence and compliance. Instead, we are working to develop aspirational professional standards that will engage and motivate practitioners and their employers, and enhance the reputation of the sector by supporting the development of highly skilled teachers and trainers. Our thinking was also influenced by the Commission on Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning and its recommendations for the development of the workforce.*

*Central to our approach, is a belief in professionalism which recognises the importance of teacher/trainer responsibility for, and ownership of, their own professional learning.*

---

\(^{11}\) CAVTL It’s about work… Excellent adult vocational teaching and learning, March 2013
2. The Consultation

2.1 Methods of Consultation

Phase 2 (the consultation phase) extended over a period of seven weeks between January 7th and February 18th 2014. The following methods were agreed:

1. An online survey - target was 500 responses;
2. Follow-up phone interviews with 70 respondents;
3. Regional events – organised via partner organisations including ACETT, HOLEX and IFL, and;
4. Up to five focus groups with target groups and/or additional interviews.

Figure 1: Diagrammatic illustration of the consultation activity
Consultation responses and participants

In total, over 950 individual responses were received.\(^\text{12}\)

The online survey achieved 622 responses, 75 interviews were conducted and 213 people attended a total of eleven events organised by ACETT, HOLEX and IFL.

Two short focus group sessions were organised as a final activity - with trainee teachers courtesy of the Institute of Education, and with the Higher Level Teaching and Learning Skills group led by the South Essex Consortium. Additional interviews were conducted in place of further focus groups.

Promotion of the consultation phase

A ‘consultation document’ was prepared and used as the main vehicle to explain the approach and purpose of the standards. The document explained audience and terminology, links to the 2013 education and training qualifications, and the specification used to structure the professional standards.

The document also set out the draft standards and explained their design and layout.

For reference, the full Consultation Document is appended as Appendix 1.

The survey\(^\text{13}\) was promoted by four main means:

- via the Education and Training Foundation’s website,
- promotion by members of the Project Steering Group and Practitioner group to their own organisations, and their existing communication channels which, collectively enabled the consultation to reach a wider audience,
- the contacts originally alerted to the work by Pye Tait Consulting in December 2013 and finally,
- the partner organisations (ACETT, AELP\(^\text{14}\), IfL, and Holex).

2.2 Type and Distribution of responses to the consultation

Responses received via the online survey

The survey achieved a total of 622 responses. The largest body of responses came from colleges (further education/ specialist) at just under 35%, followed by commercial/private training providers at just over 16%, followed by adult and community learning at just under 15% (see Table 1).

\(^{12}\) There is some element of duplication, as some individuals participated in more than one method.

\(^{13}\) The survey was designed to balance costs and time against the desired sample of a very large population (for example many thousands of commercial training providers). The sample achieved overall returns a margin of error of between ± 4% and ± 5% for quantitative responses. No attempt has been made to discuss quantitative findings by provider type because this results in a small sample and therefore higher margins of error.

\(^{14}\) AELP assisted the review by acting as a sub-contractor to Pye Tait with the consultation and on the guidance material.
Over 12% responded on behalf of an organisation rather than as an individual. Such responses came from partnership organisations representing for example specialist teaching, other representative bodies, an inspection body and professional bodies, among others.

Table 1  Survey responses distribution by organisation type (workplace)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type</th>
<th>Responses (Nos)</th>
<th>Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Organisation delivering in-house staff training</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Training Provider</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Learning Organisation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training Charity</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Education College (FEC)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>34.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Institution (HEI)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Provider</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Sector Organisation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison/Offender Learning Organisation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>622</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 622, Pye Tait Survey ; 2014

*Others represent: Awarding Organisations/Professional Bodies (6), Campaigning Organisation (1), Centre for Excellence for Teacher Training (1), Independents/self-employed (8), Inspection Body (1), Representative Organisations (4), Schools (4), Other organisations (6)

Figure 2: Responses by Workplace (where greater than 5%)
Table 2: Survey responses distribution by stated job role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job role</th>
<th>Responses (Nos)</th>
<th>Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Chief Executive</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal or Senior Manager</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Leader</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Manager</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/Training Manager</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Manager</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Teacher or Lecturer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Teacher or Trainer</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Lecturer or Teacher</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL Teacher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN or LLDD Teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Teacher or Trainer</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 622, Pye Tait Survey; 2014

*Others represent: Advisers(2); Assistant/Officer(3); Consultants(7); Governors(2); Independents/retired(7); Managers/working on behalf of representative bodies (12); Support workers(4)

Figure 3: Survey Responses collated by (stated) job role type
### Table 3 Geographic location of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical location</th>
<th>Responses (Nos)</th>
<th>Responses (% - rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK – ie representing four nations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>622</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 622 – Pye Tait Survey; 2014

### Regional Events

A total of 213 people attended 11 partner events, representing the following organisations and job roles.

### Table 4 Organisation type represented at partner events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type</th>
<th>Total (Nos)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further Education College (FEC)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Institution (HEI)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Provider</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Training Provider</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Learning Organisation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training Charity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Organisation delivering in-house staff training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison/Offender Learning Organisation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Sector Organisation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Others include: Awarding Organisations, Consortium made up of 5 divisions across learning and skills setting, Consultant, County Council, National Subject Centre, Representative organisation of staff in the post 16 sector Adult Education College*
Table 5 Job roles represented at the partner events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job role</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Chief Executive</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal or Senior Manager</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Leader</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Manager</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/Training Manager</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Manager</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Teacher or Lecturer</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Teacher or Trainer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Lecturer or Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN or LLDD Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Others include: Commissioning Support Manager, PCET Co-ordinator, Trade union official, Foundation Skills Team Leader, Author of text books for FE/skills sector, Self-employed trainer & coach, Awarding Body National Advisor, Professional Development Specialist, Curriculum Development Organiser, Assistant Manager: Staff Development.

**Telephone Interviews**

To further enrich the survey findings and explore emerging issues in greater depth, a series of in-depth telephone interviews were conducted as follow-up, mainly with a subset of survey respondents.

The interviews were not intended to be representative but sought a mix of responses from organisation types and job roles. A total of over 75 interviews were completed in just over three weeks.

Individuals representing the following organisations and job roles were interviewed (Tables 6 and 7).
Table 6 Job role distribution (in-depth telephone interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job role</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Chief Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal or Senior Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Leader</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/Training Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Teacher or Lecturer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Teacher or Trainer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Lecturer or Teacher</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN or LLDD Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Organisation distribution (in-depth telephone interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further Education College (FEC)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Institution (HEI)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Education Provider</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Training Provider</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Learning Organisation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Organisation delivering in-house staff training</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformed Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison/Offender Learning Organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Sector Organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus Groups

Finally, two short focus group sessions were run: 1: a group led by the South Essex Consortium which includes senior management from FE, and 2: over 30 trainee teachers organised through the Institute of Education. Additional feedback on the draft professional standards was acquired, in place of other focus groups, from members of the Network of Black and Asian Professionals and a group of learners attending Redbridge Institute of Adult Education.
3. Feedback on the approach and audience

This section presents the feedback not only from the survey questionnaire but from the events and individual participants who spoke to us during in-depth interviews. The feedback is discussed under the research questions posed across all of the tools used in the study and is set out in the following order:

- Approach and purposes;
- Breadth of audiences and diversity of sector;
- Use of age of the learner as a key differentiator for this sector;
- One set of professional standards for the whole of the FE and skills sector; and
- Links between the standards and the 2013 qualifications

3.1 Do you agree with the approach and purposes as outlined?

The review of the professional standards for teachers and trainers in England is set against a backdrop of workforce deregulation following the Lingfield Review\(^\text{15}\). The 2007 FE Workforce Regulations were revoked in 2012 so, from 2013, teachers and trainers in this sector are no longer required to join a professional body for teachers/trainers, achieve specific teaching qualifications, meet any minimum standards of performance, or fulfil CPD requirements beyond those specified by their employer and/or through their contract of employment.

The regulations were removed because, in the view of BIS and some other stakeholders, it is far more appropriate for employers and individuals to define and regulate professionalism for themselves, rather than have this decided by government regulations.

FE workforce deregulation has been interpreted by some in the sector as signalling that FE and skills teachers do not require teaching qualifications. Many respondents took the opportunity through the consultation to express their disappointment at the revocation as they perceived the changes as entailing the de-skilling and de-professionalisation of FE and skills teachers.

The new 2013 education and training qualifications at Level 3, Level 4 and Level 5\(^\text{16}\) were introduced following guidance developed by the Learning Skills Improvement Service (LSIS)\(^\text{17}\) for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and Awarding Organisations (AOs).

They were accompanied by guidance for employers and practitioners\(^\text{18}\). Further details on the new qualifications, and their development, is explained within those Guidance documents.

---

\(^{15}\) Available online at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/professionalism-in-further-education-final-report-of-the-independent-review-panel

\(^{16}\) Level 3 Award in Education and Training, Level 4 Certificate in Education and Training, Level 5 Diploma in Education and Training

\(^{17}\) LSIS closed in August 2013

\(^{18}\) Guidance for employers and practitioners, Teaching and Training Qualifications have been developed for the Further Education and Skills Sector in England LSIS updated July 2013
Report on the consultation on draft professional standards for teachers and trainers in England

Thus any new professional standards would be operating within a deregulated context where new teaching qualifications have already been introduced.

From the research conducted into practice in other sectors and countries, it became clear that, in almost all cases, professional standards exist within a context of licensing or regulation of practice. As explained above, there is now no equivalent regulatory context within which the revised professional standards will operate for the FE and skills sector in England.

This new context within which the review took place was therefore seen as an opportunity to move beyond professional standards and minimum levels of competence and compliance.

Instead, the work focussed on developing aspirational professional standards that will engage and motivate practitioners and their employers, and enhance the reputation of the sector by supporting the development of highly skilled teachers and trainers.

This thinking was also influenced by the Commission on Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning\(^{19}\) and its recommendations for the development of the workforce.

Central to the approach, is a belief in professionalism which recognises the importance of teacher/trainer responsibility for, and ownership of, their own professional learning.

A ‘consultation document’ (see appendix 1) prepared for participants of the review set out expectations which underpin the draft revised professional standards:

**Teachers and trainers:**

- are reflective and enquiring professionals who think critically about their own educational assumptions, values and practice in the context of a changing contemporary and educational world;

- whether they are vocational or subject staff, are ‘dual professionals’ - both vocational/subject specialists and pedagogical experts, committed to maintaining and developing their expertise in both aspects of their role.

In support of this, the **purposes of the professional standards** were noted in the consultation document as:

- Setting out clear expectations of effective practice in education and training against which teachers and trainers can compare, affirm and celebrate their own practice;

- Enabling teachers and trainers to identify areas for their own professional development in a consistent and systematic way;

- Providing a national reference point that organisations can use to support the development of their staff and so improve learning experiences and outcomes for learners;

---

\(^{19}\) [http://www.excellencegateway.org.uk/cavtl](http://www.excellencegateway.org.uk/cavtl)
• Providing a framework to support initial teacher training and staff development and enhance their teaching.

In addition to choosing agree or not agree survey respondents were given the opportunity to explain their choice of answer.

Over 91% of survey respondents are in agreement with the approach and with the purposes for the draft professional standards, ie in supporting teachers and trainers to maintain and improve standards of teaching, and outcomes for learners.

For this majority of 91% there were a number of common responses with many typically centred on the need for professionalism in the sector, the need to uphold standards for those working in the sector and for the benefit of learners.

The 8% who were not in support, cited the recent revocation of workforce regulation as their reason - as there is no statutory requirement there would be no purpose to such standards.

Typical examples of explanations provided in support are:

- **Organisations have a duty to the learners to ensure that the quality of teaching they are receiving can be benchmarked against the highest standards in the country.** (Service Manager at Private Company)

- **It is important to have a shared set of standards across the sector to ensure learners receive high quality learning experiences and that these are consistent wherever they learn. The existence of standards encourages professionalism within the sector and provides focus and motivation for CPD.** (Curriculum Leader at Commercial Training Provider)

- **Other professionals have declared standards and expectations. Deregulation has damaged the sector - standards will help to rebalance/replace, motivate, point of reference through career, good for learners (experience and expectations from the profession).** (Consultant in Adult Learning at Community Learning Organisation)

The response to the same question on support for the approach and purposes for the professional standards differs slightly by organisation type as can be seen below (although caution must be applied due to the relatively small samples from certain types of organisation - see Table 1).

For example, although around a third of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) provider respondents believe standards are not necessary this equates to just two responses.
Very similar responses in support of the approach and purposes as outlined were noted at the partner events, but at these events there was an opportunity to discuss the landscape, need and purposes in far more detail.

The event feedback also provided a general consensus that a set of professional standards for the FE and Skills sector would be welcome and that the approach followed was appropriate. But some concerns were expressed about the value or purpose of such professional standards in a deregulated sector and respondents sought reassurances about how the professional standards might be used by external stakeholders such as Ofsted. A number of attendees also questioned the added value of having non-mandatory professional standards.

The majority of event attendees agreed that the professional standards should be useful to teachers at whatever stage in their career. The only argument put forward for possible differentiation was the perceived different needs of trainees and experienced teachers/trainers. However, as the professional standards are aspirational there would not appear to be any substantive reason why trainee teachers should not work towards them and be aware of their requirements.

This view was supported by the telephone interviewees who did not want to see a differentiation made between trainee teachers’ expectations and those of experienced/qualified teachers in the standards. Nearly two thirds of interviewees believe the standards should be applicable to all teachers at any stage of their career.

Survey feedback (4%) and a focus group with trainee teachers themselves were also positive. Their first concern was whether the standards look too broad, but feedback was on the whole
encouraging, not least because they confirmed that they could see the professional standards reflected throughout their studies.

The revised professional standards seem to match the teacher training qualifications quite closely. They seem a bit more concise than the previous standards, so that can only be good. The (LLUK) standards just went on and on and on... (Trainee Teacher)

It is also seen as a strength of the standards that they recognise the ‘dual professionalism’ of those working in the sector.

**Summary of key findings in 3.1:**

- There is positive support (91%) for the approach taken and for professional standards that support teachers and trainers to maintain and improve standards of teaching, and outcomes for learners.

- Equally the events and interviews point to significant support for the approach and purposes as outlined. Concerns regarding the value and purpose of having professional standards in a de-regulated sector will need to be addressed in supporting material accompanying the final professional standards.

- The fact that the professional standards are intended for teachers of all stages of their careers was positively received by the majority of the participants.

- This feedback indicates a strong endorsement for professional standards that recognise the importance of teacher/trainer responsibility for, and ownership of, their own professional learning.

**3.2 Do the standards reflect the breadth of the audience as described?**

The overall picture from this question is that four out of five survey respondents feel that the standards do reflect the breadth of the audience as described in the consultation document:

- *teachers and trainers of post-16 learners in the following contexts in England: colleges (excluding sixth form colleges), the community, commercial and charitable organisations, industry, the armed and uniformed services, prisons/ offender learning, and other public sector organisations;*

- *their employers.*

Separate standards are being developed for those working in sixth form colleges. However, many respondents and interviewees questioned why this should be the case.
Responses to the question about audience vary by organisation type.

**Figure 5 Do the draft standards reflect the breadth of the audience?**

Base: 622 – by respondent organisation type (Pye Tait survey).

The proportion of survey respondents choosing ‘Initial teacher education’ as a type of organisation was very low (<1%).

### 3.2.1 English and maths and learner types

There are two aspects to the findings in relation to English and maths.

Firstly, the reference in the draft professional standards to literacy, language and numeracy needs to be changed to English and maths. It was pointed out by many respondents that there is a need for greater prominence of the responsibility for ALL teachers to work to improve their learners’ English, maths and language skills, as required. 20. This responsibility needs greater clarification in the professional standards than is currently stated.

The second issue is in relation to feedback responses from several partnership organisations of initial teacher educators. Some had concerns that a lack of emphasis on subject specialist pedagogy implies a generic teacher role that detracts from the professionalism that teachers gain through their subject expertise. It was also pointed out by others that the Lingfield review raised an expectation that English and maths teachers and those working with students with learning difficulties or disabilities should have specialist training (SLDD) and that this needs to be reflected in the standards.

It should be emphasised that the professional standards are not intended to be descriptions of specific job roles, but have been developed to apply to all teachers. Whatever learner types are being taught, teachers will need to know the appropriate pedagogical approaches to meet their

---

20 This is separate to the need for teachers themselves to have a minimum core in English and maths skills appropriate to their role and which is reflected in the 2013 education and training qualifications.
learners needs, whether they are English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), maths, English or SLDD. Contextualised case studies will be useful to help with this situation.

A learner focus

It was also requested by a number of groups at events, interviewees and a focus group session that the standards should have a far greater emphasis on learners, and that their needs, experiences, aspirations and responsibilities be incorporated. This request will be reviewed and carried forward in the development of the next iteration of the professional standards.

3.2.2 Diversity of the sector

Among the discussions at the events a very similar issue arose but was a broader discussion reflecting the widespread recognition of the diverse nature of the sector. It prompted some debate on how to incorporate this reality into a set of professional standards.

Broadly speaking, there are two schools of thought:

- one which advocates making the diversity of the sector more explicit, possibly by inclusion of varied working examples from different practices, eg prisons, community centres, charities etc.

- The other recommends the standards are kept broad so that they can be easily applied and ‘personalised’ according to user. This would allow for a set of universal standards be applicable to all teachers in any sector.

In most cases it was offered that a depository of associated guidance which can go into greater detail for each subsector/learning environment and can be regularly updated would be a very useful tool.

> Although there is some common ground, particularly associated with teaching and learning, many of the approaches in FE would not work in adult and community learning which requires greater skills in terms of engagement, negotiating learning around family commitments and encouraging lifelong learning. (Quality Manager at Community Learning Organisation)

A small number of interviewees, just over 1 in 7, feel the standards do not fully reflect the sector’s variety of audience including catering for SEN learners; a couple of interviewees also felt strongly that the professional standards are too lightweight to successfully apply to any type of learner.

Whilst the majority of organisations rated the relevance of the draft professional standards to different contexts between 7.5 and 8 (see Figure 5), business organisations conducting training in-house gave a relatively lower rating. These respondents were keen on making the diversity of the sector more explicit in the standards.
3.3 Defining the audience: a question of ‘age’

The consultation document clarified the rationale for using age as a means for distinguishing the audience for the professional standards:

- A majority of survey respondents (4 out of 5) believe the professional standards do reflect the breadth of audience. Initial teacher educators were less content however and their feedback highlight perceived shortcomings, particularly in the knowledge and skills sections in the professional standards in relation to the teaching of English, maths and of specialist learning for learners with difficulties and disabilities.

- The need for English and maths teaching by all teachers should be strengthened, ie remove any implication that the responsibility for this can be passed to others.

- A small number of survey respondents but a larger number of event attendees requested that the professional standards focus more on the learner which will be taken into account.

- As the basis of the standards is for generic standards that can apply to all teachers in the FE and Skills sector, a recommendation will be made to the Foundation to consider developing contextualised case studies, at a later stage, that demonstrate how different groups of teachers are taking forward the professional standards with different learner types.

Summary of findings in section 3.2

- A majority of survey respondents (4 out of 5) believe the professional standards do reflect the breadth of audience. Initial teacher educators were less content however and their feedback highlight perceived shortcomings, particularly in the knowledge and skills sections in the professional standards in relation to the teaching of English, maths and of specialist learning for learners with difficulties and disabilities.

- The need for English and maths teaching by all teachers should be strengthened, ie remove any implication that the responsibility for this can be passed to others.

- A small number of survey respondents but a larger number of event attendees requested that the professional standards focus more on the learner which will be taken into account.

- As the basis of the standards is for generic standards that can apply to all teachers in the FE and Skills sector, a recommendation will be made to the Foundation to consider developing contextualised case studies, at a later stage, that demonstrate how different groups of teachers are taking forward the professional standards with different learner types.

3.3 Defining the audience: a question of ‘age’

The consultation document clarified the rationale for using age as a means for distinguishing the audience for the professional standards:
We have used the age of the learner (post-16) as a means of differentiating the audience for the revised professional standards. We recognise the limitations of this, following the Raising of the Participation Age and because learners aged 14+ are now able to attend FE colleges on a full-time basis or attend FE colleges and other providers on a part-time basis. However, by retaining the age distinction, we are aiming to highlight that one of the distinctive features of working as a teacher or trainer in this sector is the diverse, and often older, age profile of the learners.

Over 73% of survey respondents believe an age range is necessary as a distinguishing metric for this sector, but it was clear that at the partner events, where a fuller debate could be had, many could not see the point of stipulating ‘16’ as the starting point for these standards.

The standards should apply to the teaching of any age of learner - the outcome for learners of all providers should be the same regardless of their age. (Curriculum Leader at Community Learning Organisation).

In response to this debate, one event at a Centre for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT), suggested that the standards should directly refer to the ‘full spectrum’ of learners - 16-19 year olds, adults, young people not in education or employment, offenders, those with severe mental health issues - in order to fully illustrate and acknowledge the full breadth of the sectors’ learner audience.

In common with the events, a number of interviewees (slightly more than 1 in 5) raised concerns over the provision for the 14-16 age group. A number believe these younger learners have different needs to older students and teachers would require additional skills to teach this age group.

Many liked that the standards are ‘generic’ enough to be easily applied to individual contexts and learner types, and a number praised the reference to vocational and community learning audiences; some noted in particular and were also pleased by the standards not appearing too “college focussed”.

The standards are generic enough and encompasses all ages of learners; I like that they’re not too specific because then they can be applied to different teaching contexts. (Curriculum Leader at Further Education College)

The standards reflect this audience very well and I appreciate how vocational and academic needs are both matched. The standards reflect the real world and can be applied to different contexts. We cater for 16-24 year-olds and the standards reflect their needs well. (Vocational Teacher at Further Education College)
If they successfully reflect the core values and practices of the sector, they do not need to be concerned about learner age or subject area as they would apply to all teachers (Vice Principal at Higher Education Institution)

Summary of findings in section 3.3

- Whilst there is some concern surrounding the teaching of learners aged 14 to 16, the majority of survey respondents (73%) like ‘age’ being used as a distinguishing metric to these standards.

- Additionally, the generic nature of the professional standards has been well received.

- The generic approach has been followed in support of the fact that no matter what age or social or ethnic background the learner comes from, the role for the teacher and trainer is to adapt to, and meet those, specific needs; this is a fundamental element already present in the standards.

- Therefore the use of age does not seem to be a ‘vital’ distinguishing factor as it is one of only a number of equally important factors, such as ethnic, social, gender and culture and even geographic which can impact on learners; consequently focussing on one factor only could invite further unnecessary complications given the intention that they should be universally applicable across the FE and Skills sector. It is therefore recommended that age is not overtly stipulated in any descriptor or promotional material about the professional standards but is addressed in the Guidance.

3.4 Is there a rationale for developing these standards for this sector?

It was opportune to review, through this consultation, the need for professional standards specifically for this relatively diverse sector or if in fact the sector would be better adopting other, related, standards such as those for higher education or for teachers in schools.

This question prompted a diverse set of responses which fell into two broad camps based on respondents’ differing standpoints. The first group, around 85%, argued that a single set of standards is essential for the FE and Skills sector.

---

21 Since the closure of LLUK, the definition of the sector appears to have shifted from Lifelong Learning in that, today, the sector is more widely understood or referred to as ‘FE and skills’
Everyone working in FE whether they are a tutor, trainer, lecturer or assessor is working towards the same goal - ensuring that the learner receives the best possible educational experience. I believe that these standards highlight all the necessary factors that contribute to that learning experience.

(Subject Lecturer at Further Education College)

Indeed, as the quotes below show, some went a stage further and suggested a need for one set of standards for all who teach.

Teachers are teachers across the sectors – more alignment is needed to achieve parity and cohesion among the profession as a whole. (Initial Teacher Education Manager at an HEI).

As educators we make things complex. The general public is not interested in terminology of FE or HE or adult education. There must be one set of standards that applies to all. (Learning/Training Manager at Commercial Training Provider)

The other group, of around 15%, proposed that the diversity of the “FE and Skills sector” necessitates more than one set of standards i.e. one set of standards cannot be universally applied across the breadth of the FE and Skills sector.

Although having professional standards is clearly supported by the sector, some - including telephone interviewees and event attendees - pointed out there may be other standards around that fit the need.

The most commonly mentioned standards, in particular at ACETT and IfL events, were the Department of Education (DfE) Teaching Standards22; other standards mentioned at a few events were the UK Professional Standards Framework supported by the Higher Education Academy (HEA)23.

Summary of key findings for section 3.4:

- Around 85% are in support of one set of professional standards for the FE and Skills sector.

- Suggestions for using other standards instead of these professional standards came from a few survey respondents and was debated at around half of the partner events, as well as a small proportion of interviewees. These suggestions were twofold -

---

23 See http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpdf where it is also explained how the UK professional standards framework can be used - for example becoming a Fellow of the HEA, making use of their accreditation service, CPD and others.
that further work could be done to the FE and Skills sector professional standards to streamline or condense them to reflect the schools sector standards approach,

or an alternative route would be to adopt the DfE teaching standards to help with cohesion. This latter possibility was mentioned by relatively few organisations/individuals, however.

- There are clear indications that the next version of the professional standards should be condensed further, not for the purpose of being aligned to the school teaching standards, but to enable teachers and trainers to have professional standards that are memorable and have impact as well as potentially being more effective at encouraging use than a lengthy and wordy document.

3.5 Linking the professional standards and the 2013 education and training qualifications

Survey respondents and event attendees were asked about the new qualifications at Levels 3, 4 and 5 that emerged during 2013, and whether they believe the professional standards reflect the requirements of those qualifications.

In order to answer this question, survey respondents were asked firstly about their familiarity with these new qualifications: the survey reveals some uncertainty about the new qualifications as the average rating is 5.4 - a rating out of 10, where 1 is extremely unfamiliar and 10 is extremely familiar (base: 596).

Just under half (47%) of that base rated their familiarity with the new qualifications at 6 or higher - indicating good to strong familiarity with the new qualifications. Of this same group, 83% believed the standards do successfully reflect the latest qualifications.

From the total survey responses, regardless of familiarity with the 2013 qualifications, over 73% feel there is harmony, and although there is an element of cautiousness, survey respondents were positive.

\begin{quote}
The draft standards are succinct and flexible. This means that it should be relatively easy to 'map' the standards against the LSIS qualifications framework. (CETT Vice Principal/Senior Manager)

Having been involved in Teacher Training, I looked at the new qualifications in detail in my own specialisms and feel that the standards underpin the aims of the qualifications (Curriculum Leader at Local Authority Learning Service)

These standards seem to be describing the spirit and intention rather than attempting to be a checklist. (Head of Department, Business organisation delivering in-house training)
\end{quote}
Of the few who felt the professional standards do not reflect the new qualifications, they suggested there are gaps such as between the theory of items within the standards and actual practice. As explained earlier, another specific example given is that the standards do not appear to reflect the requirements of the subject specialist qualifications, whilst they do reflect the generic qualifications.

A number of event attendees questioned whether the standards were suitably linked to the new teaching qualifications; delegates at several events, including the Yorkshire and Midlands HOLEX events, for example want to see a greater connection made between the standards, new teaching qualifications, and Ofsted’s Common Inspectors’ Framework (CIF).

Some believed this would make the three documents more transparent and easier to apply in all contexts; this was particularly important for those who work for multiple local authorities and so may be exposed to different applications of the three documents.

**Mapping research**

A small but important piece of research to map the standards to the Levels 4 and 5 qualifications, and - separately - to the CIF operated by Ofsted took place during the early stage of the consultation.

The work was conducted by an experienced member of the team involved with the development of the 2013 qualifications.

The object was to examine whether the values, knowledge and understanding and skills set out in the draft revised professional standards are consistent with those that a trainee teacher, who has achieved the 2013 Education and Training qualifications would have been introduced to/begun to develop or even mastered.

As anticipated, the conclusions from the mapping work indicated very close harmonisation between these qualifications and frameworks and the draft professional standards. Since then a proposal was made to conduct this mapping work between the standards and the Level 3 Award in Education and Training qualification to help those who typically enter the sector at that level.

**Summary of Key Findings in section 3.5**

- Just under half of the survey respondents rated their own familiarity with the 2013 education and training qualifications as six or more out of ten. Of all survey respondents, over 78% feel the professional standards reflect the requirements of the new 2013 qualifications.

- At some point additional Guidance would be useful that points to explicit or implied linkages, where appropriate, to those frameworks and qualifications of relevance to many professionals in the sector. The mapping work already undertaken could also be updated and referenced in the Guidance at a later stage, and this should also include a mapping between the professional standards and the Level 3 Award in Education and Training.
4. Feedback on the structure, layout and design of the professional standards

During Phase 1 of the research, other standards and applicable frameworks were reviewed in order to inform the review of the professional standards. The version that went out to consultation drew upon the research and on a number of other professional standards including those used in Scotland and aspects of the DfE Teaching Standards.

The approach used in the USA of having five core propositions, to which individual States add critical aspects of relevance to their States, and for which extensive guidance exists, was another important input into the design. The characteristics and succinctness provide opportunities for the standards to be memorable and usable as such to users. This was a feature that not only appealed to the Project Steering and Practitioner Groups in Phase 1 but also, when explained, to the attendees at the events.

Discussions at two or three of the events also extensively focussed on the DfE Teaching Standards and the attractive features (eg the one-page layout).

4.1 Other comments on the professional standards

Before focusing on the detail of the professional standards in the survey, respondents were invited to make further general comments.

Of the 15% that chose to provide some commentary, there was significant positive feedback; people seemed pleased there had been a consultation on the professional standards and were happy with its approach as well as the fact that a wide range of practitioners are being consulted. Others specifically mentioned the standards in a positive light. A large number of respondents commented that they thought having standards were important and useful, especially in the newly deregulated sector.

From that 15% providing other commentary, there were also comments expressing concerns. These include, for example, respondents suggesting the professional standards were either too wordy or too vague: opinion was divided whether the standards are detailed enough or open to interpretation. This last was also mentioned at the events with a number querying the standards not being measurable and therefore causing confusion as to whether they had been ‘met’ or not.

The intention of the draft professional standards is to remain generic. Whilst a few respondents perceived there to be gaps such as ethics, employability skills and behaviour management, and several organisational survey respondents pointed to gaps for those undertaking specialist teaching, many liked the flexibility of the standards. Those who did not think the standards accurately reflect the requirements of those delivering education to those with special educational needs were also discussed in section 3.2.1.

---

24 See RCU report for the Foundation, Fletcher, Walker and Boniface 2013
4.2 Improvements suggested

Just under 95% of all survey respondents responded to the question ‘to what extent do you agree that the following sections require improvement?’. Although ‘Neither agree nor disagree’ was the most common answer from individuals, organisational responses most commonly chose ‘Tend to agree’.

Figure 6 is typical of the responses received back by organisation type not just on values, but also the knowledge and skills section.

**Figure 7 Need for Improvement to 'Values and Attributes' by organisation type**

![Graph showing need for improvement to values and attributes by organisation type](image)

Base 584: Pye Tait Survey

In response to the questions about any improvements that may need to be made, the following summarises key points from the survey respondents.

The majority of respondents think that there is no requirement for changes to the layout, terminology and language, or presentation.

4.2.1 Layout

In response to the question on improvements to layout over half of the respondents indicated that they would not want to see any changes made to the layout with many commenting that they found the draft standards user friendly and easy to read.
4.2.2 Diagram

As can be seen in Appendix 1 the standards are introduced by a circular diagram which depicts three sections intended to convey a sense of an interrelated nature.

![Diagram Example]

The most common suggested improvement to the layout was about the diagram.

Many recommended using a more traditional Venn diagram format, whilst others suggested reordering the diagram to reflect how the sections interrelate more succinctly.

As suggested by one of the HOLEX events (diagrams are courtesy of HOLEX), the image seems to need to be as below, with circles in the centre, not to the bottom. This makes the values more central.

![Reordered Diagram]

**Wonder if Part B should not actually be the smallest circle, then C and A last. Theories - are general, but a very small part of what makes us good teachers, are our professional skills – these are possibly more important, and, therefore, would be the next circle, but the most important and all-encompassing things are our values and attributes. Combining B and C creates A, so maybe you should have two circles of about the same size, representing B and C (dual professionalism), and A being a big circle with the other two inside, which makes us a well-qualified professional.** (Trainee Teacher at Further Education College)

**I think the diagram should have 3 interlocking circles of equal size to indicate their equal importance.** (Subject Lecturer at Public Sector Organisation)

A concern raised by both survey respondents and in-depth telephone interview participants was the potential misinterpretation of the diagram; some were concerned the size of the circles indicated an inherent hierarchy of importance among the three sections whilst others suggested section A should appear centrally to illustrate that values are at the heart of the FE and skills teaching profession.

Similarly, several survey respondents and telephone interview participants suggested including more diagrams to aid readers with different learning styles or learning difficulties.
A little bit wordy, maybe more diagrams and even pictures to help any dyslexic readers. (Quality Manager at Adult Community Learning Organisation)

I would like to see a range of layouts to suit teachers' different learning styles. (Curriculum Leader at Public Sector Organisation)

4.2.3 Terminology and language

Again, over half of the survey respondents who answered this question felt that that the terminology and language used in the draft standards did not require any change. Of the very small number who suggested improvements (less than 3% provided suggestions), the main theme was a request to see less academic jargon and ‘emotive’ words used and advocated the benefit of ‘Plain English’.

Lose the pedagogical edu-babble and write in plain English. (Curriculum Leader at Higher Education Institution)

Terminology is too ‘fashionable’. Therefore it is better to use standard phraseology. For example why is important to have ‘passion’? This has various connotations and misconceptions and puts lots of people off. (Chief Executive of Commercial Training Provider)

A good number of event attendees questioned the use of the word ‘understanding’ in the knowledge section, believing it to be a non-measurable item and that these need to be SMART.

4.2.4 Presentation

Again, over half the survey respondents who responded to a question on improvements to the presentation of the professional standards did not think there was a need to change any aspect of the revised standards’ presentation; many respondents commented that the document was easy to read and navigate. Of those few (less than 3%) who suggested improvements, most recommended using more colour and images to make the document engaging.

Others raised concerns over the provision for those who are colour blind or dyslexic, and some suggested allowing the background colours to be manipulated to cater for these special requirements.

Whereas a number of arguments were made at the events for condensing the standards, cutting verbosity and removing instances of repetition, only one group at one event felt that the standards should be longer.
In general, event attendees felt that the draft professional standards are succinct and easy to read (most felt it is an improvement on the LLUK 2007 standards) but could be cut even further.

A number of improvements have been suggested across the consultation events, including the possibility that some statements duplicate one another or overlap considerably or whether certain points or aspects are missing.

Similarly, over half (54%) of the telephone interviewees would like the professional standards short enough to be set out on one page, although from that same group 26% liked the idea but were concerned this could lose vital detail.

Ten percent suggested three documents—a summary page, the standards with the extra detail, and the guidance document. The Guidance document concept is well liked by many.

Other benefits for condensing the professional standards include the opportunity to put the standards on a poster/print-out card/lanyard/make an acronym out of it, and so on.

4.3 Structure (Values and Attributes, Knowledge and Understanding and Skills)

From those responding to the survey, just under 86% strongly agree or tend to agree that the standards follow a logical structure and order that is easy to navigate; slightly less than this (83%) strongly agree or tend to agree that the terminology and language used is appropriate and easy to understand. Over 52% strongly or tended to agree that the standards style, colour scheme and font is engaging.

Only 36% of the total 622 survey respondents provided any changes they would like to see made to the ‘structure’ of the professional standards, and of these just under half commented that they did not think the draft standards’ structure required any changes.

The most frequent comment from those who offered suggestions was about the length of the document and the perceived repetition between the sections. The message was to streamline or condense the standards and suggestions included combining Section B and C (Knowledge and Understanding, and Skills). Feedback from the events corroborated this view and extensively discussed suggestions for better words, the length and where duplication could be avoided.

There is far too much overlap and repetition and overall the document is far too long. As each element of the structure is embedded in the diagram, the content has far too much repetition in it for clarity, (for example, Collaboration in A, and Working with Others in C looks as though elements are simply in twice) (Initial Teacher Education Teacher at Further Education College)
Emphasis on CPD, Continual Professional Development i.e. some further guidance. Minimum standards linked to the teaching qualifications i.e. “if teaching in the context of X then you need Y...” (Self-employed Subject Teacher and Practitioner)

The word cloud below gives some indication of the general positive nature of the improvements suggested through words used by respondents, such as clear, good, like and professional.

Summary of findings in section 4

- The succinct nature of the DfE teaching standards and the concept behind the core propositions was liked by a number of event attendees, and provides further support and evidence for a next iteration of the professional standards to be shorter and more succinct;

- High proportions of the survey respondents agree that the structure, language and terminology are appropriate and follow a logical order, with little change required – except to the length;

- A large number of improvements have been mentioned but most point to improving the diagram, making the standards more concise, succinct and possibly combining either 2 of the 3 sections (values, knowledge and skills) or statements to reduce repetition;

- It may be worthwhile to consider putting the standards through the Plain English (crystal mark) exercise to aid accessibility;

- Respondents have pointed to gaps for example for those delivering to learners with LLDD or in a work based learning environment. However, as has been discussed before, these will be handled through the Guidance material rather than in the professional standards which have been developed specifically to be generic.
5. Feedback on using the professional standards

5.1 Applicability and uses

Further questions in the survey took the issue a step beyond the need for standards and asked respondents to consider how they themselves would see their purpose and uses.

There was a very strong message emerging from the events that the ‘purposes’ of these professional standards are not yet clear, which left people uncertain about their uses. This seemed to emerge from some initial uncertainty from many event stakeholders (particularly those at the ACETT and IFL events) about how these standards will be used particularly by Ofsted.

During the consultation (February) a joint statement emerged from the Foundation and Ofsted for the professional standards.

‘Ofsted has been involved in the Education and Training Foundation’s review of the 2007 professional standards for teachers and trainers in FE and Skills in England. Inspectors will use the final version of the new professional standards as part of ITE and FE and Skills inspections. We are exploring opportunities to work together in other ways to further improve the quality of training for teachers and trainers in the FE sector.’

This was taken in a positive light, but still prompted further questions as to what that would mean in practice.

At one event, for example, there was a strong view that in reality for the “FE & Skills Sector” there is no need for any such standards for ‘FE’ but that maybe they were more relevant to the non-FE elements - ie the ‘skills sector’ which are not inspected by Ofsted.

In contrast, others were less concerned about Ofsted’s role and spoke positively about the standards representing an excellent opportunity to establish benchmarking, whether against the CIF, teaching standards or other measurements used in FE.

Two other themes arose at several events: 1) how to secure buy-in from the sector. It was posited that the Foundation would need to ensure that not just teachers will use the standards but that also managers will need to buy into the aspirational nature of the standards. And, 2) ownership: some attendees were curious about the ownership of the standards, wanting also for it to be clear that they should not be used for employers’ agendas.

The majority of in-depth telephone interviewees believe the standards would be useful, with just under half commenting they would provide a national benchmark of professionalism to which teachers of all levels could aspire; a number argued this would be particularly useful for those who had not undergone teacher training.
Standards will be useful because they are important to ensure a standardised quality of professional teaching as there will be some teachers who have not undergone teacher training. (Initial Teacher Education Lecturer at Community Learning Organisation)

Many of the telephone interviewees pointed out that owing to the standards’ non-mandatory status, they could be used by employers in many different ways. Some were, as a consequence, concerned about the quality of teaching provided by those organisations not adhering to the standards, but recognised that essentially this choice is up to employers.

I would use the standards as a matter of professional pride, and my students would recognise that. (Vocational Trainer at Further Education College)

Another point that could be used as a good promotional message was most commonly mentioned by those in community learning and vocational training organisations, which was their perception that the professional standards will be useful in boosting morale and pride within the sector.

5.2 Comparisons with and usage of the current and new professional standards

The figure below indicates a positive trend of feedback on intended use of the draft professional standards. Just under 15% of respondents suggest they will not use these standards in the future in comparison with over 85% who do intend to use them.

Figure 8: Future use of the draft standards in comparison with usage of the current standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use the 2007 standards currently, and will use the revised standards in the future</td>
<td>56.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the 2007 standards currently, but will not use the revised standards in the future</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t use the 2007 standards currently, but will use the revised standards in the future</td>
<td>29.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t use the 2007 standards currently, and will not use the revised standards in the future</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 571: Pye Tait Survey; 2014
The next two diagrams represent data from survey respondents, which continue to mirror the positive trend by indicating ways they are likely to use the professional standards. Whilst the least supported ways of using the professional standards, over 60% believe organisations could use them to support staff recruitment, performance management and staff development.

**Figure 9  Appropriate ways to use the professional standards?**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who believe organisations could use the professional standards for different purposes.]

- To support personal professional development
- To support professional development of others
- Within organisations to support improvements in teaching
- Within organisations to support staff recruitment, performance management and staff development

**Base:** 586 (multi-response answer) Pye Tait Survey

**Figure 10 Ways in which you may use the professional standards?**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who strongly agree, tend to agree, neither agree nor disagree, tend to disagree, strongly disagree, don’t know, and not applicable to different purposes.]

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don’t know
- Not applicable

**Base:** 606 (multi-response answer) Pye Tait Survey
The views of event attendees were not too dissimilar to the above findings. At the events the attendees discussed in varying order the uses of the professional standards.

A good example of a discussion on CPD was at one event that suggested the professional standards identify and highlight the range and quantity of work that teachers do. The attendees feel this will make practitioners in the sector feel valued and be useful for organisations developing a CPD policy as they will be able to use the standards to frame the policy. In contrast a small number pointed to uncertainty about using the standards for CPD reasons.

Other discussions looked at improvements in teaching, staff recruitment and development. Finally performance management stimulated more debate and in particular brought up the continuing issue of Ofsted and how they would use the standards.

Attendees would like to use the revised standards in performance management processes but are concerned that these are currently geared around what Ofsted does and wants; ‘if Ofsted expects management of performance, the sector needs something else to support this management of performance rather than just ‘aspirations’.

**Summary of findings in section 5.**

- Very positive findings have been received from the survey with 85% of the respondent base pointing to an intended use of the professional standards in the future.

- Concerns arose when discussing usage of these professional standards which centred around two main stakeholders types: Ofsted and what their support for these standards may mean in reality; by employers and the importance of securing their buy-in with these aspirational standards.

- The survey in particular noted a very positive trend in responses regarding usage; in order of response – personal development, and personal development of others are seen as the top two uses followed by organisational use of the standards to support improvements in teaching. Use by organisations for performance management purposes received the least support but is still positive at over 60%.

- Additionally, respondents were keen to understand where ownership of the standards will reside. The intention is that the sector will ‘own’ the standards but it is recognised that the Foundation does need to play a role in monitoring their usage and measuring support.

- Numerous ways that the standards could be used were highlighted at the events, including CPD which many saw as an excellent reason for the professional standards for both individuals and for organisations for example developing a CPD policy. These are useful promotional items that could be illustrated both in the Guidance and subsequent marketing material.
6. Conclusions

The main aim of this consultation exercise was to capture the views of a diverse range of professionals working in and for the FE and Skills sector. The basis of the consultation was a survey, interviews and events and succeeded in attracting around 950 responses during a seven week period.

These conclusions have been discussed with members of the Project Steering and Practitioner groups and were approved as being accurate and forming the main conclusions as the basis for the way forward.

1. There is a need for professional standards in the FE & Skills sector in order to achieve a number of objectives but particularly to improve outcomes for learners especially in a de-regulated workforce context.

2. With some exceptions the vast majority of participants feel the purposes outlined for the standards are right.

3. The professional standards are seen as useful for providing a benchmark to aspire to for trainees and CPD opportunities for established or experienced teachers. The standards should link to ITE qualifications whilst also providing a basis of continuing development and self-evaluation post-qualification, and that discussions with Ofsted about this will be a priority.

4. The existence of other teaching standards and their potential applicability to professionals working in the FE and Skills sector. Most commonly mentioned were the Department of Education (DfE) Teaching Standards, others less commonly mentioned but were discussed include the Higher Education standards produced by the Higher Education Academy (HEA). The majority (85%) also feel a single set of standards for use by this sector is appropriate.

5. At the time these concerns prompted a number of survey respondents and event attendees to question the added value of the professional standards. They were unsure about their aspirational aspect, querying the fact that these standards are non-measurable in contrast to previous standards. Many were simply expressing uncertainty over how to apply non-mandatory and aspirational standards.

6. Securing buy-in to the standards from the sector especially from employers and senior managers is a priority task for the Foundation once the professional standards are finalised and launched.

7. There is widespread recognition of the diverse nature of the sector and broad agreement that the professional standards are appropriate for the breadth of the sector. Contextualised case studies for those, in particular, teaching specialists, should be created.

8. The audiences for the professional standards - described in the consultation document as 'teachers and trainers of post-16 learners in the following contexts in England: colleges (excluding sixth form colleges), the community, commercial and charitable organisations, industry, the armed and uniformed services, prisons/ offender learning, and other public sector organisations, and their employers' - are approved by 80% of survey respondents; although many wondered about separate standards for sixth form colleges.
9. Whilst circa 73% of survey respondents approved of the use of “age” as being the main distinguishing metric between this and other sectors, some say the scope should point to the full spectrum of learners such as offenders, those with special needs and so on. It was agreed by the Project Steering Group and Practitioner Group that rather than adjusting “generic” standards, it is sensible to show usage of the professional standards whilst working with different learner types in the accompanying Guidance.

10. Over 78% of survey respondents feel the professional standards reflect the new education and training qualifications, and although there is some cautiousness, survey respondents were positive about this, including the 4% trainee teacher survey respondents. Mapping work has been done to test the original belief that the professional standards and qualifications do have a close harmony and the standards reflect the qualifications.

11. High proportions of the survey respondents agree that the structure, language and terminology are appropriate, with little change required or suggested with just over a third of survey respondents providing suggestions for improvement to the structure (ie the values, knowledge and skills).

12. The succinct nature of the DfE teaching standards and the concept behind the core propositions was liked by many of the event attendees.

13. In summary, a number of improvements have been mentioned but the majority point to improving the diagram, making the standards more concise, succinct and possibly combining two of the three sections in order to reduce apparent repetition.

14. Key overarching area of improvement or change suggested for Phase 3 stem from the majority view that standards are relatively clear, easy to understand and do not contain jargon, but that the professional standards in draft form are too long. Statements ideally need to be condensed or a merging of two of the three current sections to reduce duplication. A one-page document was seen as ideal by many.
7. Recommendations

As with the conclusions these recommendations have been discussed, accepted and agreed by the Project Steering and Practitioner groups as the basis for the way forward.

The recommendations are listed in two sections: those that are more strategic in nature, and those that are standards-specific and, therefore, largely tactical.

Strategic Recommendations

1. The Foundation and sector stakeholders should support the introduction of the new professional standards by clearly communicating the purposes and value of these professional standards and address the ongoing confusion about their use.

2. Any marketing or communications materials developed to support the launch of the professional standards should not only present the benefits of this approach, but should also clarify how they will be used by key stakeholders such as Ofsted. The Foundation should develop key messages to be incorporated in any marketing or communications materials.

3. The Foundation and sector stakeholders should consider developing, for the launch or thereafter, promotional materials that may incorporate a postcard and/or poster to raise awareness of the professional standards.

4. The Foundation should work closely with employers in the sector to raise awareness, and encourage use, of the professional standards.

Standards-specific Recommendations:

With respect to the standards themselves we would recommend that the Foundation:

5. Aim for a reduced set of statements ideally combining sub-sections and closely-related statements where possible to ensure that the final professional standards are no longer in length than the current form and preferably shorter.

6. Simplify the diagram and consider using a column layout to move towards a one page presentation.

7. Incorporate those features of the DfE Teaching Standards mentioned most often in events; for example: an introductory Preamble, headings with a succinct set of statements to underpin them, and an overall condensed set of standards.

8. Continue with the intended use of the Guidance to exemplify how the standards may be used for the different purposes, across different settings and for the different groups of learners.
9. Consider adding to the Guidance strategic findings from the mapping work across the education and training qualifications and the standards.

10. Consider undertaking further mapping between Level 3 and the professional standards.

11. Explain in the Guidance how the standards link to the qualifications while emphasising the point that the standards are not intended to inform the development of qualifications.
Appendix 1 – Consultation document

Review of the Professional Standards for Teachers and Trainers in England

Consultation Document

January 2014
1. Background

One of the key areas of activity within the delivery plan for the Education and Training Foundation is to review the current professional standards for teachers, tutors and trainers in the lifelong learning sector, which were developed by LLUK and introduced in 2007. These standards were not updated when initial teacher qualifications were reviewed by LSIS in 2012/13. Our intention is to launch the revised professional standards in early April 2014.

There are three phases to the review:

**Phase One** ran from October to December 2013. The Foundation worked closely with teachers, trainers, their employers and sector stakeholders through our Project Steering Group\(^\text{25}\) and Practitioner Group\(^\text{26}\), to shape the approach to the review. Research into practice in other sectors and countries has also informed our thinking about the purpose of, and audience for, the revised professional standards and their design. The Foundation commissioned Pye Tait Consulting to develop the revised professional standards and manage the consultation.

**Phase Two** runs from 7 January to 18 February 2014. During this phase, we are collecting feedback from the wider sector on the draft professional standards to ensure that the final version of the revised professional standards has the support of teachers, trainers and their employers. To ensure that teachers, trainers and employers from all parts of the sector can contribute to the review, we are using a variety of approaches, such as an online survey at [www.pyetait.com/etfstandards](http://www.pyetait.com/etfstandards), regional workshops (arranged by ACETT, HOLEX, and the Institute for Learning), in depth interviews and thematic focus groups.

For further information, email [enquiries@etfoundation.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@etfoundation.co.uk).

**Phase Three** will run from the end of February to mid-April 2014. During this phase, we will analyse and review feedback from the sector, finalise, and then launch the revised professional standards. The standards will be accompanied by guidance illustrating how they can be used by teachers, trainers and their employers.

---

\(^{25}\) The Project Steering Group includes representatives from the following organisations: 157 group, ACETT, AELP, ASCL, ATL, ATFL, FISSS, HEA, HOLEX, JFL, LANDEX, learndirect, MoD, NATSPEC, NPB, NIAACE, PPC, SFCA, TSNL, UCET, UCU, and Unison. Representatives from Ofsted, BIS and the Welsh Department of Education are observers. The chair is Dereth Wood, Director of Strategy at learndirect and ex-CAVTL commissioner.

\(^{26}\) We invited applications from the sector to join the group and from the 40 applications, selected 25 practitioners from a range of different types of organisations across the sector.
2. **Our approach**

From our research into practice in other sectors and countries, it became clear that, in almost all cases, professional standards exist within a context of licensing or regulation of practice. However, there is no equivalent regulatory context within which the revised professional standards will operate for the FE and skills sector in England. The 2007 FE Workforce Regulations were revoked in 2012 so, from 2013, teachers and trainers in this sector are not required to join a professional body for teachers/trainers, achieve specific teaching qualifications, meet any minimum standards of performance, or fulfil CPD requirements beyond those specified by their employer and/or through their contract of employment.

We see the context within which this review is taking place as an opportunity to move beyond professional standards focused on minimum levels of competence and compliance. Instead, we are working to develop aspirational professional standards that will engage and motivate practitioners and their employers, and enhance the reputation of the sector by supporting the development of highly skilled teachers and trainers. Our thinking was also influenced by the [Commission on Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/adult-learning-standards) and its recommendations for the development of the workforce.

Central to our approach, is a belief in professionalism which recognises the importance of teacher/trainer responsibility for, and ownership of, their own professional learning.

The following expectations underpin the draft revised professional standards:

**Teachers and trainers:**

- are reflective and enquiring professionals who think critically about their own educational assumptions, values and practice in the context of a changing contemporary and educational world;

- whether they are vocational or subject staff, are ‘dual professionals’ - both vocational/subject specialists and pedagogical experts, committed to maintaining and developing their expertise in both aspects of their role.

Below we describe the intended purpose and audiences for the revised professional standards. The online survey presents an opportunity for us to collect feedback on these aspects of the review as well as on the draft revised professional standards themselves. This feedback will be particularly important in helping us to develop the accompanying guidance as well as finalising the standards. The survey is available here: [www.pyetait.com/etfstandards](http://www.pyetait.com/etfstandards).
2.1 Purpose

The overall purpose of the revised professional standards is to support teachers and trainers to maintain and improve standards of teaching, and outcomes for learners. The revised professional standards are intended to:

- set out clear expectations of effective practice in education and training against which teachers and trainers can compare, affirm and celebrate their own practice;
- enable teachers and trainers to identify areas for their own professional development in a consistent and systematic way;
- provide a national reference point that organisations can use to support the development of their staff and so improve learning experiences and outcomes for learners, and
- support initial teacher training and staff development and enhance their teaching.

2.2 Audience and terminology

The intended audience for the revised professional standards are:

- teachers and trainers of post-16 learners in the following contexts in England: colleges (excluding sixth form colleges), the community, commercial and charitable organisations, industry, the armed and uniformed services, prisons/ offender learning, and other public sector organisations;
- their employers.

We are using the term ‘teachers and trainers’ to encompass the wide range of roles and titles that exist in the sector, including teachers, trainers, lecturers, tutors, assessors, mentors, coaches, and workplace supervisors. The revised professional standards are not aligned to specific job titles, roles or contracts of employment.

We recognise that there are already separate professional standards for teachers in schools, sixth form colleges and HEIs and we considered using those standards for the FE and skills workforce. However, initial feedback from our Practitioner and Project Steering Groups indicated that those standards do not reflect the diverse, complex and increasingly entrepreneurial context within which the FE and skills workforce is employed - where teachers and trainers deal with a diversity of learner and issues that staff working in schools and higher education institutions would not encounter - and that the revised professional standards should reflect these differences.

We have used the age of the learner (post-16) as a means of differentiating the audience for the revised professional standards. We recognise the limitations of this, following the Raising of the Participation Age and because learners aged 14+ are now able to attend FE colleges on a full-time basis or attend FE colleges and other providers on a part-time basis. However, by retaining the age distinction, we are aiming to highlight that one of the distinctive features of working as a teacher or trainer in this sector is the diverse, and often older, age profile of the learners.
As discussed earlier, we recognise that employers are not required by regulation to use the revised professional standards, but we anticipate that employers will recognise the value of being able to refer to a national set of standards to support their own organisation’s recruitment, performance management and staff development policies and procedures.

The current LLUK professional standards are used by Ofsted inspectors within their inspection of initial teacher education and we anticipate that the revised professional standards would be used in the same way. We also hope that Ofsted inspectors will consider the revised professional standards within their inspection arrangements, in the same way that they use the Teachers’ Standards when inspecting schools.

The revised professional standards may also be of interest to learners and to employers who purchase their staff training from colleges or other providers and we will gather feedback from these groups in January and February.

3. The relationship between the revised professional standards and the 2013 Education and Training Qualifications

The revised professional standards are not intended to specify the curriculum or the assessment arrangements for initial teacher training courses or qualifications. This has already been determined by the guidance for universities and awarding organisations issued by LSIS in 2013 for the Education and Training suite of qualifications. These new qualifications and guidance will not be revised when the revised professional standards are launched. However, we intend there to be a consistency of expectations between the revised professional standards and the proposed outcomes for trainee teachers who take the qualifications. A trainee teacher who has completed one of the new qualifications should be able to see how the knowledge and skills they have developed during their training are embedded in the revised professional standards.

4. Specifying the draft revised professional standards

Our intention has been to set out the draft revised standards as clear and succinct statements of professional values, knowledge, understanding and skills, underpinning the effective practice of teachers and trainers. We have deliberately reduced the length of the standards, simplified the structure, removed repetition and tried to make the language clearer and more accessible. In taking this approach, we are responding to feedback from our Practitioner and Project Steering Groups, the majority of whom were very critical of the way in which the existing LLUK standards are expressed and who felt that this had been a barrier to their use. There was also a strong message that all standards require professional interpretation and judgement and that more detail did not necessarily make for more robust professional standards.

Please now review the revised professional standards in Section 5 and then respond to as many of the survey questions as you feel able to complete.

The online survey is available here: www.pyetait.com/etfstandards. Thank you for your participation.
5. The draft revised professional standards

The draft revised professional standards are set out in the following three interrelated sections as depicted below.

Please note- the numbering of the individual statements in the values, knowledge and skills is purely for ease of reference for commenting in the online survey.

A. Professional values and attributes

Teachers and trainers should demonstrate commitment to all of the following values and display the following attributes in all aspects of their professional practice:

**Reflection and evaluation**

1. Develop their own judgement of what works and does not work in their teaching
2. Critically examine personal and professional attitudes and beliefs to challenge assumptions and practice
3. Respond positively to feedback and advice from others

**Enthusiasm, creativity and innovation**

4. Value learning and its potential to benefit learners socially, economically, emotionally, intellectually and as citizens in a rapidly changing world
5. Have passion for their vocational/subject area and convey that passion to learners and colleagues
6. Employ creativity and innovation to achieve the best outcomes for learners, and overcome barriers to learning
Expertise

7. Demonstrate and maintain expertise in what they are teaching
8. Demonstrate skill in the selection of teaching strategies, methods and resources to meet the needs of individual learners to enable them to achieve their goals and fulfil their potential
9. Demonstrate commitment to career-long professional development

Inclusion

10. Value and respect social and cultural diversity, and promote equality of opportunity
11. Value all learners, their aspirations, and the experience they bring to their learning
12. Build positive relationships that engender mutual respect and motivate learners to achieve

Collaboration

13. Behave in ways that encourage a culture of trust and respect with learners and colleagues
14. Work cooperatively and collaboratively with colleagues, partners, employers and the wider community to enhance the learning and wellbeing of those they teach
15. Support and contribute to the professional learning of colleagues and others

B. Professional knowledge and understanding

Teachers and trainers should apply the following throughout their professional practice:

16. Understanding of their own role and responsibilities, and their contribution to the social, economic, emotional and intellectual well-being of individuals, communities and the wider society
17. Understanding of how learners learn, what motivates learners to learn, and the importance of learners’ experience and aspirations
18. Understanding of the principles, frameworks, and theories that underpin effective practice in teaching and learning, and how to use these to develop appropriate strategies and techniques to engage and motivate learners
19. Knowledge of their statutory responsibilities, associated Codes of Practice, and the limits of the teaching role
20. Understanding of the underpinning theories and approaches that develop and manage the learner behaviours that promote respect for, and between, others, and create an equitable and inclusive learning environment
21. Understanding of the principles, frameworks, and theories that underpin effective practice in assessment and evaluating learning, and how to use these to develop appropriate assessment strategies and tools to enable learners to progress and achieve
C. Professional Skills

Teachers and trainers should strive for excellence and develop their skills in all of the following areas:

### Teaching, learning and assessment

#### Planning

22. Plan coherent and inclusive learning programmes that meet learners’ needs and curriculum requirements
23. Plan teaching sessions that meet the needs of individual learners, using a variety of strategies, methods and resources, including new and emerging technologies

#### Teaching and learning

24. Maintain a safe learning environment that conforms to statutory requirements and promotes equality, including appropriate consideration of the needs of young people and adults
25. Use flexible and varied teaching strategies, methods and resources to implement learning activities that develop the skills of all learners and promote learner autonomy, confidence, resilience, enterprise and aspiration
26. Make appropriate use of, promote the benefits of, and support learners in the use of technologies
27. Encourage the development and progression of all learners through recognising, valuing, and responding to individual motivation, prior experience, and aspirations
28. Work with learners to address particular individual learning needs, and overcome barriers to learning
29. Work with learners to identify the transferable skills they are developing, and how these might relate to employment or further learning opportunities

#### Assessment

30. Negotiate appropriate and challenging learning goals with learners
31. Ensure that learners understand, are involved in, and share in responsibility for the assessment of their learning
32. Apply appropriate methods of assessment fairly and effectively to provide valid, reliable, and sufficient evidence of achievement
33. Provide timely, detailed, and constructive feedback to learners to enable them to develop their skills
34. Use assessment information to evaluate and plan further learning to enable learners to progress and achieve

#### Working with others

35. Use appropriate systems to communicate information and feedback about learners to appropriate others, whilst respecting confidentiality
36. Work with colleagues to identify and address the literacy, language, and numeracy development needs of learners to enable them to progress
37. Work with colleagues to provide effective guidance and support to enable learners to progress onto further learning or employment

38. Contribute to a collaborative learning culture that promotes learning in organisations, employers and the community

Developing and maintaining subject and/or vocational expertise

39. Where appropriate to the role, engage with research to update and deepen subject knowledge

40. Where appropriate to the role, engage with the workplace and employers to update and deepen vocational knowledge, build and maintain relationships

Developing own practice

41. Systematically analyse and evaluate the impact of own teaching on learner engagement, achievement, and progression to develop an informed rationale for improving professional practice

42. Critically engage with research and development to inform and challenge beliefs, assumptions, and practice

43. Contribute to a collaborative culture of professional development, through collaborative enquiry, peer observation, and/or professional dialogue and debate

44. Contribute to organisational development and quality improvement