

Strengthening Qualified Teacher Status and Improving Career Progression for Teachers

UCET response to DFE consultation

Introduction

UCET welcomes the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. We are supportive of the intentions behind the proposals and agree with many of the recommendations. In particular we support:

- The recognition that the quality of initial teacher education provided by accredited SCITT and HEI-schools partnerships in this country is strong, and that new teachers should during their induction have access to tailored and structured early professional development that builds on and complements their initial training
- Recognition of the benefits of teachers undertaking CPD at Master's degree level
- Proposals for the strengthening of coaching and mentoring for new and established teachers
- Allowing accredited ITE providers to act as appropriate bodies
- The ring-fencing of funding for CPD, and the introduction of personal CPD records for teachers
- The principle of an early career content framework (although we prefer the term 'early career development framework')
- Extension of the induction period from one to two years, subject to funding and to safeguards in respect of diversity and equality

We would however caution that:

- CPD for both new and experienced teachers will have to be properly funded and should meet the development needs of individuals as well as schools
- All teachers, including those working in free schools and academies, should have the opportunity to benefit from the proposed changes, meaning that requirements that all teachers hold QTS should be re-introduced for all publicly funded schools. Re-introduction would also remove any incentive for academies and free schools to avoid their new responsibilities in regards CPD and induction by employing unqualified teachers
- Care will have to be taken to ensure that delaying the 'final' award of QTS does not dissuade people from entering the profession. This could be done by leaving QTS as it is and only changing induction processes

- The fixed two year induction period will have to be flexible enough to accommodate the needs of, for example, teachers with disabilities, those on maternity leave and those working part time and on a supply basis
- Responsibility for ensuring access to high quality CPD should be shared between teachers, schools, networks of schools & teachers, central government and CPD providers. Central government's contribution could in part be funded by abolishing the pre-ITE skills tests (which would be redundant if proposals to strengthen QTS are a success) and recruitment savings resulting from improved retention
- CPD should be quality controlled, with care taken to guard against the dumbing down recently experienced with unregulated ITE provision
- Assessments of teachers for final recognition should be made consistently and equitably using both summative and formative assessment

Strengthening QTS: proposals for post ITE teachers

Induction period and the award of QTS

We are sympathetic to the idea that the current induction period be extended from one to two years, although this would only have a positive impact if proposals relating to the development framework and non-teaching time are also implemented and fully funded. We agree that a more flexible approach might be confusing and could lead to inconsistency and inequitable treatment. Account will however have to be taken to ensure equity for those teachers: working part time; with disabilities or experiencing illness; changing school; qualifying from overseas; on fixed term contracts of less than two years; and taking maternity leave. Care will also have to be taken to make sure that NQTs do not avoid working in challenging schools in order to make successful completion of their induction as easy as possible.

We have concerns about the use of the term 'QTS (P)' to describe NQTs who have successfully completed their ITE but have yet to embark on their induction. There is a danger that potential teachers will be dissuaded from applying for ITE if they think they are only going to be 'provisionally' qualified on completion of their training (despite having met the Teacher Standards) and will have to wait a further two years before being confirmed. We realise that this is partly an issue of perception and language, but such things are important, especially in the context of a challenging recruitment situation. Reforms can be implemented, and objectives achieved, without changing the QTS rules at all and focussing exclusively on the development framework and the induction period. If changes are however necessary, it is preferable to retain 'QTS' on successful completion of ITE, with the award of either 'confirmed' or 'enhanced' QTS at the end of the induction period or, as an alternative, use the term 'QTS part 1' for the post training qualification instead of 'QTS(P)'. The use of 'provisional' will send the wrong message.

The changing of the induction requirements might provide a useful opportunity to review the alignment between qualification and induction arrangements for teachers working in the FE and the school sectors. Although teaching in the FE sector is (wrongly, in our view) unregulated, FE teachers holding QTLS (which is awarded post initial qualification after a period of professional formation) can be employed in schools on the same basis as those holding QTS.

It is important that the changes to induction are presented as a way of nurturing beginning teachers and supporting their development and well-being and not as a way of forcing them to undertake further programmes of training.

Development framework

UCET supports the introduction of a CPD entitlement for NQTs, although we think that it is better described as a 'career development framework'. We have argued for many years that, however good ITE is, only so much ground can be covered in sufficient depth on what, in most cases, are 9-month programmes. We have consistently argued that new teachers should have an entitlement to, and a responsibility to utilise, tailored and structured early professional development that builds on and complements their ITE. This should where appropriate be delivered at Master's degree level, the benefits of which have been repeatedly demonstrated.¹ This will represent real progress towards teaching becoming an all Master's qualified profession, something that at a stroke would represent the biggest step change in the status of teaching since it became an all-graduate profession in the 1970s. Such a move aids not only retention, but would also attract ambitious new recruits, as the Teach First experience demonstrates. Some funding for this could be secured by removing unnecessary restrictions on the rules for awarding postgraduate loans, as referred to elsewhere in this document.

We agree that the career development framework should be consistent with the ITE framework for ITE developed by Stephen Munday. We do not however agree that it should include 'mandatory' components as this could prevent it from being tailored to reflect individual needs. Access to all elements of the framework should be accessible by all NQTs, regardless of which part of the country they are in or which school they are employed by. We welcome the suggestion that the profession, including ITE providers, are involved in developing and delivering the framework. Failure to do this undermines the credibility of the framework before it is even launched. The temptation to go into too much detail about what is included in the framework should be resisted and teachers should, within agreed parameters, be able to choose the CPD that is best to them, their pupils and their schools.

The delivery of development frameworks should not be restricted to a limited number of DFE 'favoured' providers, which in the past has appeared to bias particular sectors and types of (sometimes untested) provision. Instead, we recommend that potential providers (including ITE providers, who will be well placed to ensure synergy between ITE, the Teacher Standards and the framework) be invited to register as approved delivery bodies. The number of registered framework providers should not be artificially restricted so as to allow adequate national coverage and genuine choice. Any provider that meets the criteria should be registered. Continued registration should be conditional on quality assurance measures to be agreed between DFE, professional associations and representatives of CPD providers.

We also think that:

- The framework should be flexible enough to reflect the needs of particular schools and teachers, including teachers working in different types of school and those qualified through different routes²
- Tailored development frameworks might include:
- Development frameworks should focus on pupil progress rather than on 'assessment' and might include: SEND; diversity; participation; empathy; professional enquiry; engagement with research; data management; being part of a profession; leadership; tailored/contextualised subject knowledge; subject pedagogy;

¹ TDA PPD longitudinal study. Peter Seaborne, 2009.

² Those achieving QTS through undergraduate programmes might, for example, have fewer development needs in some areas than their postgraduate colleagues

well-being & mental health; research on working in particular contexts; transition points for pupils; access to coaching & mentoring; acting as coaches and mentors; experience of working in different contexts & settings; and engaging in professional dialogue with colleagues from across the sector.

- Frameworks should not give the impression that they are designed to address deficits in the skills, knowledge and abilities of beginning teachers that can be addressed through the 'ticking-off' of particular training courses

Mentoring

The role of the mentor is an essential one the importance of which is often overlooked. UCET welcomes the emphasis given to mentoring in the consultation. Strong mentoring, provided alongside the development framework and properly funded, can help new teachers embed their subject and pedagogic knowledge and provide them with the pastoral and practical support that will help them to manage their workload and so help retain them in the profession. We agree with the proposals to: add an additional mentor role into the statutory induction guidance; require schools to provide additional mentoring sessions and for this to be more rigorously assessed; and develop (in partnership with ITE providers) better mentor training. We also think that OFSTED should consider the quality of mentor support when it carries out school inspections.

The work of the mentor should be separate from any assessment, management or supervisory role. If it is not the mentees will not be open about their perceived weaknesses or professional development needs. Research suggests that mentoring should be: separate from line-management; non-judgemental; supportive of the well-being of the mentees; tailored to the needs of the individual concerned; developmental; and empowering.³ Mechanisms need also to be established to ensure that there is sustained contact between mentors and mentees.

We also agree that the existing mentor standards be reviewed, and that training for mentors, ideally leading to a nationally recognised qualification at Master's degree level, be developed, possibly comparable to that for SENCOs. The scope to use the apprenticeship levy to support such training should be investigated.

Development time

The potential benefits of the consultation proposals will not be realised, and may indeed have a detrimental impact on retention, if new teachers are not given the time, space and encouragement to utilise the new development opportunities. The reduction in the teaching timetable should be extended on a tapering basis into the second induction year and beyond. The time released should be distinct from PPA time and be protected for tailored experiences that are genuinely developmental. Development opportunities should not be restricted to this earmarked time, but should also be included in the time devoted to the day to day work of the NQTs.

Parallel to these developments should be a continuation of moves to reduce the workload of teachers, particularly those new to the profession. Although this may be challenging for some schools, the pressures of having to either recruit new staff or manage unfilled posts are likely to be significantly greater.

Assessment and accreditation

³ Hobson, A.J. (2016) Judgementoring and how to avert it: introducing ONSIDE Mentoring for beginning teachers. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 5(2): 87-110.

Accredited ITE providers probably have more experience than any other organisations in carrying out assessments, using both formative and summative assessment, against the Teachers' Standards, and the quality of these assessments is closely monitored as part of OFSTED ITE inspections. Accredited providers are also well placed to ensure consistency across the profession and measure the progress made between the initial award of QTS and final confirmation as a teacher. It therefore stands to reason that appropriate bodies should include ITE providers. We also agree that measures need to be in place to strengthen the independent validation of final assessments.

It is important that large numbers of teachers do not reach the end of their extended period of induction to then be told that they have failed. Assessment processes should make sure that any issues are identified, and addressed through targeted support, before then.

It seems from the consultation proposals that the government does not plan to change the Teachers' Standards introduced in 2012 and would in the normal course of events now be subject to review. We think that there is a case for either developing the standards to reflect the new QTS arrangements or exemplifying what will be required for NQTs to demonstrate that they have met the standards at the end of their ITE and again on successful completion of their induction.

Additional considerations

It is right to consider the implications induction and QTS processes in other parts of the UK. There are, at present, no plans to increase the amount of time it takes to achieve QTS in Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland. Care will have to be taken to ensure that prospective teachers are not tempted to cross the border in order to secure full QTS recognition more quickly. Discussions might therefore have to take place with the General Teaching Councils in Scotland and Northern Ireland and with the Education Workforce Council in Wales. UCET would be happy to facilitate further discussions involving UCET NI, the University and Schools Council for the Education of Teachers (USCET) in Wales and the Scottish Deans of Education Departments.

Post-QTS teacher career progression and leadership

Background and the case for change

UCET applauds the stated commitment to evidence based professional development and the introduction of individualised development pathways. We also agree that such pathways apply to the overlapping categories of teachers aiming to continue working primarily in the classroom and those on leadership and other career pathways. The Chartered College of Teaching should have a role in developing such pathways in partnership with professional associations and representatives of teacher education providers, drawing on the Standard for Professional Development and on research evidence from the UK and overseas. The scope to use apprenticeship funding to support individualised professional development pathways should be investigated.

Professional qualifications

There are not sufficient opportunities for teachers to access CPD programmes for those who do not aspire to traditional 'leadership' positions (bearing in mind that leadership takes many forms and applies in a variety of contexts). Developing new NPQs, or introducing new specialisms within existing NPQs, are indeed options for filling the gap. We do however have concerns about the amount of choice available to teachers in

respect of NPQ providers, and the process under which delivery contracts are awarded do sometimes appear to favour some types of provider over others.

An alternative and preferred option would be to allow recognised CPD providers (including HEIs, subject associations etc.) to develop their own specialist modules, and for these to be 'badged' as suggested elsewhere in the consultation. Teachers would then choose from these modules which could contribute towards both full Master's qualifications and the award of Chartered status by the Chartered College. Funding could then be allocated according to the choices made by individual teachers. This would remove the need for DFE to undertake a complex and expensive tendering and commissioning process.

We strongly agree about the benefits of teachers studying at Master's degree level, and we welcome progress towards teaching becoming a fully Master's level profession. Evidence demonstrates that Master's programmes delivered in partnership by schools, universities and others (e.g. those supported prior to 2010 by the Postgraduate Professional Development – PPD – fund) have a demonstrable impact on teachers' classroom performance and aid retention.⁴ The programmes can also build on the 60 Master's-level credits that most teachers qualifying through the postgraduate route receive as part of their qualification, and mechanisms to facilitate the recognition across the sector of Master's credits awarded by different institutions could be developed. The achievement of a relevant Master's degree might lead to the award of Chartered Teacher status by the Chartered College.

Badging of CPD

The CPD market is indeed overly crowded and it is difficult for schools and teachers to distinguish between relevant and robust CPD and 'snake-oil' provision by organisations out to secure a 'fast-buck' rather than contribute in any meaningful way to teachers' professional development or to school improvement. A badging system – introduced over a period of time based on independent evaluation and feedback from teachers – would help teachers to navigate the market and make informed choices. This should in due course be led by the Chartered College, working in partnership with key organisations such as the Teacher Development Trust, the professional associations, UCET, NASBTT and IPDA. Many CPD programmes, such as those delivered by universities, are already of course subject to robust quality assurance processes and the badging of these will need to be little more than a formality.

Further CPD

Teachers, at whatever stage they are in their career, should have an entitlement to individualised CPD of the kind that supports them in their intellectual and professional development and benefits the children they currently teach and those they will teach in the future. Effective CPD with an impact on pupil performance must be sustainable and developmental, ideally including space for reflection and the sharing of what has been learnt amongst colleagues. This should be in addition to 'whole-school' training relating to child protection, health & safety, OFSTED preparation etc. which, although important, does not in our view constitute the kind of CPD covered by this consultation.

We caution against prescribing a set number of CPD hours to be completed each year as this could (as it did in for teachers in further education with the Institute for Learning's '30-hour' rule) lead to a tick box approach and compliance with the letter rather than the spirit of the requirement. We do however support the establishment of individual CPD

⁴ TDA PPD longitudinal study. Peter Seaborne, 2009.

records of the kind being developed in Wales (to which ITE students will also have access), the content of which can be monitored on a sample basis each year and to be kept throughout a teacher's career.

Adequate funding for CPD is essential. A February 2017 report from the Teacher Development Trust found that 20,000 teachers work in schools with no budget for professional development, and across the country just 0.7% of budgets are spent on CPD. This is not acceptable. Funding should be ring-fenced with a proportion held at a middle-tier level above that of individual schools and academy chains so that development meets the needs, and reflects the ethos, of not only individual schools but of schools collectively. The remainder of the money should be allocated directly to professional learning accounts to be held by teachers for them to invest in 'badged' development opportunities that reflect their tailored professional development plans.

One easy way to facilitate the availability of funding for Master's level CPD would be to relax the over-restrictive rules surrounding the award of loans for postgraduate study. At the moment teachers wanting to access loans to gain a master's degree in an education related area have to take out a loan that covers the cost of a full Master's degree. They are not allowed to borrow only enough to secure the additional 120 credits they need to top-up the 60 credits they will in many cases have carried forward from their PGCE. This makes no sense, from the perspective of either the Treasury or the teacher. Previous UCET attempts to persuade BIS and then DFE to amend the policy on this have not been successful.

Mentoring

We agree that mentoring should be covered in new specialist qualifications and that the Chartered College could have a role on identifying and accrediting high-quality mentor programmes, including those delivered by HEIs. We also support moves to develop a Level 7 apprenticeship route to train mentors for trainees, NQTs and experienced teachers.

Sabbaticals

Giving teachers an entitlement to time out from school to carry out research and engage in academic study has the potential to benefit both individual teachers and the schools they work in. The benefits could extend through a 'multiplier effect' to the colleagues of the teacher undertaking the sabbatical as it has been shown to do for Master's level CPD. There are examples from other countries, for instance Australia and New Zealand, which might inform the development of sabbaticals for teachers in this country.

The kinds of professional development undertaken during sabbaticals would have to be carefully defined and directly linked to pupil progress, and there would have to be a responsibility on the teacher in terms of defined outputs and a commitment to remain in the profession for a set number of years. The scope for teachers to spread sabbatical time out over a longer period while still working in the classroom could be investigated, as might reciprocal sabbaticals with teachers being exchanged across settings.