

Number: WG15359



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

www.cymru.gov.uk

Welsh Government

Consultation – summary of responses

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

Date of issue: April 2012



Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

- Audience** All bodies concerned with initial teacher training in Wales leading to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS); higher education institutions; the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW); the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers Cymru (UCET Cymru); Estyn; The General Teaching Council for Wales (GTCW); local authorities in Wales; teaching unions; maintained schools; the Independent Schools Council; other interested parties that responded to this consultation exercise.
- Overview** This document provides a summary of responses and feedback about the consultation on proposals to introduce a revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme in Wales. This would be a replacement for the Employment-based Teacher Training scheme 2011 (2011 No: 32) and would introduce provisions allowing an additional training programme as a school-improvement measure.
- Action required** None – for information only.
- Further information** Further information about this consultation can be obtained from:
Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Welsh Government
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ
Tel: 029 2082 6530
e-mail: teachingenquiries@wales.gsi.gov.uk
- Additional copies** The consultation documents can be accessed from the Welsh Government's website at www.wales.gov.uk/consultations

Contents

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1. | Introduction and overview | 1 |
| 2. | The consultation process | 2 |
| 3. | Responses to the consultation questions and our feedback | 3 |
| 4. | General comments not directly related to the specific questions asked | 21 |
| 5. | The way forward | 23 |
| | Annex A: Full list of respondees | 24 |
| | Annex B: Published responses | 25 |

1. Introduction and overview

1.1 The Welsh Government has consulted on proposals to introduce a revised employment-based teacher training scheme. This would be a replacement for the Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme 2011 (2011 No.32) (“the 2011 Scheme”) and would introduce provisions allowing an Additional Training Graduate Programme (“the ATGP”) to run if required.

1.2 The 2011 Scheme currently makes statutory provision for employment-based routes for persons to become qualified teachers and gain Qualified Teacher Status (“QTS”) to enable them to teach in maintained schools. It sets out the requirements of specific employment-based teacher training (“EBTT”) programmes – the Graduate Teacher Programme (“GTP”) and the Registered Teacher Programme (“RTP”) – and how they would operate in Wales.

1.3 The inclusion of a programme in an EBTT Scheme does not necessarily mean that it would operate at all times. The RTP is not operating at present, for example. A statutory EBTT Scheme is an enabling mechanism which sets out the details of particular programmes, which then may be operated as required.

1.4 We have also taken the opportunity to make some miscellaneous amendments to the Scheme to clarify the period of time required in a second or other school placement under the GTP and to correct some minor typographical errors.

1.5 We also sought views on the timetable for making a revised Scheme. The changes would only affect people participating in employment-based teacher training which commences on or after 1 September 2012. Individuals commencing programmes of training prior to this date are subject to the requirements set out in the 2011 Scheme.

2. The consultation process

2.1 Views were sought from stakeholder groups to inform the proposed policy changes. This report summarises all of the comments received during the public consultation process together with our response. Some of the responses included general comments not directly related to the questions asked and these are addressed in more detail in section 4.

2.2 The consultation closed on 31 January 2012. A total of 15 responses to the consultation were received. Synopses of the main points raised are outlined below, along with the resulting action taken where necessary to address these and provide feedback on the main themes and key points raised. A list of respondees is provided in Annex A, with the exception of the author of one response who asked for their contact details to be kept confidential. Copies of all responses received can be found at Annex B.

2.3 Some comments were outside the scope of the consultation, and although every effort was made to link these responses to the specific themes of the consultation this was not always practicable. However, the essence of all such comments has been fully considered.

2.4 The consultation document and the response form adopted for this consultation can be found on the Education and Skills section (closed consultations) on the Welsh Government's website at: www.wales.gov.uk/consultations.

2.5 We would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who responded to the consultation for their contribution.

3. Responses to the consultation questions and our feedback

Question 1 – Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

General overview

3.1.1 Responses to this question were mixed. Six respondents agreed overall with introducing the proposal, while four disagreed and a further five said they were either not sure or did not answer the question directly. Several of those who disagreed or were not sure said that they agreed in principle with the overarching aim of introducing a school/pupil improvement programme.

3.1.2 The majority of those that either disagreed or were not sure qualified this by saying that there was insufficient detail in the consultation document on which to make an informed judgment.

Points raised

3.1.3 Some of those that agreed, or agreed in principle, said that the aim of introducing a school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through EBTT in Wales was welcomed based on the evidence of the success of similar programmes in England. Qualifying these comments one response said that the proposals as outlined appeared similar to the Teach First programme operating in England and that elements of that programme could benefit Wales and improve opportunities for young people in Welsh schools. This response added that it was important to ensure other routes into teaching were seen as being of equal status to the ATGP.

3.1.4 Others were of the view that the proposals in the consultation document seemed to assume that the calibre of applicants would be superior to those entering through other routes and that they would be more effective teachers of disadvantaged learners. One response, while welcoming the proposal and its aim, added that improving the performance of disadvantaged learners required not only good teachers but also a range of other factors, including effective leaders, whole school approaches for teaching and learning and effective intervention programmes. This response added that a key aim of the revised scheme should be to provide an alternative route for recruiting high-quality entrants, and that the new route should also focus on providing these entrants with a challenging but supportive programme of initial teacher training.

3.1.5 Others who agreed, or agreed in principle with the overall approach, questioned the rationale for using an English provider to deliver part of the training and sought explanation as to why Welsh providers couldn't undertake this role in

Wales. One commented that initial teacher training (“ITT”) providers in Wales should have sufficient input at the design stage of the proposals which would result in an innovative employment-based teacher training route unique to Wales. One response wondered if the Open University’s flexible route into ITT could provide the type of trainee teacher needed.

3.1.6 Four responses disagreed with the proposal. Three of these, and one other who said they were not sure, commented that whilst they agreed that young people who face educational disadvantage should be supported fully they could find no rationale or evidence for introducing an additional employment-based route to meet this need and that there was already surplus experienced, qualified teachers in the education system or existing ITT provision to meet this need. One response argued that this support programme for young people should be made available to existing qualified teachers as a strategy to avoid compulsory redundancy for those facing it. These responses along with others who either disagreed or were not sure sought greater clarity around the cost implications of implementing the ATGP.

3.1.7 One response with a not sure notification emphasised that only qualified teachers should be teaching in classrooms. It commented that should a training programme be introduced preference should be given to candidates who find difficulties in securing teaching posts through normal ITT routes, and those with a proven track record and a demonstrable commitment to remain in education for the longer term.

3.1.8 Two responses which disagreed with the proposal said that in principle they could support the aim of the ATGP but that the target cohort was unclear and that the term ‘educational disadvantage’ would need to be defined. They raised a number of questions about the issue of high quality entrants, including how such individuals would be defined and identified, one querying in what way would the admission requirements differ from the requirements for acceptance onto a PGCE course. The other said that acceptance of entrants should not just be based on academic standards but should also cover interpersonal skills and the acquisition of professional skills and the ability to apply them. This response said that more information about the content of any additional training would be required in order to indicate the advantages of additional spending on such a programme.

3.1.9 Several responses asked how many trainees the ATGP would take, and whether these numbers would be part of ITT intake targets or in addition to them. One asked if successful trainees would be able to apply for any teaching job, or if they have to apply for specific jobs that matched their expertise. A similar query was raised in another response under general comments, asking if trainees would become substantive members of a school’s staff once they had gained QTS or whether they would be required to seek other posts.

3.1.10 One respondent suggested that the definition of high quality students could imply that entrants through other forms of ITT were not deemed to be of high quality. It noted that entrants had to meet requirements for entry to ITT set by the Welsh Government and that ITT providers had to confirm that trainees meet the Welsh Government’s QTS Standards. It added that statistics showed that 53% of PGCE students had a first or 2.1 degree classification on entry.

How we are planning to address these

Rationale

3.1.11 With regard to the rationale for the introduction of a targeted ATGP, the Welsh Government looked at the evidence from the latest OCED Programme for International Student Assessment (“PISA”), which demonstrated that effective school systems require the right combination of trained and talented personnel. Among the successful PISA countries identified in the report specific systems have been put in place to attract the most talented individuals into the most difficult classrooms. Evidence provided in recent Estyn annual reports has also demonstrated that where schools succeed despite challenging circumstances, consistently good teaching is highlighted as one of the key performance indicators.

3.1.12 We also looked at evidence of the operation and impact of the Teach First scheme in England. This has similar underlying principles to the ATGP and although delivery mechanisms and scale would have differences it provides an indicator of the potential impact of such a scheme. An Ofsted inspection of Teach First’s operation in June 2011 graded it as outstanding and said that it was very successful in meeting its commitment to address educational disadvantage. The quality of the participants was described as exceptional, particularly their personal characteristics, personal attributes, self-motivation, critical reflection and their commitment to raising the aspirations and achievements of the students in their schools and addressing educational disadvantage. Pre-school training of the sort envisaged as the additional training element of the ATGP, was regarded as a high quality vehicle which ensured that participants were extremely well prepared for teaching.

3.1.13 A research study undertaken by the University of Manchester on the impact of Teach First teachers in their classrooms and schools was published in October 2010. It considered the impact of Teach First teachers on classroom practice, leadership and pupil achievement. Overall, the study found converging evidence that Teach First teachers had a positive impact in schools. Evidence included a quantitative analysis showing positive pupil outcomes in these schools compared to comparator schools; classroom observation data showing that Teach First teachers were effective classroom practitioners; interview data confirming that these teachers were seen as leaders in their schools and as effective practitioners by their second year in the school; classroom observation data demonstrating that individuals on the programme consistently rated above the midpoint of the scale for the factors observed, indicating overall high levels of teacher effectiveness including increased performance; and evidence of a correlation between Teach First schools and increased pupil attainment at GCSE level.

3.1.14 Some responses suggested alternative approaches to a new programme under the EBTT Scheme for sourcing teachers for an improvement programme. The Open University’s flexible route into ITT could provide the type of trainee teacher needed, but could not guarantee to do so, and this and the variable modular nature of its courses meant that it was felt to be unsuitable for a planned targeted programme of the sort envisaged. One response suggested that the pre-employment course should be offered as a retraining programme for teachers who are facing redundancy. The pre-employment training is not envisaged as a general training

event, but as a more specific complementary programme for someone undertaking this particular EBTT programme. It would provide targeted support in areas such as analysis of individual strengths and areas for development, including subject knowledge, as well as issues relating to educational disadvantage, with the aim of enabling EBTT participants to begin their teaching period with an increased effectiveness. The ATGP is envisaged as a small-scale tightly focussed programme and would not be suitable or practicable for a compulsory redundancy avoidance scheme.

Possible use of English ITT providers

3.1.15 Several of the responses expressing concern on this issue seemed to have assumed that this would mean an English ITT provider running the scheme or doing a majority of the training. One response, for example, referred to the ATGP having a large proportion of training carried out in England, which would not be the case at all.

3.1.16 The consultation document said that the draft EBTT Scheme included the flexibility to enable ITT providers from England to be involved in the ATGP to deliver the proposed period of university-led intense pre-employment training should this be required to support the delivery of the programme. It does not say that this must happen; it is an option available, if this were considered to be a desirable way to deliver an effective and efficient course of initial training.

3.1.17 In terms of the proportion of training time, the consultation document was clear that the potential use of an English ITT provider only applied to the proposed period of pre-employment training. It also said that a minimum of half of the period of the initial training must be delivered in Wales and that no more than half of the period of the initial training could be delivered by an accredited English ITT provider. Finally, it said that the whole of the period of employment-based training must be delivered through an ITT provider accredited in Wales. For the combined period of pre-employment training and employment-based training, the maximum period covered by training run through an English ITT provider (if any) would be less than 7% of the total.

3.1.18 In terms of responsibility, the consultation document stated that the production and delivery of training and the assessment of trainees against the QTS Standards would have to be done by an accredited ITT provider. Given the points on training time, this would mean that an accredited Welsh ITT provider would be responsible for a minimum of half of the period of the pre-employment training and all of the employment-based training. Even if half of the period of the pre-employment training were to be run through an accredited English ITT provider, the approved organisation running the ATGP would be required to ensure that the content, structure and delivery of the course of initial training for ATGP trainees reflected the QTS Standards in Wales. Assessment of trainees against the QTS Standards would be solely a matter for an accredited Welsh ITT provider.

Educational disadvantage

3.1.19 One of the Welsh Government's national priorities for all school effectiveness work is reducing the impact of poverty on educational attainment. For

the ATGP the targeting would be aimed at schools in socially deprived, educationally disadvantaged areas. One identifying option would be to use Child Index of Deprivation Lower Social Output Areas (LSOA) scores to identify those schools that have more than 50% of their pupils living in the lowest 20% of these LSOAs with the poorest pupil attainment results against the level of 5+ GCSEs at grades A*-C. Work on this would be undertaken in more detail with the approved organisation running the ATGP.

Trainee quality/numbers

3.1.20 The ATGP would be much more specifically focussed than mainstream ITT courses and comparisons with the present entry requirements or the academic standards of ITT entrants generally are unrealistic. The recruitment of high quality entrants to existing mainstream ITT courses is of course equally important, as indicated by the recent announcement introducing increased value incentives for individuals with the highest degree classifications undertaking PGCE ITT courses across priority secondary subjects in the 2012/13 academic year.

3.1.21 For the ATGP we would be aiming for it to attract and recruit into teaching in Wales amongst a particular target audience: outstanding individuals who have a desire to help reducing the impact of poverty on educational attainment by working in schools in challenging circumstances. Trainees would be expected to deliver improvements quickly and effectively. Minimum academic requirements would be likely to be higher than for ITT generally, but a range of skills would be likely to be targeted, including high level communication skills, strong leadership qualities, and the ability to work effectively and to see matters through despite difficulties.

3.1.22 The consultation paper noted that the ATGP is envisaged as a small-scale programme. It is not envisaged at this stage that it would be any greater in size than the Graduate Teacher Programme ("GTP"), which for 2012/13 has 72 places, and probably smaller at the outset. Numbers would be part of the agreement with the approved organisation running the ATGP and would not be included in the intake targets which are set for mainstream ITT courses or the GTP. Trainees who had completed their ATGP placements and secured QTS would have the same options open to them as any qualified teacher and circumstances are likely to vary in individual cases.

Comparative costs

3.1.23 The ATGP is not being introduced as a simple alternative ITT option. For the reasons set out, the Welsh Government thinks that a making use of an EBTT provides the most appropriate route for introduce a targeted and limited pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage. Any such programme would be likely to have requirements and resource implications beyond straightforward teacher training schemes and comparisons with existing ITT routes are not appropriate. No agreement has yet been organised for an approved organisation to operate the ATGP so details on this have not been settled.

Question 2 – Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

General overview

3.2.1 Eight responses agreed, three disagreed and four respondees said they were either not sure or did not answer the question directly.

Points raised

3.2.2 One response which agreed with the proposal said that the provision of additional pre-training was seen as positive given that the GTP has been subject to criticism in the past because of the limited nature of its university led training, and another said that the proposal for a period of intense pre-employment training was highly appropriate as trainees would obtain a clear understanding of the requirements of the programme and the curriculum in advance of their school based training. Both responses suggested that such pre-employment training could be incorporated into the current provision for GTP.

3.2.3 One response who said they were not sure said that they did not agree with the introduction of the ATGP, but on the assumption that it was to proceed, delivery as part of an additional programme seemed to be the most appropriate way forward. This was on the proviso that any pre-employment training did not impact negatively on individuals in terms of additional workload, or on others already undertaking teacher training through other training routes.

3.2.4 One response which disagreed with the question said the introduction of a new and alternative route to QTS which involved a course of initial training provision preceding the period of being employed was supported. It felt that it could be an attractive alternative for high fliers and career changers who might not embark on a career in teaching without the ATGP. However, the introduction of such a programme as a means of supporting young people who face educational disadvantage could not be supported without justification that it was the most appropriate and cost effective method.

3.2.5 One response which did not directly answer the question commented that the current statutory requirements for ITT accreditation and quality assurance of ITT in Wales was already well established and questioned the use of an approved organisation to organise the training along with the potential to use an English ITT provider to deliver the pre-training given that this provider would not have been accredited by HEFCW to deliver ITT in Wales.

3.2.6 This response also raised concerns about how candidates would be selected; commenting that providers should be involved in the selection process and that it should not be a matter for the approved organisation alone. This point was echoed in another response which said that it would be inconsistent that other EBTT routes in Wales would be managed by Welsh HEIs but that the ATGP could be

delivered by a non-HEI organisation possibly from outside of Wales, and queried how this programme was substantially different from a PGCE course of teacher training or the GTP. Another response favoured introducing the element of support for to support for young people who face educational disadvantage through existing mainstream ITT courses.

How we are planning to address these

Pre-training for the GTP

3.2.7 The pre-employment training in the ATGP is not envisaged as a general training event, but as a more specific complementary programme for someone undertaking this particular EBTT programme. It would provide targeted support in areas such as analysis of individual strengths and areas for development, including subject knowledge, as well as issues relating to educational disadvantage, with the aim of enabling these EBTT participants to begin their teaching period with an increased effectiveness.

3.2.8 The GTP is a more general training programme and does not have the targeted nature of the ATGP. The GTP also has a more variable entry, with a number of trainees who are already working in schools as experienced overseas qualified teachers or teachers who hold a further education teaching qualification. Additionally, we have recently introduced a new provision in the current EBTT Scheme which requires GTP trainees to be supported with a minimum of 50 days' training time per academic year in a school setting, separate from the teaching timetable, and the equivalent of a minimum 10 days university-led training organised by employment-based ITT providers. We would want to see how this is implemented before considering further changes.

Approved organisation/programme comparison

3.2.9 We have said that the ATGP may be organised and operated by an approved organisation, but have emphasised that the employment-based training must be delivered by accredited Welsh ITT provider. The course of initial pre-employment training must also be delivered by accredited Welsh ITT provider; we have said that this may be done in conjunction with an accredited English ITT provider, but for no more than half of that element, and the content, structure and delivery of the training would have to reflect the QTS Standards in Wales. If an accredited English ITT provider was utilised, the issue of non-accreditation by HEFCW would not arise because the English provider would not be operating independently; that element would need to be organised through the accredited Welsh ITT provider. We will make that point clearer in the published scheme.

3.2.10 Any body which took on the role of the approved organisation would need to have control of the various elements outlined in order to ensure a coherent and effective operation. It would not necessarily be the case that an approved organisation was not an accredited ITT provider, and we will make that point clearer in the published scheme. Should it be the case that an accredited ITT provider was not the approved organisation, the production and delivery of training and the

assessment of trainees against the QTS Standards draft scheme would still need to be done by an accredited ITT provider.

3.2.11 The ATGP is noticeably different to the GTP: it has a different focus from the GTP with its use as a targeted pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage, and a specific element in the pre-employment training which does not feature in the GTP. Given these differences there is no reason for the ATGP's delivery to be consistent with the GTP. EBTT programmes with trainees employed in schools and learning on the job are clearly substantially different from a PGCE course of teacher training at a higher education institution, which by its nature would not be suitable for the sort of small-scale targeted intervention envisaged.

Question 3 – Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

General overview

3.3.1 The response to this question was mixed. Five agreed, five disagreed and five were either not sure or did not answer the question directly. Those who said that they were not sure indicated that it was difficult to support the approach as they felt that not enough detail has been provided in the consultation document to make an informed judgement.

Points raised

3.3.2 One response, which indicated that they were not sure, noted that revised EBTT would allow the ATGP to run if required, and wanted to know by what criteria the Welsh Government would judge if the ATGP was required. This response also sought more information on the relationship between the approved organisation and the accredited ITT providers, and the procedures for selecting ITT providers, asking if there would be a single ITT accredited provider or several. Another response also asked about the selection of accredited ITT providers.

3.3.3 One respondent who disagreed queried why the proposed ATGP would allow the course of initial pre-employment training to be delivered by an accredited English ITT provider in conjunction with an accredited ITT provider in Wales, given the strength of existing ITT provision in Wales. Another response, which indicated a not sure status, suggested that as there were differing requirements for QTS in Wales and England, sharing part of the training process would give rise to challenges regarding the quality assurance of the training programme.

3.3.4 Another respondent who disagreed said that there were elements of the ATGP which could be supported but some that gave concern, and this also questioned the involvement of an English ITT provider in the ATGP, suggesting that it would be more appropriate for two Welsh universities (one in North Wales and one in South Wales) to deliver the programme. This response was not supportive of funding going to a private body for running the ATGP given that the current GTP only provides a salary contribution and meets training costs in a limited number of

subjects. It added that this would be a further burden on already insufficient education budgets. Another response that disagreed expressed concern that the type of body the approved organisation was envisaged as being was unspecified.

3.3.5 One response which did not answer the question directly queried whether ATGP trainees would have the opportunity to receive qualifications such as PGCE as well as gaining QTS.

3.3.6 One response which indicated that they were not sure queried whether individuals would receive an incentive to undertake the training. This also asked if the ATGP would include primary places or just secondary. Another response asked who would set the admission targets, if not the Welsh Government. It suggested that if the Welsh Government was setting them that it should do so as part of the same process as with the GTP and RTP.

3.3.7 One response that disagreed with the proposal queried what the length of the pre-training period would be, stressing that students need sufficient subject knowledge and skills to work in schools.

3.3.8 One respondent who said they were not sure questioned the set up of a separate ATGP and suggested that a way forward could be to add general pre-training to conventional GTP or PGCE ITT courses. It felt that there were more efficient ways of increasing numbers into teaching than a designated new course. It suggested that the pre-training could act as subject knowledge enhancement courses to fill gaps in subject knowledge and pedagogy.

3.3.9 Two responses, which indicated that they were not sure, raised issues about who would select participating schools and how they be selected. These responses also asked whether there would be an expectation that trainees remained in post for a designated period of time after gaining QTS.

3.3.10 Two responses which indicated that they were not sure and another which disagreed raised issues surrounding the selection criteria of trainees, presupposing that candidates would need additional entry criteria and particular personal qualities above those required for the GTP. One asked who would select the candidates and match them with placement schools.

3.3.11 One response which disagreed said that the appointment of an approved body which was not an accredited ITT provider would pose significant challenges regarding quality assurance and safeguarding issues and that these needed to be considered. The same response asked how ITT providers could be responsible for training if they were not involved in the trainee selection process, querying who would hold overall responsibility for the programme. Another response similarly felt that the ATGP should be run by accredited ITT providers.

3.3.12 Several responses raised the issue of whether a Welsh medium or bilingual ATGP route would be available. A response to question 2 had raised concerns about trainees being able to train through the medium of Welsh considering the possible involvement of English ITT providers. One response thought that there should be

references to Welsh as well as English in the Annex A requirements EBR1.2 and EBR1.5.

3.3.13 One response asked whether the ATGP would have additional quality assurance requirements if a trainee was placed in an underperforming school. This response also questioned how the effectiveness of the training and the link to school improvement and school performance would be measured.

How we are planning to address these

Operating the ATGP

3.3.14 The reference to the ATGP being run 'if required' is simply a reflection of the fact noted in paragraph 1.3 of the consultation paper that inclusion of a programme in a EBTT Scheme does not necessarily mean that it will operate at all times. The RTP is not operating at present, for example. For the ATGP, there are clearly young people who face educational disadvantage and the Welsh Government has indicated that it would like to make use of employment-based training as a targeted way to introduce a pupil/school improvement programme to support them.

Possible use of English ITT providers

3.3.15 Most of the points raised about this under question 3 are covered in our responses under question 1, at paragraphs 3.1.15-3.1.18. The differing requirements for QTS in Wales and England should not be an issue as the EBTT Scheme would require the production and delivery of training and the assessment of trainees for the ATGP to be against the QTS Standards for Wales.

Approved organisation

3.3.16 Several of the points raised about this under question 3 are covered in our responses under question 2, at paragraphs 3.2.9-3.2.11. Issues about the costs of the ATGP are covered in our response under question 1, at paragraph 3.1.23. No assumption has been about the type of body the approved organisation would be; the aim would be to secure the most effective delivery of the ATGP.

3.3.17 The duties of the approved organisation in relation to the ATGP are set out at paragraphs 51-58 of the draft scheme. Assuming that the approved organisation was not an accredited ITT provider themselves, it would be for the approved organisation to make arrangements with an accredited ITT provider (or providers) willing to work with it.

Structure of the ATGP

3.3.18 EBTT programmes do not involve academic qualifications so this issue has not been covered in the consultation. The Welsh Government may explore what options there might be in this area in the context of an agreement with an approved organisation.

3.3.19 There is no present intention that individuals should receive an incentive to undertake training under the ATGP. Anyone undertaking any EBTT programme in a maintained school must be employed as a teacher and the school would need to pay the trainee a salary and any other costs as set out in the School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document. It is possible that the agreement with the approved organisation could include support to cover, e.g. accommodation for trainees during the pre-employment training.

3.3.20 No decisions have been made about the types of places on the ATGP. The intention is that the Welsh Government would set intake targets for the ATGP for specified academic years and these targets would be allocated directly to the approved organisation. Intake targets for the GTP are allocated to accredited ITT providers in Wales because they are responsible for running those programmes. The ATGP would be run as a stand-alone programme through the approved organisation, so the same process would not be possible.

Length and content of pre-training under the ATGP

3.3.21 The period of pre-employment training under the ATGP would be specified in the agreement with the approved organisation. No decisions have been taken about this as yet, but we would expect this period to be of several weeks' duration.

3.3.22 Issues about whether there could be a period of pre-employment training under the GTP, and what might be covered in the period of pre-employment training under the ATGP, are covered in our response under question 2, at paragraphs 3.2.7-3.2.8. As noted, the period of pre-employment training under the ATGP would be specific to the needs of a particular programme which would be used as a targeted way to introduce a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage, so would not be a general provision appropriate for mainstream ITT courses. The ATGP is not being introduced to increase numbers into teaching.

Operation of the ATGP

3.3.23 Issues about the selection criteria of trainees are covered in our response under question 1, at paragraphs 3.1.20-3.1.22. Paragraph 51 of the draft scheme attached to the consultation document noted that the approved organisation will consider applications for places under the 2012 EBTT Scheme against the entry requirements set out there and determine whether persons are suitable to train as a teacher through the ATGP.

3.3.24 Options for school selection are covered in our response under question 1, at paragraph 3.1.19. Paragraph 55 of the draft scheme attached to the consultation document noted that the approved organisation, in conjunction with an accredited ITT provider, would need to make arrangements with suitable school(s) to confirm trainee placements. Details of how ATGP placements are set up are still to be finalised. The EBTT scheme necessarily only covers the timescales for training leading to QTS.

3.3.25 The draft EBTT Scheme makes it clear that the approved organisation would have overall responsibility for operating the ATGP and to consider applications for places under the 2012 Scheme against the entry requirements and determining whether persons are suitable to train as a teacher through the ATGP. For the training and assessment, its job is to organise the provision, but the work itself would be carried out by an accredited ITT provider which would have to meet quality assurance standards for that work as they do for other ITT work. Details of the arrangements by which this would be done would be a matter between the approved organisation (if it was not itself an accredited ITT provider) and an accredited ITT provider (or providers) willing to work with it.

3.3.26 On the position of a trainee in an underperforming school, the draft EBTT Scheme provides that the approved organisation, in discussion with the accredited ITT provider, must make arrangements for trainees to receive the necessary training at an alternative school, if this is necessary to enable them to meet the QTS standards, in cases where training is not being carried out by a school as agreed in an individual training plan (for whatever reason) and it is not possible to resolve the situation satisfactorily; or a school closes; or a school changes its category. The approach with EBTT programmes is that trainees should not be placed in schools in special measures. We will make that point explicit in the new Scheme.

Welsh language provision

3.3.27 In terms of ensuring bilingual or Welsh language provision we would require the scheme administration, including any promotional work, to meet requirements equivalent to our Welsh Language Scheme; and for all aspects of the application process and of a programme of training under the ATGP to be fully available through the medium of Welsh for candidates who wished to pursue that option. This would include the provision of pre-employment training delivered by an accredited ITT provider, whether a Welsh or an English provider was involved; the recruitment and selection process; and the placement of successful candidates into Welsh medium schools as required.

3.3.28 The entry requirements for the ATGP will be set out in the revised EBTT Scheme. As mentioned above, the selection procedures would be a matter for the approved organisation to administer under the terms of their agreement. Additional requirements including policy priorities, subject coverage and intake numbers for any particular year will be notified to the approved organisation at the start of the year in a Policy and Priorities statement, in much the same way that policy priorities for the GTP are notified to the ITT Centres currently.

3.3.29 The requirements for the provision of EBTT programmes operated under the 2012 Scheme set out in Annex A are based on the Requirements for the Provision of ITT Courses (“the Requirements”), which are part of the statutory Criteria for Initial Teacher Training Accreditation by the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales 2006, as amended. A consultation on the Requirements included a proposal that they should incorporate some Welsh-specific entry requirements for Welsh-medium courses. Although respondents welcomed the principal of Welsh-specific entry requirements having standards which matched those for

ITT courses generally, in practice many felt that there would be serious practical issues. It was felt that referencing a Welsh GCSE standard would discriminate against those who had learnt Welsh as a second language at school and who had pursued subsequent learning through the medium of Welsh. There were concerns that Welsh-specific entry requirements would create a barrier before entry to Welsh-medium ITT compared with an approach of offering Welsh language support during training. There were also concerns about what would constitute a 'Welsh medium course', with some courses felt to have insufficient Welsh-medium content to justify an insistence on high level language skills on entry.

Reporting

3.3.30 The draft scheme published with the consultation document states that the approved organisation would need to provide the Welsh Government with information (in a form specified by us from time to time) which sets out the status and number of trainees on the ATGP; the associated costs; the outcomes of the training programmes; and any other data required. We intend that the agreement with the approved organisation would include provision for reports on progress with an objective analysis of improvements. Details are yet to be finalised.

Question 4 – Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

General overview

3.4.1 Eight respondents agreed, three disagreed and four said that they were either not sure or did not answer the question directly.

Points raised

3.4.2 The majority of those respondents who said that they agreed did not go on to comment further on the proposed timetable. One response that agreed went on to say that the question was dependent on their support for the ATGP (about which they had raised various issues), but said that if the programme were to go ahead the timescales outlined appeared acceptable (NUT).

3.4.3 Another response did not object to the timetable arrangements set out in the consultation document but said that further clarification would be required about the timing of when ATGP numbers would be revealed and when the application process would commence. The same response queried what the impact the ATGP might have on mainstream allocations and those for the GTP and whether there would be different schools for GTP students and ATGP students.

3.4.4 Responses which said that they were not sure, said it was difficult to respond to this question because of lack of detail in the consultation document and that the feasibility of a start date would depend on what form the ATGP would take.

3.4.5 Two responses disagreed with the approach to timing as they disagree with the proposals to introduce the ATGP overall. One added that while the other said

that the issues it raised in response to question 1 should be addressed prior to the introduction of new programme of this nature.

How we are planning to address these

Transitional arrangements

3.4.6 The transitional arrangements proposed relate to the GTP and RTP. For the GTP and RTP, the 2011 Scheme would apply to all programmes where the training commenced prior to 1 September 2013, and the 2012 Scheme would apply to programmes where the training commenced on or after 1 September 2013.

3.4.7 This provision provides a necessary continuity between the current 2011 EBTT Scheme and its replacement, but in practice will have no significant effect. The consultation document stated that no material changes are proposed to the GTP and RTP in the 2012 Scheme as compared with the 2011 Scheme, so in practice the only differences would be in details covered in the annual policies and procedures statement, which can be changed annually in any event.

Timing of ATGP

3.4.8 For timing in relation to the ATGP, the 2012 Scheme would apply to programmes where the training period commenced on or after 1 June 2013. The additional period of June to September would provide for the proposed pre-employment training period. The issue of timing only relates to the 2012 Scheme document (so other matters, such as an agreement with an approved organisation for example, might take place beforehand) and only states the point it commences (so any ATGP training placements would not start before 1 June 2013, but this provision does not require that any would start at that point).

Intake numbers and allocations

3.4.9 The Welsh Government would allocate intake targets directly to the approved organisation along with a policy and priorities statement for the academic year in which the ATGP is to operate, but no decisions have been made on when this would be done or when the application process would commence. The consultation document noted that the ATGP is envisaged as a small-scale tightly focussed programme, and this is unlikely to have any significant impact on ITT allocations elsewhere.

3.4.10 Both the GTP/RTP and the ATGP individually have trainee placement limits (including both trainees), but as the ATGP is a different more specifically focussed programme there is no specific provision which would disallow a school from have trainees from both. However, for both the GTP and the ATGP, there is an over-riding provision that arrangements have to be made with suitable schools to confirm trainee placements and ensure that the schools are able, for the duration of the programme, and any part of it, to provide what is needed to enable trainees to demonstrate that they meet the QTS standards.

Question 5 – We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

Points raised

3.5.1 Points raised relevant to the consultation are set out below. Two responses felt that the ATGP should not be implemented without further details and an assessment of the proposal being published, and section 5 covers the way forward.

3.5.2 One response suggested that before proceeding with the ATGP, the Welsh Government should discuss options with ITT providers, who could bring their knowledge and experience of working with disadvantaged young people and adults in Community First areas and through widening access and Reaching Wider activities.

3.5.3 One response said that if literacy, numeracy and closing the attainment gap were the main focus of the ATGP and it was considered that specific training is critical to the Welsh schools' system, then this training should be available within ITT programmes currently on offer.

3.5.4 A response which disagreed with the proposed GAP questioned the prudence of introducing an additional training programme at a time of economic constraint and reduction in ITT targets. Given the likely costs attached to successfully introducing the ATGP, it felt that it would be more cost-effective to structure the programme as a retraining scheme for teachers facing redundancy to take up posts in disadvantaged areas, which it felt would help to prevent a loss of talent and experience. Another which recognised the need to provide specialist training for those working in disadvantaged areas asked if there was sound evidence that inexperienced trainees were best placed to bring about the long term change required. It wondered if it would be worth investigating providing specialist training for teachers currently in post in the more disadvantaged schools.

3.5.5 One comment said that all of the pre-employment training should be delivered in Wales, not a minimum of half as proposed (Estyn). Another response noted that the GTP provided trainees with employment based training, and wondered if the pre-employment training on the ATGP would be sufficient.

3.5.6 A response wondered what the overall benefits of the ATGP would be, given that its view was that high quality entrants were already recruited to existing ITT routes. It wondered if there might be a demand for the RTP, which was not being used at present. It also asked what the incentive would be for schools and students to participate in the ATGP.

3.5.7 One response asked if it was intended to introduce an ambassador network on the lines of the one run by Teach First. It also asked who the approved organisation would be and whether any discussions taken place with potential organisations. It wondered, if the ATGP was aimed at failing schools or schools in challenging areas, how those schools would be able to meet the training needs of

the ATGP trainees. An additional point raised was whether the ATGP would have an effect on widening access to the teaching profession.

3.5.8 One organisation said that provision for Welsh-medium and bilingual training should be included in the scheme, with all aspects of the marketing and training to be so available.

3.5.9 One response asked for information on the number of places that would be available annually through the ATGP and their phase, and whether these would be separate to the ITT numbers identified through use of the Teacher Planning and Supply Model or form part of the overall allocation. It also asked if ATGP trainees would become substantive members of school staff once QTS was gained or whether they would be required to seek other posts.

How we are planning to address these

General overview

3.5.10 The majority of additional comments received here further reiterated the main themes and concerns raised under the previous questions asked. These issues have been covered in earlier paragraphs as follows:

- providing coverage of the pre-employment training in other ITT programmes: paragraphs 3.2.7-3.2.8 and 3.3.22;
- using the ATGP as a retraining scheme for teachers facing redundancy: paragraph 3.1.14;
- evidence of potential for trainees to have an impact: paragraphs 3.1.11-3.1.13;
- all of the pre-employment training being delivered in Wales: paragraphs 3.1.15-3.1.17 set out the situation here; we do not think that it would be sensible to rule out this possibility at this stage;
- whether the ATGP would offer benefits since high quality entrants are recruited to existing ITT routes: paragraphs 3.1.20-3.1.21;
- who the approved organisation would be and whether any discussions taken place with potential organisations: paragraph 3.3.17; a draft agreement has yet to be finalised and we are likely to see what interest there might be in acting as an approved organisation through a formal procurement process;
- provision for Welsh-medium and bilingual training: paragraph 3.3.27;
- number of places and their phase, and relationship with other ITT numbers: paragraphs 3.1.22, 3.3.20 and 3.4.9-3.4.10;
- whether ATGP trainees would become substantive members of school staff once QTS was gained: paragraph 3.1.22;

- if the ATGP was aimed at failing schools or schools in challenging areas, how those schools would be able to meet the training needs of the ATGP trainees: paragraph 3.3.26; as noted, the ATGP is not aimed at failing schools, but at young people facing educational disadvantage.

Points raised

Discuss options with ITT providers

3.5.11 As indicated, no decision has been taken on the approved organisation. We are likely to see what interest there might be in acting as an approved organisation through a formal procurement process and ITT providers will wish to consider their options in respect of this.

Sufficiency of ATGP pre-employment training compared with GTP

3.5.12 The ATGP would offer the same employment based training as the GTP. Requirement EBR2.5(d) in the draft scheme, which applies equally to the GTP, RTP and ATGP, states that a minimum of 50 days' training time per academic year (prorata), separate from the teaching timetable, must be undertaken in a school setting, including placement in school(s) other than the one where trainees are employed. The pre-employment training on the ATGP would be an additional training period over and above that.

Making use of the RTP

3.5.13 The RTP would not be a suitable option for a programme requiring a significant involvement in schools. Although it is an employment-based route to QTS, it is aimed at non-graduates who have successfully completed the equivalent of at least two years' full-time higher education and who can complete a degree while they train and work as a teacher. The time commitment needed for the degree completion makes it impracticable for the approach envisaged for the ATGP. When it was operated the RTP did not prove popular, with the level of study and additional work required of the individual while being employed being significant factors. The RTP will remain in the Scheme to enable the Welsh Government to operate the programme and allocate intake numbers should the need arise in the future, but there is no present intention to do this.

Participation in the ATGP/widening access

3.5.14 The research report referred to in paragraph 3.1.13 provides several indicators which suggest benefits to schools of this type of programme. Experience shows that this type of programme can attract good applicant numbers.

3.5.15 The ATGP was not envisaged primarily as a widening access programme, and given the likely small-scale nature of the scheme could not be expected to have a significant impact. The very specific focus of the ATGP could encourage applicants who might not otherwise have considered teaching. The Ofsted report referred to in paragraph 3.1.12 commented that that programme recruited a diverse cohort with a high proportion of participants from a wide range of minority ethnic backgrounds.

Additional initiatives following training

3.5.16 The consultation document only covers the draft EBTT scheme and the various training issues leading to QTS. We are still considering the structure of an agreement with an approved organisation and no decisions have been taken on this.

4. General comments not directly related to the specific questions asked

Points raised

4.1 One organisation raised the differences between Wales and England in terms of the value and coverage of ITT incentives available for those undertaking secondary science priority subjects, particularly physics. It also noted differences in the way in which ITT intake target numbers are allocated between the science subjects in both countries, suggesting that in Wales the intake needed to be rebalanced to reflect the demand for qualified physics teachers.

4.2 Another response commented that employment-based teacher training programmes were effective in producing excellent teachers but questioned the requirements for first degree entry requirements. It believed that this needed to be addressed particularly for potentially good quality Welsh language teachers who did not meet the requirements.

How we are planning to address these

ITT incentives/intake targets

4.3 The ITT incentives referred to relate to mainstream postgraduate ITT courses at higher education institutions. They are not available for EBTT programmes of the sort covered in the consultation document, in either Wales or England. For postgraduate ITT courses in the 2012/13 academic year, there is a comparable package of training grant support is available in Wales to that in England.

4.4 ITT intake targets have moved away from a general science targets into a greater emphasis on individual subjects. Chemistry and physics are priority intake subjects; although the relatively small numbers in ITT in Wales compared with England make separate targets problematic. However, it has been made clear that only courses where chemistry or physics were the main component would qualify for inclusion in the priority subject intake grouping, and ITT providers have been told that they need to be certain that they make the specialism and type of course clear to all trainees from the outset.

EBTT first degree entry requirements

4.5 Teaching is a graduate profession. The Education (School Teachers' Qualifications) (Wales) Regulations 2004 as amended requires individuals who are to be recognised as qualified teachers by undertaking initial teacher training or employment-based training in Wales to hold a UK first degree or equivalent qualification. The Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme 2011, made under the 2004 Regulations, requires that trainees on the Graduate Teacher Programme must hold such a qualification.

4.6 Employment-based ITT providers are statutorily required to design the content, structure and delivery of training to enable trainee teachers to demonstrate

that they have met the QTS Standards. There is no specific requirement that an individual must have a degree in the subject in which they wish to train to teach; however, individuals would need to have relevant subject knowledge at degree level to enable them to meet the QTS Standards for teaching the national curriculum phase and subject at the age ranges they are being trained to teach.

5. The way forward

5.1 Having considered fully the responses received during the public consultation, the Minister for Education and Skills has decided to proceed to make a replacement Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme 2012, which will include provision for the ATGP. This would be based on the draft scheme consulted upon, but with wording which avoids any suggestion that an approved organisation could not be an accredited ITT provider; a more specific provision that if an accredited English ITT provider was utilised for part of the pre-employment training, that element would need to be organised through the accredited Welsh ITT provider; and with an explicit point that trainees on EBTT programmes should not be placed in schools in special measures.

5.2 Work will proceed on proposals for the development and delivery of the ATGP and, in particular, on the structure of an agreement to be used with an approved organisation. No decision has been taken on the approved organisation and we are likely to see what interest there might be in acting as an approved organisation through a formal procurement process.

5.3 We will require in the agreement to be used with an approved organisation that the scheme administration, including any promotional work, should meet requirements equivalent to our Welsh Language Scheme. We will also require that all aspects of the application process and of a programme of training under the ATGP should be fully available through the medium of Welsh for candidates who wished to pursue that option.

5.4 The Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme 2012 will be made later this year.

Annex A: List of respondees

Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) Cymru

Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)

Connah's Quay High School

CYDAG

Estyn

General Teaching Council for Wales

Higher Education Funding Council for Wales

Institute of Physics

NAHT Cymru

NASUWT Cymru

NUT Cymru

South West Wales Centre for Teacher Education

UCAC (Undeb Cenedlaethol Athrawon Cymru)

Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) Cymru

One author elected to remain anonymous.

Annex B: Published responses

1. Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) Cymru Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

**Consultation
Response Form**

Your name: Gareth Jones
Organisation (if applicable): ASCL Cymru

e-mail/telephone number: gareth.jones@ascl.org.uk

Your address: Trem-y-Cwm, Kilgwrrwg, Chepstow, NP166DB

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | X <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | X <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | X <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

2. Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

Consultation Response Form

Your name: Dr Philip Dixon
Organisation (if applicable): The Association of
Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)

e-mail/telephone number: cymru@atl.org.uk, tel:
02920 465 000

Your address: 1st Floor, 64 B Newport Road, Cardiff,
CF24 ODF

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

We must stress at the outset that only qualified teachers should be teaching in classrooms. This proposed new departure takes place against a backdrop at present where there are already too many teachers being trained for the amount of posts that are currently available. If such a scheme is introduced preference should be given to those candidates and those with a proven track record and a demonstrable commitment to remain in education for the longer term.

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------|--|----------|--|
| Agree | X | Disagree | | Not sure | |
|-------|---|----------|--|----------|--|

Comments:

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------|--|----------|--|
| Agree | X | Disagree | | Not sure | |
|-------|---|----------|--|----------|--|

Comments:

The Welsh Government needs to do more to ensure that graduates who have undertaken their teacher training in an area to be able to find posts in that area once they are qualified. At present there is much anecdotal evidence that qualified teachers are working as LSAs because they cannot find teaching jobs.

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------|--|----------|--|
| Agree | X | Disagree | | Not sure | |
|-------|---|----------|--|----------|--|

Comments:

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

We would urge that the assessment of this programme be clearly laid out before it is commenced, and takes full account of all factors. Evidence from England suggests that it is not so much the programme as the calibre of its students that has made ventures such as Teach First so apparently successful. As we have noted, the programme also needs to be assessed in terms of value for money given the alleged high 'drop out' rate from teaching of such programmes.

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

3. Connah's Quay High School

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

**Consultation
Response Form**

Greg Dixon :
Connah's Quay High School:
Flintshire

Greg_dixon@flintshire.gov.uk

01244 813491

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

Employment based training programmes are effective in producing excellent teachers. We have experience of training 2 individuals who are now providing very good service in schools in North Wales.

We have however experienced very real frustrations when attempting to take on another trainee in a very serious shortage area, i.e. Welsh language teaching. The barriers we have encountered with regards to entry requirements have resulted in us losing a potentially excellent teacher of Welsh due to the fact that his first degree did not meet the entry criteria. This I believe is a very short sighted approach, and is something I believe needs to be addressed.

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

4. CYDAG

Fersiwn Diwygiedig o'r Cynllun Hyfforddi Athrawon ar sail Cyflogaeth

Ffurflen Ymateb i'r Ymgynghoriad

Eich enw: Arwel George

Corff (os yn briodol): CYDAG

e-bost/rhif ffôn: arwelg@btinternet.com

01970 820223

Eich cyfeiriad: LLYS HEDD, Bow Street, Aberystwyth, SY24 5AX

Dylai ymatebion gael eu dychwelyd erbyn 31 Ionawr 2012 fan bellaf at:

Gail Deane
Yr Is-adran Gwella Dysgu a Datblygiad Proffesiynol
Adran Addysg a Sgiliau
Llywodraeth Cymru
Rhadbost NAT8910
Parc Cathays
Caerdydd
CF10 3NQ

Neu eu cwblhau'n electronig a'u hanfon at:

EBTTSConsultation@cymru.gsi.gov.uk

1. A ydych yn cytuno â'r nod o gyflwyno rhaglen gwella disgyblion/ysgolion i helpu pobl ifanc sydd o dan anfantais addysgol drwy raglen hyfforddi athrawon ar sail cyflogaeth sy'n targedu ymgeiswyr o safon, wedi'u cefnogi gan hyfforddiant penodol gan ddarparwyr HCA?

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Cytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Anghytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ddim yn siŵr | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|

Sylwadau:

Dim sylw. Y cwertsiwn y un anelwig iawn.

2. A ydych yn cytuno â'r cynnig i ddarparu'r hyfforddiant ar sail cyflogaeth hwn drwy raglen ychwanegol sy'n cynnwys darpariaeth ar gyfer cwrs hyfforddiant cychwynnol cyn y cyfnod lle câ'r unigolyn ei gyflogi i addysgu mewn ysgol?

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Cytuno | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Anghytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ddim yn siŵr | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------|---|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|

Sylwadau:

3. A ydych yn cytuno â manylion y Rhaglen Hyfforddiant Ychwanegol arfaethedig i Raddedigion?

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Cytuno | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Anghytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ddim yn siŵr | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------|---|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|

Sylwadau:

4. A ydych yn cytuno â'r amserlen arfaethedig a'r trefniadau trosiannol a awgrymir?

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Cytuno | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Anghytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ddim yn siŵr | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------|---|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|

Sylwadau:

5. Rydym wedi gofyn nifer o gwestiynau penodol. Os oes gennych unrhyw faterion cysylltiedig nad ydyn ni wedi mynd i'r afael â nhw, defnyddiwch y lle hwn i wneud hynny:

Sylwadau:

Gwneir nifer o gyfeiriadau at y posibilad o gydweithio, o dan amodau, gyda darparwyr hyfforddiant cychwynnol o Loegr.

Does dim sôn o gwbl am sicrhau argaeledd hyfforddiant ar sail cyflogaeth ar gyfer y sector cyfrwng Cymraeg a dwyieithog.

Mae yn gryf o'r farn y dylid gwneud hynny'n elfen echblyg ac amlwg o'r cynllun.

Enghraifft benodol byddai gosod rhwymedigaeth ar ddarparwyr i gyfeirio at argaeledd ymgymryd â'r hyfforddiant trwy gyfrwng Gymraeg neu'n ddwyieithog yn rhan o'u prosesau marchnata yn ogystal â sicrhau bod ganddynt yr abled i gynnal pob agwedd o'r broses hyfforddi trwy gyfrwng y Gymraeg neu ddwyieithog, yn ddibynnol ar gyd-destun lleoliad y Gyflogaeth.

Mae'n bosibl y caiff ymatebion i ymgynghoriadau eu cyhoeddi - ar y rhyngwyd neu mewn adroddiad. Pe bai'n well gennych i'ch ymateb gael ei gadw'n gyfrinachol, ticiwch y blwch hwn:

5. Estyn

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

Consultation Response Form

Your name: **Sarah Lewis**
Organisation (if applicable): **Estyn**

e-mail/telephone number: **sarah.lewis@estyn.gov.uk**
077955 20469

Your address: **Anchor Court, Keen Road, Cardiff CF24**
5JW

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|

Comments:

Agree overall. There is evidence of the success of similar programmes in England and the intention to introduce such a programme in Wales is welcomed.

However, the rationale for introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme is not set out convincingly in

the consultation document.

The proposal is underpinned by a number of assumptions:

- that the calibre of applicants will be superior to those on other routes;
- that ATGP trainees will be more effective teachers of disadvantaged learners;
- that schools in challenging circumstances will be able to support ATGP trainees (that these school requires an improvement programme suggests that they are underperforming);
- that the needs of schools in disadvantaged areas are the same in every case; and
- that the ATGP route will be superior to other routes in producing high quality teachers.

However, to improve the performance of disadvantaged learners successfully requires not only good teachers but also a range of other factors, including effective leaders; systematic, whole school approaches for teaching and learning; effective intervention programmes to address underachievement; and efficient and effective multi-agency working (see Estyn 2010, Tackling child poverty and disadvantage in schools; and Estyn 2011, Tackling poverty and disadvantage in schools: working with the community and other services). Any method to improve teaching in schools tackling issues of poverty and disadvantage needs to be part of a comprehensive and coherent strategy. It is not clear from this document how the ATGP is intended to link to other approaches to improve the outcomes for disadvantaged learners.

The Open University already operates a flexible route into initial teacher training which may already be providing the same type of trainee teacher. The Open University route is specifically aimed at mature students with diverse life and work experience. Individual assessments based on prior evidence of qualified teacher standards at the beginning of the course determine the length of the course, the materials and the level of the course to be studied. These trainee teachers gain a PGCE as well as QTS through study of theoretical and practical perspectives.

Another key aim of the revised scheme should be to provide an alternative route for recruiting high-quality entrants. The new route should also focus on providing these entrants with a challenging but supportive programme of initial teacher training. It may be that the combination of a school improvement role with additional training will be attractive to high-calibre students.

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--|

Comments:

Agree overall. A criticism of GTP in the past has been the limited nature of the university-led initial training for students, so the provision for additional training is seen as positive.

If such training proves successful, it will be worth considering why one group of trainee teachers can receive additional training prior to working in a school while those following the ordinary GTP do not. If a period of additional training is deemed necessary and is successful for ATGP trainees, why not improve the quality of the current GTP by providing this pre-employment element?

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | X |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|

Comments:

The proposal is mainly about introducing provisions to enable ATG programmes, but does not provide enough detail about the programmes. Because of this lack of detail (see examples below), it is difficult to answer this question.

“The approved organisation, in conjunction with an accredited ITT provider, must make arrangements with suitable school(s) to confirm trainee placements...” Who will select these schools and how will they be selected (see comment above about schools’ ability to support trainees)?

High quality entrants. This presupposes that candidates need additional entry requirements and particular personal qualities over and above those required for GTP candidates. However, the document does not make specific reference to these entry requirements, other than stating that the general requirements constitute a minimum.

Would potential trainees be contractually committed to working with the host school for a designated period of time after the completion of their training?

If a trainee is placed in an underperforming school, should the ATGP programme have additional quality assurance requirements?

Monitoring and evaluation of the ATGP. How will the effectiveness of the programme be measured? If the aim is to bring about school improvement, will this be linked to school performance and over what period of time?

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

It is difficult to respond to this question because of the lack of detail in the consultation document.

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

It is worth reconsidering 4.2di – a minimum of half the period of the initial training must be delivered in Wales. All initial training should be delivered in Wales.

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

6. General Teaching Council for Wales

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

**Consultation
Response Form**

Hayden Llewellyn
The General Teaching Council for Wales (GTCW)

hayden.llewellyn@gtcw.org.uk

9th Floor
Eastgate House
35-43 Newport Road
Cardiff
CF24 0AB

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The Council fully supports the Welsh Government's proposal to introduce a pupil / school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage.

However, the Council is not clear what the "evidence base" is for the Welsh Government proposal to address this matter through an employment based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers.

If the Welsh Government's primary objective is to introduce a programme to support young people who face educational challenge, then it could be argued that this might be better

delivered by experienced teachers, with specific experience in this area rather than by using trainee teachers.

The Council invites the Welsh Government to provide:

- details of its research and thinking in order to demonstrate that its proposal is the most effective way of addressing this issue;
- the costs of the proposed employment based teacher training programme in order that it can be compared against the costs of other options. The Council presumes that this route to QTS will be expensive when compared to other routes as the trainee will be paid an NQT salary while in school, as is the case with similar routes in England such as *Teach First*.

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|---|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | X | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|---|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The main route to gaining QTS in Wales involves a programme of initial teacher training, which comprises a mix of ITT provider based training and teaching practice in schools. In contrast, the GTP and RTP (when it has run) offer routes where there is a greater concentration of “on the job” learning (as compared to ITET) in order to demonstrate that a trainee meets the QTS standards.

The Council supports the introduction of a new and alternative route to QTS, which involves a course of initial training provision that precedes the period of being employed to teach in a school. Indeed, the Council considers that this route to QTS may be more attractive to some individuals than the existing route to QTS, for example high fliers or career changers from other professions and as such may encourage such persons to embark on a career in teaching which they may not have otherwise done if such a Programme was not available.

However, the Council re-iterates the point raised in question 1 that it is not able to support the introduction of an employment based teacher training programme to specifically support young people who face educational disadvantage without justification that this is the most appropriate and cost effective means of addressing this matter.

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|---|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | X | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|---|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The Council wishes to raise the following questions regarding the details of the Additional Training Graduate Programme:

1. As stated above, the details of the Programme set out in the consultation document do not make clear how it will achieve the Welsh Government's objective of introducing a programme to specifically support young people who face educational disadvantage.
2. The consultation document states that the programme will be targeted at "high quality entrants", however the Welsh Government does not explain how these entrants will be identified / defined, other than it will be left to providers to recruit trainees.
3. What will the length of the initial training be? It is important that this initial training equips trainees with sufficient knowledge and skills to commence work in schools.
4. The Council notes that the proposed Programme will allow the course of initial pre-employment training to be delivered by an accredited English ITT provider in conjunction with an accredited ITT provider in Wales. Given the strength of existing ITT provision in Wales, the Council questions why the Programme is to be extended to English ITT providers.
5. Further to point 4, the Council seeks assurance that the course of initial pre-employment will be available through the medium of Welsh for trainees who require it.

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The Council believes that its concerns raised in response to question 1 should be addressed prior to the introduction of any new programme of this nature.

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

The Council would like to raise the following additional points with the Welsh Government:

1. Given that there is currently an over-supply of teachers in Wales (with the exception of certain secondary subjects and Welsh medium provision), the Council wishes to clarify the number of places that will be available annually through the new Programme, the phase and whether these will be separate to the teacher training numbers identified each year through the Teacher Supply Model or form part of the overall annual recruitment numbers?
2. Will the trainees become substantive members of a school's staff once they have gained QTS or will they be required to seek other posts?

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

7. Higher Education Funding Council for Wales

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

Consultation Response Form

Higher Education Funding Council for Wales:

info@hefcw.ac.uk

Telephone: 029 20 761861

Linden Court
The Orchards
Ilex Close
Llanishen
Cardiff CF14 5DZ

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

We have not indicated agreement or disagreement as such but have provided comments below. Some of the comments may be relevant to more than one question.

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

In paragraph 3.3 of the consultation document it is noted that the Welsh Government would like to make use of an employment-based training scheme for pupil/school improvement to support young people who face educational disadvantage, and that this would require “high quality” entrants. This could be seen as implying in a rather blanket way that current entrants to ITT programmes are not “high quality”. The Welsh Government sets requirements for entry to ITT in order to ensure that entrants are suitably qualified. ITT providers have to confirm that trainees meet the Welsh Government’s Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) standards at the end of their course and their role also includes “counselling out” students who they judge will not make suitable teachers. Moreover, Higher Education Statistics Agency data from 2009/10, for example, shows that nearly 53% of PGCE students had first or 2:1 degrees on entry (over 7% had first class degrees). Only just over 10% had a degree below a 2:2 or another qualification: this will include students who enter with alternative qualifications and contribute to diversity within the teaching profession.

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

HEFCW has specific statutory responsibilities for the accreditation of providers of initial training (ITT) in Wales to ensure that such providers meet the Welsh Government’s requirements. It also has a wider duty to secure provision for assessing the quality of education in institutions whose activities it funds. It discharges this duty through contracting with the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) to assess the standards and quality of provision in higher education in Wales. Additionally for ITT, Estyn inspections are a major element in providing assurance to HEFCW that providers continue to meet accreditation and standards requirements and deliver appropriate quality provision. It allocates intake targets to individual providers following receipt of sector targets from the Welsh Government and may also carry out or commission research to improve the training of teachers and the standards of teaching.

In the light of these responsibilities, we have some concerns about the proposed approach for the Additional Graduate Teacher Programme (AGTP).

We are particularly concerned at the involvement in Wales of an “approved organisation” which does not deliver ITT and also potentially of an English ITT provider, even though this would only be in the pre-employment training. As Welsh Government officials are aware, even though the Open University delivers ITT across the UK, for it to offer ITT in Wales, HEFCW required it to receive separate accreditation to ensure that Welsh requirements would be met. Estyn inspects the

provision to ensure that these requirements continue to be met. We are not aware of a precedent for an English ITT provider, not accredited by HEFCW, being involved in the delivery of ITT in Wales.

The involvement of an English provider seems to be given differing emphases in the consultation document and the draft scheme, so that it is unclear to what extent it would lead on the pre-employment training. The consultation document says the new scheme would allow the pre-employment training to be delivered by “an accredited English provider in conjunction with an accredited ITT provider in Wales” (4.2), but the Scheme (12) says “must be delivered by an accredited [Welsh] ITT provider; this may be in conjunction with an accredited English ITT provider”.

It would appear from the consultation document and draft scheme that the “approved organisation” would have a significant role in allocating targets, selecting trainees, organising and ensuring the required training programme and monitoring trainee’s progress. This may not sit well with the responsibilities of the providers for ensuring the suitability of trainees on entry and as they proceed through the programme, and the content of training, particularly if differing priorities emerge. ITT providers should at least be fully involved in the selection and be able to agree with the approved organisation whether a trainee should be accepted or not. It is also not clear how the ITT provider(s) in Wales would be chosen.

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The change which has led to the Welsh Government allocating Graduate Teacher Programme places to accredited ITT providers will help improve the consistency of training and its comparability with mainstream PGCE training. Successful GTP trainees are awarded QTS at the end of their training but the opportunity to complete a PGCE is not part of the arrangements. While it may not be for inclusion in the formal Scheme as such, the consultation does not indicate whether AGTP trainees will have the opportunity to receive a qualification such as a PGCE in addition to QTS.

The consultation also notes that GTP trainees must receive the equivalent of a minimum of 10 days university-led training organised by the ITT providers. There does not, however, appear to a requirement for any university-led training for ATGP trainees while in employment, in addition to the pre-employment training.

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

On a broader note, if the Welsh Government sees the need for a programme of this nature, we would urge that officials discuss this at any early stage before proposals are finalised not just with HEFCW, but more particularly with the ITT sector as a whole in Wales. ITT providers in Wales have a good record of working together, particularly through UCET Cymru and can contribute their expertise not just in ITT but also in other education areas and continuing professional development for school teachers.

Beyond this, the institutions concerned would bring their knowledge and experience of working in disadvantaged areas in Wales. They are heavily engaged in raising aspirations and improving the performance of young people and adults in Community First areas or facing other aspects of disadvantage through widening access and Reaching Wider (regional widening access partnerships) activities. In South-East Wales, we would note the involvement of the University of Wales Newport in the Universities Heads of the Valleys Institute.

Involving the ITT providers in this way would help to achieve a programme which is tailored to the needs of Wales. A scheme which may have been developed in the context of the education agenda in England, where policies are different, may not do so. It may also offer a more cost-effective approach.

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

8. Institute of Physics

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

**Consultation
Response
Form**

Professor Peter Main
Director, Education and Science

Institute of Physics

Peter.Main@iop.org

76 Portland Place
London
W1B 1NT

Professor Manuel Grande

Chair of the Institute of
Physics in Wales

mng@aber.ac.uk

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

**Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ**

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

- 1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?**

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

The aim implies that there is a link between school-centred training and supporting the disadvantaged. Is there evidence to show that employment-based teacher training gives better results with young people who face educational disadvantage than experienced proven teachers? We welcome the aim of getting a broader cross-section of people into teaching (for example, people who have already been in employment). These teachers can contribute in all schools and not just in schools

where a significant fraction of the pupils are educationally disadvantaged. In order to address the pupils who are educationally disadvantaged we should look to deploy experienced teachers. Most teachers take several years to gain enough experience to become effective.

The specific training provided by an ITT provider will be crucial to the success of the scheme. Trainee teachers need to know more about teaching than they can acquire through simple observation: they need to be able to discuss the observation with an experienced observer; and they need to put their observations into a broader context and relate them to theories of learning. Trainee teachers need to understand why a strategy works so they can develop their own ideas. For physics teachers this is especially important as most of the concepts are abstract rather than concrete. Therefore, we feel that to get the most from observations, trainees need the guidance of a trainer and the structure of a training course.

It is not clear how the experience of being trained in an employment-based scheme would necessarily be better than a PGCE. Those taking PGCEs already spend two thirds of their course in schools. They should have the added benefit of spending time in a university department with the support of a dedicated trainer. As long as they get proper mentoring support in the school, this offers all the advantages of an employment-based training programme with the additional benefit of having the support of a subject trainer, being connected with research, and a network of colleagues learning to teach the same subject. Although trainees are sent into schools and are given a subject mentor there is no guarantee that the mentor will be teaching the same subject as the trainee. For example a physics trainee may have a science mentor but that mentor might not be a specialist physics teacher. Also, it is crucial that the mentors are given training and on-going support. There are cases of trainees being mentored by teachers who are teaching outside their specialism and/or the mentors not having undergone training to teach them how to mentor effectively. We need to look at ways to fully support and engage with in-school mentors and schools that, through taking trainee teachers, are helping develop the next generation of teachers.

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

We believe that the current one-year teacher training course is insufficient preparation for teaching the sciences and that a longer course, perhaps including the first 2 or 3 NQT years, would not only provide greater subject specific training, it would also engender a culture of CPD. An additional programme prior to employment based teacher training or to a PGCE would be welcome but not as a replacement for the support supplied by a PGCE tutor during the course.

Additional training prior to employment-based training (or prior to a PGCE) would also enable the Welsh Government to increase the number of trainees in designated secondary priority subjects e.g. physics and chemistry. A scheme that operated in England between 2004 and 2010 was the Physics Enhancement Project. The IOP worked with the TDA on this project (funded by the Gatsby Charitable Foundation) and it consisted of 3 parts: an initial intensive six-month course designed to strengthen subject knowledge; a training course that led to Qualified Teacher Status, for example a PGCE course or school based GTP teacher training; and a follow up mentoring programme for the first two years of teaching after qualifying, to further build subject knowledge and skills. The initial intensive course still exists and is now part of [S\(ubject\) K\(nowledge\) E\(nhancement\)](#) courses or SKE. SKE courses are available across England and vary in length. Courses which last several months have been producing between 150 and 200 entrants in physics each year, a very substantial fraction of the cohort.

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

We suggest that the WG may want to look at setting up an additional training programme which would then be followed by a GTP, RTP or a PGCE, rather than set-up an entirely new method of qualifying as a teacher. Separation of the two parts, the pre-training and the QTS part of training, could allow the pre-training to be used prior to PGCE courses or as top-up courses for teachers, during employment, who would like to gain additional specialism. This would ensure value for money and would allow the course to be accessed by more students. It would also be an opportunity to initiate a more structured approach to CPD.

We believe that there are more efficient ways of increasing numbers into teaching than a designated new course. We suggest that the WG look at schemes such as

SKEs, Physics with Mathematics PGCEs and separate targets for the sciences (see our response to Question 5 below).

It is not clear from the documentation what the additional training would cover. PGCE courses seldom have time to improve a candidate's subject knowledge and that, given the dramatic shortage of physics teachers, it is inevitable that many, probably the majority, of candidates for teaching will have substantial holes in their knowledge which will not be filled during their PGCE. We suggest that the additional training covers subject knowledge and pedagogy.

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

The feasibility of a start date would depend on what form the additional training graduate programme would take.

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

In 2011 significant differences in the recruitment of teachers in designated specialist subjects emerged between England and Wales. The three main differences are: Physics with Mathematics PGCE courses; separate ITT targets for teachers of the sciences and bursaries of up to £20,000 for trainee students in physics, mathematics, chemistry and modern languages.

Physics with Mathematics PGCE

The TDA is piloting this new joint course from September 2012 at 32 centres in England (a total of 306 places will be allocated to those centres), following discussions with the Institute of Physics and Royal Academy of Engineering. The scheme also has the backing of the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications. Students would study for a mainstream physics PGCE but replace the chemistry and biology elements with maths. This innovative move follows the UK government's recognition that many physics and engineering students want to train as physics teachers, or physics and maths teachers, but they are put off by current training programmes which require them to teach chemistry and/or biology. At the same time, head teachers have suggested to the government that a new physics with maths PGCE would satisfy unmet demand in schools. (The 306 allocated are in addition to the 925 mentioned below under Separate Science Targets.)

Separate targets for teachers of the sciences

Even though in Wales since 2010 there are specific recruitment targets for ITT centres in chemistry and physics (the figures are combined) the UK government announced earlier this year separate targets for each of the sciences in England. 925 teacher training places have been allocated in physics. Although the separate targets were initially unpopular with ITT providers, they have resulted in record numbers of recruits to physics in England, 864 people are training to become physics specialists this year – up 30 per cent on 2010, and approximately twice the long term average.

In the [Annual Statistics Digest 2011](#) produced by the General Teaching Council for Wales (GTCW) there are 165 registered teachers teaching physics who were trained in physics¹, 247 registered teachers teaching biology who were trained in biology and 201 registered teachers teaching chemistry who were trained in chemistry. Maintaining the current quota of 85 for Biology and Integrated Science and 81 for Chemistry & Physics (combined) does nothing to improve this balance. It is also known that physics applicants tend to apply late in the cycle for PGCE and therefore places on “Science” PGCE courses can be filled before physics graduates even apply. We, the IOP, would be willing to

¹ Table 1.2 of the Annual Statistics Digest 2011 states that there are 165 registered teachers teaching physics who were ITET trained in physics, 194 registered teachers teaching physics whose ITET training was not physics and 41 teaching physics where the subject of their ITET training is unknown.

help the WG and ITT providers in Wales to market their courses. Our [Marketing Initiative for Teacher Recruitment](#) (MITRE) encompasses all of our work to raise the profile of a career in teaching physics with our target audience and the wider community.

Training Bursaries

There is a new system of financial incentives for trainees with good degrees in shortage subjects in England. Bursaries are available for trainees on eligible postgraduate courses who are not employed as a teacher. Bursary amounts will vary depending on teaching subject and degree class. For a first class degree trainees would be awarded a bursary of £20,000; 2:1 would receive £15,000 and 2:2 would receive £12,000. (There is flexibility within the scheme to recognise exceptional achievement outside of degree results.) The subjects are physics, mathematics, chemistry and modern languages. Physics (or physics with mathematics) trainees, with (or predicted) a 1st or 2:1 degree or holding a PhD or Masters Degree, can apply for a bursary or an IOP Teacher Training Scholarship. The scholarship will be worth £20,000 and be instead of the standard bursary. It will have additional benefits such as membership of the Institute of Physics and mentoring support. Although bursaries are a useful means to attract the best graduates into teaching and to raise the status of the profession, it is important that all graduates with the potential to become excellent teachers, particularly in shortage subjects, should not be deterred from entering teacher training by financial constraints.

These three initiatives are targeting the shortage of physics teachers. The question to ask is whether they will have an adverse effect on recruitment to physics teaching in Wales if no changes are made to the Welsh system. There is also the additional consideration in Wales of the supply of physics teachers able to teach through the medium of Welsh.

Good subject knowledge is essential. Even graduates need to brush up basic ideas that they met at school but have not revisited during their degrees. The gaps in knowledge are not formally addressed on ITT courses; it is often incumbent upon the mentors in schools to rectify misconceptions and fill the gaps. This needs to be monitored and we would like to see some assessment of subject knowledge at the end of the training period or prior to QTS. We have online assessment tools which we could share with the Welsh Government.

Compounding the issue of recruitment to the profession is the low retention rate. Currently, only 60% of all new physics teachers are in the profession after five years of teaching. It is therefore important that consideration is given to the development of teachers during their careers as well as during their official training period.

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

9. NAHT Cymru

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

**Consultation
Response Form**

Your name: Anna Brychan
Organisation (if applicable): NAHT Cymru

e-mail/telephone number: anna.brychan@naht.org.uk

Your address:
9 Columbus Walk
Brigantine Place
Cardiff CF10 4BY

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

**Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ**

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

- 1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?**

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

We understand that literacy, numeracy and closing the attainment gap – the national priorities for education – are the main focus of the proposed new programme.

We feel that if specific training is considered critical to the Welsh schools' system, it should be contained within initial teacher training programmes on offer.

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

10. NASUWT Cymru



Welsh Government

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

January 2012

1. The NASUWT welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposals to revise the employment-based teacher training scheme.
2. The NASUWT is the largest teachers' union in Wales and the UK representing teachers and school leaders.

GENERAL COMMENTS

3. The NASUWT is in some difficulty in commenting on the proposals in the consultation document as they are unclear and poorly explained.
4. The NASUWT maintains that it is critical that the Welsh Government provides a much clearer explanation of what is being proposed and that this must include an explanation of why the scheme is needed and how it fits in with other initial teacher training (ITT) programmes.
5. The NASUWT reminds the Welsh Government that investment in high-quality training and support is crucial to the success of ITT programmes.
6. The NASUWT questions, therefore, the prudence of introducing an additional training scheme at a time of economic constraint and following a reduction in the ITT targets in Wales.

7. In addition, the NASUWT questions the need for the introduction of this particular scheme given the incidence of teacher redundancy across Wales.

8. As far as the NASUWT is able to establish, it appears that the Additional Training Graduate Programme (ATGP) is designed to provide a period of pre-employment training to graduates to enable them to work with young people who face educational disadvantage.

9. Given the high levels of investment needed to ensure the success of both the pre-employment training and the subsequent employment-based training, the NASUWT maintains that a more appropriate and cost-effective way of assisting pupils who face educational disadvantage would be to offer the pre-employment course as a retraining programme for teachers who are facing redundancy.

10. The NASUWT has consistently argued for the introduction of strategies to avoid the compulsory redundancy of teachers and is concerned that, having identified a specific area of need, the Welsh Government has failed to recognise that the situation could provide an alternative to redundancy through retraining.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

11. The NASUWT offers the observations and comments that follow in relation to the questions posed on the consultation response form.

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The NASUWT has no difficulty in agreeing that young people who face educational disadvantage should be supported fully but finds no merit in introducing an additional ITT employment-based teacher training programme to meet this need.

The NASUWT maintains that the high incidence of redundancy facing employees within the education service across Wales argues for the opportunity to provide this support to young people to be made available to existing qualified teachers as a strategy to avoid compulsory redundancy.

- 2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?**

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The NASUWT disagrees with this proposal for the reason given above.

- 3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?**

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The NASUWT disagrees with this proposal for the reason given above.

- 4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?**

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The NASUWT disagrees with this proposal for the reason given above.

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

As stated previously in this response, the NASUWT questions both the prudence and appropriateness of introducing the ATGP scheme.

The NASUWT is confident that the support needed by young people who face educational disadvantage can be provided from within the educational establishment and deeply regrets that the Welsh Government is seeking to introduce a scheme that could result in existing talent and experience being lost to young people through redundancy.

The NASUWT urges the Welsh Government to refocus the training strategy on reconciling the needs of young people who face educational disadvantage with the needs of the highly skilled professionals who are facing redundancy.



Chris Keates

General Secretary

For further information on the Union's response, contact Rex Phillips, Wales Organiser.

NASUWT Cymru

Greenwood Close

Cardiff Gate Business Park

Cardiff

CF23 8RD

029 2054 6080

www.nasuwt.org.uk

nasuwt@mail.nasuwt.org.uk

11. NUT Cymru

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

Consultation Response Form

Your name: Owen Hathway
Organisation (if applicable): NUT Cymru

e-mail/telephone number: 07921146442 /
o.hathway@nut.org.uk

Your address: Ty Sinnott, 18 Neptune Court, Vanguard
Way, Cardiff, CF24 5PJ

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|---|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | X | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|---|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

In principle there could be support for this scheme but the target cohort is unclear. What is defined by educational disadvantage? The individuals suffering educational disadvantage could be on a personal level, learning difficulties or problems with the family structure, or it could be a social issue, such as, coming from an area with high levels of deprivation. If this is not identified fully within the consultation, as it has not been, it is difficult to fully endorse the aims of the programme.

There is also concern regarding the notion of 'high-quality entrants.' What/Who is defined as being high quality? How is this distinction made and by whom? Equally what is done to nurture performance amongst entrants who are not deemed high-

quality?

If entrants are deemed high quality based on academia alone that underestimates the other factors needed in teaching. Of course a high quality educational background is important and expertise should be exploited, but the interpersonal skills of teachers and their ability to bring the best out of their students are also critical, but far less easily quantifiable. The acquisition of professional skills and the ability to apply them is also crucial. Without the ability to identify and apply the most appropriate pedagogical approaches for individual pupils and classes, even those with the highest level of degree will be unable to engage pupils in their learning and support their progress.

In addition to the above concerns the consultation document does not make clear the ways in which the extra training will support young people facing disadvantage. More information about the content of the additional training would be required in order to indicate clearly the advantages of additional spending on such a course.

Unless these classifications are defined it is difficult to be able to fully appreciate or support such a project.

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

In the first instance this question is assuming that we agreed with question 1, of which we did not, given the lack of detail relating to the target cohort of the educational disadvantage.

In answering the question under the assumption that the training course was to be delivered by implementing it as part of an additional programme this would seem like the most appropriate way of introducing it.

However, there would have to be an examination on the workload associated with the programme for teachers undertaking it. The course should not impede on a teacher's ability to attain employment by running into a school term, but equally should not impact on those who are already undertaking studies through the teacher training provision. If this can be assured then, naturally, additional training where financially viable to the practitioner, would be welcomed.

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

There are elements of the ATGP that could be supported but also sections that give concern.

Why is an English university ITT provider involved in the delivery of this scheme? It would be deemed more appropriate for two Welsh Universities, one in the north and one in the south, to be tasked with delivering the programme?

Equally we are not supportive of a private body running the additional training graduate programme. Given that the number of subjects for which partial funding can be applied from the Assembly is now limited, how much money will be spent on using a private agency/company to administer and publicise the scheme when there is insufficient funding to make a contribution to the salary and training costs in all but a limited number of subjects? There is a fear here that education budgets, which are already insufficient in Wales, will be squeezed further by this outsourcing.

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

Again this question is dependent on our support for the ATGP. If the programme does go ahead then the timescales outlined seem acceptable.

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

12. South West Wales Centre for Teacher Education

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

Consultation Response Form

Your name: Suzie Pugh / Catharine Bleasdale
 Organisation (if applicable): SWWCTE

e-mail/telephone number: suzie.pugh@smu.ac.uk;
c.bleasdale@tsd.ac.uk

Your address: Swansea Metropolitan University, Townhill Campus,
 Swansea;
 University of Wales Trinity Saint David, Carmarthen Campus, Carmarthen SA31
 3EP

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
 Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
 Department for Education and Skills
 Welsh Government
 Freepost NAT 8910
 Cathays Park
 Cardiff
 CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------|--|----------|--|
| Agree | X | Disagree | | Not sure | |
|-------|---|----------|--|----------|--|

Comments:

There is agreement *in principle* but only if ITT providers have sufficient input at the design stage of the proposed AGTP. This could result in an innovative, employment-based programme unique to Wales, not one simply modelled on 'Teach First'.

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

Comments:

The proposal for an intense pre-employment training is highly appropriate, as trainees will be able to obtain a clear understanding of the requirements of the programme, as well as receiving intense input regarding the curriculum etc in advance of their school-based training. This is something that could be incorporated into the current GTP as a very useful addition to the current provision.

Such input would provide a firm foundation upon which to begin the SBITT but has obvious financial implications.

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|

At present, it is difficult to agree to this proposal, as the details presented in the consultation document are somewhat vague and there is not a clear rationale to consider. There are elements that appear to mirror the Teach First scheme in England, but this scheme is not explicitly referred to.

There are some aspects of the proposal that require further explanation. For example, in 4.2c, it states that the ATGP ‘might be organised and operated by an ‘approved body’. The proposal implies that ‘they’ would be responsible for *organising and operating* the scheme including consideration of applications. The *production and delivery* of the *training and assessment* would be carried out by ITT providers. The involvement of an approved body that was not an established ITT provider would pose significant challenges regarding Quality Assurance. More information regarding the safeguards that would be in place to ensure robust procedures is required. Also, it would be necessary to identify how ITT providers could be responsible for training if they had not been involved in the selection process.

Another aspect of the proposal that requires clarification is the inclusion, in 4.2d, of the opportunity for training to be carried out in part by accredited English ITT providers. This is a confusing suggestion, in particular the idea of sharing the training process. As there are differing requirements for Qualified Teacher Status in England and Wales, there would again be challenges regarding the Quality Assurance of the training programme. Is this suggestion linked to a view to including Teach First providers in the proposed scheme, and opening access to their trainees?

The comment at 4.2d.i suggests that the initial introduction of the AGTP would require Teach First trainees to be phased into Wales' scheme. Is this a viable option?

Further clarification is required for 4.2d.iii, which suggests that an *'approved organisation'* would ensure that content, structure and delivery of the course reflected the QTS standards. Again, the Quality Assurance of this would be challenging. It also seems to be an unnecessary complication, given that Welsh ITT providers could be doing this as an integral part of the AGTP.

The approved organisation would 'have responsibility for all aspects of the administration and delivery of the 2012 Scheme within the requirements set out in the statement issued by the Welsh Government under the provisions of paragraph 49, including arrangements for selection of trainees for places; managing the appeal process; and monitoring the progress of trainees'.

Again, further clarification of the process would be required in order to make an informed decision on whether it was a viable option. The Quality Assurance would need to be carefully considered.

A key consideration to clarify is whether the ITT providers or the 'approved organisation' would hold the overall responsibility of the programme.

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--|----------|--|----------|---|
| Agree | | Disagree | | Not sure | X |
|-------|--|----------|--|----------|---|

Comments:

The suggested 'transitional arrangements' have not been made explicit; it is therefore impossible to fully 'agree' with the proposals.

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

Do you intend to introduce an ‘ambassador network’ as modelled by Teach First?

Who is the ‘approved organisation’? Have there been any discussions with potential organisations? If so, it would be useful to have further information regarding these within the proposals to clarify a range of aspects highlighted above.

As the AGTP is aimed at ‘failing schools’ or schools in challenging areas, how will they be able to meet the training needs of the AGTP trainees? The ethos of the GTP is to provide trainees with *employment based training*. Does the WG consider the initial pre-employment training to be sufficient?

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here:

13. UCAC (Undeb Cenedlaethol Athrawon Cymru)

Fersiwn Diwygiedig o'r Cynllun Hyfforddi Athrawon ar sail Cyflogaeth

Ffurflen Ymateb i'r Ymgynghoriad

Eich enw: **Rebecca Williams**

Corff (os yn briodol):
Undeb Cenedlaethol Athrawon Cymru (UCAC)

e-bost/rhif ffôn:
Rebecca@athrawon.com / 01970 639950

Eich cyfeiriad:
UCAC, Ffordd Penglais, Aberystwyth SY23 2EU

Dylai ymatebion gael eu dychwelyd erbyn 31 Ionawr 2012 fan bellaf at:

Gail Deane
Yr Is-adran Gwella Dysgu a Datblygiad Proffesiynol
Adran Addysg a Sgiliau
Llywodraeth Cymru
Rhadbost NAT8910
Parc Cathays
Caerdydd
CF10 3NQ

Neu eu cwblhau'n electronig a'u hanfon at:

EBTTSConsultation@cymru.gsi.gov.uk

1. A ydych yn cytuno â'r nod o gyflwyno rhaglen gwella disgyblion/ysgolion i helpu pobl ifanc sydd o dan anfantais addysgol drwy raglen hyfforddi athrawon ar sail cyflogaeth sy'n targedu ymgeiswyr o safon, wedi'u cefnogi gan hyfforddiant penodol gan ddarparwyr HCA?

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Cytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Anghytuno | X | Ddim yn siŵr | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|

Sylwadau:

Cytunwn â'r nod o helpu pobl ifanc sydd dan anfantais addysgol, ond nid yw UCAC o'r farn mai dyma'r ffordd orau i wneud hynny.

Nid yw'r ddogfen ymgynghorol yn esbonio'n ddigon clir sut y bwriedir i'r rhaglen arfaethedig hon weithio. Hynny yw, nid yw'n cynnig rhesymeg ddigonol dros gyflwyno'r cynigion, ac nid yw'n manylu'n ddigonol ar agweddau ymarferol y rhaglen.

Dyma rai enghreifftiau o gwestiynau gwbl greiddiol sydd heb eu hateb:

- Beth yw ystyr 'anfantais addysgol'? Ai pobl ifanc mewn ardaloedd difreintiedig? Mewn teuluoedd sydd â phroblemau? Pobl ifanc sy'n tangyflawni'n gyffredinol, neu sydd ag AAA?
- Beth yw ystyr 'ymgeiswyr o safon'? Ym mha ffordd fyddai'r gofynion derbyn yn wahanol i ofynion derbyn cwrs TAR?
- Faint o hyfforddeion y rhagwelir eu derbyn? A fyddai'r niferoedd hyn yn rhan o'r targedau derbyn HCA neu'n ychwanegol atynt?
- A fyddai hyfforddeion llwyddiannus yn gallu ymgeisio am unrhyw swydd addysgu, neu a fyddai'n rhaid ymgeisio am swyddi penodol sy'n cyd-fynd â'u harbenigedd?

2. A ydych yn cytuno â'r cynnig i ddarparu'r hyfforddiant ar sail cyflogaeth hwn drwy raglen ychwanegol sy'n cynnwys darpariaeth ar gyfer cwrs hyfforddiant cychwynnol cyn y cyfnod lle câi'r unigolyn ei gyflogi i addysgu mewn ysgol?

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Cytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Anghytuno | X | Ddim yn siŵr | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|

Sylwadau:

Ni welwn yr angen i gymhlethu'r system drwy gyflwyno dull arall eto o gymhwyso i fod yn athro. Mae cysondeb yn ystyriaeth bwysig, ac nid ydym wedi ein darbwylo gan unrhyw elfen o'r ddogfen ymgynghorol fod angen creu llwybr newydd ar hyn o bryd.

Barn UCAC yw y byddai cyflwyno'r arbenigedd hwn trwy gyrsiau (TAR a BAdd) a chyfundrefnau sy'n bodoli eisoes yn llawer fwy effeithiol ac effeithlon ac yn fwy cadarn o ran cynnal safonau.

3. A ydych yn cytuno â manylion y Rhaglen Hyfforddiant Ychwanegol arfaethedig i Raddedigion?

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Cytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Anghytuno | X | Ddim yn siŵr | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|

Sylwadau:

Os bwriedir sefydlu cwrs newydd, sef y RhHYR, pam na fyddai'r cwrs hwnnw'n cael ei weinyddu yn yr un ffordd â'r cyrsiau 'hyfforddiant yn y gweithle' eraill megis y RhAG (a'r RhAC)? Pam creu anghysondeb o ran dulliau gweinyddu'r gwahanol gyrsiau?

Mae'r darparwyr HCA achrededig wedi hen arfer â marchnata cyrsiau, dethol ymgeiswyr, trefnu cyfnodau o hyfforddiant yn y gweithle, asesu, gweinyddu a chynnal prosesau monitro ansawdd – a hynny'n effeithiol iawn. Anodd iawn yw deall yr angen am “sefydliad cymeradwy” i wneud y gwaith hwnnw. Rhagwelwn y bydd rhannu'r cyfrifoldebau hyn yn cymylu llinellau atebolrwydd, ac yn debygol o achosi tensiynau ac anawsterau rhwng y “sefydliad cymeradwy” a'r darparwyr HCA achrededig.

Nid yw'r ymgynghoriad yn cynnig unrhyw fath o esboniad am yr angen i sefydlu'r RhHYR “ar wahân i'r RhAG a'r RhAC” na'r angen iddi gael ei “rhedeg fel rhaglen annibynnol.”

Beth yw hyd a lled y term hollol amhenodol “sefydliad cymeradwy” – cwmni preifat, elusen, corff hyd-braich? Mae hyn yn destun pryder.

Os nad Llywodraeth Cymru sy'n pennu targedau derbyn, pwy fydd yn gwneud hynny? Ac os mai'r Llywodraeth fydd yn gwneud, pam na fyddai'n gwneud hynny yn rhan o'r un broses â'r RhAG a'r RhAC? Pwy fydd yn penderfynu pa ddarparwyr HCA achrededig fydd yn rhan o'r cynllun?

Nid oes unrhyw gyfeiriad yn y ddogfen ymgynghorol at gyfrwng iaith y ddarpariaeth. Byddai'n rhaid sicrhau bod y ddarpariaeth ar gael trwy gyfrwng y Gymraeg, hyd yn oed petai darparwr HCA achrededig yn Lloegr yn darparu'r cwrs hyfforddiant cychwynnol cyn-gyflogaeth (mewn cydweithrediad â darparwr HCA achrededig yng Nghymru).

Yn ychwanegol at hynny, mae Atodiad A, EBR1.2 yn cyfeirio at yr angen am gyrraedd “safon sy'n cyfateb i radd C mewn arholiad TGAU mewn Saesneg a mathemateg”; tybiwn y dylid fod wedi dweud “*Cymraeg neu Saesneg a mathemateg*”. Yn yr un modd, dylai EBR1.5 gyfeirio at “ddarllen Saesneg neu Gymraeg” ac at y gallu i “gyfathrebu'n glir ac yn gywir yn Saesneg neu Gymraeg ar lafar ac yn ysgrifenedig.”

4. A ydych yn cytuno â'r amserlen arfaethedig a'r trefniadau trosiannol a awgrymir?

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Cytuno | <input type="checkbox"/> | Anghytuno | X | Ddim yn siŵr | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|

Sylwadau:

Ar sail y wybodaeth yn y ddogfen ymgynghorol, ni allwn gymeradwyo symud ymlaen â'r cynllun hwn, felly nid ydym yn teimlo y gallwn wneud sylw am yr amserlen arfaethedig na'r trefniadau trosiannol.

5. Rydym wedi gofyn nifer o gwestiynau penodol. Os oes gennych unrhyw faterion cysylltiedig nad ydyn ni wedi mynd i'r afael â nhw, defnyddiwch y lle hwn i wneud hynny:

Sylwadau:

Mae'r ddogfen ymgynghorol yn codi llawer fawr iawn fwy o gwestiynau nag y mae'n eu hateb.

Gyda'r diffyg gwybodaeth a manylder yn y ddogfen ymgynghorol, nid yw'n bosib i ni bwysu a mesur manteision ac anfanteision y cynigion, ac yn sicr ni allwn eu cymeradwyo. Byddem yn bryderus dros ben petai'r Llywodraeth yn symud yn ei blaen i weithredu'r cynlluniau hyn heb gyhoeddi dogfen lawnach a heb ymgynghori pellach.

Mae safon y system hyfforddi athrawon yn eithriadol o bwysig ar gyfer creu gweithlu addysg o'r safon uchaf, ac mae hynny'n yn ei dro yn allweddol o safbwynt cynnal a chodi safonau ysgolion. Gallai rhuthro i weithredu cynllun nad sydd wedi cael ei wyntyllu'n ddigonol fod yn gamgymeriad costus a pheryglus i system addysg Cymru.

Mae'n bosibl y caiff ymatebion i ymgynghoriadau eu cyhoeddi – ar y rhynggrwyd neu mewn adroddiad. Pe bai'n well gennych i'ch ymateb gael ei gadw'n gyfrinachol, ticiwch y blwch hwn:

14. Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) Cymru

Revised Employment-based Teacher Training Scheme

Consultation Response Form

Your name: Paul Herrington & Karen Morris
Organisation (if applicable): On behalf of UCET Cymru.

e-mail/telephone number:

Your address:

Responses should be returned by 31 January 2012 to:

Gail Deane
Learning Improvement and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Freepost NAT 8910
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Or completed electronically and sent to:

EBTTSConsultation@wales.gsi.gov.uk

1. Do you agree to the aim of introducing a pupil/school improvement programme to support young people who face educational disadvantage through an employment-based teacher training programme targeting high-quality entrants, supported with specific training by ITT providers?

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

- In principle we are in agreement with it. However, what is the rationale for using an English provider? What evidence is provided that suggests that English providers, who will have no direct experience of the context of Welsh schools, are able to offer something that Welsh ITT providers cannot? Is there a danger that, in having a large proportion of training carried out in England, NQTs will be tempted to teach in English schools?
- We require further information with regards to funding implications and value for money.

2. Do you agree with the proposal to deliver this employment-based training through an additional programme incorporating provision for a course of initial training preceding the period of being employed to teach in a school?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

- How is this additional programme substantially different to a PGCE course or the current GTP route?
- How would trainees be able to train through the medium of Welsh considering possible involvement of English ITT providers?

3. Do you agree with the details of the proposed Additional Training Graduate Programme?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|

Comments:

- By what criteria will the Welsh Government judge that the ATGP is required? What does 'if required' mean? The criteria should be identified in advance.
- We need more information on the relationship between the approved organisation and the accredited ITT providers (i.e. their relative roles and responsibilities).
- Procedures for selecting ITT providers. Would there be a single ITT accredited provider or would there be a collaborative approach with several ITT providers?

4. Do you agree with the proposed timetable and suggested transitional arrangements?

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

Comments:

- What impact will ATGP have on mainstream allocations and those for GTP and RTP?
- We do not object to the timetable arrangements set out, however further clarification is required in the following areas:
- When would numbers for the ATGP be revealed?
- When would the application process commence?
- Are there different schools for GTP students and ATGP students?

5. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Comments:

- What are the overall benefits of this additional route, bearing in mind that we already recruit high-quality students on existing ITT programmes?
- Is there demand for RTP considering it is not being used at present?
- What is the incentive for schools/students participate in this programme?
- There are questions to be asked as to whether the ATGP will have an effect on 'widening access' to the teaching profession.

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here: