

'Teaching Tomorrow's Teachers' (Furlong Report)

Disclosable

Meeting
08/05/14

Agenda Item
8

Reference No
HEFCW/15/37

1 Issue

- 1.1 This paper provides a summary of Professor John Furlong's 'Teaching Tomorrow's Teachers' report and its recommendations. Council is asked to discuss the implications of the report and its recommendations for HEFCW.

2 Corporate Planning Implications / Rationale for paper

- 2.1 Under the Education (School Teachers' Qualifications) (Wales) Regulations 2004 and the Education Act 2005, HEFCW is responsible for funding and accrediting providers of initial teacher training (ITT) for school teachers and commissioning research to improve the standards of teachers and teacher training. This legislation supersedes the Education Act 1994 which first gave these responsibilities to HEFCW.

3 Recommendations

- 3.1 The Council is invited to:
- i. note the content of Professor Furlong's 'Teaching Tomorrow's Teachers' Report; and
 - ii. discuss the implications of the report and its recommendations for HEFCW.

4 Timing for decisions

- 4.1 The Minister is due to respond to the recommendations in June 2015.

5 Council members' interests

- 5.1 No conflicts of interests have been declared in advance of the meeting.

6 Further information

Contact Kimberley Meringolo (Tel 029 2068 2258; E-mail: kimberley.meringolo@hefcw.ac.uk)

7 Background

- 7.1 In 2005 the Welsh Government commissioned a review of ITT in Wales to advise on how it might more effectively meet the current and likely future needs of schools in Wales. The Review, led by Professor John Furlong, was published in January 2006. The overall conclusions of the report were that there needed to be a large reduction in ITT intakes to match more closely the numbers of newly-qualified teachers required in Wales. It also recommended that ITT provision should be reconfigured into three main regionally-based schools of education.
- 7.2 Working with Welsh Government and ITT providers, HEFCW took forward the report's recommendations, with a budget of £12.4m. As a result three regional ITT centres were established, each comprising two higher education institutions but in a policy context of proposed reconfiguration and collaboration, and one provider (Glyndŵr University) withdrew from ITT provision. In all cases compensatory funding was provided for ITT numbers to be reduced and other education provision introduced, with accompanying capital funding support.
- 7.3 In October 2012 Professor Ralph Tabberer was commissioned by Welsh Government (WG) to carry out a review of ITT in Wales. The final report was published in October 2013 along with a response from Welsh Government.¹
- 7.4 Recommendation one of this report set out the need for a Senior Adviser to be appointed by WG with the specific responsibility for ITT and raising the standards of ITT. In March 2014 Professor John Furlong was appointed as the Senior Adviser.
- 7.5 As part of his role Professor Furlong prepared a report for WG that sets out recommendations and options for the future of ITT. In preparing the report Professor Furlong has met with the Chief Executive and HEFCW officers over the last year to discuss the current position.
- 7.6 In March 2015 the outcomes of the 'Independent Review of Curriculum and Assessment Arrangements in Wales'² carried out by Professor Donaldson on behalf of WG were published. The Furlong review outcomes interlink with those of the Donaldson review.

8 Summary of 'Teaching Tomorrow's Teachers' (Section A)

- 8.1 The report 'Teaching Tomorrow's Teachers' is divided in to two sections: the first section looks at the main challenges facing the education sector, and the second provides a set of recommendations to WG that will work towards improving the quality of provision in Wales.
- 8.2 Furlong proposes that change is needed for two very specific reasons:
- firstly current provision overall is not of a high enough quality (as evidenced by Estyn reports); and
 - secondly the changing nature of schooling in the 21st century. The report also recognises that the proposals set out in the Donaldson Review will have many implications for the content of ITT provision and continuing professional development (CPD).

¹ <http://gov.wales/topics/educationandskills/publications/wagreviews/review-of-initial-teacher-training-in-wales/?lang=en>

² <http://gov.wales/docs/dcells/publications/150317-successful-futures-en.pdf>

- 8.3 Furlong considered what high quality ITT looked like, and used the recent collaborative review of ‘international research evidence on high quality ITT’, carried out by the British Educational Research Association (BERA) and the Royal Society of Arts (RSA), which he had also led.
- 8.4 Furlong concluded that ITT in Wales would need to be:
- a strong university based research led provision that integrated well with the school elements of the provision; and
 - that the Welsh Government’s standards for Newly Qualified Teachers (NQT) would underpin any provision.
- 8.5 The report explains that current ITT provision is predominantly provided through three Centres:
- the North and Mid Wales Centre (comprising of Aberystwyth University and Bangor University);
 - the South East Wales Centre (Cardiff Metropolitan University and University of South Wales); and
 - South West Wales Centre (University of Wales Trinity Saint David).
 - there are also two employment based programmes, the Graduate Teacher Programme and Teach First.
- 8.6 Furlong points out that current provision is not as strong as it should be and this is due to a number of differing factors:
- provision falls short of international evidence of best practise;
 - provision falls short of recommendations set out in Donaldson review; and
 - the level of weakness is at different levels: national; institutional; and programme.
- 8.7 Furlong concluded that ITT is not currently well led at National level and it is not clear who or what body is responsible for providing a leadership role.
- 8.8 HEFCW and the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) have administrative roles that are undertaken appropriately, but this is very different to strategic leadership. In England this role is carried out by the National College for Teaching and Leadership and in Scotland by the General Teaching Council for Scotland.
- 8.9 Furlong discusses Estyn’s role and their capacity to undertake inspection in a timely manner. To date only two of the three centres have been inspected within the normal timeframe of every 6 years. Furlong believes that the Welsh Government’s standards for Qualified Teachers Status (QTS) are crucial in the management of ITT. The standards were originally written in the 1990s and although they have been updated, there has been no fundamental revision of the standards.
- 8.10 Furlong points out that reconfiguration took place following his report in 2006 and this was to ensure sufficient capacity during a time when numbers were being cut significantly. The report points out that collaboration has been challenging within the Centres and this has predominantly been down to different institutions having differing processes and procedures for staffing, quality assurance and financial accounting. The bringing together of effective management strategies has been difficult if not impossible. We note below the implications of reduced funding in to support area.

Council is invited to note the content of Furlong's 'Teaching Tomorrow's Teachers' Report.

9 Recommendations and implications

9.1 A number of recommendations look specifically at the standards and the accreditation procedures. These recommendations will have direct implications for HEFCW.

9.2 Recommendation 1 – Welsh Government, as a matter of priority, revises the Standards for Newly Qualified Teachers.

Furlong recognises that the standards that underpin the accreditation process should look closely at development with clear links to probation and early professional education. The standards should also have a much broader reference to curriculum that will be covered by schools and universities. This would be essential in order to align with the Donaldson review recommendations.

9.3 Recommendation 2 – WG establishes a revised accreditation process for providers of ITT.

Furlong believes that schools need to have a leading role in key parts of ITT programmes and they have to work collaboratively with university partners. Responsibility would need to be placed on schools for key aspects of ITT. Programmes should also integrate what trainees learn in schools along with other professional knowledge. This recommendation also sets out the need for 're-accreditation'.

Currently HEFCW are responsible for the accreditation of providers using criteria set out by Welsh Ministers. Under existing legislation this is a 'one off' process. HEFCW assess performance against these criteria by using evidence from Estyn through their periodic inspection process. Accreditation remains in place unless the outcomes of an inspection are 'non-compliance' with the Welsh Government standards. Furlong believes this process is 'light touch' and is not carried out by a body with specialist expertise in teacher education.

9.4 Recommendation 3 – WG establishes a 'Teacher Education Accreditation Board' within the Education Workforce Council for Wales (EWC).

Furlong believes that in order to place the accreditation process with a body who has specialist expertise in teacher education, it would fit best with the EWC. The report also points out that re-accreditation should take place on a periodic basis. As this change would be more resource heavy, but also periodic it is recommended that a Board is set up with a range of stakeholders, would be best placed for the task.

Furlong feels that a generic organisation such as HEFCW should not become the lead body in a specific professional field. If recommendation 3 was to be accepted by the Minister that would end HEFCW's current role of accrediting current providers and would raise questions about other ITT work, including the annual allocation of ITT intake targets.

9.5 Recommendation 4 – That the role of Estyn within ITT be reviewed once a revised process is fully in place. This may mean that Estyn does not have responsibility for inspecting ITT.

9.6 Recommendation 5 – Estyn's 'Guidance for Inspection' for schools be revised to include specific recognition of the contribution of a school to ITT.

- 9.7 Recommendation 6 – Primary BA (hons) QTS in its current form be phased out and replaced by a four year degree with 50% of students' time spent in main subject departments.

Significant funding (£1.48m) was allocated to ITT providers in Wales in the 1990s to reduce the size of undergraduate BEd courses from four years to three years. As a result, there could be communications implications arising from a proposal to move back to four year degrees. In addition, any increase in the length of a course would have implications for the tuition fee grant. If the proposal is accepted the commitment would be for an additional one year fee grant for around 300 students, based on current ITT target numbers. Following the transfer of tuition fee grant monies from HEFCW to Welsh Government, this would impact on WG funding but plans to review it every year, may result in the retention of further funding from HEFCW should there be a shortfall.

- 9.8 Recommendation 7 – WG monitors closely the impact of financial incentives on recruitment, particularly taking into account different funding levels in comparison to those available in England.

HEFCW's Diamond Review response drew attention to differing financial incentives in England compared to Wales (paragraph 63-66).

- 9.9 Recommendation 8 – WISERD Education be extended to include a pedagogical dimension linked to a network of five centres of pedagogical excellence across Wales.

As reported at item HEFCW/15/CE3, the contract for WISERD education has been extended until July 2017 at no extra cost to HEFCW. We understand that Welsh Government are in discussions with WISERD about a possible Chair in Pedagogy.

- 9.10 Recommendation 9 – WG agrees to resolve future provision of ITT through a process of competitive tendering with the Teacher Education Accreditation Board making the final decision as to how many universities should become accredited providers.

- 9.11 As well as accrediting and funding current ITT providers, HEFCW is also responsible for allocating ITT intake targets. In light of the limited amount of funding provided by HEFCW to ITT Centres, we are constrained in how we can manage this effectively. We have no levers in place to penalise Centres for over or under recruitment. It may therefore not be appropriate for HEFCW to retain responsibility for the allocation of numbers for this provision.

Council is invited to discuss the implications of the report and its recommendations for HEFCW.

10 Financial implications

- 10.1 Details of the financial implications, current or future, for the Council of agreeing to the recommendations in the paper.
- 10.2 As well as allocating credit based teaching funding, HEFCW also provided additional funding to ITT Centres, once established, to work together strategically to deliver ITT. Following the completion of the ITT reconfiguration funding referred to above, in 2010/11 funding was allocated to the three centres for the development of joint ITT strategies (and a strategy for Glyndŵr's withdrawal from ITT) amounting to £1.48m. In light of the reducing amount of HEFCW grant to

support funding streams of this nature, ITT strategy funding was incrementally withdrawn and was removed in 2014/15. HEFCW funding to support ITT across Wales now amounts to £10,000 (the standard £5 per capita element).

11 Communications implications

11.1 The Minister is due to respond to the recommendations in June 2015.

12 Diversity and Equal Opportunities implications

11.1 This paper has no implications for age, disability, marital/civil partnership, maternity/pregnancy, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, any other protected characteristic or Welsh Language.

13 Risk Assessment

13.1 The main risks are:

Risk	Action to address risk
ITT provision remains 'adequate'.	The recommendations within the report are considered by the Minister with a view as to developments which may best be taken forward.
Providers do not attract the best quality applicants.	The report recommends the monitoring of different incentives between Wales and England. Recommendations from the Donaldson and Furlong reviews, which should make teaching in Wales more attractive.