

University of Strathclyde - Further Education Teaching Programme

Consultation Analysis

October 2022

Contents

About this report	3
Background	4
Overview of Respondents	5
Overview of Responses	6
Analysis	8
Question 1	8
Question 2	10
Question 3	12
Question 4	14
Question 5	15
Question 6	15
Annex A - List of organisations that responded	17

About this report

This report provides an analysis of responses to the Scottish Government's consultation on "University of Strathclyde – Further Education Teaching Programme" which ran from 4 April 2022 to 16 May 2022. The consultation paper can be accessed here:

[University of Strathclyde – Further Education Teaching Programme Consultation - Scottish Government - Citizen Space](#)

Background

Under article 30 of the Public Services Reform (General Teaching Council for Scotland) Order 2011, it is for the Scottish Ministers to determine what constitutes a recognised teaching qualification for individuals seeking registration as a further education teacher with the General Teaching Council for Scotland.

Before making or changing a determination under article 30, the Scottish Ministers must consult further education institutions or their representatives, the General Teaching Council for Scotland and such other persons appearing to them to have an interest. They must have regard to any views expressed by those consulted in relation to any determination. Determinations must be published.

The consultation sought views on a proposed further education teaching programme to be delivered by the University of Strathclyde in respect of which Scottish Ministers are proposing to make a determination in the context explained above. The Consultation asked for feedback on the University of Strathclyde's programme with reference to:

- The programme admission arrangements.
- The content, nature and duration of the programme.
- The programme's assessment arrangements.
- The functions of the governing bodies, principals and members of staff of the University of Strathclyde providing the programme.
- Whether the University of Strathclyde is an appropriate programme provider.

Overview of Respondents

A total of 8 written responses were received.

Of the 8 total responses, 7 have been published on the Scottish Government website. The respondent in the remaining response did not want their response to be published. All responses have been included in this analysis, irrespective of whether or not they have been published. The published responses can be accessed here:

[University of Strathclyde – Further Education Teaching Programme Consultation - Scottish Government - Citizen Space](#)

Of the 8 responses, 7 were received from organisations and 1 from an individual.

A full list of respondents can be found at Annex A.

Overview of Responses

General

- Many comments were received relating to the wider context of the Teaching Qualification (TQFE) as opposed focused on the specific purpose of this consultation. The Scottish Government will consider these wider comments as part of ongoing work to review the TQFE landscape. This analysis report focusses on analysing comments specifically in relation to the University of Strathclyde's Programme.
- Respondents were generally supportive of the programme proposed.
- The key areas of comment and concern related to assessment arrangements for the programme (in particular queries surrounding the viva/virtual assessment approach) and the content, nature and duration of the programme.

Programme Admission Arrangements

- Some respondents sought clarity on the application of Annex C (entry requirements) whilst some others noted that the entry requirements set out within the programme were in line with other TQFE programmes in Scotland.
- Some respondents raised concerns that some lecturers are being strongly advised to obtain the level 8 unit "Teaching in Colleges Today" and that this creates a potential additional barrier for lecturers seeking to access TQFE.
- One respondent raised concerns around ensuring part-time lecturers are not disadvantaged in accessing TQFE.
- One respondent asked if the PDA "Teaching Practice in Scotland's Colleges" would be acceptable for entry where the applicant has no other relevant HNC or HND.

Content, nature and duration of the programme

- Respondents sought additional detailed information on the content of the programme, including the inclusion of specific topics within the programme. One respondent welcomed the variety of important topics covered but questioned if this would enable students to gain a deep understanding of concepts.
- Respondents were supportive of the duration of the programme, commenting that the extended route meets the varying needs of lecturers within the college sector.
- Some respondents raised concerns about the time commitment for both students and mentors as set out within the programme being applied in practice.

Programme Assessment Arrangements

- Respondents raised concerns around the assessment methods, noting these were new to TQFE programmes and that the virtual approach adopted may present issues.
- Whilst many respondents supported the alternative approach outlined, it did prompt requests for additional information on how assessments would work in practice from respondents.

Functions of the governing bodies, principals and members of staff

- The majority of respondents agreed that the functions of the governing bodies, principals and members of staff of institutions providing the TQFE course were suitable, with two respondents commenting that they were consistent with other TQFE providers.
- One respondent commented that it would have been helpful to have details on the university's quality assurance processes given the assessment tasks and methods adopted are innovative.
- One respondent considered the delivery schedule to require reconsideration to bring it into line with the college academic year.

University of Strathclyde as programme provider

- All respondents agreed that the University of Strathclyde would be an appropriate provider of the TQFE programme.

Analysis

There were 6 questions in the consultation document which related to the proposed further education teaching programme to be delivered by the University of Strathclyde.

The following analysis follows the layout of the consultation document.

All questions which asked for a “yes” or “no” answer have been broken down into the following categories for responses:

- Yes – the respondent selected “yes” when answering the question
- No – the respondent selected “no” when answering the question
- No definitive answer (NDA) – the respondent did not select “yes” or “no” but provided comments which highlighted issues or made suggestions about the proposal
- Not answered (NA) – the respondent did not answer the question and made no comments about the proposal

Admission

Question 1

Do you consider that the Teaching Qualification Further Education (TQFE) programme as detailed in this consultation is suitable in relation to: admission?

6 respondents agreed that the admission arrangements detailed in the consultation are suitable; 1 respondent was unsure and the final respondent did not answer the question.

Answer	Number	%
Yes	6	75.00
No		
Unsure	1	12.50
Not answered	1	12.50

In further detail, respondents made the following comments about the admission arrangements set out in the consultation. The below comments are direct quotes from respondents who were content to have their responses published:

- It is important to ensure that lecturers teaching fractional/part-time contracts are not being disadvantaged in practice and are not facing barriers to accessing TQFE. The provisions of the Equalities Act 2010 and the Part-time Workers (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000 ensure that they should have equal access to TQFE and contractual provisions which support this, such as the agreed reduction in class contact time through the NJNC Agreements.
- It is important to ensure that lecturers teaching fractional/part-time contracts are not being disadvantaged in practice and are not facing barriers to accessing TQFE. The provisions of the Equalities Act 2010 and the Part-time Workers (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000 ensure that they should have equal access to TQFE and contractual provisions which support this, such as the agreed reduction in class contact time through the NJNC Agreements.
- With no dedicated support, funding or time given to complete the Teaching In Colleges Today ('TICT') course, this additional recommendation is likely to act as a further barrier to admission for lecturers, who find themselves through no fault of their own, in these circumstances. Whilst we welcome the reference later in the paragraph to 'relevant industry and teaching experience' being taken into account as part of the admission process, completion of an additional qualification appears to be contrary to the widening access agenda, advocated in other parts of the consultation.
- If the CDN Level 8 unit is actually a requirement for ensuring a successful application, then, that should be made clear rather than being 'strongly advised' (which is likely to be perceived as a requirement).
- Although for level 9 entry the admission requirements say that the PDA 'Teaching Practice in Scotland's Colleges' satisfies the requirements for English, numeracy and ICT, this appears to be in addition to the requirement for an HND/HNC.
- The admission requirements are equivalent to those of other TQFE programmes.

- The proposed programme bases its entry requirements on Annex C of the Professional Standards for Lecturers in Scotland's Colleges (2006) in line with other equivalent TQFE programmes in Scotland.
- We considered the programme specification as currently laid out to require high levels of digital competence and query whether ICT at SCQF level 5 would be sufficient to cope with the demands of the programme.

Question 2

Do you consider that the TQFE programme as detailed in this consultation is suitable in relation to: content, nature and duration?

5 respondents agreed that the content, nature and duration of the TQFE programme detailed in the programme is suitable; 2 respondents were unsure and the final respondent did not answer the question.

Answer	Number	%
Yes	5	62.50
No		
Unsure	2	25.00
Not answered	1	12.50

In further detail, respondents made the following comments about the content, nature and duration of the programme set out in the consultation. The below comments are direct quotes from respondents who were content to have their responses published:

- This is a progressive model of teacher/lecturer education which fits well with developments in the college sector. The options for programme duration, through either the standard route (9 month) or the extended (21 month) route, are welcomed and supported. We would wish to further explore where there is capacity to cover child and adult protection. There appears to be a possibility that this could be incorporated in modules 1 or 3. Reassurance that this forms part of the TQFE content is required.
- The extended route which allows those embarking on the programme to complete TQFE over a 21 month period will allow a range of lecturers who

have hitherto been excluded from participation (for various reasons) to undertake the qualification.

- We also support the student-centred approach to learning and teaching, which is referenced throughout the consultation and believe that this should assist in ensuring a clear focus on meeting needs and on scaffolding learning to build on the prior knowledge and experience of the student.
- Module 3 is welcomed regarding achievement of 'Professional Standards', however, it should be more explicitly linked to progressive CPD and as a means to an end, rather than its current wording which gives the perception as an end in itself. Professional obligations, as well as the aims of professional registration that encapsulate review and 'fitness to practice', could then ensure a moving horizon linked to CPD that sustains expectation and does not provide an unintended end-point or terminus.
- The training and standardisation of college mentors is well described and useful; and the inclusion of WorldSkills methodology is welcome and sets this course apart from other TQFE programmes. The provision of an extended mode of delivery is also welcome.
- We would have found more detail about the research and theory underpinning the programme and the design helpful. There were several places in sections 4,5 and 6 of the consultation document where we did not feel there was enough information to understand fully why the programme has been designed this way and how it will work practically.

Question 3

Do you consider that the TQFE programme as detailed in this consultation is suitable in relation to: assessment of the programme?

4 respondents agreed that the assessment of the TQFE programme detailed in the programme is suitable; 1 respondent did not agree; 2 respondents were unsure and the remaining respondent did not answer the question.

Answer	Number	%
Yes	4	50.00
No	1	12.50
Unsure	2	25.00
Not answered	1	12.50

In further detail, respondents made the following comments about the assessment arrangements set out in the consultation. The below comments are direct quotes from respondents who were content to have their responses published:

- The viva approach also promotes depth of learning, providing an opportunity for the student to engage in collegiate discussion about the contents of the portfolio and exemplify the range of experiences through which they have adopted the Professional Standards. Reference is made to the programme being conducted entirely online. However, we would welcome clarification as to whether the viva will be conducted in person or remotely. To ensure inclusive practice, we would again recommend that the views of the individual student should be taken into account in determining this format.
- The assessment methods of portfolio and viva are new to TQFE programmes in Scotland and are noted with considerable interest. Lecturers come from diverse range of subject/workplace/industry sectors and we would be interested in learning the benefits of this approach to TQFE assessment including lecturer/college feedback. There is however a potential for inconsistency across colleges in relation to the more substantial college mentor role/assessment suggested in this programme. GTC Scotland questions whether it is possible to ensure that the professional standards can be fully assessed in scenarios where only virtual assessment has been used and would propose that a caveat needs to be considered in order to ensure

there is a balance between assessment approaches undertaken. With regard to observations (as a form of assessment), it is noted that the observation by the university will be digital, however, teaching observations (in the main, i.e., “most observations”) will be face-to-face; at least one of the university observations should be face-to-face in order to capture verbal and non-verbal interactions and engagement. This would naturally extend to the in-class professional discussion following observations as a crucial aspect of developing Learning and Teaching practice.

- The proposed role for college mentors in Module 3 is welcome, enabling a greater emphasis on this critical aspect over other TQFE providers, giving mentors a bigger role in supporting the development of the Module 3 Portfolio and prep for the viva. This links to mentors’ development as a CPD opportunity.
- The focus on authentic assessment and assessment for learning, along with the evidencing of achievement of the professional standards, is modelling good practice to students.
- We considered the assessment tasks themselves to be authentic and relevant for college lecturers. However, we do have some queries about assessment methods, grading and workload required from students to complete these assessments. Some more detailed assessment criteria are needed to fully understand the appropriateness of the assessment approach.
- Observations of practice are not listed as an assessment task but we presume these are assessed. It was not clear whether these will be assessed in a pass/fail way (in line with other TQFE programmes) and why these are shorter than is typical in other TQFE programmes (where observations are 1 hour). As we understand the programme design, observations of practice are not linked with any of the modules but more stand-alone and this is perhaps a missed opportunity to further cement the links between the learning taking place during the modules and teaching practice. We suggest it is essential that observations of practice are assessed formally during a TQFE programme.
- It is good here to incorporate remote methods for observing practice but relying solely on these can be problematic. In particular, some guidance is needed about what constitutes an acceptable recording for assessment purposes. We also foresee an equity issue with online-only observations as this creates choice in the assessment for some students (who teach both online and in a physical classroom) but not for others (who only teach physically in the college).

Question 4

Do you consider that the TQFE programme as detailed in this consultation is suitable in relation to: the functions of the governing bodies, principals and members of staff of institutions providing those courses?

6 respondents agreed that the functions of the governing bodies, principals and members of staff detailed in the proposed programme are suitable; 1 respondent was unsure whilst the remaining respondent did not answer the question.

Answer	Number	%
Yes	6	75.00
No		
Unsure	1	12.50
Not answered	1	12.50

In further detail, respondents made the following comments about the functions of the governing bodies, principals and members of staff of the institution set out in the consultation. The below comments are direct quotes from respondents who were content to have their responses published:

- Students on this proposed programme are to be supported by a range of different people from the University and college. We think this will need careful management to avoid support becoming fractured. In addition, students, tutors and college mentors should be clear about how and under what circumstances information can be shared between the supporting staff. We feel the role college staff are being asked to play in this programme is substantial. As some of the assessment tasks and methods here are innovative, it would have been helpful to have some details of the University's own QA processes mentioned in the consultation documents - particularly how any concerns raised by that process had been addressed in the programme specification.
- One key reflection, however, is that the university delivery schedule is out-of-sync with the college academic year; a longer window of opportunity and/or

an approved asynchronous model (e.g., secure access FutureLearn) would prove helpful to the many part-time and temporary lecturers in the college sector who are seeking to achieve registration-linked qualification.

Question 5

Do you consider the University of Strathclyde to be an appropriate provider of the TQFE programme described?

7 respondents agreed that the University of Strathclyde is an appropriate provider of the TQFE programme described, whilst the remaining respondent was unsure.

Answer	Number	%
Yes	7	87.50
No	0	0
Unsure	1	12.50
Not answered	0	0

In further detail, the following comment was made. The below comment is a direct quote from a respondent who was content to have their response published:

- The University of Strathclyde could be an appropriate provider of TQFE but we feel there is insufficient detail in the consultation document to judge the programme itself. We have outstanding questions about the design of the programme, justification for this, assessment procedures and student support.

Question 6

Do you have any further comments that you consider to be relevant to the Scottish Ministers' determination?

6 respondents provided further comments. The majority of comments provided within this section relate to the wider context of the TQFE as opposed specifically in relation to the University of Strathclyde's Programme, which is the sole focus of this consultation and the Scottish Ministers' determination. Respondents made the following comments in answer to this question:

- The proposed introduction of a TQFE programme by Strathclyde University is a welcome development. At present, there is no provider of TQFE in the west of Scotland and a small number operating across the country. A local, high quality provider of TQFE would greatly enhance the professional development environment for college lecturers within the city region and beyond.
- We have concerns that the programme title itself downplays the importance of TQFE. It may be read as though this programme is offering TQFE + something additional and this is problematic since a TQFE itself should constitute 60 credits and this programme is 60 credits in total. This could create the misleading impression that it is not equivalent to some other TQFE programmes. We suggest that all TQFE programmes should carry this name prominently to avoid this confusion.

Annex A - List of organisations that responded

- Glasgow Clyde College
- Dumfries and Galloway College
- City of Glasgow College
- School of Education, University of Aberdeen
- General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTC Scotland)
- The Educational Institute of Scotland
- College Employers Scotland
- 1 individual



© Crown copyright 2022



This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at www.gov.scot

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-80525-014-2 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, October 2022

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA
PPDAS1166203 (10/22)

W W W . g o v . s c o t