

---

**Ymateb i Ymgynghoriad / Consultation Response**

---

<b>Enw / Name:</b>	Owen Evans
<b>Rôl / Role:</b>	His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education and Training in Wales
<b>E-bost / Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:ChiefInspector@estyn.gov.uk">ChiefInspector@estyn.gov.uk</a>
<b>Rhif Ffôn / Tel No:</b>	029 2044 6446
<hr/>	
<b>Dyddiad / Date:</b>	21.11.23
<b>Pwnc / Subject:</b>	<b>Education Workforce Council (Additional Categories of Registration) (Wales) Order 2024</b>

**Background information about Estyn**

Estyn is the Office of His Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales. As a Crown body, we are independent of the Welsh Government.

Our principal aim is to raise the standards and quality education and training in Wales. This is primarily set out in the Learning and Skills Act 2000<sup>1</sup> and the Education Act 2005. In exercising its functions, we must give regard to the:

- Quality of education and training in Wales;
- Extent to which education and training meets the needs of learners;
- Educational standards achieved by those receiving education and training in Wales;
- Quality of leadership and management of those education and training providers, including whether the financial resources made available to those providing education and training are managed efficiently and used in a way which provides value for money;
- Spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of learners; and,
- Contribution made to the well-being of learners.

Our remit includes (but is not exclusive to) nurseries and non-maintained settings, primary, secondary, special and all age schools, independent schools, pupil referrals units, further education, adult community learning, local government education services, work-based learning, and initial teacher training.

We may give advice to the Welsh Parliament on any matter connected to education and training in Wales. To achieve excellence for learners, we have set three strategic objectives:

- Provide accountability to service users on the quality and standards of education and training in Wales;
- Inform the development of national policy by the Welsh Government;

---

<sup>1</sup> This act to be replaced by the Tertiary Education and Research (Wales) Act 2022 when the quality provisions are commenced.

- Build capacity for improvement of the education and training system in Wales.

This response is not confidential.

**Response**

We agree with the proposals to register community-based adult learning practitioners and senior Further Education (FE) leaders.

We agree in principle with the general proposal for registered FE teachers to hold a minimum level 5 teaching qualification, and for registered adult learning practitioners to hold a minimum level 3.

We disagree with the proposed list of level 5 teaching qualifications presented in Schedule 6. No rationale has been presented identifying why any qualification has been included on this list. The list includes many qualifications which are not intended to prepare to teach – they are not ‘teaching qualifications’ and do not include a teaching practice or professional practice component. The risk is that this sets up a market for poorer quality teaching qualifications that may undercut the existing PCE / PgCE / PGCE route into FE teaching.

We also disagree with the list of qualifications for community-based adult learning practitioners. This list (Schedule 4) is also presented without a clear rationale identifying why any of the qualifications listed has been included. It is not clear which of these qualifications is a suitable preparation for teaching in community-based adult learning.

We think that the lists of qualifications in Schedules 4 and 6 could have a negative impact on the Welsh language. Currently, despite the fact that providers of the PCE / PgCE / PGCE notionally offer their programmes through Welsh, very few trainees take this option. Very few of the wide range of potential qualifications listed will have any element of bilingual pedagogy included. In our response to Q2 and Q6 of this consultation, we indicate that we disagree with the proposed lists of qualifications. It is likely that, if unchanged, these proposals will increase the risk of even fewer FE teachers or community-based adult learning practitioners studying through the medium of Welsh or developing an understanding of bilingual pedagogy.

**Consultation questions**

**Question 1** – Do you agree with the proposal that Further Education Institution Teachers will have to hold a minimum Level 5 teaching qualification to be able to work in the sector?

<b>Agree</b>	✓	<b>Disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	---	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

**Supporting comments**

We agree with this proposal. It is in line with current expectation through the FE colleges' common contract for lecturers that FE lecturers should complete either the PCE (PCET) or PgCE/PGCE (PCET). The proposed change formalises the current custom and practice.

However, there is risk that specifying a minimum of Level 5 will reduce expectations on FE lecturers. The current PCE is for non-graduates is a Level 5/6 qualification (with some variation between providers) and the PgCE/PGCE is level 6/7 (with some variation between providers). WG and EWC should be made clear that the Level 5 is a minimum and that the PCE or PgCE/PGCE route for FE lecturers is the preferred option for FE lecturers.

**Question 2** – Do you agree with the proposed list of Level 5 (and above) teaching qualifications included within the [draft Order](#) (including equivalent qualifications across the UK and relevant historical qualifications)? If you consider any qualifications should be omitted or that any qualifications need to be added, please list these in the Supporting comments box and explain why.

<b>Agree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Disagree</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

**Supporting comments**

We feel that this list of qualifications is unfit for purpose. No rationale has been presented for any qualification to be included on the list. The list should specify only those qualifications which are intended to prepare people to teach and have a clear practice-based component. For example, there are BA / BSc Education or Education Studies programmes listed that are not practice-based teaching qualifications and are not intended as ITE programmes.

The proposed list of qualifications in Schedule 6 risks negative unintended consequences, including the risk that this sets up a market for poorer quality teaching qualifications that may undercut the existing PCE / PgCE / PGCE route into FE teaching and devalue FE teaching as a profession.

It is not clear how the inclusion of the breadth of qualifications here would support progress towards the recommendations in the recent independent [Review of PCET ITE](#) for Welsh Government, for example to accredit initial teacher education in post-compulsory education and develop a Qualified Practitioner Status (PCET). This review aimed at increasing the professional value of FE practitioners.

**Question 3** – Do you agree with the proposal to add a registration category for practitioners of community-based adult learning?

<b>Agree</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

**Supporting comments**

This is a sensible step towards professionalising the community-based adult learning workforce and placing it on an equivalent professional footing to other post-16 teaching staff.

There is a risk in this approach however, as many community-based adult learning staff work on small part-time contracts and registration may act as a disincentive to teach in the sector. This step towards professionalising the workforce is welcome but this risk needs to be explored in full, with appropriate mitigating action, such as improved professional learning opportunities for practitioners.

**Question 4** – Do you agree with the definition of adult learning practitioner and community-based venue included in the legislations?

**Definition:**

Adult learning practitioner - A person who provides further education and training to adults for a community-based adult learning provider.

Community-based Adult Learning Provider - a provider (other than a school, further education institution or higher education institution) of further education and training for adults which is based in the community and funded or otherwise provided by a local authority, the Commission for Tertiary Education and Research, or the Welsh Ministers.

<b>Agree</b>	✓	<b>Disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	---	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

**Supporting comments**

No additional comment

**Question 5** – Do you agree with the proposal to require practitioners of community-based adult learning to hold a minimum Level 3 teaching qualification?

<b>Agree</b>	✓	<b>Disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	---	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

**Supporting comments**

There are particular challenges associated with a minimum requirement for community-based adult learning teachers, not least that they are often part-time. We agree in principle that this is a sensible step towards professionalising the workforce without introducing an unhelpfully high barrier for entry.

**Question 6** – Do you agree with the proposed list of Level 3 (and above) teaching qualifications included within the draft Order (including equivalent qualifications across the UK and relevant historical qualifications)? If you consider any qualifications should be omitted or that any qualifications need to be added, please list these in the Supporting comments box and explain why.

<b>Agree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Disagree</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

**Supporting comments**

No rationale has been presented as to why any qualification should be included on this list. Not all the qualifications are suitable preparatory qualifications (at level 3) for someone wishing to teach in the community-based adult learning sector.

**Question 7** – Do you agree with the proposed requirement for all senior leaders and principals in FE Institutions to be registered?

<b>Agree</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

**Supporting comments**

This is currently a 'gap' within the regulatory framework and will allow professional regulation for those in senior leadership roles.

**Question 8** – Do you agree with the proposal that that volunteers or those providing training in relation to a profession on a temporary or occasional basis for a Further Education Institute are not required to register with the Council?

<b>Agree</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

### Supporting comments

This is a sensible approach. To require these categories of people to register would introduce an unhelpful barrier to participation and would reduce colleges' abilities to deploy experts in niche areas of provision.

**Question 9** – Do you agree with the fee structure for the proposed new registration categories?

<b>Agree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

### Supporting comments

No additional comment

**Question 10** – Do you think there are any further changes to the legislation associated with the proposed changes to the categories and qualification for registration with the Education Workforce Council (EWC) that should be considered?

<b>Agree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------

### Supporting comments

The recent [Review of PCET ITE](#) for Welsh Government identifies a number of proposals for the qualification structure for PCET ITE, including an equivalent for post-16 practitioners to school teachers' Qualified Teacher Status, the 'Qualified Practitioner Status (PCET)'. This offers an alternative longer-term option to address the disadvantages we mention in our response to Q2. For example, the QPS (PCET) could be the minimum requirement for FE teachers, and would be achieved through nationally accredited courses.

**Question 11** - What, in your opinion, would be the likely effects of the new registration categories for the Education Workforce Council on the Welsh language? We are particularly interested in any likely effects on opportunities to use the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English.

- Do you think that there are opportunities to promote any positive effects?

- Do you think that there are opportunities to mitigate any adverse effects?

### Supporting comments

Estyn's report, [Initial teacher education in the post-compulsory education and training sectors \(2021\)](#), identified that very few trainees take their ITE qualifications through the medium of Welsh. This is despite the fact that all current providers of the PCET PCE/PgCE/PGCE notionally offer their qualification through the medium of Welsh.

Very few of the wide range of potential qualifications identified in Schedule 6 and Schedule 4 will have any element of bilingual pedagogy included. In our response to Q2 and Q6 of this consultation, we indicate that we strongly disagree with the proposed lists of qualifications. It is likely that, if unchanged, these proposals will increase the risk of even fewer FE teachers or community-based adult learning practitioners studying through the medium of Welsh or developing an understanding of bilingual pedagogy.

**Question 12** – In your opinion, could the legislation on the new categories for registration be formulated or changed so as to:

- have positive effects or more positive effects on using the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English; or
- mitigate any negative effects on using the Welsh language and on not treating the Welsh language less favourably than English?

### Supporting comments

We have already indicated that we consider the proposed list of qualifications as unfit for purpose and should be revisited. However, one way to positively impact on the use of the Welsh language would be to specify that any teaching qualification must give some grounding to practitioners in bilingual pedagogy. Implementing a nationally accredited system of qualifications would allow this to be achieved.

**Question 13** – We have asked several specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

We think that the EWC should publish statistics identifying the range of the different teaching qualifications held by FE teachers and by community-based adult learning practitioners in order that trends in the qualification levels of the workforce can be identified.

Responses to consultations are likely to be made public, on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to remain anonymous, please tick here: