



**University and College Union**

**‘Further, higher, better’**

**Submission to the government’s  
second Comprehensive Spending  
Review**

**Section 27**

## 27 Initial training and continuing professional development

### Further education

Further education White Paper, 2006

'We will invest more in recruiting and training the best staff, with a stronger flow of business expertise coming into the sector and more college staff helped to gain workplace experience.'<sup>146</sup>

Foster Review, 2005

'Until recently there has been little systematic work around workforce development. Although improving, morale is low in some areas and there are some recruitment and retention problems in skill shortage subjects and where there is competition with schools.'<sup>147</sup>

The 'think piece' on staff for the Foster Review, by Colin Flint, said that FE had a tradition of widespread use of part-time staff, which had the benefit of enabling practitioners to contribute to courses. Flint wrote: 'There need not, of course, be any adverse effect on the quality of provision through this: good structures and effective management can ensure proper levels of communication and integration into college strategies. It is, however, a good deal harder to manage effectively a team made up largely of part-time staff, and opportunity for staff development and attendance at team meetings are more difficult to ensure.'<sup>148</sup>

On professional development as a whole, Flint was highly critical of the situation in FE: 'There has not been additional financial support for staff development in further education since incorporation'.<sup>149</sup> Although the proportion of lecturing staff with a teaching qualification is increasing, Flint said: 'The quality of initial teacher training for those planning to work in FE is widely believed to have deteriorated and to be of doubtful relevance. The specialist institutions which once provided training specifically for FE teachers have become more general in their offer: there is no opportunity for vocationally specific and practical training, because it is all classroom based. It is assumed that the practical applications will be learned at work.' Flint concluded: 'We need to rethink approaches to and become more serious about vocational teacher training, and we must develop new approaches to learning at work, which is a vital development area if we are to achieve ambitious targets for vocational skills and qualifications. There is also a need for a more robust programme of industrial placement for vocational staff ...'<sup>150</sup>

The target for FE teaching staff is that by 2006 90% of full-time and 60% of part-time staff will be fully qualified. According to analysis of the FE Staff Individualised Record for 2003-4 by Lifelong Learning UK, 70% of full-time staff and 47% of part-timers were already fully qualified.<sup>151</sup> On the basis of teaching staff currently working towards a full qualification, LLUK estimated

that by 2006 95.1% of full-time and 62.6% of part-time teaching staff would be fully qualified.

### **Comment**

We consider that additional funding needs to be made available over the period of the second Comprehensive Spending Review to ensure adequate continuing professional development for all lecturing staff in FE. The amount spent by FE colleges on staff development, although around 4% of budget, were much lower than the equivalent expenditure in the NHS.<sup>152</sup> We consider that a hypothecated funding stream should be established for CPD in the FE sector.

The Skills White Paper published just before the 2005 general election reaffirmed the priority that would be given to remedying the endemic low skills in the UK workforce. These curriculum developments will need to be supported by professional development for staff across the learning and skills sector who will be delivering these new programmes to new learner groups. Changes have cost implications; for these changes to be successful, they will need to be resourced properly.

We note the proposal in the Foster Review for a workforce development plan to be produced by November 2006. We strongly recommend that this is undertaken jointly with trade union representatives.

We note in the 2006 FE White Paper the intention that workforce development will form part of the framework of the Quality Improvement Strategy to help create 'a well qualified workforce and a sustainable culture of professionalism, and enable staff to improve and update their skills continuously'.<sup>153</sup> We urge that this initiative – and the regulatory CPD requirement for teachers, starting from September 2007 – is adequately costed and resourced.

We have strongly supported the DfES proposals around initial teacher training and continuous professional development, and is supporting the newly established Lifelong Learning Sector Skills Council. However a recent on-line survey of NATFHE members on the remission from teaching that they received to undertake a course to obtain the mandatory professional qualification now required for new FE teaching staff, showed that 50% of the respondents were receiving no remission to undertake this and some were even having to pay for their course. For a sector that is supposed to be at the heart of lifelong learning, these are shocking facts.

We would urge the government to ensure that colleges put in place the necessary resources to implement initial teacher training and CPD plans.

Developing the leaders, teachers, lecturers, trainers and support staff is essential for the delivery of excellent education. The task is urgent. Demographic factors mean that the sector must soon find the next generation of leaders and replace at least half the teaching staff. The national targets for

a qualified workforce and requirements in college development plans are both welcome, but without adequate resources will come to nothing.

Recent proposals for improving initial teacher training will have considerable cost implications for colleges, on top of spending on continuous professional development for all staff. Initial teaching training is important and funding should be additional to that needed to ensure staff are equipped to deal with curriculum changes from the 14-19 skills strategies for example, or new technological developments such as e-learning.

### **Higher education**

In 1999, the Independent Review of Higher Education Pay and Conditions (IRHEPC) pointed out that 'there is a need, across the sector, for greater investment of time and resources in the training and development of *all* groups of staff'.<sup>154</sup>

Since the publication of the IRHEPC report, new bodies with responsibility for workforce development, such as the Higher Education Academy, the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education and Lifelong Learning UK, have been established. We have also seen the introduction of HRM schemes such as Rewarding and Developing Staff in England.

During this period there has been a greater emphasis on training and professional development for new permanent members of academic staff. For example, over 90% of UK based HEIs currently have at least one accredited programme for staff new to supporting student learning. The Higher Education Academy is also taking the lead in setting professional standards for all staff involved in teaching and in supporting student learning.

The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education was created in March 2004 and since then it has developed a range of training and development programmes targeted at senior members of staff. In addition, the sector skills council, Lifelong Learning UK, was launched by the government in June 2005, to promote professional development in higher education, community learning and development, further education, libraries, archives and information services and work-based learning. As well as developing occupational standards, LLUK produces labour market intelligence on skills gaps and shortages among the lifelong learning workforce.

The Rewarding and Developing Staff (R&DS) initiative was established in England in 2001 by the government to enable higher education institutions to recruit, retain and develop staff. Between 2001-2 and 2003-4 HEIs in England received approximately £380m. Between 2001 and 2006, a total of £880m was allocated under the R&DS initiative. The bulk of this funding has been spent on implementing the Framework Agreement on pay and grading in higher education, management development, annual performance reviews, management of poor performance, job evaluation schemes, and equal pay and equal opportunities activities. Nevertheless, a small amount of the R&DS money has gone on staff development initiatives such as waiving of study fees

for postgraduate study, and on assistance with NVQ work or continuing professional development for support staff.<sup>155</sup>

### **Comment**

Overall, we feel that the sector has very little to show for the very large amount of public money spent on the R&DS initiative. We have the strong impression that a significant amount of the R&DS money has been put into developing the management function in higher education institutions, but we remain to be convinced that this has been for the good of students and staff in higher education in England.

We believe that additional funding needs to be made available over the CSR2 period to ensure adequate continuing professional development for all higher education staff. In particular, more resources are needed to guarantee that casual and hourly-paid staff are able to access institutional training and development opportunities.<sup>156</sup> It is critical that such funding is explicitly earmarked for practitioners' professional development, as experience shows that when funding pressures are acute, budgets for CPD are not safeguarded at the faculty/departmental level, where they are most needed and can most effectively be deployed.

We believe that the Higher Education Academy should work to ensure that accredited teacher training programmes and continuing professional development frameworks are underpinned by a practitioner-led approach. Whilst institutions have made some investment in programmes of initial training for staff new to teaching in HE, this has not been extended into investment in continuing professional development. We also note that the Academy professional standards framework is quite clear that effective teaching and learning in higher education must be integrated with disciplinary research and scholarship. In our view this means that the funding councils should provide the necessary funding to facilitate scholarship and research activity by all academic staff regardless of institutional mission.

We generally welcome the creation of the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, for example, its emphasis on equal opportunities. However, it is too early to gauge the success of the organisation and we look forward to the first impact assessment in 2006.

### **HE in FE**

#### **Comment**

Where FE staff are involved in providing higher education, we strongly believe that they should have the same terms and conditions as higher education teaching staff regarding paid time for scholarship. This is to enable staff to keep up with their subject, and keep abreast of technological change. There should be funding made specifically available for this, both in terms of paying for relevant CPD, and in ensuring adequate staffing levels to enable HE-in-FE staff to undertake CPD during paid work time.