

Case study for projects

ABOUT YOUR PROJECT

1. Project title “An intensive route to QTLS”

2. Project summary (max 50 words)

This may be the same as in the original submission, but please amend in light of changes you may have made during the duration of the project.

We aim to train outstanding teachers to deliver high quality teaching and learning to meet needs of our organisation and local businesses in a short period of time. Focusing on the concentration of the 2 year syllabus into one year creating a more affordable option for trainees in the economic climate.

3. Your ITE provision (approx 200-300 words)

Describe the ITE provision you are offering from September 2012, including as a result of the project: number of students (predicted or estimated if not confirmed), accreditation, delivery methods and target audience

We are planning (have started to deliver) an intensive 1 year programme to enable students to gain QTLS in a condensed period. We are working in collaboration with the University of Gloucestershire in developing and validating PCET provision both full time and part time. For this year only we have had to enrol students on an awarding body PTLLS in September as the University could not validate the provision in time. We are working to a validation date of 21st November. The PTLLS unit has been boosted by three extra credits to 15 credits to a PTLLS plus with the extra 3 credits being written in conjunction with the University to APL into the main PCET Diploma. We will offer the 120 credit Diploma at level 5 and we will also offer it at level 6/7 as a PGCE. We are running the programme as an “apprenticeship model” and have 3 distinct types of market;

- 1) Trainee Lecturers. These lecturers were recruited for Health and Social Care and Early Years areas on a reduced contract for two years to undergo their initial teacher training via the intensive route and then to be built up in their subject area and subject pedagogy through continuing teacher education and CPD;
- 2) Lecturers already working in service for either the College or an outside organisation that wish to get their staff qualified;
- 3) Learners that are not currently in teaching roles who wish to train as teachers and for whom we are providing the required number of teaching hours and a mentor.

We have 13 intensive candidates on the programme. We had originally aimed for STEM and BME teachers and we have a mix;

3 Health and Social care trainee lecturer – reduced timetable employed by the college mentors provided.

3 Early Years Trainee lecturers – reduced timetable employed by the college and mentors provided

2 Maths trainees (1 BME, 1 volunteer lecture capacity, us providing hours and mentor and 1 full time in service lecturer)

1 Chemistry trainee (Volunteer lecture capacity, us providing hours and mentor)

1 History/ Sociology trainee (Volunteer lecture capacity, us providing hours and mentor)

1 Hairdressing trainee (Volunteer lecture capacity, us providing hours and mentor)

1 Dance School trainee (external organisation, BME)

1 Arts and Media (BME)

Delivery is via an intensive model 6 hours per week for 36 weeks, 1330 – 1930 hrs. Students are in teaching environments to varying degrees but we have provided the necessary hours as per an intensive DTLLS model 100 hrs of teaching, 8 observations and tutorials. One observation will be recorded and one will be by the mentor. The other two observations will be by the University tutor. We will also be encouraging peer observations, volunteering for videoing of and discussion of alternative sessions, non- graded but to be used for teaching and discussion in the classroom. Currently a real community of practice and a learning circle is emerging in this group and it is bonding very well together. This is also diffusing out into the respective college areas with a real element of increased collegiality emerging.

4. Resources used *(you may decide upon the level of detail to be provided here)*

Outline the resources used to run this provision (outlined in 3 above) including: teaching time, resources used, tutoring/mentoring etc.

Where possible please provide a cost for these resources.

Adobe connect virtual classroom software £600 for 5 licences

Mentors – 12 across the cohort @ £65 per hour

Mentor training 1 day x 12 x 6 hrs at £65 per hour

2 tutors for mentoring course 12 @ £65 per hour

Teaching hours 2 lecturers at 3 hrs per week for 36 weeks = 108 hrs at £65 per lecturer.

Student workbooks created for the provision.

Mahara tutorial software

8 observations and 8 tutorials for each trainee = 208 hrs at £65 per hour.

On-going administrative support for development of project. 1 hr per week x 30 wks x £25. £1500

VLE development to match Mahara tutorial package.

VLE resources for support for students and to support remote and independent learning.

Student workbooks for supporting learning programme and reflective element.

5. Achievement against aims and objectives of project, and lessons learnt (approx 400 words)

The main purpose of these projects was to set up new sustainable models of delivery of ITE (DTLLS and equivalents) which will:

- support providers to develop new and sustainable models of delivery to the highest quality standards;
- create efficient models of delivery, while maintaining fitness for purpose, with a focus on creating excellence in teaching and learning;
- Develop ITE provision which is attractive, and affordable, to new trainees and employers and stimulate new partnerships and increased co-operation between subject associations, employers and providers.

Please comment on how well you believe your project has addressed these overall aims and objectives by answering the questions below. Any supporting evidence will be welcome here.

- What lessons have I learnt in terms of efficiency, quality improvement, costing and affordability?
- How can I implement the outcomes from this project in other similar provision?
- In what ways has technology been used to support the delivery? What advice would you give in terms of where it should be used and in what ways? (Answer only if applicable.)
- What should be avoided? What doesn't work?

It has been interesting to look at this project with an overall view of what the intention is and to look at where I sit with that professionally and ethically. As an Initial Teacher Training team we had discussed replicating University Provision and offering a full time PCET qualification and mapped to the new DTLLS specification. Having conducted a bit of research with previous candidates that had completed DTLLS over 2 years a one year option was attractive and so we went down that route. It was also felt that a more intensive course would help with the more immediate alignment of theory with practice and help trainees to see the relevance and significance of theory particularly when reflecting which we also wanted to play a large role in the qualification. However, the time scale for writing and constructing the qualification although a condensed version of a qualification already delivered, it was to a different specification and we had to create it with University procedures and validation in mind, particularly when writing the first unit the "PTLLS +" that we upgraded to 15 credits to fit in more easily with a University modular programme and progression to the next modules. I have also had to question whether it is too quick to train learners in this amount of time, particularly if the student has not studied at a higher level, e.g. at least degree level, as my research has also revealed that students that have studied at higher level for their subject specialism frequently find the pedagogical theory easier to assimilate. The jury is still out on this and I have also been studying teacher education in Europe where they appear to be taking the view that teachers should be more educated not less and particularly in light of Lingfield, there is an uneasiness I feel in the professional levels that I feel we should expect from and train our teachers to. We have written the qualification and expect Validation to happen on 21st February and the intensive is just one option of a larger suite of qualifications as we feel that Teacher Education should sit in Higher Education on some level. We hope that the qualification will also stand the test of the Lingfield and any future reviews that are bound to happen- not least with the next comprehensive spending review next year. We are still asking for 60 credits for our "University Certificate" and 120 credits for our "University Diploma" in spite of the Lingfield recommendation for qualifications of half this size. We anticipate that our organisation will ask for a minimum of level 4 for its trainees in the future and are still convinced that there will be a market for the PGCE level (which we are also offering on the intensive this year for those trainees with a degree) judging by the levels of recruitment across our current provision this year. We need to consider our markets and how attractive these qualifications will be to the private sector and ensure that we are aware of our markets in terms of what they will bear cost wise and the degree to which they will perceive their trainers and teachers need to be qualified.

We have looked at using technology for delivery – in particular using the Adobe connections software for remote/virtual classroom, but really the group wants to come together and the time they spend is invaluable for professional discourse and feedback about their teaching and the challenges they face and successes they have had. We will use it for peer observation of classroom teaching as we feel this will be more valuable and "real time" observation. We use the VLE extensively, for resources and submission and marking of student work and also have started to use Mahara in conjunction with the VLE for E portfolios for the students and this is proving popular, however, we won't know the real impact of this and the course generally until next year.

6. Advice to others

This case study will be made available to other providers via the Excellence Gateway. Please outline any advice you would wish to give to others who may be inspired to develop a similar model by answering the questions below. Where possible please highlight any resources (publicly available) that may be of use to others.

- What difference has this project made to our knowledge of running affordable and excellent ITE programmes as an organisation?
- What, if any, further developments are you considering as an organisation following on from this project?
- Will this project result in sustainable improvement? If so, how?
- How can the lessons learnt in this project be applied to other provision?
- What lessons are there about the strategic use of technology for ITE?

The difficulties encountered when introducing new procedures and new provision into a well-established HEI. Lack of understanding of Further Education ITT and the FE landscape in HE. We are looking at extending the suite of qualifications at the University to extend to masters level and wish to provide as broad an offer of teacher qualifications as we can, although we envisage this will take a few years to fully develop. We have had to consider other cost implications such as the cost for the University of employing somebody to actually manage the course at their end as it will be delivered across at least three partner FE colleges. We have struggled to keep a key partner on board due to the delay in the validation process and with this partner being such a large college, they are very cost and efficiency conscious and therefore Lingsfield's proposition looks attractive. This will affect recruitment numbers across the partnership. We are also conscious of how the uncertainty has affected the learner and the inability of them to access funding through the student loan company due to the programme not having a UCAS number yet as it has not gone through validation has meant they cannot apply for loans. This is significant and something that we did not foresee and on reflection we would not have wanted to inconvenience the learner in this way and an awarding body qualification would have been easier. However, the project has really highlighted how government policy can really hijack projects and the need to be flexible wherever possible.

Internal buy in and collaboration has been vital, particularly in a large organisation and continual communication of the message is paramount. It is vital that at the outset of the intended collaboration that a meeting is called that involves as many of the key partners in the resource network that you will need to make the project work. It is important at this point that this network includes both the people on the ground and the key decision makers at management level that can make this work. Bearing in mind that different parties will be interested for different reasons and will have different agendas it is key that you sell not only the features of the project to them, but the specific benefits of the project to each and every one of them. You also have to ensure that their agenda does not overwhelm yours and the ethics and key objectives of your project.

External collaboration- again it is vital that all external partners have the same feeling of buy in and feel that they are a vital contributory to the cog of the project. It is also important to bear in mind that at micro level the people involved in the project may have very similar agendas and outcomes for the project, but at institutional macro level, the various organisations may have very different strategic objectives and aims and this could side line the key objectives of the project. Finance often has a huge part to play in this.

External policy changes in the wider social, political and economic arena may affect the project. If possible a contingency plan should be in place. Little did we know that Lingfield would put a spanner on the works and that QTLS is no longer compulsory? Whilst the project has to be planned and structured and scheduled, without a doubt, it also needs to have some inbuilt flexibility and the capacity to bend slightly rather than break altogether. The key objective should remain the focus and any "bending" that takes place, still has to have the learner outcome and success at the heart of it. Ensure that you read the criteria for the bid thoroughly. However, in terms of sustainability we will ride out the Lingfield storm and are still thinking to the future and 2015 and potentially a new government with different policy on HE in Teacher Training and will hope that the suite of qualifications that we are developing will be fit for purpose well into the future.

Feedback from the course leader:

"Hi Katrina

I would like to comment on the community of practice element.

This emerged right from the beginning with the group that were taken on as trainees by the college. The ones that came a little later were quickly incorporated into the group. Being a fairly small group they have created a real friendship group. They constantly comparing their experiences, sharing things that did and didn't work, bringing in and sharing

resources, offering hints and tips on behaviour. The group we have had so far has been overwhelming female (just Dan) but this will change as of this week. It will be interesting to see how this changes with the introduction of those who have already done PTLLS.

In my experience of teaching PTLLS this is the most responsive group I have ever had. When introduced to a new topic they are constantly running ahead and making the connections the work is intending to encourage them towards before we have done the activity. This has led to some 'reflection in action' for us as tutors, having to change sessions as we go along to ensure we are keeping up with them rather than vica versa.

They have submitted all their work electronically through moodle and have received their feedback in the same way. We will definitely experiment with the virtual classroom in some way in the next Module.

Drawbacks – we should have started earlier. The PTLLS element should have been completed whilst they were still observing sessions or definitely before they were teaching so much. A late August start would be ideal.

Unlucky for some – but hopefully not them – we have 13!"

7. Contact information

Please provide contact information of the author of this case study and state whether you are willing to answer queries from others.

Katrina Diamond
Head of School education and training
Gloucestershire College
01242 532133. Katrina.diamond@gloscol.ac.uk

I am happy to answer queries from others.

8. Resources available for others

Please provide details of the resources that can be made available to other providers as a result of this project. Examples may include teaching and learning resources, handbooks, spreadsheets to calculate costs, flyers and recruitment materials, procedure documents etc. These should be referenced in this report and submitted at the same time.