

Registration fees for the education workforce in Wales

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Consultation response form | Your name: Greg Walker Organisation (if applicable): ColegauCymru e-mail/telephone number: greg.walker@collegeswales.ac.uk Your address: Uned 7 Cae Gwyrdd, Greenmeadow Springs, Tongwynlais, Caerdydd CF15 7AB. |
|---------------------------------------|---|

Responses should be returned by **7 November 2014** to:

Robert Hobbs
Practitioner Standards and Professional Development Division
Department for Education and Skills
Welsh Government
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

or completed electronically and sent to:

e-mail: ewc.enquiries@wales.gsi.gov.uk

Question 1 – Do you agree that the fee level should be set according to practitioner categories, i.e. school teachers, FE teachers (lecturers), school learning support workers and FE learning support workers?

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

Supporting comments

ColegauCymru agrees with the principle of proportionality as outlined in section 8 of the consultation document. If this principle is to be applied to registration fee levels then it would lead us to the conclusion that fee levels should be set according to practitioner levels. We therefore agree with this proposal.

Question 2 – Should the Welsh Government seek an amendment to the *School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD)* to remove the reference to the existing subsidy for teachers in maintained schools, in order for the subsidy to be redistributed across the whole workforce, reducing the fee for **all** registrants from 2016, as suggested under model 1?

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|

Supporting comments

It is important that the existing subsidy should be shared across the whole workforce covered by the EWC. This would clearly be the most equitable option, reflecting the new role taken on by the EWC. It would send the wrong signal to the post-16 education and training workforce if all practitioners' were not placed on the same footing.

Question 3 – If the *STPCD* **cannot** be amended; or if you believe that the *STPCD* should **not** be amended; do you agree that model 2 is a fair and appropriate model in order to raise the funding that the Education Workforce Council will require?

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

Supporting comments

Though fee model 1 is our preferred option, fee model 2 is an appropriate fallback position. If the Secretary of State for Education failed to agree to changes to the STPCD then it would be appropriate to pursue fee model 2.

Question 4a – If the funding for the subsidy becomes unavailable, model 3 will be required. Do you agree with the proposal to base the fees on scale 4 of the table, as highlighted on pages 12–13 of the consultation?

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

Question 4b – If you disagree with the use of scale 4 in model 3, please indicate which scale would be more preferable by ticking the relevant box in the table below:

| Fee Scale | School and FE Teachers | School and FE Learning Support Workers | |
|-----------|------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| 1 | £71 | £15 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | £68 | £20 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | £65 | £25 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 | £62 | £30 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 | £58 | £35 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 | £55 | £40 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7 | £52 | £45 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8 | £49 | £49 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Supporting comments

Fee scale 4 seems reasonable and proportionate.

ColegauCymru believes that if registration fees for the EWC were to be raised to a figure well above the levels envisaged in this fee model, we would request that a consultation should be held to determine whether staff working less than half of full time equivalent hours/days should be subject to a lower registration fee. We hope and expect that such a scenario would not be necessary and that the fees for all practitioners will be held at a reasonable level.

Question 5 – Given the option, which fee model would you prefer?

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Model 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Model 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Model 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|

Supporting comments

Our comments in response to the previous question give our justification for our preference for fee model 1.

Question 6 – We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them.

ColegauCymru believes that it is timely for there to be a new set of professional standards for teachers and trainers in the post-16 education and training sector in Wales. The current LLUK-devised standards are no longer appropriate and should be replaced. This should be a matter of priority for the Welsh Government and partners in the coming months. We would welcome the EWC playing an important role in helping to devise and promulgate the standards. ColegauCymru would also wish to play a key role in the formulation of a new set of professional standards.

A fit-for-purpose set of professional standards would help providers to work with teachers and trainers to identify areas for effective professional development. It would help create a helpful reference point for employers in the post-16 education sector in relation to their practitioners' CPD needs. Just as importantly, it would provide the basis of a formal qualification framework for teachers and trainers in the post-16 education and training sector in Wales - which we currently lack. Professionalism will only be promoted effectively by the EWC in the post-16 education and training workforce once both the professional standards and a qualifications framework are in fully in place.

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: