

Regulating Awarding Organisation Training Events for Teachers

2. Consultation questions

1. To what extent do you agree that the draft new Condition F4, about information that awarding organisations should provide to teachers, is appropriate?

Disagree

2. If you disagree, what are your reasons? Please be clear in your answer with which particular points or clauses you agree and disagree.

F4.1 is not restrictive enough. It does not achieve the stated intention of excluding instructional (as opposed to administrative) information.

3. To what extent do you agree that the proposed wording of the draft new Condition F4 is clear?

Disagree

4. If you disagree, what are your reasons? How could the wording be clearer?

F4.1 does not clearly prohibit, 'face-to-face awarding organization training events for teachers about a qualification.'

5. To what extent do you agree that the draft new parts of Condition G4, about confidentiality in awarding organisation training events, are appropriate?

Strongly agree

6. If you disagree, what are your reasons? Please be clear in your answer with which particular points or clauses you agree and disagree.

7. To what extent do you agree that the proposed wording of the draft new parts of Condition G4 is clear?

Strongly agree

If you disagree, what are your reasons? How could the wording be clearer?

8. To what extent do you agree that this new Condition F4 and these draft new parts of Condition G4 should apply to all regulated awarding organisations and qualifications?

Don't know or no opinion

9. If you think any specific qualifications or types of awarding organisations should not be covered by the Conditions please explain your reasons.

10. To what extent do you agree that the proposed definition of 'Teacher' is clear and appropriate?

Strongly agree

11. Do you have any comments or suggestions about this definition?

No

12. If you are responding from an awarding organisation, how might these new Conditions change the way that your awarding organisation provides information and training to schools or colleges?

N/A

13. Are there any specific positive or negative impacts on people who share particular characteristics [12](#) that we should consider in relation to these draft Conditions? If so, what are they and how could any negative impacts be addressed?

No

14. Are there any consequences of these draft Conditions that we should consider before introducing them? Please specify any actions we, awarding organisations or others could take to mitigate any negative consequences.

There may well be some teachers that are disadvantaged by not having face-to-face training, especially those with a learning disability, so examining bodies may well need to make provision for them through webinars for example. A particular disability we have in mind here is dyslexia: we are aware, for example, of an excellent student mathematics teacher who had dyslexia, and she had no problems with face-to-face sessions explaining about how to handle the SoWs, curriculum maps and official documents that came through. However she had problems when it came to reading official documents and making sense of them. However, since such methods will be recorded, any unauthorised information would be on record and appropriate action could be taken.

If webinars are available then teachers would have the option of watching and re-watching these at a time of their choosing. Departments could watch together. Making training available online also levels the playing field for those who live far from training centres and prefer not to miss teaching days in order to attend courses.

15. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about any aspect of these proposals?

The LMS will welcome amendments to the regulatory framework which would forbid involvement of the examination boards in production of textbooks, endorsement of textbooks, and running CPD courses and events. In particular we would welcome an introduction of a rule (similar to the one existing in the Civil Service) that senior employees and examiners of awarding bodies should be forbidden to publish educational material or deliver any forms of CPD during their employment in an awarding body and for a specified period after termination of their contract.

We are concerned that there is no mention of any procedures that will be put in place to deal with any breaches in confidentiality and recommend that sanctions, such as loss of licence to be an awarding body, disqualification as an examiner, loss of job, big fine, etc. should be included in these recommendations. Without such penalties these regulations are likely to be ineffective.

With regard to confidential material it is essential that such material be labelled clearly as such so there can be no misunderstanding about what is and what is not confidential. People authorised to handle such material should be specifiable and should sign confidential disclosure agreements so that they are fully aware of their obligations to maintain confidentiality.

3. Your details

Name

Professor Alice Rogers

Email address

education@lms.ac.uk

Organisation name

London Mathematical Society

Organisation

Other (including General Public)

School / College Type

Representative group / interest group type

Representative group or interest group name

How many staff does your organisation employ (full and part time)?

Nation

England

How did you find out about this consultation?

From our website

May we contact you for more information?

Yes

Would you like your response to be kept confidential?

No

We want to write clearly, directly and put the reader first. Overall, do you think we have got this right in this consultation?

Yes

Do you have any comments or suggestions about the style of writing?

4. Thank You!

Send responses
