

## SCHOOL FUNDING FOLLOW-UP REPORT

### Evidence from the General Teaching Council for Wales (GTCW), February 2008

1. In 2006, the GTCW was invited to present advice to the former National Assembly for Wales Committee on School Funding. The focus of the Council's input was on the funding of teachers' professional development (CPD). Advice on the 'training, career development and performance management' of teachers is a key area of the Council's remit, as set out in the *Teaching and Higher Education Act, 1998*.
2. In responding to this call for evidence for the follow-up report on School Funding, the Council again focuses on the area of the funding of teachers' CPD, rather than the five areas suggested in the 'Call for Evidence'.
3. To assist in submitting evidence, we make a progress report on three key issues raised in our earlier evidence (see Annex). The issues are:
  - clarity and transparency of funding;
  - funding for 'maintenance' type CPD;
  - individually focussed CPD.

#### **A. Clarity and the transparency of the funding arrangements**

4. In our earlier evidence (Annex, para 6), we said that there were two key concerns:
  - the total level of funding available for teachers' professional development; and
  - the lack of clarity about how funding for professional development is distributed.
5. We recommended that "*A factual statement from the Assembly setting out the various funding arrangements would go some way to improving this situation. The Council also believes it is right for employers to commit financially to the development of their teaching staff and believes that a similar statement should be made by LEAs.*" (Annex, Para 8).

#### **Total level of funding**

6. Progress On the total level of funding for teachers' CPD, we are pleased to report that in June 2006 the Welsh Assembly Government responded to our recommendation and provided a full statement on funding targetted at supporting teachers' CPD. These detailed tables

totalled £59,083 million for the 2005-06 year and £57,511 million for the 2006-07 year. We believe that an annual statement of this type would be beneficial.

7. Action needed We are disappointed that LEAs have not made a similar statement about the level of investment in teachers' CPD. Following the recommendations of the School Funding Committee, LEAs are now required to state annually how much they are spending on education compared to their Assembly budget allocation. This is a good first step, but does not address the specific point about what is available for CPD within the overall education spend. Different LEAs use different methods for calculating what counts towards funding CPD and some use this as a reason for stating that it is not possible to compare one authority's spending on CPD with another.
8. As a result of the lack of information from LEAs, a partial baseline only can be established in seeking to determine the appropriate level of spending on CPD for teachers.

### **Clarity on distribution of funding**

9. Progress On the issue of clarity of the distribution of funding for teachers' CPD, in June 2006 the Welsh Assembly Government also provided a diagrammatic representation of the funding routes and access points for professional development available to teachers. This diagram was helpful but served to reinforce the plethora of routes through which Assembly funding for CPD is made available to schools and to teachers at various stages of their career.
10. Progress has also been made in lodging responsibility with GTCW for the majority of CPD funding for the individual needs of new as well as more experienced teachers. Since Sept 2006, GTCW has been responsible for administering CPD funding relating to Teacher Induction and Early Professional Development i.e. the first three years of a teaching career. In addition, the GTCW continues to administer the Assembly Government funding programme designed to support individual teachers' professional needs.
11. Action needed Council believes that the system could be further simplified and respective responsibilities made more coherent and easily understood. For example, if in due course, funding to support the headship development programme and Chartered Teacher were also to be lodged with GTCW, this would create a genuine 'one stop shop' for all CPD funding relating to national professional standards and individual professional needs
12. The Assembly Government, LEAs and the GTCW might wish to agree arrangements which clearly demarcated responsibilities for CPD funding related to:

- national and local priorities
- school priorities
- professional standards.

### **B Funding for 'maintenance' type CPD**

13. In our earlier evidence (Annex, Para 7, 2nd bullet), we identified that the move from the GEST programme to the Better Schools Fund (BSF), which was for “pump priming” and time-related training and development administered through LEAs, had meant that *“a number of the specific CPD needs of teachers are not being adequately funded. This is particularly the case with the need for ongoing school professional development priorities of a “maintenance” type which enable teachers, for example, to keep their knowledge up to date regarding various processes, systems and statutory or syllabus requirements;”*
14. Action needed We do not believe that any progress has been made on this aspect. Indeed, we are aware that some headteachers are requiring individual teachers to apply to GTCW for ‘low level’ activities of a maintenance type rather than these activities being funded from a local or school budget. This runs counter to the purpose of the GTCW individually focused programme. We would recommend that the Assembly Government should re-examine the current parameters established for the BSF, or, earmark elements of an increased revenue support settlement to LEAs for such CPD type activity.

### **C. Individually focussed CPD**

15. In our earlier evidence we welcomed the move to a 3-year budget for the GTCW-administered programme but said, *“However, the Council is disappointed that the level of funding available is still not at the level set by the Assembly in the second and third years of the pilot stages. In its 2002 advice, the Council stated that guaranteeing an annual entitlement to all teachers would cost in the region of £20million, a relatively small sum compared to the overall school budget. Unfortunately, this recommendation is a long way from being realised, and the Council looks forward to discussing further with the Assembly a date by which the Council’s recommendation could be implemented.”* (Annex para 11).
16. Progress Council is pleased that a second three year budget has been agreed for the period 2008-11. This gives a guarantee of some stability.
17. Action needed Although greatly welcomed, the funding does not amount to an entitlement. The budget stands at £3million and supports about 4,500 teachers per year. Were all 34,000 eligible teachers to apply for the lowest level of funding (the £600 bursary), the funding

would be expended within a few months of the start of a financial year. It was for this reason that the Council had identified a sum of £20 million as being required in due course to bring into an effect an entitlement. However, the then Minister had rejected that particular recommendation.

18. This is an issue that may come to a head with the Assembly Government during the coming year as pressure mounts on the budget available and the number of teachers applying to the fund increases.

## **Conclusion**

19. Whilst pleasing progress has been made since the publication of the Committee's report on School Funding, there are still some fundamental issues that remain - notably in relation to the transparency of individual LEA contributions to CPD and the creation of a more straight forward and easier to understand system.
20. Finally, whilst not the subject of this or our earlier evidence (and neither within the remit of the Teaching Council), it is fair to say that planning, provision and funding for the training and development of the wider school workforce is an area of considerable weakness in Wales. This will need to be addressed if the ambitions of government in respect of the Foundation Stage, 14-19 Learning Pathways and school workforce restructuring are to be realised. If coherent systems can be established for CPD for teachers, these systems could be applied to the wider workforce in due course.

**PAPER SUBMITTED BY THE GENERAL TEACHING COUNCIL FOR  
WALES (GTCW) AS EVIDENCE TO THE FORMER COMMITTEE ON  
SCHOOL FUNDING, 2006**

*(Drawn from the GTCW's advice on 'A Professional Development Framework for Teachers in Wales', July 2005)*

**Chapter 11            Funding of teachers' professional development in  
Wales**

1. In its 2002 advice to the Assembly '*Continuing Professional Development – An Entitlement for All*', the Council stated that there was a need for "sufficient focused funding, which ensured that all teachers are able to access CPD opportunities and have sufficient time to both undertake their activities and reflect upon them. This should include time to plan, undertake, reflect on and disseminate the lessons learnt from undertaking their professional development".
2. While the specific focus of this advice to the Assembly is on the establishment of a Professional Development Framework, the Council advises that these recommendations can only be meaningful if there are sufficient levels of funding for teachers' professional development that the Framework is designed to support.
3. Concern to tackle the current lack of coherence and clarity over the funding of teachers' professional development in Wales was shared by many organisations and individual teachers responding to the Council's consultations.

**Equality of opportunity and appropriate levels of funding**

4. As described in chapter 2 of this document, current CPD activities are numerous and include:
  - **formal and centrally organised CPD** - for example, all newly qualified teachers are required to complete programmes of Induction and Early Professional Development (EPD). Support is also provided for prospective headteachers through the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) and heads who take up their first post, through the Professional Headship Induction Programme (PHIP);
  - **professional development activities specifically organised by a particular school or LEA** - this includes in-service training courses or support in schools and the use of specialist advisors and advisory teachers;

- **individually focused CPD, under which activities are vast in number and extremely varied** - these range from activities which are accredited such as a higher degree course to less formal learning such as a visit to a local school or familiarisation with a new software package. Activities cover ones identified both through the performance management process and ones initiated by the teacher on a personal basis.
5. At present, these requirements are largely catered for through the following funding arrangements:
- the Assembly's Better Schools Fund (BSF) which replaced GEST;
  - the Assembly's unhypothecated revenue support settlement to local authorities which forms the basis of schools' budgets and which is supplemented by local authority funding;
  - the Assembly funded, GTCW administered individually focused CPD funding programme;
  - various Assembly ring-fenced budgets for specific CPD initiatives;
  - self-funding by individual teachers or schools.
6. Many of the respondents to the Council's consultations continue to be concerned that the funding arrangements for teachers' professional development are inadequate. In broad terms, the Council's consultations have indicated that there are two particular problems perceived by teachers and others:
- the total level of funding available for teachers' professional development;
  - the lack of clarity about how funding for professional development is distributed.
7. Specifically, consultees expressed the following concerns:
- some teachers are restricted in their ability to access funds equitably based upon the LEA or school where they work. The reasons for this vary on a case by case basis, but include:
    - differences between LEAs in the level of funding available;
    - differences between LEAs in the way funding for CPD is distributed to schools;
    - a reluctance on the part of some headteachers to release teachers for CPD due to internal pressures or the small size of the school;

- the replacement of the GEST programme by the Better Schools Fund (BSF), which is for “pump priming” and time-related training and development administered through LEAs, has meant that a number of the specific CPD needs of teachers are not being adequately funded. This is particularly the case with the need for ongoing school professional development priorities of a “maintenance” type which enable teachers, for example, to keep their knowledge up to date regarding various processes, systems and statutory or syllabus requirements;
  - the level of funding available to schools does not adequately cover teachers’ CPD needs, in particular, there are concerns that certain subjects are not treated equitably as a result of the BSF arrangements;
  - local authorities claim that extra funding from local budgets beyond that included in the revenue support settlement is available to schools. However, the unhypothecated revenue input from the Assembly and the variation of investment in CPD between local authorities mean that there is a lack of clarity about how much is or should be available for teachers’ development.
8. The Council considers that it is important for the Assembly to address the issue of the clarity and the transparency of the funding arrangements for CPD. A factual statement from the Assembly setting out the various funding arrangements would go some way to improving this situation. The Council also believes it is right for employers to commit financially to the development of their teaching staff and believes that a similar statement should be made by LEAs.
9. In addition, for schools and LEAs to provide a viable CPD programme, there is a need to develop a strategic and forward programme of activities. However, this is very difficult to undertake when funding received by LEAs and schools is provided on an annual basis, rather than over a longer period. The Council understands that the Assembly is investigating the establishment of budgets over a longer period, such as three years. The Council encourages the Assembly to continue with this approach in order that the longer term CPD needs of teachers can be planned.

### **Individually focussed CPD**

10. The Council welcomed the Assembly’s decision to put the GTCW administered individually focused programme on a permanent footing from April 2004. It further welcomed the Assembly’s commitment to a three year budget for this programme from April 2005 and the increase in the level of funding available between 2005 and 2008.
11. However, the Council is disappointed that the level of funding available is still not at the level set by the Assembly in the second and third years

of the pilot stages. In its 2002 advice, the Council stated that guaranteeing an annual entitlement to all teachers would cost in the region of £20million, a relatively small sum compared to the overall school budget. Unfortunately, this recommendation is a long way from being realised, and the Council looks forward to discussing further with the Assembly a date by which the Council's recommendation could be implemented.

### **A structure for funding**

12. The Council re-iterates its advice to the Assembly in '*Continuing Professional Development – An Entitlement for All*' namely that funding strategies should be in place at three levels, namely:
  - **individually focused.** The Council advocates that every teacher should have an entitlement to individually focused professional development, and this should be backed by an agreed sum of money available on an annual basis;
  - **school focused.** Funding for these activities should continue to come from school budgets. However, headteachers and teachers in the consultations highlighted that there is now inadequate funding available in school budgets for headteachers to develop a CPD programme which concentrates on the school's priorities and which builds from the school development plan. This is particularly the case for professional development which might be described as of an ongoing 'maintenance' nature. At the same time, the Council is aware from anecdotal evidence that the five non-pupil contact days are not always used to their best advantage by all schools for CPD and there may be scope for development in this area;
  - **LEA / nationally focused.** The Council continues to advocate a clear stream of funding through LEAs to support local and national priorities. The Council recognises that the Better Schools Fund (BSF) has replaced GEST in this regard and provides specific support for teachers' professional development.
13. In repeating this advice, the Council acknowledges that in practice there is sometimes overlap between these three categories.

#### ***Recommendations:***

The Council recommends that:

- the Assembly Government makes a statement setting out a coherent funding strategy for teachers' professional development in Wales. This should address funding needs at three levels (the individual, the school and LEA / national) and seek to explain the mechanisms through which each of these needs is funded;

- the Assembly ensures that there is sufficient funding to enable all teachers to access CPD opportunities and have sufficient time to undertake them;
- all local authorities, as employers commit local resources to the funding of teachers' CPD;
- the Assembly Government commits itself to a specified date to reach a target of £20m which would give all teachers an annual entitlement to individually focused CPD.