

Editorial: Teaching Standards, FELTAG And The IfL

The new standards from the Education and Training Foundation (ETF) have been finally published and most (if not all) awarding institutions have mapped these to their curriculum and provision. Whilst the number of standards has been reduced, the range of the standards encompasses values/attributes, skills and knowledge, and understanding. In particular, the standards include knowledge of educational research to develop evidence-based practice - something that previously had a low profile. It is now appreciated that all teachers need this facility if they are to keep up-to-date in their subject and its application to teaching and learning. Another key feature is the use of technology and supporting learners in its implementation; this clearly links to the Further Education Learning Technology Action Group (FELTAG) which has recommended modules on Further Education (FE) Teacher Training courses on using digital technology effectively, alongside a target of 10% online provision by 2015/16 and 50% by 2017/18. Whilst all teachers would recognise the need to ensure effective incorporation of technology, the mandatory targets for online provision seem daunting and, perhaps, blind to the realities of teaching and learning in the sector. Many of the learners in the FE and Skills Sector are ones that have not necessarily achieved at school and need much more support, including face-to-face. Although many learners are digitally 'savvy' and use various devices (tablets and smartphones) and systems/software, they still require support using good practice in pedagogy. Many of us will have experienced open and distance learning over the last 20, or even 30, years and recognise that at the heart of any learning is good practice and that simply calling learning 'online' or 'digital' does not mean that we can escape the sound tenets of teaching. Finally, we note that the Institute for Learning (IfL), formed in 2002 as a member-led professional body, decided on 1st July to close and offer the stewardship of its legacy to the ETF, as its aims and objectives relating to the professionalism of teachers and trainers align closely with IfL's. It was perhaps inevitable that this day would come, given the lack of government or practitioner support. It is, nevertheless, a sad day, and it is hoped that the ETF will continue the good work of professional development offered by the IfL.

This Summer 2014 edition has four papers. The first paper by Thirtle, '*Self-assessment in learning: The relationship between active feedback strategies and metacognitive development*', reveals that, where students actively engage with the feedback process, there is evidence to show that metacognitive development and achievement are improved, and that this supports previous studies. Noel and Waugh's paper '*Confronting the difference: Ethnicity and patterns of achievement in Initial Teacher Education for the Further Education and Skills Sector*' presents the findings of a research project on ethnicity and differential achievement in Initial Teacher Education (ITE) for the FE and Skills Sector. This is explored through analysis of grading of a trainee cohort, where differential achievement by ethnicity has been revealed. In addition to presenting their findings, the authors offer strategies to overcome impediments and improve the achievements of such trainees. Simmons et al's paper '*Liberal and General Studies in Further Education: voices from the 'chalk face'*' presents an insight into Liberal and General Studies provision from the 1950s to the 1980s and, through document analysis and interview data from those teachers, reveals how the approaches to teaching and learning are perhaps still relevant today. Finally, Zeng and Burrows' paper, '*Lost in translation? A report into action research on the effects of interpretation on learning and teaching*' offers an insight, through a small action research project, into the possible impact of interpretation in the context of teaching and learning. The project was based in a Chinese university in Guangdong Province on Vocational Education and Training (VET) training programmes and aimed to improve student-centred learning. UK Teacher Educators lead the training whilst the Chinese

institution provides resources, including a translator. It is to be noted that the authors identified a paucity of research on the effects of interpretation on learning and teaching; this paper therefore, provides an initial probe into this phenomenon. Interestingly, the authors note that although interpretation does slow down the process of teaching, it does not necessarily hinder learning and, according to the authors 'Good teaching is good teaching, whatever the context' (p. 49).

Finally, this is the last time I act as editor of the *Teaching in Lifelong Learning* journal. Looking back at the various papers we have published since 2009, I think we can assert that we have established a profile of journal papers that focus on the sector – for practitioners and Teacher Educators - and provided a vehicle by which the sector can demonstrate its developing awareness, knowledge and understanding in terms of research and application for the sector. The journal will continue with a new Director of HUDCETT/PCET Consortium of the University of Huddersfield, who will take on the editorship on behalf of HUDCETT and the Association of CETTs. I call on you to maintain the flow of papers, based on your various projects that can inform and inspire the rest of the sector.

We welcome any comments about the work of the journal; please email them to d.robinson3@hud.ac.uk.

Please note that this edition is available in e-version only at:
http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/journal_till



Dr Denise Robison
University of Huddersfield
HUDCETT

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5920/till.2014.613>