

Redefining teachers' continuing professional development in further education providers in England

Lorna Loy

To cite this article: Lorna Loy (2024) Redefining teachers' continuing professional development in further education providers in England, *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 29:3, 520-540, DOI: [10.1080/13596748.2024.2371646](https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2024.2371646)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2024.2371646>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 13 Aug 2024.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 1499



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



Citing articles: 2 [View citing articles](#)

RESEARCH ARTICLE



Redefining teachers' continuing professional development in further education providers in England

Lorna Loy 

Faculty of Health, Education and Life Sciences, Birmingham City University, Birmingham, UK

ABSTRACT

This research investigated the role of continuing professional development (CPD) in further education (FE) through a small-scale study involving two general FE colleges and two independent training providers (ITP) in England. Teachers' experiences of their continuing development were collected through focus groups. These encouraged the teachers to disclose formal and informal learning, together with development opportunities that they undertook. Analysis of the data revealed that the purposes of these developmental activities could be divided into two categories: organisational and occupational. Organisational training functioned to transmit knowledge linked to externally-driven objectives, whilst occupational development functioned to update vocational subject specialisms and develop classroom pedagogy. Organisational training was college/provider-led, whereas occupational development was teacher-controlled. Essentially, both were needed to support teachers in their full professional roles, but organisational training took precedence. The study will further an understanding of professional development processes and purposes in FE, thereby informing the planning of CPD systems and policy in the sector.

KEYWORDS

College; independent training provider; collaborative learning; professionalism; teacher agency

Introduction

From 2007 to 2012, sector regulation required all FE teachers to complete a minimum number of CPD hours on an annual basis in order to maintain a licence to practise. The regulation brought significance and awareness to CPD hitherto unseen in the sector, but this regulation was revoked in 2012 following the recommendations of a government commissioned report (Lingfield et al. 2012). Studies and government policy documents in the intervening years since 2012 have stated the importance of teachers' CPD to improve educational outcomes (DfE and BIS 2013; BIS 2016; DfE Department for Education 2021), but lack of research in the sector

CONTACT Lorna Loy  lorna.loy@southwales.ac.uk

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

(Solvason and Elliott 2013) means not only is there poor understanding of how teachers in FE providers develop their practices and subject disciplines, there is likewise poor understanding of quality, processes and priorities of professional development. CPD is an under-researched area in FE, especially in independent training providers (ITP) and there is overall a lack of empirical evidence in the sector compared to schools (Coffield 2014). Shifting policy from regulation to de-regulation resulted in college leaders being afforded the freedom to determine the nature and duration of CPD provision (LSIS 2013). This presents the possibility of inconsistency of CPD provision (quantity and quality) across the sector. Moreover, with the revocation of mandatory initial teaching qualifications, new teachers may enter the profession with little or no training in how to teach their subject disciplines.

A diverse sector

The FE sector has undergone a series of government interventions, such as Incorporation of Colleges in 1993, as well as operational drivers such as marketisation, managerialism, funding rules and cuts (Lobb 2017); regulation for CPD and several revisions to initial teacher training. This has brought a fluidity and an ongoing climate of instability in working practices for teachers in the sector who are required to adapt their practices as education policy and teaching and learning needs change, but more importantly the role of the teacher has expanded beyond teaching in the classroom. Jephcote and Salisbury (2009) argue that an understanding of teachers' work and practices should acknowledge the abundance of education policy and regulation that define the environment that they work in, as well as impact on their professional roles. Moreover, these roles are categorised by a number of terms: *assessor*, *instructor*, *demonstrator*, *trainer*, *tutor*, *teacher* and *lecturer*, with associated differences in pay and conditions.

The sector comprises general FE colleges (GFE), specialist colleges and independent training providers – including adult, community and offender learning – educating students at entry level qualifications (pre-level 1) up to foundation degrees at level 5, giving six distinct levels. The student population for the sector overall is diverse with students as young as 14, along with adults returning to education, meaning that students in the sector can have a range of educational and work experiences. The sector plays a key part in recruiting and educating those from disadvantaged backgrounds (Halfon and House of Commons Education Committee 2019), but this diversity of students in FE intensifies the demands of the teaching role further, in terms of supporting students who have social and learning needs (Jephcote and Salisbury 2009). In fact, FE is a sector that embraces everyone as a potential learner regardless of background and experience (BIS and DfE 2016).

Furthermore, there is an imperative to build teacher-student relationships as these have a major influence on experiences of learning, individual engagement in the learning process and student outcomes (Brinkworth et al. 2018). The FE sector employs teachers with a range of educational and vocational backgrounds, some of whom may not hold a full teaching qualification, meaning that some FE teachers develop teaching skills or pedagogy whilst in the job (Husband 2018).

One sub-sector of FE that is a major part of a work-focused agenda is independent training providers (ITPs), delivering vocational training to young people and adults (AELP 2021). They are an important part of the FE sector for work skills, through the delivery of apprenticeships, but ITPs also deliver adult skills training, education for adolescents and specialist provision. Some are subcontracted by FE colleges to deliver courses, but where ITPs deliver courses that are directly funded by government they are in competition for students with these same colleges. The ITP sector has grown significantly and accounts for 67% of FE providers in England and delivers 75% of apprenticeships with 25% being contracted from colleges (AELP 2021), so this sector which is an under-researched part of FE delivers a high proportion of apprenticeships.

CPD regulation and de-regulation

There has been a wider historical political narrative regarding the importance of FE as an instrumentalist or economic utility tool for educating and training the workforce to enhance the UK's global economic competitiveness. A corollary of this narrative was a focus on the quality of teaching and learning, which included discussion of teacher training and continuing development post-training (Department for Education and Skills 2002, 2004, 2006). This narrative continued in the Skills for Jobs White Paper (DfE 2021). However, there are two aspects to the skills discourse, firstly, the skills-training of the wider population, along with the skills of teachers within the FE sector who deliver this work skills training. The skills of the workforce and educational standards were politically linked to the skills of the teaching workforce and the quality of FE as a whole.

A key policy milestone was the 2007 regulation governing mandatory CPD hours for teachers in the sector (DIUS 2007, as this meant that teachers needed to register with a professional body – the Institute for Learning (IfL). In order to obtain a licence to practise and to maintain this licence full time teachers had to undertake 30 hours of CPD (pro rata for fractional contracts). CPD regulation stated that completion of professional development had to be officially recorded to retain employment as a teacher in FE. Importantly, it also ensured that CPD was completed by all FE teachers and it conferred significance to CPD in the sector. This regulation was

revoked in 2012, along with mandatory registration to the IfL and the need to have a teaching qualification (DIUS 2012). The Lingfield review (Lingfield et al. 2012) recommended that employers support CPD, by allowing teachers time to be innovative and return to the workplace to update vocational skills and knowledge. These suggestions though, cannot happen spontaneously in the workplace, but need to be part of an authorised structure. The revocation of the CPD regulation signals a return to voluntarism that existed in the sector pre-2007.

Revocation did not mean that CPD was less vital and one issue for teachers in an era of post-CPD regulation is how they remain current in skills and knowledge for their roles. The recent Skills for Jobs White Paper (DfE 2021, 60) declares a necessity for ‘high-quality professional development’, a programme of workforce industry exchange, employer links and peer support (DfE Department for Education 2021). However, despite this rhetoric, since 2012 there has been no regulated CPD entitlement to support FE teachers and, currently, FE leaders have the responsibility to decide CPD quantity and content. There is still no specific guidance from policy on how teachers are to be upskilled or remain current for teaching any work skills, though industrial placements and CPD are both briefly mentioned. The Skills Act does not include any professional development entitlement (Skills and Post-16 Education Act ETF 2022). The Educational and Training Foundation (ETF) provides courses and a repository of resources for teachers, but no assessment of how useful these are to teachers in the sector.

Continuing professional development: definitions, processes and purposes

There are variations in the terminology used in the literature that theorises both CPD purposes and processes: *professional learning*, *professional development*, *professional development and learning*, as well as *professional growth*. The number of terms used amounts to theoretical ambiguity in the field of teachers’ CPD (Fraser et al. 2007) and this imprecision inhibits efforts to understand and assess its effects (Porritt 2014). Conversely, the expanded terminology suggests that the theoretical positioning of CPD has advanced (Appova and Arbaugh 2018). However, the terms are sometimes used interchangeably, which complicates the theoretical positioning of CPD. Although a number of terms are used in CPD theory, ‘CPD’ is commonly used in education and professions, but the term *Continuing Professional Development* is an overarching term for complex processes and multi-level purposes.

A basic definition of CPD states that it is any purposeful ongoing training that is undertaken once initial training has concluded (Collin, Van der Heijden, and Lewis 2012; Porritt 2014) and in this respect Leaton Gray

(2005, 6) argues that CPD is a 'long-term investment' in teachers' development. CPD is positioned as a process that serves the needs of teachers (Evans 2019) and the ETF (2022) FE professional standards conceptualise CPD as an updating of subject discipline and pedagogy. It is a process by which teachers understand professional values, improve students' learning outcomes, train for new job tasks, develop effectiveness and increases job satisfaction, all ensuring 'continuing competence in the current job' (Earley and Bubb 2004, 4). Clarke and Hollingsworth's (2002) model of professional growth positions teacher change as an individual endeavour arising from practice and reflection. Their model identifies four interconnected fields – teacher knowledge, CPD events, experimentation and consequences of change – all leading to professional growth. However, professional development is not a straightforward process but can be 'unpredictable, non-linear, emotional and cerebral' (Dadds 2014, 15) and teacher learning and change are complex, as transferring theory into practice is not straightforward, especially if teachers are not supported to do so. The meaning of *development* has become devalued through being associated with 'mere participation in CPD courses' (Coffield 2014, 29), but Fraser et al (2007, 157) see *development* as referring to 'broader changes that may take place over a longer period of time resulting in qualitative shifts in aspects of teachers' professionalism'. CPD is multi-layered and serves organisations, teachers and students, which illustrate differences in developmental purposes.

Kennedy (2014b, 690) argues CPD can be conceptualised as 'a pedagogical construct and as a policy construct'. As a 'policy construct' (Kennedy 2014b, 690), organisationally-focused CPD trains a large number of people at one time to disseminate policy, so is generalised and transmissive CPD, not accommodating differences in teachers' needs and experiences. This means that such CPD is not contextualised to localised demands (i.e. the classroom). It addresses and makes teachers aware of organisational and policy changes along with any associated work tasks. Organisationally-focused CPD can be understood as a product of marketisation and managerialism, that is to say, it is 'institutional development' to meet organisational goals (Trorey and Cullingford 2002, 2), which are externally driven and include target setting related to retention, punctuality and achievement. Accountability underpins organisational CPD purposes and processes, which has created tension between teacher professional values and organisational demands, whereby teachers are responsible for meeting organisational targets. However, these can conflict with teacher values, discretion and selfless service: a desire to do well by the learner – a traditional discourse in FE: a place for educational 'second chances' (Bibby et al. 2015, 1), though there are extenuating factors that impact on student success which are outside of the teacher's control. Organisationally-focused CPD may create

negative reactions in teachers who believe that such development based on organisational objectives minimises the amount of time that they have for their own personal professional development (Fielding et al. 2005; Timperley 2011).

Conversely, CPD that is occupationally-focused relates to subject discipline knowledge and skills, pedagogy and students' learning, based on Evetts' (2011) and Bathmaker and Avis's (2013) conceptualisation of occupational professionalism. Such development is a personalised process that accords the teacher a sense of autonomy and control over their work and this recognises their prior work experience and expertise in their subject specialism. Essentially, teachers need to identify their own developmental priorities or needs as opposed to addressing organisational or inspection priorities that may have little pedagogical (or subject knowledge) value for them (Fielding et al. 2005). Allowing teachers some discretion over their own occupational CPD is premised on the basis that teaching is individual and teachers make pedagogical decisions locally according to context, subject specialism and learning needs. To this end, the classroom provides a 'powerful learning' space (Desimone 2011, 1) for in-the-moment development that is contextualised and localised to students, which is instrumental for the day-to-day uncertainties of teaching and learning. This development can be addressed by observing, talking and listening to students, creating a multi-functioning learning environment: one for students and one for the teacher.

Development processes need to be engaged with voluntarily or sought out purposely by the teacher, but if CPD is imposed, this can work to undermine professional independence and agency. This agency can be exercised by teachers undertaking development on an opportunistic basis, such as meeting with colleagues. This informal pedagogic development is essential for teachers with work demands and limited time, meaning that they seek out CPD as and when needed, again personalising the development activity (Evans 2019). Learning is situated in the workplace through and with colleagues and this learning may comprise a major personalised developmental mechanism for teachers, but on account of its informal and quotidian aspect, such development may not be recognised as CPD by teachers (Evans 2019) nor afforded any value by managers. This informal and implicit CPD is opportunistic, unintended and unstructured, but may be instrumental in supporting teachers carry out their professional role, especially new teachers.

Workplace collaboration provides occasions to share and this can be especially pertinent for new teachers or teachers experiencing challenges in the classroom. Teachers can exchange new ideas and experiment with these followed up by reflection, which is an effective way for teachers to change beliefs and practices. Such collaboration can include teachers of

varying teaching experiences and skills who can solve each other's specific problems, pointing to personalisation in the collaborative process. According to this perspective, a learning community situated within and amongst other teachers can help change practices through reflective and critical discussion informed by teacher experience. This teacher-led transformative development can be differentiated to needs and is crucial for teachers working with diverse students and changing curricula. However, Lloyd and Jones (2018) argue that teachers need time and space to collaborate, which can be a challenge in managerialist college structures.

Research methodology

The research that this article draws on examined teachers' perceptions and experiences of CPD, that is, how teachers develop their practices in terms of meeting diverse student learning needs, enhancing subject specialism knowledge and skills, as well as learning about new teaching and learning methods and resources. To this end, an interpretative paradigm seeks to discover personal perspectives which can provide an understanding of the social world. In this study, that social world is the FE environment, which has at its core people who are interacting and creating social realities, so collecting verbalised experiences of teachers is key, to '... explain and demystify social reality through the eyes of different participants; the participants themselves define the social reality' (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison 2011, 15). The facets of the interpretative research paradigm that underpin this research are its values with respect to recognising that individuals are 'deliberate and creative in their actions' and 'make meanings in and through their activities', and 'events and individuals are unique and largely non-generalizable' (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison 2011, 17), even so it may be possible to consider how findings are indicative of CPD practices across the sector, because there are commonalities across colleges and ITPs. The principles within qualitative research methods applies to this study in that it will collect data that is unique, specific, as well as diverse reflecting the processes at work in the sites researched. People's accounts or views of the processes under research are central, so talking and having them interact are key. They are witnesses to CPD processes as well as direct participants in those processes (Mason 2018).

Qualitative research methods, derived from interpretivist principles, fulfilled the aims of this small-scale study which were to explore a concept for which there is little prior research and theory, allowing for the uncovering of data and extrapolation of findings (Creswell 2014). Listening to people is instrumental in exploring and uncovering the foundations of meanings. In this research, questioning, discussion and dialogue helped to elicit varieties of meanings as well as allowing the

participants time and space to formulate and analyse their concepts (Groenewald 2004). This recognises teacher agency and individuality (Priestley, Biesta, and Robinson 2015). Talking together, therefore, is a process for data to unfold, through interaction, responding and listening. Speech is a significant means of communication and its essential quality is the interaction of ideas and viewpoints, allowing participants opportunities to voice points, listen, respond and ask questions, providing access points for the researcher to clarify and ask questions to explore ideas (Denzin and Lincoln 2000).

Focus groups (Krueger and Casey 2015) as a data collection method, provided space and time to listen, discuss and reflect on CPD. This interpretative data collection tool can elicit several interpretations and perspectives related to CPD, and focus groups provided possibilities to uncover and explore these layers of meaning and interpretation. Undertaking the study involved collecting examples of CPD experiences in order to comprehend the different ways that teachers develop their classroom practices. The aim was to conduct focus groups to enable a continuous momentum of discovery in the form of probing questions, discussion and dialogue. Listening to and analysing teachers' experiences, therefore, was significant in uncovering practices and purposes of development activities to meet aspects of their professional roles. Through collecting data from teachers, cultures, practice and impact of CPD were uncovered, providing insight and understanding into the area. Importantly, access to teachers at two ITPs provided unique data from organisations that operate in the shadow of colleges.

The focus groups allowed individuals to express their opinions in their own words as part of a group. To ensure cooperation, bring focus to the topic of CPD and maximise the generation of data, the focus group participants completed small group activities, which were foundational for the discussions that followed, so the groups were semi-structured. One task was a ranking activity, which involved the teacher participants writing their CPD events on cards and ordering these according to usefulness for their teaching roles. Activities were planned for individuals to share ideas in pairs/threes in preparation for sharing in the whole group, as speaking in small groups provided more occasions for individuals to voice opinions and experiences. In this way, participants in each small group were given time to speak and share, thereby mitigating chances for one person to dominate. Focus groups provided a way to bring several people together in order to amass a sizeable amount of data in a short space of time. The data were collected from 19 teachers in total in 4 focus groups at 4 sites. Participants and research sites cannot be identified and teachers' names are anonymised. Ethical research involves safe working practices, data protection and legal claims protection. The proposal for the data collection method was submitted to the Ethics Review Committee at Birmingham City University and the research upon

Table 1. Teacher participants.

Teacher Participant	Number of years teaching	Teaching qualifications	Subjects taught
College A			
Diane	10 years	Assessor and Verifier Awards DET	Electrical Installation
Alan	17 years	Cert Ed	Electrical Installation
Clive	9 years	DTLLS	Electrical Installation
College B			
Rebecca	4 years	DET	Health and Social Care GCSE English
Rahul	20 years	PGCE (FHE)	Accounting and Business
ITP1			
Jack	2 years	BA Hons, PTLLS	English
Sue	5 years	PTLLS	BTEC Work skills Childcare Sports Customer Services
ITP2			
Alison	7 years	Cert Ed	Personal and Social Development Home cooking Work skills BTEC Vocational Studies GCSE Leisure and Tourism
Debbie	8 years	DTLLS	Functional Skills Maths and English BTEC L3 Equine Studies

which the article is based had institutional ethical approval. [Table 1](#) provides the details of the teacher participants cited in this paper.

Findings and discussion

Organisational objectives and CPD

Though CPD is conceptualised as benefitting teachers and students, according to the participants, organisational objectives dominated CPD content. For instance, occupational professionalism concerns student learning, and relationships are at the basis of student engagement and achievement (Brinkworth et al. 2018), but my data revealed that CPD events listed by the teachers did not focus on teacher-student relationships, so this relational foundation of the learning process was not acknowledged by the CPD offer organised by the colleges and ITPs. The data showed that the CPD offers focused on broad policy such as Safeguarding, Prevent, Equality and Diversity and British Values – not teaching and learning – as well as administrative related skills (software training) which do not lead to improvement in classroom practices, but instead informs teachers of and prepares them for external policy and organisational demands: a facet of organisational professionalism (Evetts 2011). However, such one-off CPD events on policy are not contextualised to immediate classroom practice and

student needs and is most likely forgotten by teachers soon after the event (Timperley 2011). One-off events are not conducive to embedding or advancing learning because they transmit information (Kennedy 2014a and b), but the idea that Jack proposes below – akin to Kennedy’s (2014a and b) collaborative professional enquiry – did not take place at ITP1.

One thing about the CPD, CPD is implemented, it’s never reflected . . . they should have a session [in a] month’s, two months’ time to sit and reflect on it and get together and say is this working . . . I always feel it dies down a little bit and you never get time to reflect on it and something new is chucked on the table. (Jack, ITP1)

One-off development described above is knowledge transmission and does not provide an iterative and processual aspect to learning and development, nor is it respectful of teacher agency or pedagogically sound in terms of active learning, revision and reflection over time which are key to teacher growth (Clarke and Hollingsworth 2002). It is not CPD for teacher improvement but focused on teachers’ continual flexibility and responsiveness to college and provider demands. This means such CPD activities described by Jack above failed to meet his development needs because the content is controlled by the deliverer-expert and is standardised to one-size fits all, which does not align to the actualities of the teacher’s classroom (Kennedy 2014a). There was no formal space and time to contextualise or localise the content to the teacher’s classroom. This suggests that if teachers do not have a critical space to question these external forces, teachers cannot fully engage with policies that impact on FE and this creates a professionalism that is compliant to government and organisational policy.

Developing subject specialisms and pedagogy

The narrative for work skills training that makes FE a tool for economic growth, has positioned FE as a sector to train people for the workforce to strengthen the country’s productivity, but this necessitates investing in CPD for vocational subject specialisms. Currently, there is no mandated CPD requirement for maintaining and developing trades and vocational skills, illustrating a disconnect between policy and vocational CPD practices, so the vocational teachers at College A organised subject specialism CPD themselves.

But we’ve done that [subject specialism CPD] within ourselves. I’m looking at what CPD the college has put in place for us. The relevance of CPD, conference days – nothing is relevant to our curriculum area . . . We’ve done our own CPD. We don’t get enough that’s directly effective to us, our area or our curriculum and I think that if you spoke to any of the construction guys, they would say the same thing. (Diane, College A)

Furthermore, Diane, an Electrical Installation teacher explained that some teachers, who were not working in their trade, had obsolete knowledge and skills suggesting that teachers who are not up-to-date are not teaching up-to-date trade skills.

How can you standardise something when we try to talk to people [teachers] who haven't been on the tools for 30 years. . .when you've got people who have been here for that long that they haven't been out there, they don't know what the standards are?
(Diane, College A)

In the light of a government focus on work skills training, out-of-date trade skills potentially have repercussions for the industry and the workforce in general, in terms of the currency of vocational and trades knowledge and skills students are taught. The introduction of T level and apprenticeship courses means that trades and vocational teachers need to be continuously up-to-date particularly for apprenticeship courses where apprentices work in the field, which points to an ongoing development need to meet the demands of work-related courses. This shows the value of current experience, reinforcing the importance of the relationship between FE providers and workplaces for professional-to-professional sharing, collaboration and critical dialogue focused on a vocation or trade. The 'dual professional' identity situates CPD as having two distinct teaching-focused purposes: development of subject specialism and development of pedagogy for that specialism (ETF 2022), but the sector has not generated formal structures for dual development. However, occupationally-focused development is essential to ensure currency of teachers' skills and knowledge in the classroom.

The data revealed a clear imbalance in the types of CPD on offer and being accessed, so much so that the CPD offers in my study have distorted the meaning of CPD – as development for teachers' occupational role – by becoming the dominant type of formal development that teachers undertook. This means that the CPD offered was not adequate for the full professional role. College and provider-organised CPD was externally driven to meet organisational goals and organisational training largely consisted of the transmission of information rather than the development of practice. Organisational training events tend to be based on an all-encompassing approach which fails to recognise and incorporate the complex needs of individuals (teachers and students). My research found that teachers in the sector undertook a number of their own occupational development activities along with formal organisational training events, pointing to an expanded organisational and occupational professional role with increased priorities that teachers were accountable for, such as retention and achievement. CPD processes and purposes, therefore, have expanded and been reshaped to incorporate non-teaching duties (i.e. policy and administrative related) as well as teaching and pedagogy related duties, which are further explored in the next section.

Teachers as continuous learners

The data showed that in ITP1 cross-subject communities were created informally within formal CPD events, which led to learning from colleagues. This allowed knowledge and skills development along with gaining knowledge of how other departments operate. This permits cross comparison of systems, as well as understanding that other teachers have different approaches to their similar roles.

I was just about to say, the words I was thinking about earlier was, sharing best practice and when you're on CPD you all get together with different people working on different areas, like one can be an English tutor and one can be BTEC but you're all sharing ideas of different ways of delivering things. So, sharing best practice it all helps. (Sue, ITP1)

Teachers new to the sector are in the process of developing multiple skills for the divided professional role (student engagement, assessment, lesson planning for the teaching/occupational role, data management and enacting policy for the organisational role), so talking to experienced teachers can be formative and reassuring. There is a practical and contextualised aspect to teachers sharing resources and ideas and this can create a micro-culture of occupational development between colleagues: a micro culture that can arise naturally among teachers who have a space to interact. The data also disclosed that teachers with experience know what works in the classroom and can share this knowledge with new teachers who thereby learn how to perform the professional role, leading to transformative development. Importantly, this demonstrates teacher agency (Priestley, Biesta, and Robinson 2015), enhanced through relational agency (Edwards 2006), as seen below.

I think the trouble is as teachers we tend to go for a bit of one size fits all, don't we, and it's only when you hear what other people have tried, particularly with challenging students or reluctant students, that you think well, if they've tried that and it's been successful I'm going to try it ... I've got 3 sports lads on a Thursday morning and they're an absolute nightmare for me, really difficult. It was only after I had lots of conversations with L and K [teaching colleagues], what do you do with them in sport? What can I do to stop this behaviour? ... so I completely changed my approach and I stopped trying to be [authoritative], ... and one of them, not all of them, is a complete angel for me now, works hard, and that has been really valuable. (Rebecca, College B)

Such opportunities are a supportive part of development and may represent a key asset of transformative development for occupational professionalism, but teachers and college leaders may not consider it as development (Evans 2019), so it remains hidden or unrecognised, though valuable all the same. This informal or incidental learning (Evans 2019) can meet the demands of working in varying and diverse classroom

environments, so opportunities to meet and talk are valuable. This leads to personalisation of development through the process of professional-to-professional support and sharing of pedagogical experience. Such solution-focused collegial support, namely seeking support from colleagues that is contextualised to the classroom, is essential for individualised teaching and learning needs and this is a personalised and pragmatic dimension to teachers' development.

I think we've got a lot of experience here, if you think about what we've got in college, you've got years of experience, teaching experience and we don't tap into that. (Rahul, College B)

This means that formal CPD in College B was poorer for not exploiting local knowledge from the teachers, but doing this would transform generalist whole-college CPD from a one-way transfer of information into a dialogic process guided by teachers' experiences. In the past, teachers at College B participated in a formal sharing of ideas meaning that local expertise was utilised benefitting others.

What we did was we used the last ten minutes, [to] say, can you think of anything that's worked well in the group and it was something we were told to do and every week somebody would say something different, that would work really well . . . every week they were saying something different that was working really well. (Rahul, College B)

This was professional sharing not linked to problem solving (reactive development) but linked to what works well for the teachers (proactive development). Teachers share examples of what worked well, so professional enquiry from a basis of success rather than failure, which can be inspiring leading to transformative development. Priestley et al's research (2015) explores teacher agency as operationalised through the environment or working conditions and my data showed that teachers within organisational cultures can create their own developmental practices. This means that the teachers can create an occupational development culture despite the dominance of college objectives. This is a local or micro culture of development.

Outside of formal institutional structures, in their own time and space or at the end of a formal organisational training event, teachers addressed occupational development for their contexts and needs either independently or collaboratively without college or provider intervention. A finding from the data is that occupational development led by teachers in developmental spaces they controlled was necessary to enable them to fulfil their full roles. An overarching point from this study is that teachers need to control their own development, which calls for a negotiation between college/ITP leaders and teachers to implement this. This must be development for the

occupational role guided by novice and experienced teachers. Such development can be independent or collaborative, whichever is suitable for the teacher, but allocated time is needed for this, so locally controlled teacher-led developmental activities should be at the heart of occupational development.

CPD reconceptualised for the demands of the divided professional role

The sense that CPD is a continuous process that must be valued and encouraged (Earley and Bubb 2004) is in tension with FE structures, as the comments from the teachers depict time-pressured professional roles. The data uncovered that teachers are continuous learners, but workload and time pressures intervene and this workload comprised responsibilities beyond teaching. Alison and Debbie, who taught students with diverse and complex learning needs, disclosed an acceptance of and responsibility towards safeguarding duties: ‘everyone’s responsibility, isn’t it, safeguarding’ (Alison, ITP2). This responsibility was reinforced by organisational training focused on bureaucratic procedures, which Alison described as ‘invaluable, affects everything we do every day’, because, ‘we’ve got to have the right paperwork ... or they don’t get the support they need’ (Debbie, ITP2). This was echoed in College A in terms of duties linked to the pastoral care of students.

It’s pastoral care for me it’s not direct teaching, dealing with the students, it’s dealing with everything around them, because unless you tick the box, do this, do that behind the scenes. The classroom work for me is 40% of the job (Rebecca: I agree with you). (Alan, College A)

If you have got time, [you spend time] chasing up why haven’t they attended. I find you do more pastoral care than I do actually prepping for work. (Clive, College A Vocational)

Tracking attendance in order to monitor retention and achievement, as well as pastoral duties, are part of the intensification of the organisationally-focused workload and this can also include student welfare, administration and enrolment (Illsley and Waller 2017; Jephcote and Salisbury 2009) and these administrative and pastoral duties can marginalise teaching as Alan and Clive comment above. Time pressures limit purposeful professional development because occupationally-focused development opportunities may be displaced by tasks driven by tasks for organisational objectives. Demands on time also mean that teachers do not have the cognitive space, that is, unburdened reflective space to assess their practice or their developmental needs because of the demands of the organisational role.

Teachers spoke about time deficiency as though time itself is the problem but lack of time points to an intensified and broader role that

makes time a scarce commodity in the workplace, where time is circumscribed by the pressures of solvency, meaning that FE colleges operate as businesses focused on income generation (Panchamia 2012). Intensified teaching timetables do not accommodate time away from teaching for CPD because within a business model any time spent not teaching is not financially productive. This has created a situation in FE in which income generation disregards professional values and discretion, as teaching for income become paramount concerns in colleges, such as passing exams to secure funding (Illsley and Waller 2017; Lobb 2017). Teachers respond to problematic situations and react creatively on an ongoing basis as part of their occupational role, but organisations or colleges operate according to inflexible systems and processes, such as the academic calendar, exam times and timetables. These rigid working environments may restrict teachers' sense of control over their development. College-managed CPD follows rigid college calendars (end/beginning of term for example), which may not meet teachers' ongoing day-to-day needs and purposes.

The findings from College A illustrate that CPD was a tool for training teachers to carry out the performance managed or organisational part of their role: organisational training. This is further seen in the data that highlight that teachers attended CPD for data management training in order to be able to use data collection software that records attendance, retention, punctuality, targets and achievement. However, this college data collection is a result of central funding mechanisms that colleges and ITPs operate within. The CPD offers seen in my data have been expanded and reconfigured to address different purposes that incorporate non-teaching duties (i.e. policy and admin related) as well as teaching related, demonstrating organisational and occupational dualism in the professional role in the sector. There is a paradox here in terms of how CPD is theorised as individualised development that support teaching and learning - occupational development – set at odds with organisational training that reinforced and perpetuated the demands of the marketised professional role. College/ITP-organised training, as currently configured in my research serves organisational and central goals for the organisational role and not the occupational one.

Redefining CPD: organisational training and occupational development

Teachers in FE face challenges coping with an increased role that is divided between teaching and non-teaching duties. The current FE structure compels ITPs and colleges to focus on externally-driven objectives, prioritising the organisational role; however, teachers redress the balance (in their own time and spaces) as and when needed by focusing on internally-driven ones.

Table 2. Components of the organisational and occupational roles.

Components of the organisational role	Components of the occupational role
-Non-teaching, administrative and data management	-Subject specialism expertise
-Customer and service provider relationship	-Pedagogy and pedagogical content knowledge
-Control of work practices through performance management and managerialism	-Teacher-student relationship as a basis for learning
-Regulation, inspection and grading	-Discretion and judgment in the classroom and planning
-Externally driven demands	-Teacher as local/internal expert
-Focus on the college or provider	-Focus on the teacher and students

My findings indicated that the boundaries of CPD have expanded to include training and development for both the organisational and occupational roles.

My research has evolved the conceptualisations of professionalism from Evetts (2011) along with Bathmaker and Avis (2013) through combining their concepts with CPD experienced by the teachers in the focus groups. Essentially, one of the themes to emerge from the data is that the role is divided between organisational priorities driven by central demands related to performance management, funding and accountability, alongside occupational needs determined by internal demands related to subject specialisms, pedagogy and the teacher-student relationship. CPD, positioned as developmental, learning or growth for teacher and student benefit (Coffield 2014; Day and Sachs 2004; Earley and Bubb 2004) has become regulated and commanded for organisational goals (achievement, funding, targets, policy). The data provided evidence that this divided role was validated, embedded and underpinned by the two types of CPD that addressed the demands of this divided professional role – organisational and occupational.

Table 2 below summarises the dualism of the organisational and occupational roles based on my data and on concepts of professionalism (Bathmaker and Avis 2013; Evetts 2011). Having a divided role means that ongoing occupational development and organisational training are needed to support teachers in the wider multifaceted professional role. From this point of view, the professional role fulfils two different principles: humanistic, driven by teachers' personal values and mechanistic, driven by performance management regimes. The current FE structure drives ITPs and colleges to prioritise externally-driven objectives, but teachers redress this as and when needed by focusing on internally-driven ones.

My data has led to a conceptualisation of dualism in the purposes of CPD: organisational training and occupational development. Table 3 below outlines the differentiated purposes of these two types of CPD that support teachers in fulfilling the full professional role.

Table 3. The organisational and occupational purposes of teacher development.

Organisational training	Occupational development
Spaces/timetable controlled by organisation	Spaces/time controlled by teachers
Generalised content (planned for whole-college)	Teacher-decided, contextualised content
De-personalised	Personalised
Takes place at set times of the year	Spontaneous
Transmissive	Transformative
Focuses on policy churn driven by government intervention and regulation	Individual or collaborative, addresses gaps in skills
Part of performance management	Focuses on actuality of classroom teaching not political and managerial agendas
Restricts teacher agency	Recognises teacher agency
De-professionalising	Practical and useful
Mechanistic and technicist	Guided by values, discretion and individual expertise
One-off events or topics	Subject disciplines, pedagogical content knowledge
	Ongoing with periodic reviews

Conclusion

The findings regarding the CPD that teachers completed revealed two parts to the role – organisational and occupational. The data have led therefore to a dual conceptualisation of CPD – organisational training and occupational development – that is needed to fully support the expanded role of the FE teacher. This binary classification provides a practical, straightforward, convenient way to evaluate and explore the purposes and intended outcomes of CPD offers, thus providing awareness and understanding of how CPD systems support teachers' needs and college objectives. Any analysis of CPD offers using this classification can at once show the balance or imbalance between the two types of development. This classification can accord teachers insight and control over their CPD in terms of seeing how any CPD offer at their organisation supports the dual dimension to their roles. With this knowledge they can monitor the provision of official time and spaces for occupational development, so that organisational training does not dominate.

College and ITP leaders and managers need to recognise and understand the dual purposes of CPD, and incorporate these two types of CPD in teachers' contracts and timetables. Crucially, leaders in colleges and ITPs need to create a protected space for occupational development in the timetable. This presents a challenge to colleges and ITPs, but one that is well-worth addressing. For a provider to recognise that there are two types of CPD would be the beginning of change pointing to leadership awareness of the actual needs of teachers in the sector. That is, to recognise that CPD has two purposes serving the requirements of the organisational and the occupational professional roles. Importantly, organisational training must not be allowed to dominate. Essentially, time and space need to be equitably allotted to both organisational training and occupational development. Both are ongoing processes that recognise fluctuations in the full professional role related to policy, college

structures, curriculum and assessment, developments in industry and differences in the changing needs of learners. These suggestions need to be underpinned by FE educational policy in terms of funding and guidance to ensure an appropriate balance of these two types of development in colleges and ITPs. Finally, the term ‘CPD’ that colleges and ITPs continue to use is unspecific and unhelpful. However, this research and the emergent classification have the potential to empower teachers and providers to identify and focus on meaningful development to support the full professional role of teachers in the sector.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

The author(s) reported there is no funding associated with the work featured in this article.

ORCID

Lorna Loy  <http://orcid.org/0009-0000-2528-5848>

References

- AELP (Association of Employment and Learning Providers). 2021. *Key Facts About Independent Training Providers*. Bristol: AELP.
- Appova, A., and F. Arbaugh. 2018. “Teachers’ Motivation to Learn: Implications for Supporting Professional Growth.” *Professional Development in Education* 44 (1): 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2017.1280524>.
- Bathmaker, A.-M., and J. Avis. 2013. “Inbound, Outbound or Peripheral: The Impact of Discourses of ‘Organisational’ Professionalism on Becoming a Teacher in English Further Education.” *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 34 (1): 731–748. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2013.728367>.
- Bibby, D., A. Cerqua, M. Gould, D. Thomson, and P. Urwin. 2015. *Further Education: Social Mobility, Skills and Second Chances*. London: University of Westminster.
- BIS (Department for Business, Innovation & Skills). 2016. BIS Research Paper Number 296, *Understanding the Further Education Market in England*. London: Dept of Business, Innovation and Skills.
- BIS (Department for Business, Innovation & Skills) and DfE (Department for Education). 2016. *Post-16 Skills Plan*. London: BIS and DfE.
- Brinkworth, M. E., J. McIntyre, A. D. Juraschek, and H. Gehlbach. 2018. “Teacher-Student Relationships: The Positives and Negatives of Assessing Both Perspectives.” *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 55 (Mar–Apr 2018): 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2017.09.002>.

- Clarke, D., and H. Hollingsworth. 2002. "Elaborating a Model of Teacher Professional Growth." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 18 (8): 947–967. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(02\)00053-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00053-7).
- Coffield, F., ed. 2014. *Beyond Bulimic Learning*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Cohen, L., L. Manion, and K. Morrison. 2011. *Research Methods in Education*. 7th ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Collin, K., B. Van der Heijden, and P. Lewis. 2012. "Continuing Professional Development." *International Journal of Training and Development* 16 (3): 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2419.2012.00410.x>.
- Creswell, J. W. 2014. *Research Design*. 4th ed. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Dadds, M. 2014. "Continuing Professional Development: Nurturing the Expert within." *Professional Development in Education* 40 (1): 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2013.871107>.
- Day, C., and J. Sachs. 2004. *International Handbook on CPD of Teachers*. OUP: Maidenhead.
- Denzin, N. K., and Y. S. Lincoln, eds. 2000. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Desimone, L. M. 2011. "A Primer on Effective Professional Development." *Phi Delta Kappan* 92 (6): 68+.
- DfE (Department for Education). 2021. *Skills for Jobs: Lifelong Learning for Opportunity and Growth*. London: DfE.
- DfE (Department for Education) and BIS (Department for Business, Innovation & Skills). 2013. *Rigour and Responsiveness in Skills*. London: DfE and BIS.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills). 2002. *Success for All: Reforming Further Education and Training Our Vision for the Future*. London: Department for Education and Skills.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills). 2004. *Equipping Our Teachers for the Future: Reforming Initial Teacher Training for the Learning and Skills Sector*. London: DfES.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills). 2006. *Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances*. London: DfES.
- DIUS (Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills). 2007. *The Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) Regulations 2007 No. 2116*. London: DIUS.
- DIUS (Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills). 2012. *The Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) (Revocation) Regulations 2012*. London: The Stationery Office Ltd.
- Earley, P., and S. Bubb. 2004. *Leading and Managing Continuing Professional Development*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Edwards, A. 2006. "Relational Agency: Learning to Be a Resourceful Practitioner." *International Journal of Educational Research* 43 (3): 168–182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2006.06.010>.
- ETF (Education and Training Foundation). 2022. *Professional Standards for Teachers and Trainers*. London: ETF.
- Evans, L. 2019. "Implicit and Informal Professional Development: What it 'Looks like', How it Occurs, and Why We Need to Research it." *Professional Development in Education* 45 (1): 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2018.1441172>.
- Evetts, J. 2011. "A New Professionalism? Challenges and Opportunities." *Current Sociology* 59 (4): 406–422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392111402585>.

- Fielding, M., S. Bragg, J. Craig, I. Cunningham, M. Eraut, S. Gillinson, M. Horne, C. Robinson, and J. Thorp. 2005. *Factors Influencing the Transfer of Good Practice*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Fraser, C., A. Kennedy, L. Reid, and S. McKinney. 2007. "Teachers' Continuing Professional Development: Contested Concepts, Understandings and Models." *Journal of In-Service Education* 33 (2): 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580701292913>.
- Groenewald, T. 2004. "A Phenomenological Research Design Illustrated." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 3 (1): 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690400300104>.
- Halfon, R., and House of Commons Education Committee. 2019. *A Ten-Year Plan for School and College Funding, 2017–19*. London: The House of Commons.
- Husband, G. 2018. "The Professional Learning of Further Education Lecturers: Effects of Initial Lecturer Education Programmes on Continuing Professional Learning in Scotland and Wales." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 23 (2): 159–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2018.1444384>.
- Illsley, R., and R. Waller. 2017. "Further Education, Future Prosperity? The Implications of Marketisation on Further Education Working Practices." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 22 (4): 477–494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2017.1381291>.
- Jephcote, M., and J. Salisbury. 2009. "Further Education teachers' Accounts of Their Professional Identities." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 25 (7): 966–972. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.010>.
- Kennedy, A. 2014a. "Models of Continuing Professional Development: A Framework for Analysis." *Professional Development in Education* 40 (3): 336–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2014.929293>.
- Kennedy, A. 2014b. "Understanding Continuing Professional Development: The Need for Theory to Impact on Policy and Practice." *Professional Development in Education* 4 (5): 688–697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2014.955122>.
- Krueger, R. A., and M. A. Casey. 2015. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. 5th ed. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Leaton Gray, S. L. 2005. *An Enquiry into Continuing Professional Development for Teachers*. London: Esmée Fairbairn Foundation.
- Lingfield, R., D. Sherlock, D. Ward, and D. Wright. 2012. *Professionalism in Further Education, Final Report of the Independent Review Panel*. London: DBIS.
- Lloyd, C., and S. Jones. 2018. "Researching the Sector from Within: The Experience of Establishing a Research Group within an FE College." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 23 (1): 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2018.1420731>.
- Lobb, R. 2017. "When FE Lecturers Go the Extra Mile: The Rhetoric and the Reality." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 22 (2): 186–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2017.1314679>.
- LSIS (Learning and Skills Improvement Service). 2013. *Teaching and Training Qualifications for the Further Education and Skills Sector in England*. Coventry: Learning and Skills Improvement Service.
- Mason, J. 2018. *Qualitative Researching*. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Panchamia, N. 2012. *Choice and Competition in Further Education*. London: Institute for Government.
- Porritt, V. 2014. "Evaluating the Impact of Professional learning." In *Challenging Professional Learning*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Priestley, M., G. Biesta, and S. Robinson. 2015. *Teacher Agency*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

- Solvason, C., and G. Elliott. 2013. "Why Is Research *Still* Invisible in Further Education?" *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education* 6 (2013): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.v0i6.206>.
- Timperley, H. S. 2011. *Realizing the Power of Professional Learning*. Berkshire: OUP.
- Trorey, G., and C. Cullingford. 2002. *Professional Development and Institutional Needs*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.