

Research Report
No 802

*Education Outside the Classroom:
Research to Identify What Training
is Offered by Initial Teacher
Training Institutions*

*Sally Kendall, Jenny Murfield
Justin Dillon and Anne Wilkin*

National Foundation for Educational Research

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

© NFER Trading Ltd 2006
ISBN 978 1 84478 834 7

Contents

Executive summary	i
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Aims of the study	5
1.3 Methods	5
1.4 The report	7
2 Overview of respondents	9
2.1 Subjects directed by secondary respondents	9
2.2 Courses taken by trainees	12
2.3 Geographical location	13
3 Provision of Education Outside the Classroom (EOtC) activities	14
3.1 The extent to which EOtC is addressed in Initial Teacher Training (ITT) courses	14
3.2 The extent to which students are required to have practical experience of EOtC	17
4 Delivery and coordination of EOtC activities	20
4.1 Objectives of EOtC training	21
4.2 The delivery of EOtC training	25
4.3 The coordination of EOtC training	31
4.4 Areas covered in EOtC training	32
4.5 External providers delivering EOtC training	38
5 Timing and quality of EOtC activities	43
5.1 Minimum expectation of EOtC training on courses	43
5.2 EOtC activities	46
5.3 EOtC areas	52
5.4 Quality of EOtC experiences	58
6 Challenges and facilitators	62
6.1 Factors that have helped or hindered the provision of EOtC training	62
6.2 Changes in the extent of EOtC training in ITT	66
7 Future developments	68

8	Conclusions	71
	References	75
	Appendices	76

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the directors of ITT courses and programmes who gave up their time to complete the questionnaire survey for this research. We are particularly grateful to those individuals who supplied examples of EOtC activities and provision.

Our thanks also go to members of the Steering Group for their invaluable advice and support throughout the study.

Finally, we are grateful to colleagues at NFER, in particular staff in the Statistics Research and Analysis Group (SRAG), from Research Data Services (our specialist survey administration service), and project support staff based at NFER's Northern Office.

Executive summary

Introduction

- The research was commissioned by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), Natural England¹, and Farming and Countryside Education (FACE) to provide information on the extent and nature of training in education outside the classroom (EOtC) in initial teacher training (ITT) institutions, across curriculum subjects and across different types of teacher training courses. The research was carried out by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) in collaboration with the Centre for Informal Learning and Schools, King's College London.
- Education outside the classroom can be defined, in its broadest sense, as any structured learning experience that takes place beyond the classroom environment during the school day, after school or during the holidays. It can include, amongst other activities, cultural trips, science and geography fieldwork, environmental and countryside education, outdoor and adventurous group activities, learning through outdoor play, and visits to museums and heritage sites.

Key findings

- The results from the survey suggested that there was substantial variation in the amount of EOtC training across courses and across institutions. The quality of provision during school placements was rated as variable by around a third of respondents.
- The findings from the survey indicated that EOtC was explicitly addressed in nearly 90 per cent of primary and secondary ITT courses.
- At the secondary level, all directors of geography, art and design, physical education (PE), music, citizenship, drama, leisure and tourism, and classics courses indicated that EOtC was addressed within their programmes. EOtC was also addressed in the majority of courses provided by science and history directors. It was less likely to be addressed on mathematics and English courses.
- The majority of respondents indicated that there was an expectation that trainees had some practical experience of EOtC on their course, either as a course requirement or a preferred option.
- Schools played a major role in training for EOtC, particularly at the secondary level. Over four-fifths of secondary respondents reported that student teachers received training in EOtC when they were on school placements.

¹ The work began through the Countryside Agency, which has since become part of Natural England.

-
- Overall, just under half of all respondents reported that there was no minimum entitlement for EOtC training on their courses. Where there was a minimum expectation, this was typically for short periods of time.
 - There were several gaps in subject directors' knowledge, particularly around factors such as the amount of time spent on activities, where responsibility lay for coordinating EOtC activities, and on what happened on school placements.
 - When respondents were asked to indicate changes in the provision of EOtC training over the last five years, over two-fifths felt that it had increased, a similar number felt there had been no change, and just over a tenth said there had been a decrease.
 - The main changes/actions that respondents thought would help to encourage their ITT institution to offer more EOtC activities to trainees on their courses were: increased funding and time; greater clarification of, and emphasis on, the Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) standards (in relation to EOtC); a change in schools' expectations and standards; course modification and the provision of additional EOtC related-materials and information.
 - Overall, three key issues emerged from the study: the variation between institutions in the provision of EOtC training; the possibility that some students may be inadequately prepared for EOtC; and the lack of quality assurance resulting from course and programme directors' lack of knowledge of what happens on school placements.

Methodology

- In June 2006, questionnaires were sent to primary programme directors and secondary course/subject directors in all of the 75 higher education institutions (HEIs) providing ITT in England. A total of 312 questionnaires (281 from secondary and 31 from primary) were received from 70 HEIs. This represented an overall response rate of 47 per cent.

Other findings

Provision of EOtC activities

- At the secondary level, directors of PE, history and geography courses most frequently indicated that trainees had to have practical experience of EOtC. Directors of modern foreign language courses were least likely to say that practical experience of EOtC was a requirement of their course.

Delivery and coordination of EOtC activities

- The main objectives of the EOtC training provided on primary and secondary courses focused on ‘preparing and enabling trainees to run EOtC activities’ and ‘enabling trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC’. Respondents were least likely to focus on gauging the quality; or measuring the impact of EOtC experiences, or enabling trainees to experience how pupils behaved in different environments.
- In addition to school-based training, most secondary respondents reported that EOtC training was delivered through stand alone compulsory units or during off-site days/residential experiences. Most primary respondents reported that EOtC training was interwoven across subject areas.
- EOtC training was generally coordinated by individual course or subject directors rather than by the overall director of ITT. A small but significant number of primary and secondary respondents indicated that EOtC training was not coordinated at all on their programme.
- Fieldwork was the most common EOtC-related training provided on both primary and secondary courses. All primary undergraduate programme directors indicated that fieldwork-related training was provided on their courses. At the secondary level, analysis by subject area showed that the EOtC training focus was closely related to the subject directed. For example, the majority of geography and science directors indicated that training on fieldwork and the natural environment was included and all English course directors indicated that EOtC training linked to creativity and the arts was included on their course.
- A wide range of external providers were involved in EOtC training, including museums, galleries, field study centres and outdoor education centres.

Timing and quality of EOtC activities

- Approximately one in ten respondents reported that students received no training in EOtC-related activities during their school placement, whilst a slightly higher proportion reported that they did not know if any training was provided on school placement.
- Where there was a minimum expectation for EOtC training on ITT courses, this requirement was more likely to relate to students acquiring theory and understanding of EOtC rather than practical experience of EOtC.
- The two main EOtC training activities most frequently and consistently identified by all respondents were ‘off-site day visits’ and ‘school site activities’, whilst fieldwork and the natural environment were the EOtC

areas most commonly cited as having time dedicated to training. The average length of time spent on training in these activities and areas was relatively short.

- The EOtC areas least likely to have time dedicated to training were: food and farming; active citizenship; places of worship; and overseas visits and exchanges.
- Overall, most respondents felt that the quality of EOtC experiences when trainees were on school placement was too variable to comment on. Most of those respondents who did provide a quality rating gave a positive response. However, one in 20 secondary course/subject directors considered the quality of EOtC experiences when on school placement to be poor.

Challenges and facilitators

- The three main factors that respondents felt had helped the provision of EOtC training within their institution over the last five years were: the 'availability of suitable EOtC sites, opportunities and activities'; an 'awareness of the outcomes of EOtC'; and 'school-based demand'.
- The three main factors that respondents felt had hindered the provision of EOtC training within their institution over the last five years were: 'funding for EOtC training'; 'curriculum changes/pressures'; and 'the demands/expectations of the ITT course'.
- In terms of changes in the provision of EOtC training over the last five years, the majority of secondary respondents indicated that they thought that there had been no change, whereas the majority of primary respondents indicated that they considered there to have been an increase. Roughly equal proportions of both primary and secondary respondents (around one in ten) considered that EOtC training had decreased during this five-year period.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The research was commissioned by the DfES, Natural England², and FACE to provide information on the extent and nature of training in education outside the classroom in ITT institutions, across curriculum subjects and across different types of teacher training courses. The research was carried out in 2006 by the NFER in collaboration with the Centre for Informal Learning and Schools at King's College London.

A questionnaire, sent to every Higher Education Institution (HEI) providing ITT for primary and secondary teachers, sought to identify the proportion of ITT providers addressing EOtC explicitly in their courses (both in the institution and in schools); the curriculum subjects in which students were trained; the objectives of the training; and the requirement for trainee teachers to have practical experience of education outside the classroom.

The purpose of the research was to identify existing provision as well as the need for, and direction of, additional training requirements and opportunities regarding the role and place of training relating to education outside the classroom within ITT provision, and thus inform the development of the Learning Outside the Classroom Manifesto.

1.1.1 Defining education outside the classroom

EOtC can be defined, in its broadest sense, as any structured learning experience that takes place beyond the classroom environment during the school day, after school or during the holidays (DfES, 2005). It can include, amongst other activities, cultural trips, science and geography fieldwork, environmental and countryside education, adventurous group activities, learning through outdoor play and visits to museums and heritage sites (Select Committee, 2005).

1.1.2 The value of education outside the classroom

EOtC is becoming widely recognised as a means of encouraging a number of desirable educational outcomes and assuring the realisation of current policy agendas. Ofsted suggested that '*outdoor education gives depth to curriculum and contributes to students' physical, personal and social education*' (Ofsted, 2004). Furthermore, two recent reports from the NFER, King's College London and the University of Bath also point to a number of potential benefits as a result of outdoor learning and experiences. In one of these, *Engaging and Learning with the Outdoors*, Dillon *et al.* (2005) concluded that, as well as

² The work began through the Countryside Agency, which has since become part of Natural England.

cognitive developments and curriculum-related outcomes, personal and social developments could also be observed in pupils involved in EOtC, confirming the potential impacts listed by Rickinson *et al.* in 2004. This research identified specific benefits, including individual growth and improvements in social skills, impacts on attitudes, beliefs and self-perceptions, and, to a lesser extent, the development of general and specific academic skills. Improvements in engagement and achievement were observed, alongside the promotion of positive behaviour (Rickinson *et al.*, 2004). Considering these outcomes, EOtC potentially provides a significant contribution to recent agendas such as Every Child Matters, personalisation and the extended schools remit.

1.1.3 Concerns about pupil access to EOtC

Despite increasing awareness of the positive impacts, there is some evidence to suggest that opportunities for EOtC have declined in recent years (Harris, 1999; Barker *et al.*, 2002; Rickinson *et al.*, 2004). The decline has been attributed to teachers' concern about health and safety issues, their lack of confidence in teaching outdoors, and school and university curriculum requirements limiting opportunities for outdoor learning (Rickinson *et al.*, 2004). Barriers to curriculum integration have also included an increased perception that a high degree of risk is attached to EOtC, exacerbated by issues of bureaucracy, funding, timing and resources (Select Committee, 2004). Finally, competing curriculum pressures limiting follow-up work and a lack of connection to wider learning is reported to limit the effectiveness of current provision (Dillon *et al.*, 2005). As such, Rickinson *et al.* (2004) urged policy makers to:

Consider their role in tackling barriers that stand in the way of effective outdoor education for all students, encouraging good programmes and practices and supporting research, development and training so that good practice can be understood, disseminated and fostered.

In January 2005, convinced of the value of EOtC, the Education and Skills Select Committee set out its importance to children and young people and recommended that a coherent strategy for EOtC was required to bring together good practice from around the country (Select Committee, 2005). To this end, the Government proposed a '*Manifesto for Education Outside the Classroom*'³ in February 2005. Its intention is to instigate a movement towards providing all children with a range of high quality experiences outside the classroom, and to support schools so they have easily accessible advice, guidance and resources, thus enabling them to manage visits safely and confidently. Examples of work already underway include the 'Growing Schools' programme which provides support, resources and information to teachers in

³ Now called '*Manifesto for Learning Outside the Classroom*'

using education outside the classroom as a cross-curricular resource for pupils of all ages. The Growing Schools website, (see <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/growingschools>) includes information on funding sources, health and safety issues, training, research materials and places to visit, as well as examples of relevant case studies.

1.1.4 Initial teacher training and EOtC

The Education and Skills Select Committee report acknowledged that in order to realise its full potential: *‘outdoor education must be carried out properly, with sessions being prepared by well-trained teachers and in accordance with good curriculum guidance’* (Select Committee, 2005). Its evidence underlined the importance of teacher training (including both continuing professional development (CPD) and ITT) to the provision of high quality education outside the classroom, and the report urged the DfES to review the place of EOtC within ITT programmes. Teaching unions, such as the National Union of Teachers (NUT), were in agreement and strongly recommended that teachers received training for running and planning any outdoor education activity.

The Select Committee report also noted that, despite its importance, many teachers are not specifically trained in EOtC. For example, the English Outdoor Council stressed the current inadequacy of ITT in failing to give trainee teachers the confidence required to take pupils out of the classroom:

Standards for QTS require trainees to be able to plan out of school experiences but, in the context that so much needs to be crammed in to so little time, we are not convinced that this is in practice being delivered consistently and effectively.

House of Commons Education and Skills Select Committee, 2004

The report recognised the diverse range of subjects currently incorporated into ITT programmes, and the significant time constraints under which they operated. However, the Select Committee viewed the exploitation of the value of EOtC in ITT as fundamental to encouraging trainee teachers to prioritise outdoor learning. Given its importance, the Education Select Committee expressed concern over the limited time devoted to EOtC in current ITT provision.

1.1.5 The provision of initial teacher training in England

A variety of routes into teaching exist at both graduate and postgraduate levels. At the graduate level there are Bachelor of Education (BEd) courses and Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Science (BSc) with QTS. At postgraduate level there are Postgraduate Certificate of Education courses (PGCE) in many

subjects. Other routes into teaching include the Graduate Teacher Programme, the Registered Teacher Programme, the Overseas Trained Teacher Programme, School-Centred Initial Teacher Training and the Teach First programme. School-based routes to QTS are not covered in this report.

Postgraduate teacher training normally takes one year, full-time; undergraduate teacher training generally takes three or four years full-time, or four to six years part-time. Most trainee teachers are required to spend a set amount of time in schools during their training. Trainees on all secondary and key stage 2/3 postgraduate courses are required to spend 24 weeks in schools; those on primary postgraduate programmes must spend 18 weeks in schools, those on four-year undergraduate programmes must spend 32 weeks in school, and, those on two- and three-year undergraduate programmes must spend 24 weeks in school.

In order to be awarded QTS, trainees must achieve the standards (<http://www.tda.gov.uk/teachers/professionalstandards/currentprofessionalstandards/qtsstandards.aspx>) laid down by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA). The current standards, which applied to all courses surveyed in this study, included one explicit reference to learning outside the classroom:

S3.1.5 As relevant to the age range they are trained to teach, they are able to plan opportunities for pupils to learn in out-of-school contexts, such as school visits, museums, theatres, field-work and employment-based settings, with the help of other staff where appropriate.

Note that the standard mentions planning opportunities rather than actually carrying them out.

The TDA has recently consulted on and reviewed the framework of professional and occupational standards for classroom teachers, including the standards for QTS, and provided advice to the Secretary of State in April 2006 on a revised framework. The TDA plans to publish the revised standards early in 2007 and the new revised standards and requirements will come into use from September 2007. The draft revised standards contain the following reference to training for education outside the classroom:

Q25 Establish a purposeful and safe learning environment conducive to learning and identify opportunities for learners to learn in out of school contexts.

This standard implies that trainees would still not be required to teach education outside the classroom.

1.2 Aims of the study

The overall aim of the study was to provide information on the extent and nature of training in education outside the classroom in ITT institutions, across curriculum subjects and across different types of teacher training courses. Commensurate with this overall aim, the study sought to answer the following questions:

- What proportion of ITT providers address EOtC explicitly in their courses?
- In which curriculum subjects are students trained to use EOtC?
- What are the objectives of the EOtC syllabus?
- Are students required to have practical experience of EOtC as part of their course?
- How is EOtC training delivered?
- Within ITT courses, what proportion of time is spent on EOtC-related training?
- Does provision vary geographically, by phase of education, or by type of course?
- Do any other factors affect provision?
- How is EOtC training coordinated within ITT providers?
- Have ITT providers made links with other organisations to inform the content and structure of the EOtC-related training?

1.3 Methods

In order to address the above research questions, a questionnaire survey was administered to ITT providers to seek information on the content of their courses. Questionnaires were devised in conjunction with the steering group. Two research instruments were devised for the survey:

- a primary programme directors' questionnaire
- a secondary course/subject directors' questionnaire.

The secondary questionnaire was eight pages in length and the primary questionnaire was 12 pages, due to the need to include both undergraduate and postgraduate courses. Draft research instruments were piloted with six representatives from a cross-section of HEIs (covering both primary and secondary courses and a range of subjects). Piloters were asked to comment on the pertinence of the themes and appropriateness of the questionnaires for respondents. Survey instruments were redrafted in light of comments received from the pilot institutions and the steering group.

Questionnaires were sent to primary programme directors and secondary course/subject directors in the 75 HEIs providing ITT in England. For primary

ITT, this included programme directors of both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. For secondary ITT, this included subject-specific course directors (e.g. head of secondary ITT science). At the secondary level, the majority of questionnaires were sent to postgraduate course directors, although there were also a small number of undergraduate secondary course directors were also included in the survey (see Table 1.1).

Table 1.1 Response rates to the NFER survey of ITT providers (number of questionnaires sent and received)

Type of programme	Questionnaires sent (N)	Questionnaires received (N)	Response rate (%)
Secondary (postgraduate)	535	268	50
Secondary (undergraduate)	36	13	36
Primary	89	31	35
Total	660	312	47

Source: NFER survey June- July 2006

At the secondary level, in order to provide detailed information on the extent and nature of EOtC training in secondary ITT, specific course/subject directors were targeted. It was felt that course/subject directors would be able to provide an accurate and informed response to the questionnaire, given their responsibility for a particular course/subject. As primary courses have less variation than their subject-specific secondary counterparts (primary general, primary foundation or primary language courses are most typical), it was not considered necessary or cost-effective to provide specific questionnaires to course/subject directors at primary level. Hence, questionnaires regarding primary ITT were directed to the programme directors of primary undergraduate and postgraduate courses.

Contact details for primary programme directors and secondary course/subject directors were collected via HEI websites and telephone calls to institutions. Questionnaires were sent to primary programme directors and secondary course/subject directors in June 2006, with reminder letters and telephone calls in July 2006.

Table 1.1 shows that the overall response rate was 47 per cent, representing nearly half of programme/course directors providing ITT in HEIs. The questionnaires returned by respondents were representative in terms of the geographical location of ITT institutions and the range of subjects directed on secondary level ITT courses.

Given the variation in the number of primary and secondary courses, which was reflected in the number of questionnaires dispatched and the responses received, care needs to be taken when comparing the number of primary and secondary respondents as one primary respondent represents 3 per cent of the primary responses, whereas one secondary respondent represents 0.4 per cent of the secondary responses.

1.3.1 Data analysis

The statistical analysis of the questionnaire data was undertaken by NFER's Statistics Research and Analysis Group (SRAG). The data were analysed using SPSS. The basic frequencies for each questionnaire type were produced and following this, the data were disaggregated by the following variables.

1. By course subject, such as mathematics, English (secondary questionnaires only)
2. By geographical location (government office region)
3. By phase of education (primary/secondary)
4. Whether they were undergraduate or postgraduate courses
5. By type of course e.g. BEd, BA, BSc, PGCE (primary and secondary).

Examples of the primary programme directors' and secondary course/subject directors' questionnaires can be found in Appendices 1 and 2. In each section of the report the relevant questionnaire numbers relating to that particular section are included in the text for ease of reference, for example [Sec Q2a and Prim Q2a].

1.3.2 Examples and cases

In order to provide a context for the quantitative findings, some qualitative data are interwoven with the report. These data come from open-ended questions in the survey questionnaires and from examples of training activities provided by ITT institutions or training providers identified by survey respondents. These findings are presented in Figures throughout the report.

1.4 Report structure

The report presents the findings in the following order:

Chapter Two provides an overview of respondents, in terms of the types of course they directed and the qualifications achieved by trainees on the courses, the subject areas directed by secondary respondents and the geographical location of ITT providers.

Chapter Three looks at the provision of training relating to EOtC, including the number of providers that addressed EOtC explicitly in their courses, the curriculum subjects in which students were trained to use EOtC and whether students were required to have practical experience of EOtC as part of their course.

Chapter Four explores the delivery and coordination of training relating to the provision of EOtC activities, including the objectives of the EOtC training provided, how the training was delivered, other ways in which EOtC training was provided, EOtC areas covered in training, how EOtC training was coordinated and links with external providers.

Chapter Five focuses on the time spent on training relating to EOtC activities both within institution-based programmes and when on school placement. It also explores whether there is a minimum expectation for EOtC training on the courses directed and addresses the quality of trainees' EOtC experiences when on school placement.

Chapter Six looks at the factors assisting and hindering the provision of EOtC training over the last five years and changes in the extent of EOtC provision over the last five years.

Chapter Seven looks at future developments, specifically the changes identified by respondents as being required to encourage the provision of additional EOtC-related training activities.

Chapter Eight concludes the report by providing an overview of the EOtC training provided by ITT institutions and identifies key factors and messages in the provision of EOtC training.

2 Overview of respondents

Key findings

- Questionnaires were sent to primary programme directors and secondary course/subject directors in all of the 75 HEIs providing ITT in England. Responses were received from a total of 70 HEIs. Nearly two-fifths of responses were from London and the South East, reflecting the concentration of ITT providers within these regions.
- A total of 312 teacher educators (which represents 47 per cent of respondents to whom questionnaires were sent) completed the survey.
- The most frequent responses at the secondary level were from directors of science, mathematics, modern foreign languages and geography courses. More than two-thirds of directors of geography courses and nearly three-fifths of science directors responded to the questionnaire.
- The vast majority (89 per cent) of respondents were postgraduate subject/programme directors.

Questionnaires were sent to primary programme directors and secondary course/subject directors in all of the 75 HEIs providing ITT in England. This chapter provides an overview of respondents, in terms of the subject areas directed, the types of course directed and the geographical location of ITT providers.

2.1 Subjects directed by secondary respondents

Secondary respondents were asked to provide details of the subject area they directed [Sec Q1a]. Table 2.1 provides details of the secondary subject areas directed by respondents.

Table 2.1 Subject areas directed by secondary respondents
(number of questionnaires returned and number of questionnaires sent)

Subject area directed	Questionnaires returned		Questionnaires sent	
	(N)	%	(N)	Overall response rate %
Science	41	15	69	59
Mathematics	29	10	68	43
Modern foreign languages	28	10	53	53
Geography	26	9	39	67
History	22	8	35	63
English	21	7	58	36
Art and design	15	5	29	52
PE	13	5	36	36
Information and Communication Technology (ICT) related subjects	12	4	36	33
Religious education (RE)	12	4	32	38
Music	10	4	28	36
Business studies	8	3	24	33
Design and technology	8	3	32	25
Citizenship	7	3	12	58
Dance	4	1	4	100
Drama	4	1	5	80
Leisure and tourism	2	1	3	67
Social sciences	2	1	3	67
Media	0	0	3	0
Classics*	2	1	1	100
Health and social care	0	0	1	0
Other	15	5	N/A	N/A
Total	281	100	571	49

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

*one questionnaire was sent out but two were returned

The top three responses were from directors of core subject areas. Respondents who indicated that they directed science courses included those who directed all science courses within their institution, as well as those who stated that they directed individual science courses, such as physics or chemistry. Two-thirds (ten) of the 'other' responses were from respondents who directed the whole secondary programme. In addition, two were from respondents who directed English and drama and the remaining three were from respondents who directed the following range of subjects:

- business studies; ICT; leisure and tourism

-
- citizenship and social science
 - citizenship; English; PE; personal, social and health education (PSHE); and RE.

Table 2.1 also shows that in 11 subject areas, responses were received from more than half of the course/subject directors who were sent questionnaires. However, it should be noted that the number of courses available in some subjects, for example classics, was very small. Nevertheless, relatively high response rates were also seen for courses in more common subject areas. More than two-thirds of geography directors and nearly three-fifths of science directors responded to the questionnaire. In contrast, the lowest response rates were seen for course/subject directors of media and health and social care courses, for which no questionnaires were returned. Design and technology, business studies and ICT-related subjects also had low response rates. Of the core subject areas, both English and mathematics had relatively low returns.

The following subject areas had responses from directors of both postgraduate and undergraduate programmes:

- science
- design and technology
- English
- geography
- ICT-related subjects
- mathematics
- PE
- RE
- drama.

Respondents were also asked to provide details of the types of course/programme they directed [Sec Q1b and Prim Q1a]. Table 2.2 shows that overall, the vast majority (89 per cent) of respondents were postgraduate subject/programme directors, with just six per cent directing both postgraduate and undergraduate programmes and five per cent directing undergraduate programmes only.

Table 2.2 Courses directed by respondents (number of respondents)

Course directed	Secondary course/ subject directors (N)	Primary programme directors (N)
Postgraduate	262	16
Undergraduate	6	9
Both	13	6
Total	281	31

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

2.2 Courses taken by trainees

Respondents were asked to indicate which course/qualification trainees achieved on their initial teacher training course [Sec Q1C & Prim Q1b]. Respondents were able to select from the following options:

- BEd
- BA
- BSc
- PGCE
- Other.

Table 2.3 highlights the courses directed/coordinated by questionnaire respondents. The vast majority indicated that the course taken (and qualification achieved) by students was a PGCE, reflecting the fact that most respondents were postgraduate programme directors.

Table 2.3 Courses taken by trainees (number of respondents)

Course title	Secondary courses (N = 281)	Primary courses (N = 31)
PGCE	272	21
BA	12	11
Other	12	0
BSc	6	1
BEd	1	2
No response	1	1

This was a multiple response question: respondents could select more than one option.

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

In addition, 12 respondents also noted that trainees could achieve additional qualifications, such as a masters or masters-level credits. Other courses taken

by trainees included: the Graduate and Registered Teacher Programme (GRTP), the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) and advanced diploma.

2.3 Geographical location

Table 2.4 details the location of respondents according to government office region. Nearly two-fifths (39 per cent) of responses were from London and the South East, reflecting the concentration of ITT providers within these regions. Overall, respondents (both primary and secondary) were based in 70 institutions (out of a total of 75 HEIs). Responses to the primary questionnaire were received from an additional six institutions to those received relating to secondary programmes. One response was received from each institution at the primary level (in all but two cases, where two responses were received). At the secondary level, the numbers of responses per institution ranged from one to 11, with an average of four responses per institution. Analysis of survey findings by government office region showed no significant variation in results.

Table 2.4 Geographical location of respondents (number of respondents and institutions)

Government office region	Secondary respondents (N)		Primary respondents (N)	
	No. of respondents	No. of institutions	No. of respondents	No. of institutions
South East	56	12	6	5
London	42	12	6	6
South West	39	7	5	4
Yorkshire & The Humber	36	8	5	5
North West/ Merseyside	35	6	1	1
West Midlands	23	7	2	2
East Midlands	21	5	3	3
Eastern	18	4	2	2
North East	11	3	1	1
Total	281	64	31	29

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

3 Provision of EOtC activities

Key findings

- The findings from the survey indicated that EOtC was explicitly addressed in nearly 90 per cent of primary and secondary ITT courses.
- The majority of these respondents indicated that their courses had an expectation that trainees would be involved in some practical experience of EOtC, with it being either a course requirement or a preference. At the secondary level, directors of PE, history and geography courses most frequently indicated that trainees had to have practical experience of EOtC. Directors of modern foreign language courses were least likely to say that practical experience of EOtC was a requirement of their course.
- Just over one in ten primary and secondary respondents indicated that EOtC was not explicitly addressed within their courses.

As already highlighted, in order to obtain QTS, trainees are required to meet a number of professional standards. The QTS standard relating to education outside the classroom, which applied at the time of the survey, stated that, in order to achieve qualified teacher status, trainees were expected to cover EOtC within their ITT course. However, as mentioned previously, QTS standard 3.1.5 only stated that trainees had to be able to plan EOtC opportunities; they did not have to have practical experience of delivering EOtC.

3.1 The extent to which EOtC is addressed in ITT courses

Questionnaire respondents were asked to report whether EOtC was addressed explicitly in the ITT course they directed [Sec Q2a & Prim Q2a]. The vast majority of respondents said that it was. Table 3.1 shows that the majority (86 per cent) of secondary respondents and a similar proportion of primary respondents indicated that EOtC was addressed in the course they directed. Nevertheless, Table 3.1 also shows that 36 (13 per cent) of secondary respondents and three primary respondents (two postgraduate programme directors and one respondent who directed both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes) indicated that EOtC was not explicitly addressed within their courses.

Table 3.1 EOtC addressed within ITT courses (number of primary and secondary respondents)

Response	Secondary respondents (N)	Primary Respondents (N)
Yes	243	27
No	36	3
No response	2	1
Total	281	31

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

At the secondary level, analysis by subject area (see Table 3.2) showed that EOtC was addressed in all geography, art and design, PE, music, citizenship, drama, leisure and tourism and classics courses. EOtC was also addressed in the majority of courses provided by science and history directors. Notably, EOtC was less likely to be addressed on mathematics and English courses.

Table 3.2 Secondary subject areas where EOtC addressed (number of respondents)

Subject area	Yes (N)	No (N)	Total (N)
Science	40	1	41
Mathematics	18	10	29 ⁴
Modern foreign languages	24	4	28
Geography	26	-	26
History	21	1	22
English	14	7	21
Art and design	15	-	15
PE	13	-	13
ICT-related subjects	7	5	12
RE	11	1	12
Music	10	-	10
Business studies	7	1	8
Design and technology	7	1	8
Citizenship	7	-	7
Dance	2	2	4
Drama	4	-	4
Leisure and tourism	2	-	2
Social sciences	1	1	2
Classics	2	-	2
Other	12	3	15

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

⁴ Note: One mathematics secondary course/subject director did not respond to this question.

At the primary level, respondents were not directing subject-specific programmes. Instead primary respondents who specified that EOtC was addressed within their programme were asked to highlight the curriculum areas in which EOtC training and activities took place [Prim Q3]. Table 3.3 provides an overview of the responses from the 27 primary respondents who indicated that EOtC was addressed explicitly in the programmes they directed.

Table 3.3 Primary curriculum areas including EOtC training and activities (number of respondents)

Primary curriculum area	Frequency (N= 27)
Geography	25
Science	24
Art and design	19
History	18
PSHE/Citizenship	12
Mathematics	11
Professional studies	11
RE	11
Design and technology	10
English	8
ICT	7
PE	7
Other	4
Modern foreign languages	2
No response	1

*This was a multiple response question: respondents could select more than one option.
Source: NFER survey June-July 2006*

The vast majority of primary respondents indicated that EOtC training and activities took place in geography and science, with more than two-thirds indicating that art and design and history were also likely to include such activities and training. EOtC training was least likely to be included in modern foreign languages. ‘Other’ primary curriculum areas identified by respondents which included elements of EOtC training and activities were: special educational needs; equality, inclusion and citizenship (EIC); and early years.

The secondary subject areas where EOtC was not explicitly addressed are detailed in Table 3.4. The table shows that over half (20) of the secondary respondents who did not explicitly address EOtC within their courses had no plans to include it in the future, whilst a quarter (nine) said they did not know. One of the primary (postgraduate) respondents indicated that they had no plans to include EOtC in their course in the future.

Table 3.4 EOtC not addressed within secondary ITT courses
(number of respondents)

Subject	EOtC not addressed (N)	No plans to include EOtC (N)
Mathematics	10	8
English	7	2
ICT-related subjects	5	4
Modern foreign languages	4	2
Other	3	1
Dance	2	-
Design and technology	1	-
Business studies	1	1
History	1	-
Science	1	1
Social sciences	1	1
Total	36	20

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

When analysed by subject area, Table 3.4 also shows that the majority of mathematics course directors who were not presently addressing EOtC had no plans to include it in their course in the future. Conversely, most English course/subject directors who were not currently addressing EOtC had plans to include it in future courses.

3.2 The extent to which students are required to have practical experience of EOtC

Those (243 secondary and 27 primary) respondents who indicated that EOtC was addressed explicitly within their courses were asked to highlight whether trainees were required to have practical experience of EOtC [Sec Q3 & Prim Q4]. Table 3.5 shows that the majority had an expectation that trainees would be involved in some practical EOtC, with over a half (145) of the 243 secondary respondents stating that it was a requirement of the course, and just under a quarter (59) saying it was a preferred option. A total of 21 (i.e. nearly one in ten) secondary respondents who stated that EOtC was addressed explicitly within their course indicated that practical experience of EOtC was not required. Nearly two-thirds (17) of primary respondents (of the 27 who said that EOtC was addressed explicitly within their course) indicated that practical experience of EOtC was a requirement of the course, and over a fifth

(6) indicated that it was a preferred option. Three primary respondents indicated that practical experience of EOtC was not required.

Table 3.5 Practical experience of EOtC required (number of respondents)

Response	Secondary respondents (N)	Primary respondents (N)
Yes	145	17
Preferred	59	6
No	21	3
No response	18	1
Total	243	27

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

There was variation in the secondary subjects in which practical experience of EOtC was required. Looking at the 243 secondary respondents who stated that EOtC was addressed explicitly within their course, Table 3.6 shows that the majority of respondents directing PE courses, over three-quarters of respondents directing history courses, and nearly three-quarters of respondents directing geography courses, indicated that trainees had to have practical experience of EOtC. However, just over half of directors of science courses, indicated that this was the case. A further third of science directors indicated that EOtC experience was preferred on their course. Directors of modern foreign language courses were least likely to say that practical experience of EOtC was a requirement of the course.

Table 3.6 Practical experience of EOtC required by secondary subject area (number of respondents)

Subject area directed	Yes (N)	Preferred (N)	No (N)	No response (N)	Total (N)
Science	21	13	3	3	40
Geography	19	3	1	3	26
History	16	3	1	1	21
PE	12	1	-	-	13
Art and design	10	1	1	3	15
Mathematics	8	5	3	2	18
English	8	5	1	-	14
Modern foreign languages	7	10	6	1	24
RE	7	3	1	-	11
Other	6	4	1	1	12
Music	6	3	1	-	10
Business studies	5	2	-	-	7
Design and technology	5	1	-	1	7
ICT-related subjects	3	1	2	1	7
Citizenship	3	3	-	1	7
Drama	3	-	-	1	4
Leisure and tourism	2	-	-	-	2
Classics	2	-	-	-	2
Dance	1	1	-	-	2
Social sciences	1	-	-	-	1

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

When the types of courses on which students were enrolled were examined, responses showed that all BA students had to have practical experience of EOtC (on the eight BA courses where EOtC was addressed explicitly). Respondents noted that just under two-thirds (139 out of 219) of PGCE courses were expected to have practical experience of EOtC, and on a further 59 PGCE courses (i.e. more than a quarter) practical experience of EOtC was preferred.

4 Delivery and coordination of EOtC activities

Key findings

- The main objectives of EOtC training provided on primary and secondary courses focused on 'preparing and enabling trainees to run EOtC activities' and 'enabling trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC'. There was less of a focus on gauging the quality or measuring the impact of such experiences, or enabling trainees to experience how pupils behaved in different environments.
- Schools played a major role in training for EOtC, particularly at the secondary level. Over 80 per cent (197 out of 243) of secondary respondents reported that student teachers received training in EOtC when they were on school placements.
- As well as school-based training, most secondary respondents reported that EOtC training was delivered through stand alone compulsory units or during off-site day/residential experiences. Most primary respondents reported that EOtC training was interwoven across subject areas.
- A wide range of external providers were also involved in EOtC training, including museums, galleries, field study centres and outdoor education centres. However, the uptake by ITT institutions, in terms of overall numbers working with external providers, was relatively low.
- EOtC training was generally coordinated by individual course or subject directors rather than by the overall director of ITT. A small but significant number of primary and secondary respondents indicated that EOtC training was not coordinated at all on their programme.
- Fieldwork was the most common EOtC-related training provided on both primary and secondary courses.

In order to provide information on the delivery and coordination of EOtC training within ITT institutions, respondents were asked a series of questions focusing on:

- the objectives of the EOtC training provided
- how EOtC training was delivered within courses
- how EOtC training was coordinated
- the EOtC areas in which training was provided
- the involvement/contribution of external organisations in providing EOtC training.

4.1 Objectives of EOtC training

Respondents were asked to highlight the objectives of the EOtC training provided within the course they directed [Sec Q4 & Prim Q5]. Nine possible objectives were presented and respondents were asked to indicate whether each one was a ‘major objective’, a ‘minor objective’, or ‘not an objective’, on their course.

Table 4.1 highlights that ‘preparing and enabling trainees to run EOtC activities’ was the most common response for secondary respondents, with more than three-quarters (187) indicating that this was a ‘major objective’ of the EOtC training on the course they directed. However, a small number (five) of secondary respondents did indicate that this was not an objective (major or minor) of their programme. ‘Enabling trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC’ was also seen as a ‘major objective’ by most secondary respondents. Objectives focusing on ‘experiencing how pupils behave in different environments’ and enabling trainees to ‘gauge the quality’ and to ‘assess the impact of EOtC on pupils’ were less likely to be identified by secondary respondents as major objectives. However, ‘enabling trainees to gauge the quality of EOtC activities’ was the most common minor objective identified by secondary respondents.

Secondary responses were also examined to see if there were any notable differences between subject types. The top six subjects (in terms of frequency of response) were focused on. These were: science, English, geography, history, mathematics and modern foreign languages. The most common major objective identified by science and English directors was to ‘enable trainees to link classroom activities to EOtC’, whereas for geography, mathematics and modern foreign language directors it was to ‘prepare and enable trainees to run EOtC activities’. Directors of geography courses also indicated that ‘enabling trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC’ was an equally important objective, this was also the most common major objective identified by history directors. All but one of the geography respondents indicated that ‘preparing and enabling trainees to run EOtC activities’ and ‘enabling trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC’ was a major objective of the training they provided. All science, English, geography and history respondents indicated that preparing and enabling trainees to run EOtC activities was an objective, either major or minor, of the training they provided. A greater proportion of geography and history directors indicated that ‘assessing the impact’ and ‘gauging the quality of EOtC’ was a major objective of the training provided than other subject respondents. Similarly, more than three-quarters of geography respondents and more than two-thirds of history respondents indicated that ‘enabling trainees to follow up EOtC in school classes’ was a major objective of the training provided, whereas less than a fifth of modern foreign language respondents indicated that this was the case.

Table 4.1 Objectives of EOtC training on secondary programmes (number of respondents and percentage response rate)

Objective	Major objective		Minor objective		Not an objective		No response	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Prepare and enable trainees to run EOtC activities	187	77	46	19	5	2	5	2
Enable trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC	181	75	45	19	10	4	7	3
Enable trainees to link classroom activities to EOtC	176	72	53	22	9	4	5	2
Enable trainees to carry out risk management	141	58	81	33	19	8	2	1
Enable trainees to consider advantages and disadvantages of EOtC	131	54	88	36	17	7	7	3
Enable trainees to follow up EOtC in school classes	117	48	89	37	26	11	11	5
Enable trainees to gauge the quality of EOtC activities	93	38	110	45	30	12	10	4
Enable trainees to assess the impact of EOtC on pupils	86	35	107	44	37	15	13	5
Enable trainees to experience how pupils behave in different environments	81	33	94	39	58	24	10	4

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

When the responses of primary respondents were examined (see Table 4.2) it can be seen that although the top three major objectives were the same as those of secondary respondents; the most frequent response for primary programme directors (at postgraduate and undergraduate level) was ‘to enable trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC’. Enabling trainees to be able to ‘carry out risk management’ was less likely to be identified by primary respondents as a major objective of EOtC training than it was by secondary respondents (over a half of secondary respondents identified this as a major objective, compared with just over a third of primary undergraduate programme directors and a third of primary postgraduate directors).

The objective least likely to be identified by primary postgraduate respondents was the same as secondary respondents, i.e. ‘enabling trainees to experience how pupils behaved in different environments’, although for primary undergraduate programme directors this was the most frequent minor objective identified. The most common minor objective identified by primary postgraduate directors was the same as that identified by secondary subject directors i.e. ‘to enable trainees to gauge the quality of EOtC activities’.

Table 4.2 Objectives of EOtC training on primary programmes (number of respondents)

Objective	Major objective (N)	Minor objective (N)	Not an objective (N)
Primary programme directors (postgraduate)			
Enable trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC	16	2	-
Enable trainees to link classroom activities to EOtC	12	6	-
Prepare and enable trainees to run EOtC activities	11	5	2
Enable trainees to follow up EOtC in school classes	9	9	-
Enable trainees to consider advantages and disadvantages of EOtC	9	9	-
Enable trainees to carry out risk management	6	11	1
Enable trainees to assess the impact of EOtC on pupils	6	8	4
Enable trainees to gauge the quality of EOtC activities	5	12	1
Enable trainees to experience how pupils behave in different environments ⁵	4	9	4
Primary programme directors (undergraduate)			
Enable trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC	13	1	-
Enable trainees to link classroom activities to EOtC	13	1	-
Prepare and enable trainees to run EOtC activities	10	3	1
Enable trainees to consider advantages and disadvantages of EOtC	9	5	-
Enable trainees to follow up EOtC in school classes	8	6	-
Enable trainees to assess the impact of EOtC on pupils	7	5	2
Enable trainees to gauge the quality of EOtC activities	6	6	2
Enable trainees to carry out risk management	5	6	3
Enable trainees to experience how pupils behave in different environments	1	9	4

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

⁵ Note: One primary postgraduate programme director did not provide a response for 'Enable trainees to experience how pupils behave in different environments'.

4.2 The delivery of EOtC training

Respondents were also asked to indicate how EOtC training was delivered in the course they directed [Sec Q5a & Prim Q6a & 12a]. They were given seven options and were asked to tick all that were applicable. Table 4.3 provides an overview of secondary course/subject directors' responses and Table 4.4 provides an overview of primary programme directors' responses, in order of frequency.

Table 4.3 The delivery of EOtC training: secondary ITT courses (number of respondents and percentage response rate)

How training is delivered	Secondary respondents	
	(N = 243)	%
During school-based placements	197	81
Stand alone compulsory session/unit	126	52
During compulsory EOtC off-site day/residential	119	49
Training is interwoven across subject areas	76	31
During an optional EOtC day/residential	29	12
Stand alone optional session/unit	27	11
Don't know	1	<1
No response	1	<1

*This was a multiple response question: respondents could select more than one option
Source: NFER survey June-July 2006*

Table 4.4 The delivery of EOtC training: primary ITT courses (number of respondents)

How training is delivered	Primary respondents	
	Postgraduate (N = 18)	Undergraduate (N = 14)
During school-based placements	12	5
Stand alone compulsory session/unit	4	5
During compulsory EOtC off-site day/ residential	8	9
Training is interwoven across subject areas	16	12
During an optional EOtC day/residential	2	1
Stand alone optional session/unit	2	3
Don't know	-	-
No response	-	-

*This was a multiple response question: respondents could select more than one option
Source: NFER survey June-July 2006*

Respondents from 33 institutions (less than half of the responding institutions) indicated that EOtC training was delivered during school based placements, via stand alone compulsory sessions or units, or via compulsory EOtC off-site

days or residentials. Figure 1 provides an example of how EOtC training was delivered in these three ways on a primary postgraduate programme.

Figure 1 The delivery of EOtC training on a primary postgraduate programme

Trainees on the primary PGCE receive three hours a week core science input for two terms. This is split between lectures and practical seminars. The seminars in the first term tackle their ideas about teaching science and then each of the areas of attainment, focusing on the children's experiences and ways in which, as teachers, they can facilitate learning. Opportunities to work outside the classroom are also built into seminar sessions on an almost weekly basis and include an entire session on a tree in the grounds, learning walks around the grounds, habitat trails, practical demonstrations of scientific concepts in action (i.e. forces, shadows, evaporation) and in the second term, to develop their use of ICT equipment in the field (i.e. data logging, digital cameras, laptop use). There are also opportunities for trainees to undertake a field study at the coast, plan and carry out activities at local woodland for primary age children and visit the local observatory. Trainees taking science as their specialism also spend a week on placement in a scientific education establishment outside of school, looking at learning in science beyond the classroom. Last year, for example, trainees worked at the Natural History and Science Museums, the Eden Project and a zoo (science lecturer, PGCE primary programme).

Tables 4.3 and 4.4 show that on more than four-fifths (81 per cent) of secondary courses and two-thirds (12) of primary postgraduate courses, training relating to EOtC was delivered during school-based placements. All classics, design and technology and social science respondents who said that they addressed EOtC on their courses indicated that EOtC training was delivered via school based placements.

The prevalence of school-based training seems to reflect the time students spend on school placements, particularly when on postgraduate ITT courses. Compared to secondary trainees, trainees on primary undergraduate courses were less likely to receive training on school-based placements, with just over a third (five) of respondents indicating that this was the case.

Nevertheless, despite the prevalence of school-based training for secondary respondents, more than half (52 per cent) also indicated that EOtC training was delivered via institution-based training, as stand alone compulsory sessions or units. Similarly, nearly half (49 per cent) of secondary respondents delivered EOtC-related training via compulsory off-site days or residentials. In contrast, primary respondents were less likely to deliver EOtC training via stand alone compulsory sessions or units, but more likely to deliver training via compulsory EOtC off-site days or residentials.

Further analysis showed that 82 per cent of secondary respondents and the vast majority of primary respondents used a mix of methods for delivering EOtC training. The most common mix of delivery methods at the secondary level (identified by 33 respondents) was via stand alone compulsory session/units, during compulsory EOtC off-site days/residentials and during school-based placements. The most common mix of delivery methods at the primary level was via training being interwoven across subject areas and during school based placements on postgraduate courses (identified by four respondents) and during compulsory EOtC off-site days/residentials and being interwoven across subject areas on undergraduate courses (identified by four respondents). Those 43 secondary respondents who indicated that there was just one way of delivering EOtC training on their course, most frequently stated that training was delivered during school based placements or during compulsory EOtC off-site days/residentials. At the primary level, directors of two postgraduate programmes and one undergraduate programme indicated that EOtC training was delivered in this way, either interwoven across subject areas (two postgraduate responses) or as a stand alone optional session.

Figure 2 provides an overview of a stand alone compulsory module taken by all secondary PGCE science trainees at one institution.

Figure 2 Open country leadership award course

All secondary PGCE science trainees take part in an 'Open Country Leadership Award' course run by the LA. The award, which takes a day to complete, qualifies teachers to lead groups of pupils on trips into the countryside. On completion of the award, and after a day's preparation, the trainees take 350 Year 8 pupils into a local woodland park area. A key outcome of the day is for trainees to work closely with small groups of pupils and get to know them better. The day starts with icebreakers, then trainees organise pond dipping and other techniques, including the use of quadrants and transects, as well as less traditional earth education activities (director of science PGCE).

An analysis of secondary responses by subject type showed some variation in approach. More than two-thirds of science and modern foreign language directors delivered EOtC training via stand alone compulsory sessions or units, whereas just over a third of English directors delivered training in this way. Nearly three-quarters of geography course directors noted that EOtC training was delivered via compulsory EOtC off-site days or residentials, whereas just over a fifth of modern foreign language directors indicated that this was the case.

A total of 29 secondary respondents indicated that EOtC training was delivered via optional EOtC days/residentials. These training opportunities were provided on a range of courses detailed below (the numbers in brackets denote the number of respondents):

- science (6)
- geography (6)
- history (4)
- English (3)
- PE (3)
- art and design (2)
- design and technology (1)
- leisure and tourism (1)
- modern foreign languages (1)
- RE (1)
- business studies, ICT, leisure and tourism (1).

Table 4.3 shows that EOtC training on secondary courses was less likely to be interwoven across subject areas and least likely to be delivered via optional courses. Similarly at the primary level, training was least likely to be delivered via optional courses. However, in contrast to secondary respondents, the vast majority of primary respondents indicated that EOtC training was interwoven across subject areas.

Respondents were also asked to provide details of any other ways in which EOtC training was provided within their institution (this was an open response question) [Sec Q13 & Prim Q20]. Just over a third (98) of secondary respondents and five primary respondents indicated that there were additional ways in which EOtC training was provided within their institutions. Table 4.5 details the responses.

Table 4.5 Other ways in which EOtC training is delivered within ITT institutions (number of respondents)

Other ways in which EOtC training is delivered within ITT institutions	Secondary respondents (N = 98)	Primary respondents (N = 5)
Through other subject areas/courses	35	2
Additional component/element of course	24	2
Through education, business and community links	12	-
Through school experience	12	1
Fieldwork and overseas visits	9	-
Professional development programme	8	-
Other	7	-
Virtual experiences	4	-
Ethos of the course	2	-
Compulsory additional component	1	-

Open response question

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

Most commonly, secondary respondents indicated that it was provided through other subject areas/courses or via additional components/elements of their own course (see Table 4.5). The delivery of EOtC training via other subject areas/courses identified by respondents included:

- citizenship training
- within other subject areas
- as part of the undergraduate programme
- as part of the undergraduate non-QTS course in sports development.

Additional components/elements of the course (identified by both primary and secondary respondents) focused on opportunities for students to participate in extra EOtC sessions and, in some instances, to achieve further qualifications. Additional components/elements identified by individual secondary respondents focused on:

- *'a visiting outdoor education expert delivering a university-based session on outdoor education, risk management and school trips'*
- *'a special study course in outdoor learning in which trainees carry out EOtC activities at school and 'home' training sessions at the university'*
- a five day science enhancement programme described as an *'informal learning placement'* (SEPIL – Science Enhancement Programme in London)
- the opportunity to take optional *'open country'* qualifications (this was Saturday based training)
- *'sessions on planning EOtC with a mentor'*

- a *‘four-day placement in the summer’*
- *‘one and a half days training in faculty’*
- the provision of *‘supplementary courses’*
- the provision of a *‘[EOtC] lecture and seminar to all trainees’*
- teaching union representatives providing a two-hour session on legislation relating to EOtC.

Those identified by individual primary respondents focused on trainees spending:

- *‘one week in an alternative education setting of their choice’* (this was a requirement for all trainees)
- two weeks on a *‘special interest placement in outdoor centres/theatres/museums* (only for certain trainees)’.*’*

A total of 12 secondary respondents indicated that EOtC training was delivered through education, business and community links, these included:

- links with Shell and science education partnerships (SEPs)
- *‘strong links with the Cambridge School Classics Project (CSCP) engaged in the online delivery of distance learning in Latin’*
- partnerships with local schools.

A similar number of secondary respondents (12) and one primary respondent also indicated that EOtC training was delivered through school experiences such as:

- youth parliament: *‘a representative from the local branch of the Youth Parliament visits the University each year and talks to the trainees about the possibilities of getting children involved in the Youth Parliament programme’*
- *‘trainees encouraged to participate in EOtC activities offered in their placement schools and supported by school-based staff’*
- summer schools.

Secondary respondents also indicated that EOtC training was delivered via involvement in fieldwork and overseas visits. Activities identified by individual respondents included:

- *‘planning a school trip/visits’*
- *‘students in English organising theatre visits on a regular basis’*.

A total of eight secondary respondents highlighted that EOtC training was provided via professional development programmes run within their institution. Other ways identified included the provision of guest speakers and

'visits to institutions to participate in activities not possible in many schools'. Virtual experiences were also cited, with one secondary undergraduate programme/course director providing further comment, as outlined in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3 EOtC training delivered through 'virtual experiences'

In the secondary religious education course at the university, trainees use the internet-based 'virtual visits' tool to 'explore diversity and global dimensions'. 'Virtual visits' is a resource that enables trainees and pupils to visit different places of worship 'virtually', providing trainees with pictures, sounds, and comments from religious leaders. The experience is intended to offer 'visits' which look like they might if trainees and pupils were actually there, but without incurring the financial expense (RE lecturer, secondary undergraduate programme).

4.3 The coordination of EOtC training

Respondents were asked to indicate how EOtC training was coordinated within the programme they directed [Sec Q5 & Prim Q7 & Q13]. They were given five options to choose from (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6 The coordination of EOtC training within ITT programmes (number of respondents)

EOtC training coordinated	Secondary respondents (N = 243)	Primary respondents	
		Postgraduate (N = 18)	Undergraduate (N = 14)
By individual course/subject directors	207	14	12
Not coordinated	27	2	2
By the overall director of ITT	20	4	1
Other	12	-	1
By a designated EOtC coordinator	1	2	-
No response	2	-	-

*This was a multiple response question: respondents could select more than one option
Source: NFER survey June-July 2006*

The vast majority of the coordination of EOtC training was the responsibility of individual course or subject directors. More than four-fifths (207) of secondary respondents and primary undergraduate respondents (12), and more than three-quarters (14) of primary postgraduate respondents, indicated that EOtC training was most commonly coordinated by individual course or subject directors (see Table 4.6).

A minority (20, i.e. less than a tenth) of secondary respondents indicated that EOtC training was coordinated by the overall director of ITT. The overall

proportion of primary courses where EOtC was coordinated by the director of ITT was higher, with more than a fifth (four) of primary postgraduate respondents indicating that this was the case. EOtC training was unlikely to be coordinated by a designated EOtC coordinator. Table 4.6 shows that three respondents (one secondary [PE] and two primary postgraduate directors) indicated that they had a designated EOtC coordinator.

Thirteen respondents (12 secondary and one primary) indicated that EOtC training was coordinated in other ways on the programmes they directed. This included coordination of training (numbers in brackets denote the number of responses):

- in partnership with specific schools (6)
- by students who were responsible for organising their own experiences or were '*encouraged to take advantage of EOtC opportunities available in different schools*' (2)
- '*by the module leader for Outdoor and Adventurous Activities*' (1)
- in connection with the 'Aim Higher' project in the institution (1)
- across curriculum areas (1)
- by the head of the department (1).

On a small, but significant number of primary and secondary programmes, respondents indicated that EOtC training was not coordinated at all. A total of 27, i.e. more than one in ten secondary respondents, indicated that this was the case. The most frequent subject areas where EOtC was not coordinated were (numbers in brackets denote number of respondents):

- mathematics (5)
- science (3)
- geography (3).

4.4 Areas covered in EOtC training

Respondents were asked [Sec Q5b & Prim Q6b & Q12b] in which of the following areas EOtC training could take place:

- fieldwork (e.g. geography and science)
- natural environment (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)
- built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)
- school grounds
- creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatre)
- use of outdoor education centres
- overseas visits/exchanges

-
- places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)
 - active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)
 - food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens).

These areas were devised in conjunction with the steering group and reflected the sector working groups established by the government to develop its Learning Outside the Classroom Manifesto.

On both primary and secondary courses, fieldwork was the most common area of EOtC-related training identified (see Tables 4.7 and 4.8). Nearly half (116) of secondary respondents indicated that training was provided in this area, whilst more than four-fifths (15) of primary postgraduate respondents and all (14) of the primary undergraduate respondents said that students had training relating to fieldwork.

Further analysis by secondary subject area showed that the EOtC training focus was closely related to the subject directed and that many of the EOtC areas were subject specific. All geography course directors and the majority of science course directors indicated that training focused on fieldwork in the course they provided. Similarly, the majority of geography and science respondents indicated that their courses included EOtC training that focused on the natural environment. Training that focused on school grounds was most frequently identified by geography directors but also by more than two-thirds of mathematics directors. EOtC training focused on fieldwork was less likely to be included on English and modern foreign language courses, with two English directors and four modern foreign language directors indicating this to be the case⁶. All directors of English courses indicated that training on creativity and the arts was included on their course and nearly four-fifths of modern foreign language course directors included EOtC training relating to overseas visits and exchanges. Furthermore, over a half of history respondents included training relating to places of worship.

Figure 4 provides an example of fieldwork-related training provided by one secondary postgraduate programme.

⁶ When looking at the top six subject areas in terms of frequency of response

Figure 4 EOtC training focusing on conducting fieldwork

Biology PGCE students undertake two fieldwork elements relating to the teaching and learning of ecology in their summer term. As well as spending up to five days at a youth hostel, they also spend two and a half days working on science investigations with 180 Year 9 pupils in a city country park. A youth hostel is used rather than a field-studies centre because it allows students to see a model of residential fieldwork that can be carried out on a relatively low-cost basis. The students also complete three written assignments and assessed tasks, which are linked to the fieldwork activities. For example, the trainees produce a booklet that can support teachers running their own fieldwork in the early years of their career (secondary science PGCE lecturer).

Training focusing on the natural environment was nominated by more than two-fifths (106) of secondary respondents, as well as by nearly three-quarters (13) of primary postgraduate respondents and more than four-fifths (12) of primary undergraduate respondents. Figure 5 provides an example of the work with ITT students conducted by the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew.

Figure 5 The provision of EOtC training focusing on the natural environment

ITT students can visit Kew Gardens for several days and work with the School Education Team. After a guided tour looking at popular activities, such as 'Rainforest Explorers' and 'Conservation and Sustainability in the Rainforest', trainees shadow Kew teachers as they lead sessions with visiting school groups, often participating in team teaching when they feel able. Finally, they can choose to lead a complete tour themselves. If time permits, some move on to use their own special interests/subjects to plan and deliver an activity to a visiting school. During the summer term, three physicists devised a project linking plants and the rules of physics. Others produced a step-by-step 'Mathematics in the Environment' worksheet which included useful and instructive visuals on, for example measuring the height of a tree, working out the age of a tree and calculating the 'shade area' (education officer).

Creativity and the arts were more likely to be covered by EOtC training at the primary level than the secondary level. More than four-fifths (15 postgraduate and 12 undergraduate) of primary respondents indicated that students received training in this area compared with two-fifths (97) of secondary respondents.

Food and farming was the area least frequently covered by EOtC training at the secondary level and on primary postgraduate courses, whereas, on primary undergraduate courses, training was least likely to focus on overseas visits and exchanges. Additional analysis by secondary subject area showed that training focusing on food and farming was provided in seven subject areas, with the

most frequent responses (four respondents each) being from geography and science subject directors. Citizenship was also an area that was infrequently covered by EOtC training.

A number of respondents did not respond to this question. When non-responses were compared to non-responses in similar questions (specifically those focusing on time spent in EOtC activities and areas within institution-based programmes) it can be seen that there was a small core of non-respondents throughout.

Table 4.7 Areas covered in EOtC training: secondary (number of respondents and percentage response rate)

Area	Yes		No		Don't know		No response	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Secondary respondents								
Fieldwork (e.g. geography and science)	116	48	66	27	4	2	57	24
Natural environment (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	106	44	66	27	10	4	61	25
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	101	42	82	34	7	3	53	22
School grounds	98	40	63	26	14	6	68	28
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatre)	97	40	87	36	8	3	51	21
Use of outdoor education centres	86	35	83	34	8	3	66	27
Overseas visits/exchanges	46	19	109	45	7	3	80	33
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	42	17	116	48	7	3	78	32
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	28	12	115	47	8	3	92	38
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	14	6	125	51	13	5	91	37

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

Table 4.8 Areas covered in EOtC training: primary (number of respondents)

Area	Yes (N)	No (N)	Don't know (N)	No response (N)
Primary respondents: postgraduate (N = 18)				
Fieldwork (e.g. geography and science)	15	2	-	1
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatre)	15	-	-	3
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	14	2	-	2
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	14	4	-	-
Natural environment (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	13	3	1	1
School grounds	13	2	1	2
Overseas visits/exchanges	8	5	1	4
Use of outdoor education centres	7	7	1	3
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	4	7	2	5
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	3	9	2	4
Primary respondents: undergraduate (N = 14)				
Fieldwork (e.g. geography and science)	14	-	-	-
Natural environment (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	12	2	-	-
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatre)	12	1	1	-
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	10	2	1	1
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	10	2	-	2
School grounds	9	1	2	2
Use of outdoor education centres	8	1	1	4
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	8	1	-	5
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	7	2	-	5
Overseas visits/exchanges	5	6	-	3

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

4.5 External providers delivering EOtC training

Respondents were asked whether any particular groups/organisations with expertise in EOtC were involved in running EOtC training or contributing to the content or structure of training in this area [Sec Q7 & Prim Q8 & Q14].

Over two-fifths (99) of secondary respondents indicated that schools were contributing to the content or structure of EOtC training on their courses, whilst nearly a third (75) indicated that schools were running EOtC training within their programmes (see Table 4.9). This level of involvement by schools was not seen on the primary courses (see Table 4.10), with the exception of schools' contribution to the content or structure of EOtC training on primary undergraduate courses.

Table 4.9 External providers delivering EOtC training: secondary respondents (number of respondents and percentage response rate)

External provider	Running EOtC training (N)	%	Contribution to course content/structure (N)	%	No response (N)	%
Schools	75	31	99	41	90	37
Other external providers	72	30	59	24	129	53

*This was a multiple response question: respondents could select more than one option
Source: NFER survey June-July 2006*

Table 4.10 External providers delivering EOtC training: primary respondents (number of respondents)

External provider	Running EOtC training (N)	Contribution to course content/structure (N)	No response (N)
Primary respondents: postgraduate (N = 18)			
Schools	4	5	11
Other external providers	4	2	12
Primary respondents: undergraduate (N = 14)			
Schools	2	6	8
Other external providers	5	6	5

*This was a multiple response question: respondents could select more than one option
Source: NFER survey June-July 2006*

Table 4.9 shows that nearly a third (72) of secondary respondents indicated that other external providers were running EOtC training on their programmes, whilst nearly a quarter (59) said that external providers contributed to their

course content/structure. It should be noted that over half of secondary respondents did not reply to this question. At the primary level, external organisations were more likely to be involved in EOtC training on undergraduate courses.

At the secondary level, schools were more likely to be contributing to courses than running them. Conversely, other external providers were more likely to be running training than contributing to courses. At the primary level, both schools and other external providers (with one exception), were more likely to be contributing to courses than running them.

Respondents from all subject areas indicated that schools were involved in running and/or contributing to EOtC training. Analysis by secondary subject area⁷ showed that geography subject directors were most likely to involve schools and other external providers in running or contributing to EOtC training. There was a very low involvement of other external providers (either running or contributing to EOtC training) in mathematics (one out of 18 respondents indicated that external providers were either running or contributing to courses) or modern foreign languages (where two of the 24 respondents highlighted that external providers were running EOtC training and three were contributing to training).

When other subject areas were examined, it was noted that three out of four drama directors indicated that schools were running EOtC training and five out of seven business studies directors highlighted that schools were contributing to EOtC training on their courses.

Respondents highlighted a wide range of other external providers who were involved in EOtC training within the programmes they directed, as detailed in Table 4.11.

⁷ When looking at the top six subject areas in terms of frequency of response

Table 4.11 External providers involved in EOtC training (number of respondents)

External provider	Secondary (N)	Primary (N)	
		Postgraduate	Undergraduate
Museums	26	5	3
Field Studies Council	15	-	-
Field study centres e.g. national forest centre	15	3	2
Galleries	14	2	2
Education links e.g. Holocaust Education Trust	13	-	-
Outdoor education centres	10	-	-
Other e.g. educational directors of places visited	8	1	3
Heritage sites e.g. English Heritage	6	-	-
Places of worship	6	1	1
County council/local authority	5	1	-
Locally based centre e.g. local development education centre	5	1	4
Botanical gardens	4	-	-
Music specialist	4	-	-
Theatres	4	1	-
Business partnerships e.g. Education Business Partnership (EBP)	3	1	-
Faith communities	3	-	-
Learning Through Landscapes	3	-	-
Media organisations	3	-	-
Youth Hostel Association	3	-	1
Architectural	2	1	-
Farms	2	-	1

Open response question

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

The most frequently nominated external providers involved (see Table 4.11) were museums (this included museum-run schemes and education officers at museums involved in EOtC training), field study centres and the Field Studies Council. Figure 6 provides an exemplar of a scheme run by the Science Museum in London.

Figure 6 The Science Museum's involvement in EOtC training

The Science Museum in London offers one-day programmes for BEd/PGCE students to give them ideas about how to use museums in general, and the Science Museum in particular, to support and enrich their classroom teaching. Staff from the Museum's Learning Unit lead an introductory session highlighting strategies for working with pupils in museum galleries. The trainee teachers then explore the Museum's galleries while completing a 'Visit Planning Task', developed in conjunction with an ITT tutor. Trainees consider: how they would use the displays with pupils; what pre-visit and post-visit work they would do to prepare students and consolidate the visit experience; what health and safety factors they would need to consider for a risk assessment, and, how they might copy or adapt the Science Museum's techniques used for communicating science to use in their own teaching.

The cost for this one-day programme is a flat-rate of £75, regardless of the number of participants. In 2005/6, the Science Museum delivered these one-day programmes to 594 BEd/PGCE students from 16 different ITT institutions. Of these, 30 students were early years specialists, 383 were primary, 113 were secondary science, 30 were secondary mathematics, 13 were secondary geography, 15 were secondary ICT and 10 were secondary health and social care. The Museum also hosted six secondary science students on one-week placements as part of their PGCE course. During the week the students became familiar with the learning opportunities available at the Museum, worked on real projects (such as developing and testing prototype activities), and completed the Visit Planning Task (manager of school visits and teacher courses).

Figure 7 highlights a fieldwork programme and 'field teaching' qualification provided in conjunction with another external provider that was frequently identified by respondents, the Field Studies Council.

Figure 7 The Field Studies Council involvement in EOtC training

In 2005/06 a new fieldwork programme and qualification in 'field teaching' was piloted for the PGCE geography trainees at the university, additional to their PGCE Geography Programme. The aim was to prepare all the trainees to lead safe and effective geography fieldwork in local, urban and rural settings. The university wanted to address the national policy agenda focusing on increasing outdoor learning opportunities for children in schools, alongside improving teacher preparation to lead off-site work safely. The programme was developed in consultation with school-based geography mentors and trainees and representatives from the UK's Field Studies Council (FSC). University funding was used to develop and staff the programme, purchase equipment and subsidise trainees' costs.

The programme includes eight university-led fieldwork sessions, one university-led weekend residential course and a five-day FSC-led residential course, together with school-based experiences with pupils across the PGCE year. The latter includes opportunities for trainees to attend and support local and/or distant fieldtrips. As a minimum, all

trainees are required to develop and lead at least one fieldwork activity with a school geography class. Trainees develop a file of evidence of their field teaching experience and expertise

A significant emphasis of the university-based programme is on developing trainees' confidence and expertise in risk management and safe navigation in the field. This includes practical sessions on map reading and navigation, the use of GPS (Geographical Positioning Systems), reading the weather and weather data, and safety in different contexts (coastal, urban and wilderness environments and day and night time fieldwork). Trainees also undertake an 'Exploration Medicine' first aid certificate awarded by the Health and Safety Executive.

This programme leads to the Award of a 'Field Teaching Certificate in Geography and Risk Management' developed by the FSC in response to the implementation of this new programme. Trainees are required to attend a five-day residential at the end of the PGCE year during which they are assessed by FSC tutors and a university tutor. The assessment includes scrutiny of fieldwork files, a viva and observation of trainees' field teaching with pupils (fieldwork programme coordinator and PGCE geography coordinator).

Whilst Table 4.11 shows a wide range of external providers involved in the delivery of EOtC training, it also shows that uptake by ITT institutions, in terms of overall numbers working with external providers, was relatively low. A total of 37 secondary directors and six postgraduate and one undergraduate primary programme directors indicated that they work with more than one external provider.

Figure 8 provides an example of a secondary postgraduate programme providing EOtC training in conjunction with an external provider, 'Learning Through Landscapes'. Learning Through Landscapes is the national school grounds charity which focuses on developing the better use, design and management of school grounds.

Figure 8 EOtC training provided by a university in conjunction with 'Learning Through Landscapes'

One of the university's PGCE five-day special studies is taught in conjunction with 'Learning Through Landscapes'. Each year, 20 trainees, from a range of disciplines, plan and implement teaching in the outdoor classroom. Trainees explore opportunities and barriers to teaching outside, devising exciting and stimulating activities. This year, a religious education trainee re-enacted the 'Sermon on the Mount' and the 'Sermon on the Plain' on a school playing field complete with a 'burning bush'. A mathematics trainee drew a large chalk grid on the playground and involved pupils in making shapes with ropes, performing reflection, translation and rotation, and carrying out enlargement transformations (director of secondary science PGCE).

5 Timing and quality of EOtC activities

Key findings

- Both primary and secondary respondents most frequently indicated that there was not a minimum expectation for EOtC training on their respective courses. Where there was a minimum expectation for EOtC training on courses, these were typically short periods of time and related more to theory and understanding, rather than practical experience.
- The two main EOtC training activities most frequently and consistently identified by all respondents were 'off-site day visits' and 'school site activities', whilst fieldwork and the natural environment were the EOtC areas most commonly cited as having time dedicated to training. The average length of time spent on training in these activities and areas was relatively short.
- Overall, most respondents felt that the quality of EOtC experiences when trainees were on school placement was too variable to comment on. Most of those respondents who did provide a quality rating gave a positive response. However, one in 20 secondary course/subject directors considered the quality of EOtC experiences trainees when on school placement to be poor.

In order to gather information about the amount of time trainees spent on EOtC training in their courses, a series of questions were posed to respondents relating to when trainees were studying within institution-based programmes and when they were on school placement.

5.1. Minimum expectation of EOtC training on courses

Respondents were asked whether there was a minimum expectation for EOtC training on the course they directed [Sec Q14 & Prim Q21]. Table 5.1 reveals that both primary (20) and secondary respondents (132) most frequently indicated that there was not a minimum expectation for EOtC training on their respective courses.

Table 5.1 Minimum expectation for EOtC training (number of respondents)

Minimum expectation	Yes (N)	No (N)	Don't Know (N)	No response (N)	Total (N)
Secondary course/subject directors	115	132	14	20	281
Primary programme directors	8	20	1	2	31

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

However, there were some key differences in the responses of primary programme directors and secondary course/subject directors. Specifically, primary respondents (both undergraduate and postgraduate) were more likely than their secondary counterparts to state that there was not a minimum expectation for EOtC training on the course they directed (nearly two-thirds (20), compared to just under half (132)). Conversely, secondary respondents were much more likely to indicate that there was a minimum expectation on their course than primary programme directors (two-fifths (115), compared to a quarter (8)).

Additional analysis by subject area also revealed that history subject/course directors more frequently stated that there was a minimum expectation attached to their course than directors of other subject areas. Finally, it should be noted that approximately a tenth of both primary and secondary respondents indicated that they either did not know whether there was a minimum expectation for EOtC training on their course, or failed to provide a response to this question.

Those primary and secondary respondents who indicated that there was a minimum expectation for EOtC training on their respective courses were asked to state what the minimum expectation was. A range of comments were made by primary (7 comments) and secondary (109 comments) respondents; some of which were made by both types of respondent, whilst some were uniquely specific to secondary course/subject directors. Table 5.2 provides details of the comments made, with illustrative examples.

Table 5.2 Detail of minimum expectation for EOtC training (number of respondents)

Minimum Expectation	Secondary respondents (N = 115)	Primary Respondents (N = 8)	Example
'One EOtC experience'	26	1	'All students accompany at least one school trip'
'Less than half a week'	18	1	'48 hour residential with linked assignment'
'Some experience'	14	2	'Have an insight into good practice in organising off-site residential experiences'
'Completion of course criteria'	12	1	'There is an EOtC planning / preparation task that every student must complete during school based work'
'Health and safety awareness'	6	1	'Awareness of health and safety issues/regulations about EOtC'
'More than half a week'	5	1	'Four days compulsory attendance at university arranged sites'

Open response question

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

The most common minimum expectations of EOtC training (on both primary and secondary courses) were short periods of time, for example, 'one EOtC experience' and 'less than half a week'. In addition, the minimum expectation for some respondents' courses related more to theory and understanding, rather than actual practical experience, such as 'completion of course criteria', which included planning and preparation, and 'some experience', such as an awareness of, or insight into, EOtC.

The secondary course/subject directors who stated a minimum expectation that was not mentioned by their primary counterparts, most frequently referred to activities to 'meet the QTS training standard' (29), such as 'a professional studies activity to meet standard 3.1.5' and 'to meet the QTS standard for organising a trip/visit'. The remaining two comments, stated by a minority of secondary course/subject directors, included a minimum expectation of between 'five to seven days' (7) or a 'cross-curricular activity' (1), where 'all students take part in a cross-curricular day off site'.

5.2 EOtC activities

5.2.1 Within institution-based programmes

Primary and secondary respondents were asked to estimate, on average, how much time a trainee on their course would spend being trained in different EOtC activities, such as school site activities and off-site day visits, within institution-based programmes [Sec Q8a & Prim Q9a & Q15a]. It should be noted that for a number of EOtC activities there was a relatively high non-response rate from all respondent types.

Tables 5.3 and 5.4, overleaf, show that for a number of EOtC activities, secondary course/subject directors and primary programme directors most frequently stated that trainees received no EOtC training, or had no time dedicated to training activities within institution-based programmes. For example, roughly half of secondary respondents and a number of undergraduate and postgraduate primary respondents said that trainees spent no time on training for:

- ‘non-residential activities that take place during school holiday periods’ (secondary:120; primary postgraduate:8; primary undergraduate:4)
- ‘off-site residential overseas’ (secondary: 119; primary postgraduate: 8; primary undergraduate: 3).

The two main EOtC training activities most frequently and consistently identified by all respondents were ‘off-site day visits’ and ‘school site activities’. For these activities, the average amount of time spent on training was relatively short. However, more time training was reported for ‘off-site day visits’ and also by primary respondents. Indeed, roughly half of the secondary respondents (118) stated that trainees involved in ‘school site activities’ would receive ‘less than a day’ or ‘one to two days’ training, whereas proportionally more primary respondents stated that trainees would typically receive ‘one to two days’ or ‘two days to a week’ of training for this activity (postgraduate: 8; undergraduate:7). With regards to ‘off-site day visits’, however, respondents most frequently indicated that trainees would experience between ‘one to two days’ or ‘two days to a weeks’ training (secondary: 154; primary postgraduate: 15; primary undergraduate: 8). It should be noted that there was an element of contradiction in some of the responses, in that respondents stated that trainees spent less than one day on ‘off-site day visits’ and residential experiences (overseas and in the UK).

Analysis showed some differences according to secondary subject area. These were:

- respondents who directed geography courses were most likely to indicate that trainees spent longer periods of time being trained in ‘off-site residential experiences in the UK’ than any other subject director. Indeed, over half (14 out of 26) of geography respondents indicated that trainees

spent between two days to more than a week receiving training in this EOtC activity

- directors of mathematics courses were most likely to state that trainees received no training in any of the EOtC activities
- modern foreign language subject directors were most likely to indicate that trainees received some training time in relation to 'off-site residential experiences overseas' (14 out of 24).

Table 5.3 Average time spent on training in EOtC activities within institution-based programmes: secondary (number of respondents and percentage response rate)

EOtC activity	None		Less than 1 day		1 to 2 days		2+ days to a week		More than 1 week		Don't know		No response	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Secondary course/subject directors														
Non-residential activities that would take place during school holiday periods	120	49	13	5	6	3	5	2	-	-	24	10	75	31
Off-site residential experiences overseas	119	49	19	8	7	3	13	5	3	1	18	7	64	26
Off-site residential experiences within the UK	92	38	26	11	18	7	28	12	4	2	19	8	56	23
Before/after school study support	73	30	35	14	25	10	3	1	8	3	30	12	69	28
School site activities	35	14	51	21	67	28	10	4	10	4	23	10	47	20
Off-site day visits	17	7	34	14	115	47	39	16	9	4	6	2	23	10

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

Table 5.4 Average time spent on training in EOtC activities within institution-based programmes: primary (number of respondents)

EOtC activity	None (N)	Less than 1 day (N)	1 to 2 days (N)	2+ days to a week (N)	More than 1 week (N)	Don't know (N)	No response (N)
Primary postgraduate programme directors							
Non-residential activities that would take place during school holiday periods	8	-	-	2	-	3	5
Off-site residential experiences overseas	8	-	1	1	5	1	2
Before/after school study support	5	2	-	2	-	2	7
Off-site residential experiences within the UK	5	2	2	6	-	1	2
School site activities	1	3	3	5	-	3	3
Off-site day visits	-	2	5	10	-	-	1
Primary undergraduate programme directors							
Non-residential activities that would take place during school holiday periods	4	-	-	-	-	4	6
Before/after school study support	4	-	-	-	-	5	5
Off-site residential experiences within the UK	4	2	1	2	2	-	3
Off-site residential experiences overseas	3	-	-	2	4	1	4
School site activities	1	-	4	3	-	3	3
Off-site day visits	-	3	4	4	2	-	1

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

5.2.2 When on school placement

Primary and secondary programme directors were also asked whether trainees spent time being trained in EOtC activities when on school placement and, if so, whether there were specific time requirements attached to this training (Sec Q8b, c,d & Prim Q15 & 9 b,c,d). Tables 5.5 and 5.6 show that three-quarters (184) of secondary respondents (which included all three undergraduate secondary programme directors) and over half (ten) of primary postgraduate respondents stated that trainees did receive training in EOtC activities when on school placement. However, this pattern was not apparent in the responses of primary undergraduate programme directors as it was slightly more common for them to state that trainees did not receive training in EOtC activities when on school placement (5).

Table 5.5 EOtC training for secondary students when on school placement (number of respondents)

Training when on school placement	Secondary respondents	
	(N)	%
Yes	184	76
No	22	9
Don't know	32	13
No response	5	2
Total	243	100

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

Table 5.6 EOtC training for primary students when on school placement (number of respondents)

Training when on school placement	Primary respondents (N)	
	Postgraduate	Undergraduate
Yes	10	4
No	1	5
Don't know	5	3
No response	2	2
Total	18	14

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

Tables 5.5 and 5.6 also show that over a tenth (32) of secondary respondents, a fifth of primary undergraduate (3) and over a quarter (5) of primary postgraduate respondents did not know whether trainees received this type of training in EOtC activities when on school placement. Furthermore, additional analysis by secondary subject area shows that geography, English and modern foreign language secondary course directors more frequently indicated that trainees did receive training in EOtC activities when on school placement, than did any other subject director. By comparison, over a quarter (five out of

18) of mathematics subject directors stated that trainees did not receive this training when on school placement, whilst nearly a quarter of science subject directors did not know whether this was the case (nine out of 40).

Of the respondents who indicated that trainees did receive training in EOtC activities whilst on school placement (see Tables 5.5 and 5.6), the majority stated that there was not a specific time requirement attached to the training (secondary: 146; primary postgraduate: 10; primary undergraduate: 3). However, 29 secondary course/subject directors (28 postgraduate; 1 undergraduate) stated that there was a time requirement attached to EOtC training activities whilst trainees were on school placement. These respondents were from a range of subject areas. However, no mathematics or modern foreign languages course directors indicated that there was a time requirement. Details of the activities and different time requirements specified by respondents are listed below.

- **Off-site visits**, including fieldwork or school trips. In the main, respondents did not specify particular details about the visit and instead referred to *'off-site visits'* generally. Those who did provide details mainly cited visits to cultural places of interest including, museums, galleries and theatres, although one respondent did refer to *'workplace visits'*. Time requirements were predominantly day visits although it ranged from *'one to two hours'*; to *'half a day minimum'*; to *'four days experience minimum'* (geography) and finally *'seven days'* (art and design). In addition, some respondents stated that time requirements varied according to school placement.
- **School site activities**. Activities specified typically concerned outdoor activities, such as *'orienteering and problem solving'* and *'outdoor and adventure activities'*, with the predominant time requirement being a minimum of six hour-long sessions. One respondent stated, however, that trainees were required to undertake *'school site activities for two hours per week'* and another stated that, whilst on school placement, trainees ran week-long *'enterprise activities'*.
- **Before/after school study support**, including extra curricular activities. Activities cited included *'extra curricular sport'*, *'study support'* and *'music activities (run alone or supporting other teachers)'*. These activities typically had a weekly time requirement ranging from *'two hour sessions a week'* to *'three to six hours a week'*. In relation to study support, although no time requirement was specified, the respondent stated that trainees were *'encouraged to be involved'*.
- **Planning and preparation**, including risk assessments. Comments focused on planning and preparation of EOtC activities when on school placement, rather than actual experiences of the activities. For example, one religious education director said that trainees had to plan a visit to a place of worship but commented that *'the visit may not take place'*. Specified time requirements varied because activities were *'dependent on the school'*. When time requirements were specified, these included *'two plus hours'* to *'more than two days but less than a week'*.
- **Off-site residential experiences within the UK**. Just one respondent made a comment about off-site residential experiences which was *'in Roman Catholic schools most trainees will go on a retreat which can be one day or two day residentials'*.

- **Variable activities and time requirements.** A minority of respondents stated that they were unable to provide specific detail of the time spent on activities whilst trainees were on school placement, mainly because of the variability that existed between schools and the fact that it was at the school's discretion. One respondent wrote '*it is impossible to give time allocations as it depends upon individual needs of the cohort from year to year and the experiences which a school can offer at any one time*'.

5.3 EOtC areas

5.3.1 Within institution-based programmes

Primary and secondary respondents were asked to estimate, on average, how much time a trainee on their course would spend being trained in different EOtC areas, such as fieldwork, when within their institution [Sec Q9a & Prim Q10a & Q16a]. It should be noted that there was some discrepancy between those respondents who previously indicated that training was provided in these EOtC areas (see Tables 4.7 and 4.8) and those who provided details of the time spent training in these areas (with the latter being less).

Tables 5.7 and 5.8 reveal that for all EOtC areas respondents most frequently stated that trainees received no training, or had no time dedicated to training in the areas whilst on their institution-based programme. This was chiefly the case for four EOtC areas in particular:

- **'Food and farming'**: more than half (55 per cent) of secondary respondents indicated that students did not spend any time being trained in this EOtC area. Similarly, more than two-fifths (eight) of primary postgraduate respondents and half (seven) of primary undergraduate respondents indicated that this was also the case.
- **'Active citizenship'**: just under a half (49 per cent) of secondary respondents, over a quarter (five) of primary postgraduate programme directors and more than two-fifths of primary undergraduate programme directors said that trainees had no time allocated to training in this area within their institution.
- **'Places of worship'**: just under a half (48 per cent) of secondary respondents indicated that trainees had no time allocated to training in this EOtC area. However, this was not the case for primary respondents who indicated that students were likely to have time dedicated to training in this area whilst on the institution-based part of their programme.
- **'Overseas visits/exchanges'**: more than two-fifths (45 per cent) of secondary course/subject directors indicated that trainees would not spend any time being trained in this area whilst on the institution-based part of their programme.

Table 5.7 Average time spent on training in EOtC areas within institution-based programmes: secondary (number of respondents and percentage of responses)

EOtC activity	None		Less than 1 day		1 to 2 days		2+ days to a week		More than 1 week		Don't know		No response	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Secondary course/subject directors														
Food and farming	134	55	11	5	1	<1	1	<1	-	-	14	6	82	34
Active citizenship	120	49	18	7	11	5	1	<1	2	1	13	5	78	32
Places of worship	117	48	21	9	12	5	7	3	2	1	12	5	72	30
Overseas visits/exchanges	110	45	26	11	6	3	9	4	5	2	15	6	72	30
Creativity and arts	90	37	23	10	51	21	13	5	1	<1	12	5	53	22
Use of outdoor education centres	86	35	33	14	23	10	18	7	3	1	17	7	63	26
Built environment and heritage	84	35	38	16	33	14	16	7	1	<1	11	5	60	25
Natural environment	74	31	43	18	39	16	10	4	-	-	14	6	63	26
Fieldwork	69	28	32	13	42	17	23	10	10	4	10	4	57	24
School grounds	63	26	60	25	20	8	5	2	6	3	16	7	73	30

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

Table 5.8 Average time spent on training in EOtC areas within institution-based programmes: primary (number of respondents)

EOtC activity	None (N)	Less than 1 day (N)	1 to 2 days (N)	2+ days to a week (N)	More than 1 week (N)	Don't know (N)	No response(N)
Primary postgraduate programme directors (N = 18)							
Food and farming	8	1	1	1	-	3	4
Overseas visits/exchanges	7	1	1	1	5	1	2
Active citizenship	5	3	1	-	-	4	5
Use of outdoor education centres	5	4	5	-	-	1	3
School grounds	3	4	5	-	-	3	3
Places of worship	2	7	8	-	-	-	1
Fieldwork	2	4	10	-	1	-	1
Natural environment	1	8	8	-	-	-	1
Built environment and heritage	1	6	8	1	-	1	1
Creativity and arts	-	7	7	1	-	-	3
Primary undergraduate programme directors (N = 14)							
Food and farming	7	-	-	-	-	2	5
Active citizenship	6	1	-	-	-	3	4
Overseas visits/exchanges	5	-	-	3	2	-	4
Places of worship	2	6	3	1	-	-	2
Built environment and heritage	1	3	4	3	-	1	2
Natural environment	1	2	6	2	-	1	2
Use of outdoor education centres	1	2	6	2	-	-	3
Creativity and arts	-	6	2	3	-	1	2
School grounds	-	2	4	2	-	3	3
Fieldwork	-	2	7	2	2	-	1

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

There were some notable differences according to subject area for three of the listed EOtC areas. Although overall ‘food and farming’ was least likely to have training time dedicated to it, nearly a fifth of geography subject directors stated that trainees received training in this EOtC area whilst within their institution. Nearly half of history subject directors indicated that trainees received some training in ‘places of worship’. Finally, nine-tenths of modern foreign language subject directors indicated that trainees received some training time on ‘overseas visits/exchanges’.

Figure 9 provides an example of one way a primary undergraduate programme provided trainees with an opportunity to experience EOtC in relation to food and farming.

Figure 9 EOtC training provided in relation to food and farming

BA/BSc Education and Subject Studies students at the university visit a LEAF (Linking Environment and Farming) farm as part of an Environment module on their course. LEAF is a charity which aims to help farmers to improve their environmental and business performance and create a better public understanding of farming through a nationwide network of demonstration farms. The trainees tour the farm and discuss the nature of LEAF activities. LEAF is a member organisation of FACE and the visits provide students with an opportunity to see at first hand what can be done to educate children and young people about food and farming in a sustainable countryside. Final year geography students also work with a FACE regional field officer and visit two contrasting farms in the region. They discuss and assess the opportunities for using farms as learning environments. The FACE officer has a wealth of expertise which they enthusiastically draw on. They meet farmers to understand the various ways in which the farming community is developing links, both with education and the wider community. They can then use this knowledge and experience when they are primary teachers and geography subject leaders (leader in geography education).

Fieldwork was the EOtC area that most frequently had time dedicated to institution-based training. Over two-fifths (44 per cent: 107) of secondary respondents, four-fifths (15) of primary postgraduate respondents and nearly all (13) primary undergraduate programme directors indicated that trainees received training in this area whilst on institution-based programmes. The ‘natural environment’ was also a commonly cited EOtC area which had time dedicated to training. When analysed by subject area, both types of EOtC area (fieldwork and the natural environment) were most frequently nominated by science and geography course directors as having time dedicated to training.

Respondents most frequently indicated that the average amount of time dedicated to training in all EOtC areas was relatively short (see Tables 5.7 and 5.8). The exact amount of training time varied between primary and secondary programmes. Training covering ‘less than one day’ was the most frequently

chosen response by secondary programme directors (305 nominations overall). Primary undergraduate and postgraduate programme directors, however, more frequently specified a slightly longer amount of training time of ‘one to two days’ (undergraduate: 32 nominations overall; postgraduate: 54 nominations overall).

5.3.2 When on school placement

Primary and secondary respondents were also asked whether trainees spent any time being trained in different EOtC areas when on school placement and, if so, were specific time requirements attached to the training. Table 5.9 shows that more than two-thirds of secondary respondents (168) stated that trainees did receive training in EOtC areas when on school placement.

Table 5.9 Training in EOtC when on school placement: secondary (number of respondents and percentage of responses)

Training when on school placement	Secondary respondents	
	(N)	%
Yes	168	69
No	18	7
Don't know	48	20
No response	9	4
Total	243	100

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

However, Table 5.10 reveals that a much lower proportion of primary undergraduate (4: more than a quarter) and postgraduate (7: nearly two-fifths) respondents stated that trainees did receive training in EOtC areas when on school placement. It is unclear whether this infers that training in EOtC areas was less apparent in primary ITT courses because roughly half of primary undergraduate (7) and postgraduate (8) respondents indicated that they either did not know whether trainees received this type of training in EOtC activities when on school placement or failed to provide a response to the question.

Table 5.10 Training in EOtC when on school placement: primary (number of respondents)

Training when on school placement	Primary respondents (N)	
	Postgraduate	Undergraduate
Yes	7	4
No	3	3
Don't know	4	5
No response	4	2
Total	18	14

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

Additional analysis by secondary subject areas parallels the findings presented in Section 5.2.2 (relating to EOtC activities) in that geography, English and modern foreign language subject directors most frequently indicated that trainees did receive training in EOtC areas when on school placement. By comparison, mathematics subject directors were most likely to state that trainees did not receive EOtC training when on school placement, whilst science subject directors were most unsure about whether trainees received this training when on school placement.

The overwhelming majority of respondents who indicated that trainees received training in EOtC whilst on school placement (see Tables 5.9 and 5.10) stated that there was not a specific time requirement attached to this training (secondary: 147; primary postgraduate: 7; primary undergraduate: 3). Conversely, 16 secondary course/subject directors stated that a time requirement was attached to EOtC training whilst on school placement (this was spread across subjects, although no mathematics, history or modern foreign language directors indicated that there was a time requirement). A small number of respondents provided further information:

- **School grounds.** Many respondents simply referred to '*school site activities*', however, those who did provide more detail included sports, outdoor and orienteering exercises. These EOtC activities were weekly and ranged from '*two or three hours per week*', to '*six hour-long sessions overall*'.
- **Fieldwork.** Comments all focused upon fieldwork trips that were a day or less. No further detail was provided about the specific nature of the fieldwork activity.
- **Planning and preparation,** including risk assessments. Comments focused on planning and preparation of different EOtC activities, for example, '*all trainees are required to discuss procedures related to EOtC with their mentor prior to arranging a trip themselves*'. The time requirement was typically two or more hours.
- **Variable activities and time requirements.** Some respondents indicated that the type of EOtC training activity trainees experienced when on school placement varied from school to school.

5.4 Quality of EOtC experiences

Using a five-point scale, where one represented ‘very poor’ and five represented ‘very good’, primary programme directors and secondary course/subject directors were asked to rate their perceptions of the average quality of EOtC experiences when trainees were on school placement [Sec Q12a & Prim Q19a]. Respondents were also provided with ‘too variable to comment’ and ‘don’t know’ options, thereby allowing them to record their responses as accurately and validly as possible. Table 5.11 sets out their responses.

Table 5.11 The average quality of EOtC experiences when trainees are on school placement (number of respondents)

Ratings of quality (N)	Secondary	Primary
Too variable to comment	78	10
Good	71	5
OK	43	4
Very good	27	4
Poor	11	-
Don't know	9	3
Very poor	2	-
No response	2	1
Total	243	27

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

The most frequent response, from both primary (10) and secondary respondents (78), was that EOtC experiences were ‘too variable to comment’ and, therefore, respondents felt unable to provide a quality rating of trainees’ experiences whilst on school placement. However, when respondents did provide a quality rating, the majority were positive. This was most notable for responses from secondary programme directors. Specifically, two-fifths (98) of secondary respondents and a third (9) of primary respondents rated the quality of EOtC experiences on school placement as either ‘good’ or ‘very good’. In addition, roughly a seventh of both primary (4) and secondary (43) respondents rated the quality of trainees’ experiences as ‘ok’.

No primary respondents reported poor quality ratings. However, poor quality ratings were made by one in 20 secondary course/subject directors. These respondents were from across different subject areas, but were most commonly mathematics subject/course directors. Examples of reasons provided to support this rating included:

[EOtC is] not really focused on. [Trainees] get it through ‘osmosis’ and we do not train mentors to do it either.

Schools find it difficult to release key stage 3 pupils for galleries etc. School grounds are insufficiently used, with risk assessment having prevented some visits taking place.

Secondary course/subject directors

Nearly three-fifths (139) of secondary respondents and just under half (13) of primary respondents qualified their response with comments. The vast majority of comments were common across both respondent types, although a small number were specifically made by secondary course/subject directors. The following comments were stated by both primary and secondary respondents:

- **Variability of the experiences** (secondary: 67 comments; primary: 5 comments). Comments here generally centered upon the perceived variability of experiences depending on trainees' school placement, including school policy and associated practices, and the opportunities offered to trainees:

Use 40 schools so experiences will vary.

Many experience residential trips abroad but some do not.

Secondary course/subject directors

There is great variation in the 800 schools in our partnership.

It varies from school to school.

Primary programme directors

- **School role and factors** (secondary: 33 comments; primary: 2 comments). Respondents pointed to the important role that schools and associated school factors had in relation to the quality of EOtC experiences for trainees. Specifically, the reluctance (secondary: 9 comments; primary: 1 comment) or supportiveness (mentioned by 16 secondary respondents only) of schools to provide and support EOtC experiences, was considered to be an important and crucial component in terms of the quality of the experiences trainees received. For example, one respondent stated that '*all [trainees] are included in the preparation of visits but very few are invited to participate*'.

Respondents also drew attention to the timing of placements (secondary: 8 comments; primary: 1 comment) which were felt to affect the quality of EOtC experiences. This included the quality of EOtC being dependent upon the school cycle for allowing EOtC activities and events. One respondent also noted that some EOtC opportunities occasionally existed during school holidays but that many trainees had childcare commitments and, therefore, were unable to take advantage of the opportunities available. It was also noted that more opportunities arose during the summer term than during other terms. However, trainees were unlikely to be able to take advantage of school opportunities at this time because of the constraints of their courses. Finally, another respondent noted that '*some schools offer outdoor experiences when students can't access them*'.

- **Good quality of experiences** (secondary: 28 comments; primary: 2 comments). Respondents qualified their ratings by stating that *‘when it occurs, it is good’* (primary programme director), with one secondary respondent providing further clarification that *‘trainees often take part in well organised geography field visits for GCSE and other work’*.
- **Trainee enjoyment and/or choice** (secondary: 12 comments; primary: 2 comments). Comments focused upon two issues; firstly that the quality of experiences could be dependent upon the trainees themselves, such as their proactive attitude to seeking out EOtC opportunities; and secondly that trainees typically enjoyed the activities they were involved in and were positive about their experiences. For example:

Trainees enjoy being involved in the planning of visits outside school.
Secondary course/subject directors

Trainees enjoy the variety we offer.
Primary programme director

This finding is reinforced by trainees’ evaluations of their EOtC experiences that were provided by one primary postgraduate programme director. Positive trainee comments included:

*Fieldwork [was the part of the module most beneficial to my studies].
Excellent creative ideas for science and great to work with children.*

There was a good amount of practical work and trips during the semi-specialist days, which all gave good, practical ideas and advice.

I thought the field trips were so beneficial to my learning.
Primary postgraduate trainees

A small number of comments were made by secondary respondents that were not mentioned by their primary counterparts. One of these, as noted previously, was the supportiveness of schools which affected the quality of trainees’ experiences (16 comments). Specific remarks were made that schools tried to facilitate experiences where possible and that *‘visits are usually arranged by experienced teachers who work closely with the trainees on focused activities’*. In addition, four secondary respondents noted that the quality of experiences depended upon trainees’ chosen subject area. Respondents stated that for some subjects EOtC opportunities were readily available, for example, in history *‘fieldwork is a central element of the school history GCSE options taken by many of the partnership schools so EOtC is well integrated into curriculum planning’*.

Finally, a number of more disparate comments were provided by individual primary and secondary respondents. These comments focused on:

- the quality of EOtC experiences and a view that quality issues were not addressed
- a lack of creativity in schools
- a lack of EOtC opportunities.

6 Challenges and facilitators

Key findings

- The three main factors that respondents felt had helped the provision of EOtC training over the last five years were: the 'availability of suitable EOtC sites, opportunities and activities'; an 'awareness of the outcomes of EOtC'; and 'school-based demand'.
- The three main factors that respondents felt had hindered EOtC training over the last five years were: 'funding for EOtC training'; 'curriculum changes/pressures'; and 'the demands/expectations of the ITT course'.
- When respondents were asked to indicate changes in the provision of EOtC training over the last five years, over two-fifths noted that it had increased, whilst a similar number felt there had been no change, and just over a tenth said there had been a decrease. The majority of secondary respondents indicated that they thought that there had been no change, whereas the majority of primary respondents indicated that they considered there to have been an increase. Roughly equal proportions of both primary and secondary respondents (around one in ten) considered that EOtC training had decreased during this five year period.

In order to identify the possible challenges and facilitators to the provision of EOtC training in ITT, respondents were presented with a list of 12 factors and asked to select those that had helped and/or hindered EOtC training in their institution over the last five years [Sec Q 10 & Prim Q17]. An 'other' option was also included allowing respondents to record additional factors that may have helped or hindered them specifically.

6.1 Factors that have helped or hindered the provision of EOtC training

As Table 6.1 shows, the factors that respondents perceived to have most helped EOtC training during the five-year period from 2001 to 2006, emerged as broadly similar for both primary and secondary respondents:

- the 'availability of suitable EOtC sites/opportunities/activities' (identified by almost three-fifths (141) of secondary and more than three-quarters (21) of primary respondents)
- an 'awareness of outcomes of EOtC' (reported by two-fifths (99) of secondary and just under three-fifths (16) of primary respondents)
- 'school-based demand', for example, a greater number of EOtC experiences provided by schools (identified by almost a third (78) of secondary and a fifth (6) of primary respondents).

Table 6.1 Factors helping or hindering EOtC training over the last five years (number of respondents)

Factors	Helped (N)	Hindered (N)
Secondary subject/course directors		
Availability of suitable EOtC sites /opportunities/ activities	141	23
Awareness of outcomes of EOtC	99	11
School-based demand	78	33
Recording main risks and how to manage them	65	55
Demands/expectations of the ITT course	62	99
Taking responsibility for pupil safety	51	62
Focus on EOtC at a national level (e.g. policies/initiatives)	46	37
Focus on EOtC at an institutional level	35	47
Teacher union/association support	26	33
Curriculum changes/pressures	26	100
Funding for EOtC training	23	109
Staffing changes	14	40
Other	4	11
Primary programme directors		
Availability of suitable EOtC sites /opportunities/ activities	21	1
Awareness of outcomes of EOtC	16	0
School-based demand	6	3
Demands/expectations of the ITT course	6	16
Focus on EOtC at a national level (e.g. policies/initiatives)	6	5
Focus on EOtC at an institutional level	6	4
Taking responsibility for pupil safety	5	5
Curriculum changes/pressures	4	14
Recording main risks and how to manage them	3	6
Staffing changes	3	5
Other	2	0
Teacher union/association support	1	1
Funding for EOtC training	1	13

This was a multiple response question: respondents could select more than one option

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

In addition, Table 6.1 also shows that the factor ranked fourth by secondary respondents, as having helped the provision of EOtC training over the last five years, was ‘recording main risks and how to manage them’, as indicated by just over a quarter (65) of secondary respondents (i.e. there was a recognised need for trainees to have those skills). Nearly a fifth (6) of primary respondents identified a ‘focus on EOtC at a national level’ and a ‘focus on EOtC at an institutional level’ as having helped the provision of EOtC training

(fifth and sixth ranked factor respectively). It is also interesting to note that some respondents indicated that ‘funding for EOtC training’ had helped over the last five years. The respondents who indicated the latter were contacted to provide further information. Two examples of the provision of funding for EOtC activities are outlined in Figures 10 and 11.

Figure 10 Primary postgraduate respondent who indicated that ‘funding for EOtC activities’ had been a help

The university does not receive any specific funding for EOtC activities but takes advantage of the funding available to the Education Department of the National Gallery in London. This allows the university to arrange educational half-day visits for 180 PGCE trainees, in groups of 25 or 26, which includes the services of an expert tutor from the Gallery’s staff. This visit occurs during the autumn term and is free of charge to the university and the trainees (primary English PGCE lecturer).

Figure 11 Secondary postgraduate respondent who indicated that ‘funding for EOtC activities’ had been a help

Trainees are required to attend a two-night and three-day residential trip to York and Bristol. The university pays a third of the costs, whilst trainees pay the remaining proportion through installments across the academic year. The institution also takes trainees on museum visits which are paid for wholly by the institution. A number of the museum visits are provided free of charge by the museum. In return, an academic member of staff from the university provides a discussion or presentation for the museum (secondary postgraduate course director).

Analysis according to subject area produced some key differences in the factors perceived to have helped different secondary course/subject directors over the last five years. The most prominent findings in terms of differences between secondary course/subject directors were:

- science subject directors most frequently stated that ‘funding for EOtC training’ and the ‘focus on EOtC at a national level’ had helped EOtC training in ITT provision (11 respondents out of 40 respectively)
- modern foreign language subject directors most frequently stated ‘teacher union support’ had helped the level of EOtC training (6 respondents out of 24)
- geography subject directors were the most likely to indicate that the ‘demands/expectations of the course’ had helped (13 respondents out of 26).

In terms of factors that were perceived to have hindered EOtC training over the last five years, Table 6.1 shows that these were broadly the same for both primary and secondary respondents.

- ‘funding for EOtC training’ (indicated by nearly half of both primary and secondary respondents (109 and 13 respectively))
- ‘curriculum changes/pressures’ (identified by two-fifths (100) of secondary and just over half (14) of primary respondents)
- the ‘demands/expectations of the ITT course’ (reported by two-fifths (99) of secondary and almost three-fifths (16) of primary respondents).

In addition, just over a fifth (62) of secondary respondents identified ‘taking responsibility for pupil safety’ as a factor that had hindered EOtC training over the last five years (fourth ranked factor), while a fifth of both primary (6) and secondary (55) respondents highlighted ‘recording main risks and how to manage them’ (fifth and fourth ranked factor respectively). In addition, one secondary respondent provided detailed comments about how the ‘focus on EOtC at an institutional level’ had hindered the level of EOtC training offered to trainees on the course they directed. The comments received are provided in Figure 12 below.

Figure 12 Secondary postgraduate respondent who indicated that ‘focus at an institutional level’ had been a hindrance

Historically, the university provided a residential experience for trainees. However, due to changes in academic staff, the residential experience is due to be abolished. This was felt to be detrimental for trainees because student feedback from the experience was very positive and it ‘enabled them to work well together at the start of the course and provided an opportunity to increase the contact time with students’. In addition, it was felt that the inclusion of a residential experience for trainees was the best way to cater for Outdoor and Adventurous Activities which, as one of the six activity areas of the PE National Curriculum had to be delivered within the programme (secondary postgraduate course leader).

For some factors, similar numbers of respondents (particularly secondary subject/course directors) considered them to be both a help and a hindrance. These were:

- ‘teacher union/association support’ (helped: 26; hindered: 33)
- ‘focus on EOtC at a national level’ (helped: 46; hindered: 37)
- ‘recording main risks and how to manage them’ (helped: 65; hindered: 55).

As noted earlier, respondents were given the opportunity to suggest ‘other’ factors which they felt had either helped or hindered the provision of EOtC over the past five years. One primary programme director responded to this opportunity, stating that the value placed on EOtC by ITT tutors was a help. In contrast, 17 secondary course/subject directors indicated that they considered there to be additional factors to those provided in the questionnaire which had

helped or hindered EOtC provision. The majority of their comments (nine) focused on the issue of time, with five specifically identifying a lack of time as being a hindrance, there was said to be *'too much to cover in too short a time'*. Three respondents highlighted the value placed on EOtC by ITT tutors, with two identifying this as a help and one stating that the value ITT tutors placed on EOtC could act as both a help and a hindrance, depending upon their viewpoint. Further additional factors identified as both a help and a hindrance by secondary respondents included: the QTS standard (helped: one comment; hindered: two comments); the agenda and/or needs of external providers (helped: one comment; hindered: one comment); and schools (helped, e.g. their appreciation of the value of EOtC: one comment; hindered, e.g. their reluctance to take trainees out because of *'red tape'*: one comment). In addition, financial constraints/funding issues were identified as a hindrance by one secondary respondent. Finally, one respondent also felt that the subject area affected the provision of EOtC training because for some courses, such as mathematics, it was felt to be *'irrelevant'*.

6.2 Changes in the extent of EOtC training in ITT

Questionnaire respondents were asked to consider whether they felt there had been any changes in the extent of EOtC training in ITT courses or programmes during the five-year period between 2001 and 2006 [Sec Q11 & Prim Q18]. Table 6.2 sets out the responses of both primary and secondary respondents.

Table 6.2 Changes in the extent of EOtC training over the last five years (number of respondents)

Change	Secondary respondents (N)	Primary Respondents (N)
Increase	95	15
Decrease	34	3
No change	107	7
No response	7	2
Total	243	27

Source: NFER survey June-July 2006

Table 6.2 shows that secondary respondents most frequently indicated that they did not think there had been any change in their respective courses (107), whereas primary respondents most frequently indicated that they considered there to have been an increase in the extent of EOtC training over the last five years (15). Roughly a tenth of both primary (3) and secondary (34) respondents considered there to have been a decrease in the provision of EOtC training, with the primary respondents being from both undergraduate and

postgraduate courses, whereas all the secondary respondents were from undergraduate programmes.

Analysis revealed that there were no key differences in the responses of secondary respondents according to subject area. There was a noticeable difference in the responses of secondary course/subject directors according to the qualification trainees achieved on their course. Those who indicated that trainees achieved a PGCE qualification most frequently indicated that there was no change in the extent of EOtC training on their courses over the last five years. By comparison, those respondents who indicated that trainees achieved a BA, a BSc or an 'other' qualification, such as an advanced diploma, most frequently stated that they considered there to have been an increase in the extent of EOtC training over the last five years.

7 Future developments

Key findings

- The main changes/actions that respondents thought would help encourage their ITT institution to offer more EOtC activities to trainees on their courses were: increased funding and time; greater clarification of, and emphasis on, the QTS standards (in relation to EOtC); a change in schools' expectations and standards; course modification and additional materials and information.

Respondents were asked to consider what changes/actions they thought would help or encourage their ITT provider to offer more EOtC activities to trainees on the course they directed [Sec Q15 & Prim Q22]. In total, two-thirds of both secondary course/subject directors (185) and primary programme directors (21) suggested some change/action that they thought would help or encourage their ITT provider to offer more EOtC activities. In the main, comments were broadly similar for primary and secondary respondents and typically focused upon the following issues:

- **Increased funding** (secondary: 72 comments; primary: 7 comments). This was by far the most commonly made suggestion to encourage ITT providers to offer more EOtC. Comments generally referred to an increase in, and specific allocation of, the funding provided for EOtC training in ITT provision. Some respondents specifically stated that more funding was needed to '*subsidise residentials*' to '*support off-site visits*' and to '*provide additional opportunities*' (see Section 6.1 for further discussion of funding and its perceived help/hindrance for EOtC).
- **Increased time** (secondary: 41 comments; primary: 4 comments). Comments centred on the challenge of providing EOtC opportunities to trainees in an '*overcrowded*' ITT course. Respondents highlighted that '*time is a real constraint on a one-year PGCE programme*' and that '*trainees now spend so little time in the institution it is difficult to fit everything in as it is*'. In relation to the latter, a minority of secondary programme directors called for trainees to spend '*less school-based time and more college-based time*' (see Section 6.1 for further discussion of time/course pressures and its considered help/hindrance for EOtC).
- **QTS standards** (secondary: 24 comments; primary: 5 comments). Respondents requested more clarity, but also flexibility, in the standards for ITT provision and EOtC. Some also wanted to see a greater emphasis on EOtC within the standards and at a national level. Comments included: '*more emphasis on EOtC in specification of the National Curriculum and exam board*'; '*more flexibility in Ofsted standards*'; '*EOtC to be valued in standards for QTS*'; and '*clearer guidance at a national level ITT*'.
- **School expectations and attitudes** (secondary: 22 comments; primary: 3 comments). Respondents pinpointed the perceived need to change schools' expectations and attitudes towards providing EOtC experiences to trainees,

with one suggestion being *'more overt government interest and expectation'*. Furthermore, respondents wanted a greater commitment to, and support for, EOtC in schools and for schools to be encouraged to become more actively involved in providing EOtC experiences. For example, *'schools to be encouraged that ICT trips are a valid part of the curriculum'*; *'greater expectation of partner schools for trainees to use outside classroom contexts for learning'*; and *'compulsory direction given to schools to provide EOtC'*.

- **Course modification** (secondary: 21 comments; primary: 4 comments). Responses varied in relation to this suggested future action, ranging from: making ITT a two year course and *'free up the ITT course to allow more innovation'*, through to making EOtC an explicit and also compulsory activity in the institution. For example, *'the possible introduction of a minimum expectation'* and a *'minimum funded half-day session which all have to undertake'*. One secondary respondent also wanted to see more opportunities offered to trainees when on school placement. Finally, some respondents wanted more subject-based EOtC activities (e.g. in mathematics) and *'better subject related opportunities'*.
- **Additional resources** (secondary: 13 comments; primary: 3 comments). The variety of comments ranged from: more information and web-based materials, such as *'a web-site dedicated to EOtC for institutions to use'*, through to more local and suitable sites.

A very small minority of respondents also argued that improved communication and liaison (secondary: 2 comments; primary: 1 comment) including the *'sharing of good practice between institutions'* and *'further liaison with teachers in partnership schools'* would encourage their ITT institution to offer more EOtC. A further minority, however, felt that an increase in EOtC provision was not a priority for them (secondary: 3 comments; primary: 2 comments), mainly because of the subject they directed, for example, *'it is inapplicable to mathematics or, at most, very peripheral'*. It was also suggested that EOtC was not the focus of an ITT course and that *'there are priorities to be decided upon and EOtC arises incidentally rather than as a central theme'*, with the priority being *'to improve teaching and learning in a subject area and you only use EOtC to enhance that'*.

Once again, a number of specific comments were made only by secondary course/subject directors. These included a call for greater recognition of, and support for, EOtC at a national level (7 comments), for example, to *'raise [the] profile of EOtC and show why it is so vital, so that it forces us to look at it in more detail'* and a need for *'recognition of its importance at a national level'*.

Other issues related to the following:

- staffing (5 comments), such as a need for *'better quality trainers'*
- improved coordination (5 comments), including the need for a *'programme-wide coordinated approach to EOtC'*
- the commissioning of research into the value of EOtC (3 comments), for example, the need to *'commission research to evaluate and assess the*

value of EOtC in RE and the value of visits to faith communities to the aims of education as a whole'.

Finally 14 secondary respondents also felt that current EOtC provision was sufficient stating that the: *'balance is fine as it stands'* and that it was *'difficult to see how more emphasis could be placed on this aspect of training'*.

8 Conclusions

Key findings

- The results from the survey suggested that there was substantial variation in the amount of EOtC training across courses and across institutions. The quality of provision during school placements was rated as variable by around a third of respondents.
- There were several gaps in subject directors' knowledge, particularly around factors such as the amount of time spent on activities, where responsibility lay for coordinating EOtC activities, and on what happened on school placements.
- Overall, three key issues emerged from the study: the variation between institutions; the possibility that some students may be inadequately prepared for EOtC; and the lack of quality assurance resulting from course and programme directors' lack of knowledge of what happens on school placements.

In the introduction to this report, it was noted that the Education and Skills Select Committee acknowledged that in order to realise its full potential: *'outdoor education must be carried out properly, with sessions being prepared by well-trained teachers and in accordance with good curriculum guidance'* (Select Committee, 2005). Evidence submitted to the Select Committee by various groups and institutions, commented on the current inadequacy of ITT in failing to give trainee teachers the confidence required to take pupils out of the classroom. However, at the time of the Select Committee's report, no secure, up-to-date or substantial evidence base existed, in terms of teachers' preparation for teaching in the outdoor classroom, on which future policy could be based. This report provides that evidence base. The data is drawn from 70 out of 75 HEIs in England and was completed during June and July 2006.

The findings from the survey, completed by 312 teacher educators (which represented 47 per cent of those to whom the questionnaire was sent) indicate that EOtC was explicitly addressed in nearly 90 per cent of primary and secondary courses and programmes. Whereas a small number of respondents reported that the extent of EOtC training had gone down over the last five years, three times as many respondents said that it had increased (with a similar number noting that there had been no change in the extent of training). Schools played a major role in training for EOtC. The majority of respondents reported that student teachers received training in EOtC when they were on school placements. A small minority of secondary subject directors and none

of the primary programme directors rated the average quality of trainees' EOtC experiences in school as 'poor' or 'very poor'.

As well as school-based training, most secondary subject directors reported that EOtC training was delivered through stand alone compulsory units or during off-site day/residential experiences. Most primary programme directors reported that EOtC training was interwoven across subject areas. A wide range of external providers were involved in EOtC training, including museums, galleries, field-study centres and outdoor education centres. EOtC training was generally coordinated by individual course or subject directors rather than by the overall director of ITT.

Despite the broadly positive picture of provision, there were some less positive findings. A number of respondents, including three primary programme directors, stated that EOtC was not addressed during ITT, despite the fact that in order to be awarded QTS, trainees must demonstrate that they have met all the standards laid down by the TDA.

Overall, nearly half of the respondents reported that there was no minimum entitlement for EOtC training on their courses and a minority (15) did not know if this was the case. One in ten respondents reported that students received no training in EOtC activities during their school placement and a slightly larger number (15 per cent) reported that they did not know if any training was provided on school placement. Nearly a third of respondents thought that the quality of EOtC experience their students received in school was 'too variable' to comment on.

In terms of the amount of time devoted to training, almost half of the secondary respondents reported that the average time trainees spent on off-site day visits within institution-based programmes was 'one to two days'; The majority of primary programme directors reported that their trainees spent 'two plus days to a week' on off-site day visits.

In summary, there was substantial variation in the amount of training across courses and across institutions. The quality of provision during school placements was rated as variable by around a third of respondents. There were several gaps in subject directors' knowledge, particularly around factors such as the amount of time spent on activities, where responsibility lay for coordinating EOtC activities, and on what happened on school placements. It would seem, then, that three key issues emerge from the study: the variation between institutions; the possibility that some students may be inadequately prepared for EOtC, and the lack of quality assurance resulting from course and programme directors' lack of knowledge of what happens on school placements.

In order to meet the existing TDA standard, all trainees should be able to: identify opportunities in the curriculum where EOtC would enhance learning; plan and carry out, safely, an activity outside the classroom, in collaboration with experienced staff, and, should be aware of strategies for assessing the value of EOtC activities.

It may be that the varied levels of provision for training for EOtC reflect varied interpretations of the existing TDA standard. As was noted earlier in the report, the TDA has formulated new, revised standards which will be implemented in September 2007. The proposed new wording of the one standard relating to EOtC would appear to be less rigorous than that which is currently in force. From September 2007, trainees will only need to demonstrate that they can 'identify opportunities for learners to learn in out of school contexts'. The wording of future standards could be critical in influencing ITT providers' provision of training. Ofsted have a role to play in assessing the extent to which ITT institutions are providing adequate training for EOtC.

The fact that some respondents were unable to comment on the quality of their provision of training for EOtC is an issue that quality assurance managers for all ITT courses may need to consider. Evidence for meeting existing standard S3.1.5 needs to be collected by schools and ITT institutions systematically. In order to ensure that adequate training is provided for all trainees in school, teachers responsible for trainee teachers might consider adopting a minimum entitlement, for example, helping to plan and carry out one school visit. Programme and subject directors in ITT institutions might also consider stipulating a minimum entitlement to training in EOtC.

In the light of the recently launched Learning Outside the Classroom Manifesto and associated programmes such as Growing Schools, the DfES is in a position to support trainees and ITT institutions in valuing and utilising the full range of opportunities for EOtC that exist in the UK and overseas. One possible role here for the DfES could be in ensuring that existing resources for training in EOtC are made more widely available than is currently the case.

An issue that affects organisations that provide opportunities for EOtC, such as the National Network of Science Learning Centres, museums, field centres and botanical gardens is the degree to which they can encourage trainee teachers to make more use of their facilities, for example, by providing reduced costs or free training, by extending hours of opening, or by increasing their marketing to ITT institutions. Given the lack of focus on food and farming highlighted by this research, organisations supporting links between farms, city farms and ITT institutions might wish to seek ways to increase the opportunities that trainees have to see how food is produced through subsidised visits or the production of educational resources aimed at ITT courses.

Finally, trainee teachers themselves have a responsibility to evaluate their own knowledge and awareness of EOtC and take steps to improve through reading research literature, making visits to possible sites of EOtC, and by seeking involvement in work in school grounds, visits and other activities.

References

BARKER, S., SLINGSBY, D. and TILLING, S. (2002). Teaching Biology Outside the Classroom: is it Heading for Extinction? A Report on Biology Fieldwork in the 14-19 Curriculum (FSC Occasional Publication 72). Shrewsbury: Field Studies Council.

DfES (2005). Education Outside the Classroom Manifesto [online]. Available: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/consultations/conDetails.cfm?consultationId=1370> [21 February, 2006].

DILLON, J., MORRIS, M., O'DONNELL, L., REID, A., RICKINSON, M. and SCOTT, W. (2005). Engaging and Learning with the Outdoors - the Final Report of the Outdoor Classroom in a Rural Context Action Research Project. Slough: NFER.

GREAT BRITAIN. PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF COMMONS. EDUCATION AND SKILLS SELECT COMMITTEE (2004). Education outside the classroom: second report of session 2004-05 report, together with formal minutes, oral and written evidence [online]. Available: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmeduski/120/120.pdf> [10 February 2005].

GREAT BRITAIN. PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF COMMONS. EDUCATION AND SKILLS SELECT COMMITTEE (2005). Government Response to the Committee's Second Report (Education outside the Classroom) Sixth Report (National Skills Strategy: 14-19 Education and Eighth Report (Teaching Children to Read) of Session 2004-5. [online]. Available: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmeduski/406/40604.htm> [21 July 2005].

HARRIS, I. (1999). 'Outdoor education in secondary schools: what future?' *Horizons*, **4**, 5-8.

OFSTED (2004) Outdoor education: Aspects of good practice. London: Ofsted.

RICKINSON, M., DILLON, J., TEAMEY, K., MORRIS, M., CHOI, M., SANDERS, D. and BENEFIELD, P. (2004). A Review of Research on Outdoor Learning. Shrewsbury: Field Studies Council.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Primary questionnaire



Education Outside the Classroom

Questionnaire for Primary Programme Directors

This questionnaire is part of a study which seeks to provide evidence on the extent and nature of training in **education outside the classroom** in ITT provision across England. The research has been commissioned by the DfES, the Countryside Agency and Farming and Countryside Education. NFER is carrying out the survey on their behalf.

'Education outside the classroom' (EOtC) refers to the use of contexts other than the classroom environment as a teaching and learning resource and may include:

- **School site activities** (e.g. science lessons in a vegetable or wildlife area, drama in the outdoors)
- **Off-site day visits** (e.g. to environmental centres, art galleries, historic buildings, local community projects, outdoor and adventurous activities)
- **Before/after school study support** (e.g. voluntary out of school hours learning activity)
- **Off-site residential experiences within the UK** (e.g. field study centre, Duke of Edinburgh Award, outdoor and adventurous activities)
- **Off-site residential experiences overseas** (e.g. cultural and language exchanges)
- **Non-residential activities that take place during school holiday periods** (e.g. city farm summer schools, Summer Reading Challenge, Do It for Real activities).

Please note that in this context, EOtC does not include general PE activities on the school site, although it could include activities that fall under the Outdoor and Adventurous Activities strand of the PE curriculum.

We would be most grateful for your help in providing information about EOtC training in your ITT provision. In your role as **Primary Programme Director of ITT provision**, we would very much appreciate it if you could fill in this questionnaire. It should take no more than 20-25 minutes to complete. Whatever the degree of your coverage of EOtC in ITT at your institution, we would very much like to hear from you. Your views are very important.

Please be assured that your answers will be treated in confidence and reported only in aggregated form. We would be grateful if you could complete the questionnaire by **30th June 2006** and return it in the envelope provided. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact **Mark Bailey on telephone 01753 637335 or email m.bailey@nfer.ac.uk**.

Thank you very much for your help with this important piece of research.

©National Foundation for Educational Research 2006,
NFER, The Mere, Upton Park, SLOUGH, SL1 2DQ

A ABOUT YOU

1a. Which ITT programme(s) do you direct? *(Please tick one box only)*

Primary postgraduate Primary undergraduate Both

1b. On the programme(s) you direct, what qualification do trainees achieve?
(Please tick all that apply)

BEd 1 BA+QTS 2 BSc+QTS 3 PGCE 4

Other 5 *(Please specify)*

B PROVISION OF EOtC ACTIVITIES

2a. Is EOtC addressed explicitly in the programme(s) you direct?
(Please tick all that apply)

Postgraduate			Undergraduate		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>

If you answered YES to either postgraduate or undergraduate, please go to Q3
If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW to both postgraduate and undergraduate, please go to Q2b

2b. Are there any plans to include EOtC training in the programme(s) you direct? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Postgraduate			Undergraduate		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>

Please go to question 20

3. In which of the following primary curriculum areas do EOtC training and activities take place? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Art and design <input type="checkbox"/> 1	Modern foreign languages <input type="checkbox"/> 8
Design and technology <input type="checkbox"/> 2	Physical Education <input type="checkbox"/> 9
English <input type="checkbox"/> 3	Professional Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 10
Geography <input type="checkbox"/> 4	PSHE/Citizenship <input type="checkbox"/> 11
History <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Religious education <input type="checkbox"/> 12
ICT <input type="checkbox"/> 6	Science <input type="checkbox"/> 13
Mathematics <input type="checkbox"/> 7	Other <i>(Please specify)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 14

4. Are trainees required to have practical experience of EOtC as part of the programme(s) you direct? *(Please tick one box only)*

Postgraduate			Undergraduate		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

*If you direct primary postgraduate programme(s) please go to Q5 below
If you ONLY direct primary undergraduate programme(s) please go to Q11*

FOR DIRECTORS OF POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES ONLY

C DELIVERY AND COORDINATION OF EOtC ACTIVITIES

5. What are the objectives of the EOtC training provided by your postgraduate programme(s)? *(Please tick one box in each row)*

	Major objective	Minor objective	Not an objective
To enable trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to link classroom/curriculum activities to EOtC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To prepare and enable trainees to run EOtC activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to follow up EOtC activities in school classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to gauge the quality of EOtC activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to assess the impact of EOtC activities on pupils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to carry out risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to experience how pupils behave in different environments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to consider the advantages and disadvantages of working outside the classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6a. How is EOtC training delivered in the postgraduate programme(s) you direct? *(Please tick all that apply)*

Stand alone compulsory session/unit	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Stand alone optional session/unit	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
During a compulsory EOtC off-site day/residential for trainees	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	During an optional EOtC off-site day/residential for trainees	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Training is interwoven across subject areas	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	During school-based placements	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
		Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/> 7

6b. Please indicate which of the following areas are experienced in the EOtC training provided in the postgraduate programme(s) you direct.
(Please tick one box in each row)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Fieldwork (e.g. geography or science)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of outdoor education centres	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatre)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural environment (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overseas visits/exchanges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. How is EOtC training coordinated within your programme(s)?
(Please tick all that apply)

- By the overall director of ITT 1 By individual course/subject directors 3
 By a designated EOtC coordinator 2 Not coordinated 4
 Other *(Please specify below)* 5

8. Have any of the following groups with particular expertise in EOtC been involved in either running EOtC provision on your programme(s) or contributing to the content or structure of the training?
(Please tick all that apply)

	Running EOtC training	Contribution to course content/structure
Schools (e.g. partnerships with schools in the local area)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other external providers <i>(Please specify below)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D TIME SPENT ON EOtC ACTIVITIES

9a. Please estimate, on average, how much time a trainee on your programme(s) would spend being trained in the following EOtC activities **within institution-based programmes** (for the postgraduate programme(s) you direct). *(Please tick one box in each row)*

Within institution-based programmes	None	Less than 1 day	1 to 2 days	2+ days to a week	More than 1 week	Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	6
School site activities	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site day visits	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Before/after school study support	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site residential experiences within the UK	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site residential experiences overseas	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Non-residential activities that take place during school holiday periods	<input type="checkbox"/>					

9b. Do trainees spend any time being trained in the above EOtC activities when on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes

No

Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q9c below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q10a

9c. IF YES, are there any time requirements specifically related to training in these EOtC activities whilst trainees are on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes

No

Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q9d below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q10a

9d. IF YES, please indicate what time requirements there are for training in EOtC activities whilst trainees are on school placement?

Type of EOtC activity
(e.g. school site activities, off-site day visits etc)

Time spent
(hours, days, weeks)

10a. Please estimate, on average, how much time a trainee on your programme(s) would spend being trained in the following EOtC areas **within institution-based programmes** (for the postgraduate programme(s) you direct). *(Please tick one box in each row)*

Within institution-based programmes	None	Less than 1 day	1 to 2 days	2+ days to a week	More than 1 week	Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fieldwork (e.g. geography or science)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Use of outdoor education centres	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatres)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Natural environments (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
School grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Overseas visits/exchanges	<input type="checkbox"/>					

10b. Do trainees spend any time being trained in the above EOtC activities when on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes No Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q10c below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Box A after Q10d

10c. IF YES, are there any time requirements specifically related to training in these EOtC activities whilst trainees are on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes No Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q10d below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Box A after Q10d

10d. IF YES, please indicate what time requirements there are for training in EOtC areas whilst trainees are on school placement?

Type of EOtC activity (e.g. school site activities, off-site day visits etc)	Time spent (hours, days, weeks)

Box A

*If you ONLY direct primary postgraduate programme(s) please go to Q17
If you ALSO direct undergraduate programme(s) please go to Q11 below which focuses upon undergraduate programmes*

FOR DIRECTORS OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES ONLY

E DELIVERY AND COORDINATION OF EOtC ACTIVITIES

11. What are the objectives of the EOtC training provided by your undergraduate programme(s)? *(Please tick one box in each row)*

	Major objective	Minor objective	Not an objective
To enable trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to link classroom/curriculum activities to EOtC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To prepare and enable trainees to run EOtC activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to follow up EOtC activities in school classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to gauge the quality of EOtC activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to assess the impact of EOtC activities on pupils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to carry out risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to experience how pupils behave in different environments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to consider the advantages and disadvantages of working outside the classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12a. How is EOtC training delivered in the undergraduate programme(s) you direct? *(Please tick all that apply)*

- | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Stand alone compulsory session/unit | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Stand alone optional session/unit | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| During a compulsory EOtC off-site day/residential for trainees | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | During an optional EOtC off-site day/residential for trainees | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Training is interwoven across subject areas | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | During school-based placements | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 |

12b. Please indicate which of the following areas are experienced in the EOtC training provided in the undergraduate programme(s) you direct.
(Please tick one box in each row)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Fieldwork (e.g. geography or science)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of outdoor education centres	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatre)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural environment (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overseas visits/exchanges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. How is EOtC training coordinated within your undergraduate programme(s)? *(Please tick all that apply)*

- By the overall director of ITT 1 By individual course/subject directors 3
 By a designated EOtC coordinator 2 Not coordinated 4
 Other *(Please specify below)* 5

14. Have any of the following groups with particular expertise in EOtC been involved in either running EOtC provision on your programme(s) or contributing to the content or structure of the training?

(Please tick all that apply)

	Running EOtC training	Contribution to course content/structure
Schools (e.g. partnerships with schools in the local area)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other external providers <i>(Please specify below)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

F TIME SPENT ON EOtC ACTIVITIES

15a. Please estimate, on average, how much time a trainee on your programme(s) would spend being trained in the following EOtC activities **within institution-based programmes** (for the undergraduate programme(s) you direct). *(Please tick one box in each row)*

Within institution-based programmes	None	Less than 1 day	1 to 2 days	2+ days to a week	More than 1 week	Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	6
School site activities	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site day visits	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Before/after school study support	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site residential experiences within the UK	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site residential experiences overseas	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Non-residential activities that take place during school holiday periods	<input type="checkbox"/>					

15b. Do trainees spend any time being trained in the above EOtC activities when on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes

No

Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q15c below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q16a

15c. IF YES, are there any time requirements specifically related to training in these EOtC activities whilst trainees are on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes

No

Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q15d below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q16a

15d. IF YES, please indicate what time requirements there are for training in EOtC activities whilst trainees are on school placement?

Type of EOtC activity
(e.g. school site activities, off-site day visits etc)

Time spent
(hours, days, weeks)

16a. Please estimate, on average, how much time a trainee on your programme(s) would spend being trained in the following EOtC areas **within institution-based programmes** (for the undergraduate programme(s) you direct). *(Please tick one box in each row)*

Within institution-based programmes	None	Less than 1 day	1 to 2 days	2+ days to a week	More than 1 week	Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fieldwork (e.g. geography or science)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Use of outdoor education centres	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatres)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Natural environments (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
School grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Overseas visits/exchanges	<input type="checkbox"/>					

16b. Do trainees spend any time being trained in the above EOtC areas when on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes No Don't know

***If you answered YES, please go to Q16c below
If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q17***

16c. IF YES, are there any time requirements specifically related to training in these EOtC areas whilst trainees are on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes No Don't know

***If you answered YES, please go to Q16d below
If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q17***

16d. IF YES, please indicate what time requirements there are for training in EOtC areas whilst trainees are on school placement?

Type of EOtC activity (e.g. school site activities, off-site day visits etc)	Time spent (hours, days, weeks)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

FOR BOTH UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMME DIRECTORS

G CHALLENGES AND FACILITATORS

17. Please indicate which, if any, of the factors below have helped or hindered EOtC training in the programme(s) that you direct over the last five years (or over the time you have been running the programme(s) if less)?
(Please tick any that apply)

	Helped	Hindered
Availability of suitable EOtC sites/opportunities/activities	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
Awareness of outcomes of EOtC	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
Funding for EOtC training	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
Recording main risks and how to manage them	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Taking responsibility for pupil safety	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Focus on EOtC at an institutional level	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Focus on EOtC at a national level (e.g. policies/initiatives)	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
School-based demand	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
Teacher union/association support	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 9
Staffing changes	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 10
Curriculum changes/pressures	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 11
Demands/expectations of the ITT course	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> 12
Other (Please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/> 13	<input type="checkbox"/> 13

18 In the programme(s) you direct, do you think there have been any changes in the extent of EOtC training over the last five years (or over the time you have been running the programme(s) if less)?
(Please tick one box only)

Increase Decrease No change

H PERCEIVED QUALITY OF EOtC ACTIVITIES

19a. Please rate the average quality of EOtC experiences when trainees are on school placement. *(Please tick one box only)*

Very poor	Poor	OK	Good	Very good	Too variable to comment	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7

19b. Please use this space to explain your answer

I AND FINALLY...

20. Are there any other ways in which EOtC training is provided in your institution?

21. Is there a minimum expectation for EOtC training on the course you direct? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes No Don't know

IF YES, what is the minimum expectation?

22. What changes / actions do you think would help or encourage your ITT provision to offer more EOtC activities to trainees on the course you direct?

Please write any further comments you would like to add on a separate sheet.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND FEEDBACK

Appendix 2: Secondary questionnaire



Education Outside the Classroom

Questionnaire for Secondary Course/Subject Directors

This questionnaire is part of a study which seeks to provide evidence on the extent and nature of training in **education outside the classroom** in ITT provision across England. The research has been commissioned by the DfES, the Countryside Agency and Farming and Countryside Education. NFER is carrying out the survey on their behalf.

'Education outside the classroom' (EOtC) refers to the use of contexts other than the classroom environment as a teaching and learning resource and may include:

- **School site activities** (e.g. science lessons in a vegetable or wildlife area, drama in the outdoors)
- **Off-site day visits** (e.g. to environmental centres, art galleries, historic buildings, local community projects, outdoor and adventurous activities)
- **Before/after school study support** (e.g. voluntary out of school hours learning activity)
- **Off-site residential experiences within the UK** (e.g. field study centre, Duke of Edinburgh Award, outdoor and adventurous activities)
- **Off-site residential experiences overseas** (e.g. cultural and language exchanges)
- **Non-residential activities that take place during school holiday periods** (e.g. city farm summer schools, Summer Reading Challenge, Do It for Real activities).

Please note that in this context, EOtC does not include general PE activities on the school site, although it could include activities that fall under the Outdoor and Adventurous Activities strand of the PE curriculum.

We would be most grateful for your help in providing information about EOtC training in your ITT provision. In your role as **Course/Subject Director of a secondary ITT course**, we would very much appreciate it if you could fill in this questionnaire. It should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. Whatever the degree of coverage of EOtC in ITT at your institution, we would very much like to hear from you. Your views are very important.

Please be assured that your answers will be treated in confidence and reported only in aggregated form. We would be grateful if you could complete the questionnaire by **30th June 2006** and return it in the envelope provided. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact **Mark Bailey on telephone 01753 637335 or email m.bailey@nfer.ac.uk**.

Thank you very much for your help with this important piece of research.

©National Foundation for Educational Research 2006,
NFER, The Mere, Upton Park, SLOUGH, SL1 2DQ

A ABOUT YOU

1a. Which subject area do you direct for secondary ITT? (If you direct more than one please tick the main subject) *(Please tick one box only)*

- | | | | |
|---|----|--|----|
| Art and design <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | ICT-related subjects <input type="checkbox"/> | 14 |
| Biology <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Leisure and tourism <input type="checkbox"/> | 15 |
| Business studies <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Manufacturing <input type="checkbox"/> | 16 |
| Chemistry <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Media studies <input type="checkbox"/> | 17 |
| Citizenship <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Mathematics <input type="checkbox"/> | 18 |
| Classics <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Modern foreign languages <input type="checkbox"/> | 19 |
| Dance <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Music <input type="checkbox"/> | 20 |
| Design and technology <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | Physics <input type="checkbox"/> | 21 |
| Drama <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | Physical Education <input type="checkbox"/> | 22 |
| English <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | PSHE <input type="checkbox"/> | 23 |
| Geography <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 | Religious education <input type="checkbox"/> | 24 |
| Health and social care <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 | Science (general) <input type="checkbox"/> | 25 |
| History <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 | Social sciences <input type="checkbox"/> | 26 |
| | | Other <i>(Please specify)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | 27 |

1b. Is the course you direct undergraduate or postgraduate?
(Please tick one box only)

- Postgraduate Undergraduate Both

1c. On the course you direct, what qualification do trainees achieve?
(Please tick all that apply)

- BEd 1 BA+QTS 2 BSc+QTS 3 PGCE 4
Other 5 *(Please specify)*

B PROVISION OF EOtC ACTIVITIES

2a. Is EOtC addressed explicitly in the course you direct?
(Please tick one box only)

- Yes No Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q3
If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q2b below

2b. Are there any plans to include EOtC training in the course you direct?
(Please tick one box only)

Yes No Don't know

Please now go to Q13

3. Are trainees required to have practical experience of EOtC as part of the course you direct? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes Preferred No

C DELIVERY AND COORDINATION OF EOtC ACTIVITIES

4. What are the objectives of the EOtC training provided in the course you direct? *(Please tick one box in each row)*

	Major objective	Minor objective	Not an objective
To enable trainees to maximise pupil learning during EOtC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to link classroom/curriculum activities to EOtC	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To prepare and enable trainees to run EOtC activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to follow up EOtC activities in school classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to gauge the quality of EOtC activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to assess the impact of EOtC activities on pupils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to carry out risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to experience how pupils behave in different environments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To enable trainees to consider the advantages and disadvantages of working outside the classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5a. How is EOtC training delivered in the course you direct?
(Please tick all that apply)

Stand alone compulsory session/unit 1 Stand alone optional session/unit 4

During a compulsory EOtC off-site day/residential for trainees 2 During an optional EOtC off-site day/residential for trainees 5

Training is interwoven across subject areas 3 During school-based placements 6

Don't know 7

5b. Please indicate which of the following areas are experienced in the EOtC training provided in the course you direct. *(Please tick one box in each row)*

	Yes	No	Don't know
Fieldwork (e.g. geography or science)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of outdoor education centres	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatre)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural environment (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overseas visits/exchanges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. How is EOtC training coordinated within your programme?
(Please tick all that apply)

- By the overall director of ITT 1 By individual course/subject directors 3
 By a designated EOtC coordinator 2 Not coordinated 4
 Other *(Please specify below)* 5

7. Have any of the following groups with particular expertise in EOtC been involved in either running EOtC provision on your course or contributing to the content or structure of the training? *(Please tick all that apply)*

	Running EOtC training	Contribution to course content/structure
Schools (e.g. partnerships with schools in the local area)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other external providers <i>(Please specify below)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D TIME SPENT ON EOtC ACTIVITIES

8a. Please estimate, on average, how much time a trainee on your course would spend being trained in the following EOtC activities **within institution-based programmes**. Please note, this refers to the total time in your subject area, rather than in the whole programme.

(Please tick one box in each row)

Within institution-based programmes	None	Less than 1 day	1 to 2 days	2+ days to a week	More than 1 week	Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	6
School site activities	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site day visits	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Before/after school study support	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site residential experiences within the UK	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Off-site residential experiences overseas	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Non-residential activities that take place during school holiday periods	<input type="checkbox"/>					

8b. Do trainees spend any time being trained in the above EOtC activities when on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes No Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q8c below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q9a

8c. IF YES, are there any time requirements specifically related to training in these EOtC activities whilst trainees are on school placement?

(Please tick one box only)

Yes No Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q8d below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q9a

8d. IF YES, please indicate what time requirements there are for training in EOtC activities whilst trainees are on school placement?

Type of EOtC activity
(e.g. school site activities, off-site day visits etc)

Time spent
(hours, days, weeks)

9a. Please estimate, on average, how much time a trainee on your course would spend being trained in the following EOtC areas **within institution-based programmes**. Please note, this refers to the total time in your subject area, rather than in the whole programme.

(Please tick one box in each row)

Within institution-based programmes	None	Less than 1 day	1 to 2 days	2+ days to a week	More than 1 week	Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fieldwork (e.g. geography or science)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Use of outdoor education centres	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Places of worship (e.g. temples, shrines, churches)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Creativity and arts (e.g. art galleries, theatres)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Built environment and heritage (e.g. streetscapes, historic buildings, heritage sites)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Natural environments (e.g. woodlands, parks, nature reserves)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
School grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Active citizenship (e.g. volunteering in the local community)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Food and farming (e.g. farms, city farms, kitchen gardens)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Overseas visits/exchanges	<input type="checkbox"/>					

9b. Do trainees spend any time being trained in the above EOtC areas when on school placement? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes

No

Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q9c below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q10

9c. IF YES, are there any time requirements specifically related to training in these EOtC areas whilst trainees are on school placement?

(Please tick one box only)

Yes

No

Don't know

If you answered YES, please go to Q9d below

If you answered NO or DON'T KNOW, please go to Q10

9d. IF YES, please indicate what time requirements there are for training in EOtC areas whilst trainees are on school placement?

Type of EOtC activity (e.g. school site activities, off-site day visits etc)	Time spent (hours, days, weeks)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

E. CHALLENGES AND FACILITATORS

10. Please indicate which, if any, of the factors below have helped or hindered EOtC training in the course that you direct over the last five years (or over the time you have been running the course if less)? *(Please tick any that apply)*

	Helped		Hindered
Availability of suitable EOtC sites/opportunities/activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
Awareness of outcomes of EOtC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funding for EOtC training	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recording main risks and how to manage them	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Taking responsibility for pupil safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>
Focus on EOtC at an institutional level	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
Focus on EOtC at a national level (e.g. policies/initiatives)	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>
School-based demand	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teacher union/association support	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staffing changes	<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum changes/pressures	<input type="checkbox"/>	11	<input type="checkbox"/>
Demands/expectations of the ITT course	<input type="checkbox"/>	12	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other <i>(Please specify below)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	13	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. In the course you direct, do you think there have been any changes in the extent of EOtC training over the last five years (or over the time you have been running the course if less)? *(Please tick one box only)*

Increase Decrease No change

F PERCEIVED QUALITY OF EOtC ACTIVITIES

12a. Please rate the average quality of EOtC experiences when trainees are on school placement. *(Please tick one box only)*

Very poor	Poor	OK	Good	Very good	Too variable to comment	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7

12b. Please use this space to explain your answer

G AND FINALLY...

13. Are there any other ways in which EOtC training is provided in your institution?

14. Is there a minimum expectation for EOtC training on the course you direct? *(Please tick one box only)*

Yes No Don't know

IF YES, what is the minimum expectation?

15. What changes / actions do you think would help or encourage your ITT provision to offer more EOtC activities to trainees on the course you direct?

Please write any further comments you would like to add on a separate sheet.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND FEEDBACK

Copies of this publication can be obtained from:

DfES Publications
P.O. Box 5050
Sherwood Park
Annesley
Nottingham
NG15 0DJ

Tel: 0845 60 222 60
Fax: 0845 60 333 60
Minicom: 0845 60 555 60
Online: www.dfespublications.gov.uk

© NFER Trading Ltd 2006

Produced by the Department for Education and Skills

ISBN 978 1 84478 834 7
Ref No: RR802
www.dfes.go.uk/research