

LESSON 13

Providers of Education and Training

60 minutes

Strand 1.2: Understanding my Progression Opportunities

Participating

Outcome LCW.M1.S2.PROG.5

Outcome LCW.M1.S2.PROG.4

WHAT THIS LESSON DOES

Pick one qualification you care about and compare two real providers that offer it. Weigh cost, commute, support, recognition and where the award leads, then land the grid and three decision lines in Provider Comparison M1U2L13 in your Strand 1.2 folder.

CURRICULUM OUTCOMES

Outcome	What the specification asks for
LCW.M1.S2.PROG.5	investigate education and training opportunities available to students post-senior cycle.
LCW.M1.S2.PROG.4	recognise how additional education and training opportunities available to senior cycle students support future progression pathways.

WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO

- Compare FET, Higher Education, private and online certified providers
- Weigh strengths and limits of different provider types
- Complete a two-provider comparison for one qualification you care about

KEY TERMS

Term	What it means here	For example
ETB	Education and Training Board: the local public body that runs many Further Education and Training courses, including PLC programmes, in your county or region.	A QQI Level 5 PLC in Business Studies delivered by your local ETB college
Provider	The organisation that delivers a course or qualification: an ETB, a university, a technological university, a private HE college, a private trainer, or an online platform with recognised certification.	Two different colleges both offering the same QQI Level 6 award
Qualification	The recognised award you leave with, often on the Irish National Framework of Qualifications, rather than the name of the building you studied in.	A QQI Level 5 Certificate, a Level 8 honours degree, or a QQI apprenticeship award (SOLAS-managed)

BEFORE THE BELL

- Confirm Qualifax, Careers Portal and provider sites load on school devices.
- Verify two fallback pairs on Qualifax/CAO the morning you teach (stable award titles; avoid freezing fee figures on handouts): QQI Level 5 Certificate in Healthcare Support at two regional FET/PLC providers; the same Level 8 Business pathway at UCD and TU Dublin (confirm current titles/CAO codes).
- Tell the room the capture method once: recreate six rows in a table, or screenshot-and-paste into Provider Comparison M1U2L13 in Strand 1.2.
- FET pair: QQI Level 5 Certificate in Healthcare Support at two currently listed FET/PLC providers in or near your region (for example one City of Dublin ETB PLC college and one neighbouring ETB PLC college). Sample sources: Qualifax course record, each provider's course page, SUSI information for fee/grant context.
- HE pair: the same Level 8 Business (or related) degree pathway at University College Dublin and Technological University Dublin. Sample sources: CAO course page, each provider's programme page, Qualifax. Confirm current CAO codes and titles before class, and leave fee figures off any handout, because they date quickly.
- On screen this lesson: options comparator.

Providers of Education and Training

HOW THE LESSON RUNS		
5 min	introduction	Getting Started
5 min	content	Key Terms
35 min	activity	Compare Two Providers
10 min	content	Think About It
5 min	summary	What you covered

STEP BY STEP

5 min Getting Started

Open with a quick show of hands: who already has a qualification in mind from recent pathway work? Remind the room that today's job is to compare the organisations that deliver a qualification, not to go hunting for a new course. If someone is stuck, point them back to a qualification they already shortlisted in this strand, or hand them one of the fallback pairs from the activity notes.

5 min Key Terms

Spend under five minutes here. The point is vocabulary for the grid, not a lecture on the whole education system. If students confuse provider with qualification, use one concrete pair on the board (same award, two delivery bodies). If anyone treats a commercial completion badge as equal to an NFQ award, send them back to the verification line in the table wrap-up.

35 min Compare Two Providers On screen: options comparator

SUGGESTED TIMING

- 0-5 mins: name the qualification and the two providers (or take a fallback pair)
- 5-22 mins: research and fill what can be evidenced
- 22-27 mins: rate, weight, read the result
- 27-35 mins: create/open Provider Comparison M1U2L13, capture the grid, write the three fixed lines

TEACHING TIPS

Spend about two minutes modelling one same-award pair on the board before anyone opens a device, so the room can see what a matched pair looks like. Then circulate while they work, watching for empty cells and for figures that have appeared from nowhere: every filled cell needs a source behind it, while a gap that is labelled honestly is fine. If two students have the same two providers but different winners, ask them to name the weight that flipped the result, since that is where the comparison teaches most. Nothing here is marked, and a tie is a perfectly good outcome.

LOOK-FORS

- Same qualification on both sides, not two unrelated courses
- Real provider names, not "College A"
- Honest empty cells where research failed, labelled with the source tried
- Provider Comparison M1U2L13 in Strand 1.2 with qualification title, grid or screenshot, and the three fixed lines before the period ends

10 min Think About It

Keep this oral, because the talk is what sharpens the third portfolio line and typing it up again slows the room for no gain. Invite two pairs to feed back one thing a prospectus hid. If energy is low, put the first prompt on the board and take three responses only. Spot-check that the third portfolio line names a real limit and a next check, rather than a vague "not sure".

5 min What you covered

Spot-check that Provider Comparison M1U2L13 exists, names two real providers for one qualification, and includes the three fixed lines. Flag anyone who compared two different qualifications: that work needs a fix before the next lesson. Brief preview: the next investigation deepens one specific post-senior-cycle option rather than provider type alone.

TEACHING MOVES

- Model one same-award pair on the board before devices open.
- Hunt empty cells and invented fees; labelled gaps on cost and progression are expected, not failure.
- Get two students with the same providers and different winners to name the weight that flipped the result.
- Keep Key Terms under five minutes so the comparator gets the bulk of the period.

WHAT TO WATCH FOR

- Comparing two different qualifications: redirect to one award, two delivery bodies.
- Filling cells from a prospectus alone: push Qualifax, CAO or the provider award page.
- Treating a commercial completion badge as an NFQ/QQI award: require a verifiable framework or professional-body reference.
- Inventing figures to avoid blanks: insist on labelled gaps with the source tried.

DIFFERENTIATION

- Support: hand the verified fallback pair and a six-row table template with source prompts already in the cells.
- Extension: add a third provider type on a second pass, or chase one thin progression cell with a second source after class.

WHAT STUDENTS ARE LEFT WITH

- Provider Comparison: one qualification, two providers compared