

## NAPTEC: 19 September 2014

### Introduction

Would like to give short overview of recent developments, and allow plenty of time for questions. Will cover in particular:

- Characteristics of schools-led ITT
- The Carter Review of ITT and UCET's likely response
- A bit about allocations for 2015 and recruitment for 2014

### Schools-led ITE

None of you will need reminding about the government's focus on school-led teacher training. The target, which they could actually already claim to have surpassed if they gave it some real thought, that half of ITT is school-led remains in place.

But the government has also acknowledged that it has no firm definition of what 'school-led' actually means, and invited us and others such as Jo to try to identify what the key characteristics actually are. Only then will they know what they are aiming for, and how far the sector is towards arriving at its desired destination.

So, with NASBTT, Jo and some schools colleagues we set out to identify what, if we were starting from scratch, a 'schools-led' training system might look like.

And I stressed there 'schools-led' rather than 'school-led'. The way teacher training is funded and organised in this country should take account of not only the needs of the particular school the trainee is initially based in, but the needs of schools generally, the full range of schools that a new teacher might expect to find themselves working in during the course of their career. In a market-driven system, individual schools are not the only consumers. Schools collectively are. And so are trainees themselves, the

people who in fact have to stump up the fees. Growing one's own teachers is an attractive concept. But it carries with it potential risks: training for the here and now rather than the wider system and the future; institutional conservatism; lack of consistency; the removal of national levers; and possibly the loss of the concept of teaching as being a unified profession.

So, how do we move towards a schools-led teacher education system that is genuinely focused on the needs of schools, and which does not throw the proverbial baby out with the bathwater?

What we have attempted to do is to identify what schools-led teacher education could look like in terms of:

- Underlying principles
- Governance & decision taking
- Who does what, how & where
- Funding & resourcing
- Accountability

We were all quite clear that schools-led training cannot be secured through:

- Particular funding mechanisms
- Delivering training at particular locations
- Imposing a purchaser and provider relationship on schools and providers

As far as underlying principles are concerned, we suggested that schools-led ITT should be:

- Focussed on the needs of all learners within partnerships
- Schools led rather than school-led
- Have a shared ownership for common cause

- Reflect national and local needs
- Integrate of ITE, EPD and CPD

On governance, our suggestions are that:

- Partnerships are governed collegiately by a consortia of equal partners, within which schools have a significant or majority voice
- This partnership collectively decides on the allocation of resources and who does what etc in response to local needs. There is no nationally prescribed model or strict demarcation of roles
- The partnership is conceived as a collective whole, rather than different groups in different contractual relationships

If the partnership includes a significant or majority of school colleagues, then the provision, however it is delivered and by who, is also schools-led. Rather than having a crude purchaser/provider model, under which individual schools buy in training from wherever they see fit, something that would lead to parochialism, loss of consistency, instability and inflexibility, we should develop a concept of teacher training providers being genuine and cohesive partnerships including people from schools, accredited ITE providers and perhaps other organisations working together to prepare the best possible teachers for pupils within their partnerships and beyond.

Decisions would be taken collectively. But there would be no place for a 'them and us' mentality. Roles would be flexible and not constrained by the restraints that inevitably result from strict contractual arrangements.

The partnership would take all decisions relating to:

- Marketing programmes and the selection of trainees
- The content & delivery of programmes, within national frameworks
- Internal QA

- The identification & supporting of mentors
- Who does what, where and when

Under this model, there would be no need for government to prescribe, as it does now, how many days a trainee spends in school. The owner or legal status of the building in which training takes place would not matter a jot. What matters is what is done and how it is done. Such things should be for the partnership to decide.

This would have clear implications for universities. It will require a re-definition of roles. And issues to do with accountability and adherence to national and institutional rules concerning the awarding of academic qualifications would have to be addressed.

And there would be implications for the role of government. Its role might be to:

- Set national frameworks
- Ensure national and regional teacher supply
- Allocate funding (to which body for administrative purposes does not matter, provided decisions about its use are made by the partnership)
- Establish national accountability frameworks
- Provide advice & support
- Identify national priorities such as behaviour and phonics

Government need not have a role in:

- Prescribing models of governance
- Who the partnership commissions to do what, where and when

Schools led cannot be government led.

Carter Review

We are nearing completion of UCET's evidence to the cater Review. The value added by the PGCE appears to be the main thing in the forefront of Sir Andrew Carter's mind, and we will collectively have to do whatever we can to demonstrate to him that the PGCE is an integral part of QTS and does not represent an additional burden on trainee teachers.

On a more positive note, there does seem to be recognition by Andrew Carter:

- That only so much can be covered during a one year programme, which should in future focus on the key skills a teacher needs to operate effectively from day one, with other things covered during induction and EPD
- Of the importance of teachers engaging with research and being research literate
- Of the importance of partnerships and the contribution of universities
- Of the importance in terms of content of: subject knowledge; pedagogic subject knowledge; behaviour; SEN; assessment; and meeting the different needs of individual pupils.

To date, UCET has:

- Held one 'phone and one face to face meeting with the review team and sent them documentation (e.g. BERA/RSA report and UCET papers)
- Given the review team contact details to discuss the Donaldson review in Scotland
- Commented on the review team's draft request for information about course documentation
- Briefed UCET members on how to present responses to the review team's request for course documentation and issued reminders (at the request of the review team) to late responders
- Circulated the invitation to submit evidence to the review team to the UCET membership, inviting them to contribute to the UCET response
- Requested examples of assignments
- Engaged in dialogue with individual members of the review team.

UCET's evidence recommends that:

- Schools and prospective trainees should be able to make an informed choice about the training programmes that best meet their needs from those that offer QTS only and those that include an academic award alongside QTS
- Prospective trainees and schools should have access to clear and transparent information about the training options available to them
- ITT should be the first part of a continuum of teacher preparation, and newly qualified teachers should have an entitlement to structured early professional development that builds on and complements their initial training
- New teachers should be equipped with the skills to access and interpret research findings and carry out their own research
- Within national frameworks and standards prescribed by government, ITT partnerships should be able to take their own decisions about course content and delivery
- National standards should be developed for mentors within school, and mentors should be properly trained and rewarded

We will also restate the evidence about the strong teacher training base on which we can build, and the reasons why so many schools choose to work in partnership with universities, and why trainees themselves value the university experience alongside their time in school.

We have argued, as we have done for several years now, that however good the quality of ITT may be, there is only so much that can be achieved in programmes lasting for just one academic year. All newly qualified teachers should be given an entitlement to structured early professional development that builds on and complements their initial training. The key knowledge and skills that teachers will need to be effective on their first day in the classroom should continue to be the priority for the initial training and

pre-service phase. Areas for subsequent professional development should also be identified and steps taken, through regulation if necessary, to ensure that all new teachers do receive the necessary additional support in the context of their needs and those of their school.

We have strongly put forward the view that schools and prospective teachers should have the option of ITT programmes that are linked to academic awards such as the PGCE. The benefits of such training include: a base, often at master's degree level, for subsequent professional development; the embedding of research skills and literacy within programmes; the linking of theory and practice; the rigour in terms of course content and assessment associated with national HE frameworks; the equipping of teachers to apply their skills and understanding in different environments and changing circumstances; the status and recognition that academic awards bring to the profession; and the attractiveness of academic awards to ambitious and high calibre prospective teachers.

The work associated with a PGCE is integral to achieving QTS. It does not constitute an additional burden on trainees. For example, assignments completed as part of PGCEs are practically focused, relate directly to the QTS standards and are used to assess trainees against those standards. PGCEs help to give teachers a capacity for systematic self-study and the ability to scrutinise their own teaching. The assessment of purely practical components of training also benefit from the rigour and quality requirements and academic frameworks associated with academic awards.

While acknowledging that many QTS only programmes are of high quality, it is UCET's position that linking of QTS to an award should be an option for schools and trainees. The system for selecting programmes should be transparent and schools and prospective trainees should be fully aware of the outcome of programmes and the difference between QTS only and PGCE programmes, and the choice available in terms of different PGCEs.

We have, of interest to many of you. Re-stated the contribution that the undergraduate route makes.

The call for evidence from the review team asks specifically about the content of ITT in respect of:

- Subject knowledge;
- The role and importance of research
- SEN, assessment, supporting pupil progress and responding to different and collective pupil needs

On subject knowledge, teachers obviously need to understand a subject if they are to teach it effectively. But holding a degree in the relevant National Curriculum subject is not in itself a guarantee that the candidate has the subject knowledge to teach that subject in the classroom. The title of a degree might not, for example, be any guarantee of its relevance to the school curriculum. Neither does a degree, regardless of content, provide any assurance that prospective teachers will be able to master the pedagogical and other skills they will need to help pupils learn. Subject knowledge is necessary but not sufficient. It must be supplemented by an understanding of how children grow and develop, how they can be motivated and assessed, how their behaviour can be managed and how the particular subject can be taught.

In the best training provision, appropriate subject knowledge is ensured through:

- The assessment process, making sure that applicants have a relevant degree and/or other qualifications and life experiences
- In the case of shortage subjects, the provision of pre-entry Subject Knowledge Enhancement (SKE) programmes
- The conduct of subject audits to identify any gaps in knowledge and the provision of tailored support to fill those gaps

Universities and schools have complementary and overlapping contributions to make in this area. Universities and schools have access to subject expertise and resources that will allow assessments to be made, and gaps filled, while schools will have a unique understanding of how, in the context of any National Curriculum requirements, subject knowledge should be applied in their particular context.

The 2013 joint BERA/RSA report into research and teacher education concluded, amongst other things, that the content of teacher education should be informed by research based evidence and scholarship, that research should be used to inform the design and structure of programmes and that teachers and teacher educators should be equipped to engage with and carry out their own research. Trainees and serving teachers should have access to the public knowledge base that underpins and informs teaching. They should also be equipped with skills in terms of, for example, data handling that will allow them to monitor and assess pupil progress, differentiate between the progress being made between different pupils and groups of pupils and tailor what they do. This will all be referred to in our evidence.

Finally, on behaviour, SEN, assessment, supporting pupil progress and responding to different and collective pupil needs. ITT programmes should ensure that trainees grasp the core knowledge of these areas and are able to operate effectively. The review team will make recommendations about effective strategies and approaches on the basis of detailed submissions from schools, ITT providers and others. Subject to these broad recommendations, we will argue that it should be for partnerships to decide how to cover these important areas in ITT and during subsequent professional development. The effectiveness of the approaches adopted will be apparent through examination results and OFSTED inspections of school and ITT provision.

Applications and allocations

Allocations for 2014/15 should, on current plans, be announced in mid-November. We know that requests for places exceed those that will be allocated under the teacher supply model. High level discussions are taking place within DFGE, at ministerial level, about the appropriate balance between SD and core provision.

On recruitment for 2014/15, an analysis of UCAS data suggests that secondary physics and D&T are the key problem areas, although RE, music, geography and perhaps RE will have difficulties in filling places. History and PE should be OK. On primary undergraduate, we are hearing of pockets of difficulty in recruiting, partly because of skills tests, and two-thirds of providers had at least one UG place in the clearing system. Final data will be available in November.

### Questions