

## **DFES Consultation: Induction of Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs)**

### **UCET Response**

#### **Question 1**

Yes.

The consultation paper adduces a range of arguments to justify the location of induction for NQTs in FE: ITT placements can take place in FE; the 14-19 agenda is increasing the movement of staff and pupils between school and FE settings; and the recruitment of NQTs to FE will enrich and broaden the staff base in FE. UCET finds these arguments wholly convincing and supports the proposal, provided that appropriate safeguards are introduced to ensure that NQTs have sufficient experience of working with school-age pupils.

#### **Question 2**

Paragraphs 3.2-3.4 provide the necessary safeguards, ensuring that NQTs will be professionally supervised and mentored; that they will have a reduced teaching timetable; that they will spend at least ten school days teaching compulsory school-age pupils; and that they will undertake experience in a school setting lasting 20-25 days.

#### **Question 3**

Yes.

Given that the boundaries between school and FE settings are becoming more porous, it is reasonable to expect FE institutions to arrange a placement in a school lasting 20-25 days.

#### **Question 4**

Yes.

We agree that it would be inappropriate to change the current policy to allow Pupil Referral Units to host induction for NQTs. Induction should fully replicate the conditions of professional life for NQTs. PRUs do not meet this condition, since many of the legislative requirements that relate to schools (for example, in relation to the national curriculum) do not relate to PRUs.

#### **Question 5**

Yes.

The case for change is that the present arrangements create confusion and unacceptable variation across the country. It will be essential that the Guidance which is to be issued exemplifies clearly what the equivalences to three terms will be.

#### **Question 6**

Yes.

The key issue here concerns exceptionality and it is helpful that what that term means will be explicated in the guidance.

#### **Question 7**

Yes.

#### **Question 8**

Agree.

The extension from two to three days will help administratively without causing inconvenience or undue anxiety to the NQT.

**Question 9**

Not sure.

While we accept that for the vast majority of NQTs there is no difficulty here, we are not wholly convinced that the case for removing the 5-year requirement has been made.

**Question 10**

Agree.

**Question 11**

UCET considers that the proposals will certainly tidy up the Induction arrangements. We find ourselves in a ready agreement with all the proposals except the proposal to remove the requirement that Induction should be completed within five years.

**Question 12**

The guidance certainly makes it clear that the 10% reduced timetable is an entitlement. We assume that the standard quality assurance arrangements will ensure that that entitlement is recognised.

Gordon Kirk  
Academic Secretary  
1 July 2007