

**'Strengthening the quality and content of initial teacher training'
Planning in partnership**

**Programme review for 2017 onwards in the context of the implementation of the
*A framework of core content for initial teacher training.***

Overarching themes.

a) The content framework sets out the minimum expectation. In a diverse system where does our programme exceed the minimum expectation?

What are the distinctive characteristics of our provision and how do we make them explicit for our trainees?

Will our programme inspire a new generation of teachers?

b) Partnerships have developed rapidly in the context of the roll out of the School Direct programme.

How are we ensuring that any changes to the programme are developed through collaboration with school partners?

How do we know that all of those involved are aware of any changes and the rationale behind them?

c) The framework is not prescriptive on the detail of content. In our professional judgment are there areas where can identify gaps or new emphases that should be addressed to ensure that our programme is up to date in meeting the changing needs of schools and children and young people?

d) Even if we are confident that our programme offers a coverage of the expected core content how do we ensure the quality of the training experience for all students and trainees?

e) As an HEI provider where are research and evidence represented in our programmes and how are we making the links with practice based professional development in schools?

Standard 1 High Expectations

Does our partnership offer a context for training which will inspire new entrants to the profession who have high expectations for themselves of teaching as a career?

UCET 9-11 Endsleigh Gardens London WC1H 0EH

T: 020 7388 2388 F: 020 7388 6988 E: info@ucet.ac.uk W: www.ucet.ac.uk

How do we use the resources of the partnership to develop well-supported training experiences meeting the needs of pupils across the full range of ability?

How do we ensure that students have an awareness of pathways for continuing professional development?

Standard 2 Pupil progress

Looking across our partnership are we accessing the full range of teaching strategies that students might encounter and encouraging them to experiment so as to develop confidence?

Where are we building in the research and evidence base for current understanding of pupils' cognitive development?

Do the references to specific topics such as strengthening pupil memory and cognitive load require any changes to our programme? How are they represented in school experience and in centre based training?

Standard 3 Subject and curriculum knowledge

What use are we making of subject knowledge audits and how are they used by both HE tutors and school based colleagues to monitor progress?

How are we making explicit the difference between academic subject knowledge, curriculum and phase specific subject knowledge and pedagogical subject knowledge?

In relation to the teaching of early reading and mathematics, how are we accessing the expertise of school based colleagues to ensure consistency across the programme?

What strategies do we have as an HEI to support our students in developing their subject knowledge as they move into induction and early career development?

Standard 4 Planning and teaching

How do we ensure that all students have the opportunity to develop short, medium and long term curriculum planning skills, when they are often working in a setting where approaches are prescribed?

How are we working with school based colleagues to develop students' critical evaluation of their teaching?

As an understanding of empirical research methods, the ability to take a critical approach to theory and the use of research and evidence to inform practice are explicit expectations of new teachers how are these reflected in our programmes and how are we integrating that knowledge with the practical work in schools?

Standard 5 Meeting the needs of all pupils

(NB There is greater detail here as the members engaged with the review team believe that it is in SEND that the most radical developments are implied)

- In expanded partnerships what do we know about the range of expertise available to support initial training and CPD and how do we model to trainees how they might access *the advice of colleagues with specialist knowledge and experience*?
- In view of the emphasis on the *cognitive, social, emotional, physical and mental health factors that can inhibit or enhance pupils' education* do we need to strengthen provision in the area of mental health?
- Thinking about the *four broad areas of need* identified in the SEND Code of Practice (communication and interaction / cognition and learning / social, emotional and mental health / sensory and or physical needs), how are our partner schools developing their support in these areas? Where are they represented in our programmes of ITE?
- Are there any gaps to address in our programme in the coverage of: *autism, dyslexia, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), sensory impairment or speech, and language and communication needs (SLCN)*?
- How well is coverage of SEND *integrated across the ITT programme* so that centre based input and the coverage in partner schools is consistent? By embedding coverage of SEND do we risk losing the impact of messages?
- In our partnership how do we give trainees opportunity to show that they can *'recognise signs that may indicate SEND, and support common educational needs through review of their teaching, making adjustments to overcome any barriers to progress and ensuring that pupils with SEND are able to access the curriculum'* Do they have opportunities to see and understand a *cycle or 'graduated approach' in the classroom*? How do we model the *cycle of assessing pupil need, planning, reviewing and implementing change to support pupil progress, as referenced in the Code of Practice*?
- The emphasis on *'the importance of emotional development such as attachment issues and mental health on pupils' performance,'* is new. Where will they be addressed in the training and how will trainees be supported *to recognise typical child and adolescent development, and to respond to atypical development*?

Standard 6 The use of assessment

Where are the key topics of summative and formative assessment introduced? Is there any risk of overlap or inconsistency?

Does our approach to assessment and pupil feedback take into account the current thinking on teacher workload?

Does our input on standardised testing match the experience which students will experience in schools across the partnership?

Standard 7 Behaviour

Is the input on behaviour made explicit in our programme design, so that students are clear that 'routines and relationships' are key aspects of maintaining discipline in the classroom?

Is the practice across the partnership consistent? Where there is variability is there space to critically evaluate different approaches to behaviour management?

Is there overlap between the input students receive in schools and the centre based programme?

How are transitions between school placements and then into induction managed to support students in gaining confidence in different settings?

Standard 8 Wider professional responsibilities

How do we make sure that our programme is up to date in respect of the relevant statutory frameworks and that students are aware of how safeguarding legislation is enacted in partner schools?

What are the opportunities offered by our partnership for constructive modelling of how fundamental British values are upheld in schools?

Does our programme develop teachers with a strong sense of the moral purposes of education, the resilience to consolidate their practice and an aspiration for the continuing professional development that will sustain them throughout their career in teaching?

Dr Jacquie Nunn
UCET
April 2017