**Notes from Management Forum**

**12 March 2019**

**Mary Summer house**

Minutes & matters arising

* Landscaping paper: JNR is continuing to visit UCET member institutions to brief colleagues about the current policy landscape for HEIs involved in teacher education.
* The group established to consider the intellectual basis of teacher education met for the first time in February.
* Apprenticeships: Despite initial opposition at ministerial level, the scope for an undergraduate QTS route is now being investigated. On leadership apprenticeships, the DFE recruitment & retention strategy indicated a relaxation of funding rules that might allow such programmes to access levy support although there is an ongoing debate about the necessity of education specific standards

UCET updates

Forum members were updated on

* FE bursaries; meeting with the minister for FE & skills;
* JNRs meeting with the Duchess of Cambridge to discuss mental health & well-being and
* Planned showcasing event in Northern Ireland (21.5.19)

Morning symposia - Suggestions for future topics included

* Understanding the role of research teacher educator
* Knowledge exchange and KEF; TEF - External drivers on HE provision
* Retention & Recruitment Strategy
* Workload
* Update on consultation re EIF & Implications of new framework (EIF) for ITE
* Conversations with others eg trainees, NQTs, teachers
* Relationship between ITE curriculum and ECF - overlay etc
* Work of IBTE Group

Early Career Framework and Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy

The early Career Framework was published alongside the teacher recruitment and retention strategy on 28 January. The ECF will be available to 50,000 NQTs in their first two years of practice from September 2021 (preceded by a trail in the North East and North West from September 2020).  It will be supported by £130m which will be used to: fund 5% non-contact time for year 2 NQTs; produce free curricula and training materials; deliver ECF training programmes; allow time for mentors to support NQTs; and provide mentor training. The ITE content framework will also be reviewed, with input from UCET and NASBTT, to ensure consistency and synergy with the ECF. The ECF itself is grouped under each of the teacher standard and identifies what NQTs should lean and what they should learn to do.

Other aspects of the recruitment and retention strategy include:

* Reducing teacher workload by reviewing the inspection and accountability systems
* Working with OFSTED to reduce the audit culture in schools
* Introducing a period of stability in terms of the curriculum, qualifications and assessment
* Provision of additional support for tackling poor behaviour
* Funding for heads to support key challenges (costs, capital projects, new vacancies service)
* Additional financial incentives to aid retention
* Provision of high quality curriculum plans and materials for NQTs
* Development of specialist qualifications
* Focus of support on schools in particularly challenging circumstances
* Supporting schools introduce flexible working opportunities
* Making the ITE application system more user friendly
* Review the ‘vibrant’ ITE market, with new providers accredited where needed and an expansion of undergraduate provision.

UCET has been supportive of the ECF and was involved in many of the policy discussions leading up to it. The content and structure of the ECF was changed because of pressure brought to bear by UCET and NASBTT after having seen an earlier overly prescriptive and detailed version that did not link to the teacher standards. We have however expressed doubts about the need for curriculum materials to support the ECF, as we fear that these will become de-facto mandatory and stifle flexibility. We have also pressed for the ECF to be delivered exclusively by ITE providers (which seems unlikely, with some kind of procurement exercise likely to be followed) and include the option to be linked to M level.

One significant piece of work flowing from the strategy will be DFE’s review of the shape of the ITE market, which could pose both a threat and an opportunity. UCET has arranged Chatham House rules meetings with DFE officials, ministerial SPADs and key players such as NASBTT to influence how the review pans out.

UCET has, with NASBTT, the Chartered College and the Teaching Schools Council written to the Secretary of State with a number of suggestions relating to the strategy. This follows an earlier letter in April 2018 which appears to have had an influence. A copy of the latest letter has been included with meeting papers.

Recruitment to ITE in 2019/20

For the next two recruitment cycles

* Institutions receiving three year allocations will be guaranteed those allocations for the full three-year period
* Providers must, during the summer of 2019, provide ‘permission to recruit’ information in order to be able to run programmes and recruit to the through UCAS
* Trainee Teacher Advisors were on hand to support applications to all programmes other than secondary PE
* Providers must record programmes as being full on UCAS once recruitment has ceased

*(d): NFER report on teacher labour market*

* The NFER report was published on 25 February. Key findings include:
* Secondary schools face a substantial teacher supply challenge over the next ten years
* Although teacher supply in the primary sector has kept pace with increasing demand over the last ten years, retention rates are getting worse and vacancies have increased, indicating challenges ahead
* Retention rates for early career teachers dropped significantly between 2012 and 2018
* Acute challenges exist in regards physics, maths, MFL and chemistry
* Alternative sources of supply such as returners (remaining flat at circa 13,000 – 15,000 a year) and overseas trained teachers (declining, probably because of Brexit) have not increased
* Teachers on average work longer hours per week than those in similar occupations
* Teachers’ mean pay in real terms is less than those in similar occupations, although mean pay is similar
* There is more unmet demand for part time working in teaching than amongst similar professionals
* The relatively string graduate labour market means that teaching’s ‘recession proof’ advantage no longer exists

Teacher workload

*(a): DFE report on teacher workload and ITE*

The DFE guidance on addressing workload issues through ITE was published on 5 November 2018, after having been the subject of widespread consultation. It contains practical examples to

* help providers reduce the workload of trainees and manage workload once qualified:
* principles for ITE providers to help reduce workload
* ensuring the content of ITE courses helps reduce workload
* addressing the workload of trainees on professional placements and their schools
* supporting the wider partnership to reduce workload
* supporting trainees’ mental health and well-being

It identifies a number of principles to help providers support workload reduction. These include:

* Addressing workload and changing the culture of burdensome practice through ITE content
* Addressing the workload of trainees whilst on placement
* Prepare trainees to address workload challenges as NQTs

The recommendations have generally been supported. Some concern has however been expressed about recommendations in respect of curriculum planning, where it has been suggested that student teachers do need to be have the skills needed to produce curriculum materials and not rely as trainees or NQTs on off-the peg resources. There may also be a tension between the recommendations in this regard and the new OFSTED focus on curriculum development.

*(b): UCET companion paper*

Concerns about the curriculum planning skills component of the workload report led to the Executive Committee commissioning Caroline Daly and Julie Greer to produce a companion report on this issue which recommends that the importance of student teachers developing knowledge and skills in this area should be discussed and considered carefully within partnerships. It identifies a number of questions that partnerships might pose:

* How do we ensure high expectations of effective planning? How do we support trainee teachers to focus on the detail of what their learners need to do to learn effectively?
* Is there a shared understanding about the purpose of lesson planning for trainee teachers within ITE partnerships?
* How do mentors view their role in planning lessons with trainees? What expectations are there that regular mentor dialogue is an opportunity to extend skills in planning for effective teaching?
* Are ITE partnerships satisfied with how progression for a trainee teacher is understood and assessed with regard to planning for pupils to learn?
* Do partners discuss progression in terms of increasing, nuanced adaptations in new teachers’ plans that will make a difference to pupils’ learning?
* What opportunities do ITE providers give to trainees to adapt existing schemes of work?
* How do ITE providers ensure trainees can make considered choices from a range of effective planning formats?
* Is one indication of progression being able to increasingly incorporate ‘off the peg’ lesson plans into one’s teaching? What are the advantages and the pitfalls?
* Is there scope to prioritise a short collaborative project within the ITE curriculum to evaluate the difference planning can make to an individual; a group; a whole class that better demonstrates the effectiveness of good planning to trainees?

The paper has been widely circulated and sent to DFE and OFSTED.

Feedback on applications

* Forum members reported a mixed picture so far this year. Some felt that they were on a par with this time last year others felt they were below this point. For the first time recruitment to primary seemed slower and this may be a direct result of the withdrawal of the bursary. Overall, it is understood that applications are on a par with 2018, although there may be some issues relating to primary.

Implications to changes to ITE requirements in respect of school experience

* Brief snapshot polls conducted by UCET and NASBTT suggested that there had been an increase in drop-outs following the changes to the ITE requirements that prevent providers for having prior school experience as a condition for recruitment. Forum members reported a mix picture some feeing retention was lower while others felt there had been no change. However most agreed that extra support had been put in place and that trainees needed this support.

DFE letter on applications, rejections etc.

To note the 11 January DFE letter on maximising recruitment, rejection rates and UCAS systems.

DFE letter on recruitment and allocation controls

DFE wrote to the sector on 30 January 2019 confirming that:

Open recruitment to all fee funded postgraduate programmes (other than secondary PE) will continue

Inspection issues

*Feedback from inspections*

A few providers talked of their phase 2 inspections and shared experiences

OFSTED consultation on new Education Inspection Framework

OFSTED are consulting on a new EIF, which will have implications for other frameworks, including that relating to ITE. The consultation proposals, and details of consultation events for ITE providers, have been circulated to UCET members. The deadline for responses is 5 April.

The following principles are said to underpin the draft framework:

* revised framework to focus inspection on what children learn through the curriculum, rather than over-reliance on performance data
* proposals will call time on the culture of ‘teaching to the test’ and off-rolling
* new separate behaviour judgement to give parents reassurance that behaviour is good
* most evidence-based, research-informed and tested framework

Suggestions for points that should be made in UCET’s response should be invited. These might include using the framework to encourage schools and FE colleges to engage pro-actively in teacher education and development, in partnership with universities.

JNR and a number of HEI colleagues attended an OFSTED consultation event on for the ITE sector on the EIF on 22 February.

New ITE inspection framework

The latest meeting of the stakeholder group to discuss the ITE inspection framework took place in January, and in addition UCET and NSBTT are having regular KIT meetings with the new OFSTED ITE lead, David Story. Formal proposals will be published later in the year. Key issues include: whether to keep the ‘outstanding’ grade (which is being retained under the EIF and will probably be so under the ITE framework)); the grading of students; and whether to have a one stage ort two stage inspection process.

Slides about the new ITE framework used by David Storrie at a recent DFE recruitment & retention even were circulated to UCET members on 28 February. Key information includes:

* A research programme will be undertaken by OFSTED in summer 2019, with the new framework piloted in the autumn of 2019. A formal consultation will take place in January 2020 with implementation likely in the summer of 2020.
* The research focus will cover: the ITE curriculum and trainee’s pedagogical preparation; the role of subject specialist training; and the distinctive features (other than outcomes) of the best quality programmes.
* The new framework *might* focus on content & quality of the ITE curriculum and trainees’ pedagogical preparation; trainee preparation to teach their subjects (not just in one school, but a range of schools); trainee workload (including those on salaried routes); and the mental health of trainees and their preparation to support pupils.
* Development priorities will include: the number of critical reflections that trainees are required to complete; assignment deadlines; inconsistency of expectations about the quantity and quality of evidence trainees are expected to collect in relation to the teacher standards; evidence file requirements; training requirements; clarity of documentation; the level of coordination required to avoid unnecessary repetition of work; and the use of online portfolio systems, including ‘cutting & pasting’ issues.
* Reducing workload associated with marking, including making use of research and including a repertoire of assessment methods in ITE programmes.

Research Excellence Framework

Final guidance and criteria for REF 2021 were published on 31 January. Key new decisions include:

* Staff on Teaching & Research contracts who are not independent researchers should be identified through HEIs processes used to identify staff with significant responsibility for research.
* Staff on non-academic contracts are not eligible for submission.
* Staff who did have significant responsibility for research for part of the REF cycle but not all are eligible for submission.
* Staff based in a discrete department or unit outside the UK can be submitted provided that the primary focus of their research on census date is clearly and directly connected to the submitting unit based in the UK.
* Independent researchers are defined as those who are employed to undertake self-directed research rather than carrying out another researcher’s programme. The majority of postdoctoral research assistants will not therefore be covered.
* Staff submitted with zero outputs will not be included in the analyses relating to environment and general information, and the names of submitted staff will not be published at the end of the exercise.
* Former staff made redundant can now be submitted. However, to prevent game-playing institutions will be required to explain their approach to selecting outputs, including those in relation to redundant staff.
* Co-authored research outputs can be submitted more than once up to a maximum of 5% of total outputs.
* The 5% tolerance band for small submissions within a particular unit of assessment has been adjusted to a maximum of 5% non-compliant in-scope outputs or one output, whichever is higher.
* Research costs by output will not now have to be identified.

Post compulsory issues

*(a): Meeting with Minister of State*

The planned meeting with Minister of State Ann Milton about regulation and qualifications required to teach in the post-compulsory sector finally took place on 12 January. A follow up letter sent by JNR has been included with meeting papers. The minister appeared sympathetic to calls for a more level playing field between HEIs and other OCE providers in terms of OfSTED inspection and referred to reference ibn the ECF documents to consideration being given to similar support being available to teachers in non-school sectors.

*(b): Bursaries and SKE funding*

The withdrawal of bursaries for pre-service trainees in maths and English and SKE funding for PCET trainees was announced on 7 February (the day before UET Post 16). UCET responded with a statement in FE Week describing the move as a ‘slap in the face’.

Items for information

To note:

* Registration for the 5-6 November UCET conference is open. Keynotes will include Morya Boland from Glasgow, Mary Bousted from NEU, Trevor Mutton from Oxford and a symposium on ITE reforms in Wales led by John Furlong. Volunteers to lead workshops and seminars would be welcome. A 5% early bird discount applies until April. There is also a 5% discount for institutions sending five delegates or more.
* The December 2018 UCET newsletter.
* ICET Conference, Johannesburg, S Africa 9-11 July 2019

Date of next meeting

25th June 2019

**Additional Information**

Questions for DfE from morning session on the ECF

1. Have potential trainees been consulted about this? Would extended probation put people off?
2. How can capacity for mentoring be addressed without depleting mentoring for ITE? Will mentors be recognised in any way for performing this role?
3. How is this going to be overseen, monitored and QA’d?
4. How will reduction in timetable be monitored and what are the expectations for that time (need to ensure supportive and not additional to)
5. Will this detract from emphasis on recruitment?
6. Have opp been missed to align the processes, schools, HEI and Ofsted?
7. Concern that this will be largely online and will this be most effective
8. Will this be rolled out to other areas of UK?
9. Is it worth providers outside the pilot/test & learn areas engaging in this early procurement process?
10. Could we have a procurement by UCET that represents the sector?
11. What does it mean if it is statutory, ie does this apply to academies and other types of schools? And / or, would the trainee have a choice, or is it the school’s decision?
12. What is the NPQ professional developer? What is the timescale for this?
13. What is the role of the appropriate body? Who will QA process? Who will check on appropriate body or other in the process?
14. How will the materials be used ? Will there be choice by school? By EC teacher?
15. Will all this be portable? Will the process follow EC teacher?
16. Has the impact of this be considered in light of employment law.... e.g. after 2 years there are increased rights for employees