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**Note of the meeting of the UCET Post 16 forum held on 7 February 2020 at Mary Sumner House, 24 Tufton Street, London SW1P 3RB**

**Welcome & introductions**

Members were welcomed to the second Post 16 forum of the 2019/20 academic year. The minutes of the meeting held on 18 October were agreed. On matters arising, information was provided by forum colleagues about publication opportunities.

**Discussions**

Forum members discussed a range of issues based around the meeting agenda. These included:

* UCET updates on non-Post 16 related issues, including: the ITE content framework; the ECF; NPQs for school-teachers; feedback from the 2019 UCET conference; and developments in Wales and Northern Ireland.
* The Society for Education and Training (SET), with a presentation on recent developments from Martin Reid from ETF, covering: the progression of teachers from ITE, to QTLS and to ATLS; the scope for HEIs to access on-line SET materials; the potential role of HEIs in delivering QTLS programmes following immediately on from ITE; the current number of 20,000 SET members, with membership remaining free for student teachers; the ETF offer to visit providers to talk to students about SET membership; and the suggestion of recruiting SET ambassadors with HEIs.
* An update from the Education & Training Foundation’s Howard Pilot covering: the implications of qualification reviews for ITE programmes; the DET review, where significant changes were still thought to be unlikely; the Talent to Teach programme, with funding for 450 participants confirmed for next year; private providers misleadingly claiming to offer DET compliant qualifications; the Train the Teacher Trainers initiative, with materials available on-line; T level professional development packages; and the consideration of new initiatives covering mentor support; mentor training; creativity in ITE and retention.
* The morning symposium on the draft OfSTED ITE inspection framework (summary of points made at Annex A) and an agreement that the next morning symposium would be on mentoring.
* Recruitment to ITE, with a mixed picture of recruitment across different providers, but with confirmation that the withdrawal of bursaries for 2019/20 had had a negative impact and an expectation that their reintroduction for 2020/21 would have the opposite effect.
* A report from Eligio-Cerval-Pena from DfE, focusing on the previous week’s bursary announcement, formal guidance for which would be published soon. The bursaries were only confirmed for one academic year because of grant settlement timetables, but may continue beyond then. Bursaries would be issued on a first come first serve basis to those formally recruited to programmes after the announcement had been made. Providers could submit applications from March, either individually or in bulk, with clear advice that applications should be made as soon as they could be. Those receiving bursaries would be expected to complete programmes within 2 years, except in exceptional circumstances. Those receiving specialist bursaries would be expected to have either a relevant Level 3 qualification or relevant experience or expertise. Subject coverage on bursary eligible programmes could include what students are teaching as well as what is covered in formal training. Other DfE updates included: student loan issues (with an agreement that SLC could accompany DfE to the next meeting); a planned review of the ITT apprenticeship standards; and the expansion of TTF and TLPD.
* The development of a new UCET strategy, drawing on the work of the Intellectual Base of Teacher Education group.

Items for information

The Post 16 Forum wished Debs Philip from Huddersfield University a speedy recovery from her illness, and looked forward to seeing her at future meetings.

Forum members noted the 2019 UCET December newsletter and details of the 2020 ICET conference at Bath Spa.

Any other business

Forum members were given details of the EAPRIL conference that would take place in Austria in November.

Date of next meeting:

22 May 2020

**Annex A:**

**Summary of points made at morning symposium on the OfSTED inspection framework**

* The language (‘pupils’, ‘schools’ etc.) is not always relevant to the post-compulsory sector? Can it be assumed that PCET ITE is not covered by sections with such references?
* There are mixed messages about the use of data, with an emphasis on inspection outcomes not being data driven alongside references to OfSTED drawing on relevant data.
* References to ‘radically different approaches’ to the ITE curriculum being permissible sit uneasily with those about specific curricula being covered (and not covered!).
* What is the status of SEDs for the PCET sector?
* There are references to national priorities for ITE, although these do not appear to have formally existed for several years.
* While welcome, the extra days’ notice of inspections might not be sufficient for the preparation these inspections will require.
* The monitoring of the extent to which partners are meeting regional demand for new teachers is problematic for the post-compulsory sector. These recruited to in-service programmes are, by definition, meeting demand, while recruiting pre-service students is dependent on placements being available.
* Some student teachers should not be subject to observation for mental health reasons.
* Assessing how providers have adjusted programmes in the light of previous inspection reports may not be appropriate given the amount of time between inspections, and the fact that inspection grades under the previous framework might not translate to those awarded under the new one.
* References to PCET inspections aligning with FE inspections in paragraph 83 need clarification.
* Concern that the emphasis on electronic data could undermine the importance of verbal feedback.
* References in paragraph 108 need to extend beyond subject areas to encompass the teaching of different types of student.
* Paragraph 116 is to an extent self-contradictory.