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**Note of the meeting of the UCET CPD forum held at 1pm on Tuesday 11 February 2020 at Mary Sumner House, Tufton Street, Westminster, London SW1P 3RB**

Welcome& introductions

Colleagues were welcomed to the meeting and introduced themselves. The note of the previous meeting was agreed. On matters arising, JNR reported that Linda La Velle would welcome institutional case studies to include in the Building Research Informed Teacher Education Communities paper.

Discussion

Highlights from the afternoon’s discussions included:

* General updates from UCET covering: the sad death before Christmas of former UCET Executive Director Mary Russell; the draft OfSTED ITE inspection framework (where UCET would be stressing in its response the importance of ITE providers being able to engage critically with things like the CCF); planned UCET events in Wales & Northern Ireland; the DfE shape of the ITE market review; and the previous week’s UCET round-table on SEND in ITE.
* Feedback from the morning symposium on the development of NPQs for teachers (with particular reference to a teacher developer NPQ), and which had been led by colleagues from DfE. The NPQs would be aimed at teachers who might not want to move into management positions, with likely coverage informed by discussions with school leaders and others. Key points made by UCET with regard to what might be covered included: supporting teachers to engage critically with research; coaching; mentoring; subject knowledge; pedagogic subject knowledge; the teaching of adults in workplace settings; engagement with policy; empathy; and pupil learning. Suggestions had also been invited by DFE about research they might consult, with suggestions made including evidence about the positive impact of master’s level CPD. Further thoughts about NPQs should be sent to either Jessica.Brown@education.gov.uk or Frances.Lalor@education.gov.uk.
* It was agreed that the next morning symposium would be on the Early Career Framework, with organisations involved in the pilot projects invited to speak, with a view to informing the review of the ECF and supporting HEIs prepare for national roll-out. Other comments made about the ECF included: concern about the extent to which schools were aware of the ECF, and what the contractual obligations might be; reference to discussions between ECF providers and subject associations that had taken place; lack of clarity about national roll-out; concern about the ECF attempting to address complex issues in a simplistic way; the tension between the ECF being used as a development tool and a means of assessment; and the scope for ECF to remove distractions experienced by NQTs and focus on key development areas.
* HEIs engagement with apprenticeship, including those relating to generic leadership skills, MBAs and those for HEI staff. Some private providers were reported as taking an overly flexible approach to apprenticeship rules that that HEIs could not.
* Delivering M level through distance learning, something which several forum members reported as being engaged with, sometimes as standalone programme and sometimes where students are given the choice about the extent to which they engage on line or face to face. Validation could sometimes be an issue at some institutions, and care must be taken about choice of the platform provider and the potentially significant resource implications. Student to student interaction can be facilitated through such programmes.
* Institutional updates and horizon scanning, including the relationship between maintaining standards and maximizing recruitment, and the implications of expecting HE staff to achieve higher level academic qualifications. The establishment of a sub-group to consider internal challenges was suggested.
* The NFER report on teacher autonomy, which identified a direct link between teachers exercising a degree of autonomy in regards their professional development and their retention in the profession. Classroom teachers were also found to make slower progress towards autonomy as they advance their careers than those in other professions.
* The new ITE content framework, with concerns expressed about the interpretation of ‘expert colleagues’ and the approach during ITE inspections of over-zealous OfSTED inspectors.
* The process for developing a new UCET strategy, drawing on the work of the Intellectual Base of Teacher Education group.
* The report into the digital skills of primary teachers in Northern Ireland, carried out by colleagues from Ulster University funded with money channeled through UCET.
* International activities, including the forthcoming ICET conference, and the UCET invitation to apply for Gordon Kirk Travel Scholarships.

Date of next meeting

2 June 2020.