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**Note of the UCET Executive Committee meeting, held on 29th June at 10:30 am – 12:00 pm**

**Virtual Online Meeting**

Attendance:

Pat Black; Clare Brooks; Jake Capper; Caroline Daly; Max Fincher; Spencer Hennessey; Emma Hollis; Vini Lander; Rachel Lofthouse; Kevin Mattinson (Chair); Jo McIntyre; Margaret Mulholland; Trevor Mutton; James Noble-Rogers; Tanya Ovenden-Hope; Cat Scutt; Paul Vare; Matt Varley; Roger Woods; Jenny Wynn.

Apologies:

Sean Cavan; Hazel Bryan; Des Hewitt; David Littlefair; Karen McGrath; Roisin McPhilemy; Jackie Moses; Elaine Sharpling.

1. Declarations of interest
* None.
1. Minutes & matters arising (enc.)
* The MATHubs briefing paper has been issued.
* Geoff Barton (CE of ASCL), Mary Bousted (NUS) and other unions have raised objections to the Market Review (MR) proposals in meetings with DfE.
* The draft report of the APPG meeting will be published soon.
* UCET is ready to go publicly and quickly once the DfE proposals are published.
* A parallel letter from UCET and NASBTT to Gavin Williamson (Secretary of State) is ready for publication
* There will also be a blog and a skeleton response to UCET members to provide input to once the proposals are published.
* The redlines for UCET are:
	+ Any overprescription of ITE programmes and a prescriptive curriculum
	+ A unnecessarily bureaucratic accreditation process
	+ The resourcing implications for ITE providers and schools and impact upon placement opportunities
	+ Further regulation and OfSTED inspections
1. ITE Market Review and Institute of Teaching
* It was noted that UCET should watch out for any ‘weasel’ words in the proposals, e.g. ‘lead mentors’ – how do the DfE interpret mentoring and training requirements for mentors and placements; what does ‘accreditation’ actually mean, and why is there a shift from assessment of the Teacher Standards to the TS and the Core Content Framework? What is an ‘intensive/immersive’ placement?
* It is important that UCET’s response to the proposals does not unintentionally sanction them in any way.
* It was agreed that putting in supplementary responses throughout the process, responding to different areas (assessment, mentoring etc.) would be a good approach.
* It was suggested demonstrating to the DfE a cost-breakdown of how much ITE providers pay for placements, but reluctance was expressed about doing this because of the DfE then making an argument to impose rules on funding.
* Concern was expressed over how there are fewer ITE departments and people doing doctoral work, and that this has an impact on the whole of the sector. FE and EYTT might also disappear if there are less teacher training departments.
* It was suggested engaging the work of the SRG to help prepare a response, as the school voice is a key supporting one.
* It was asked how trainee teachers will be allocated when there are less providers, and if there will be a bidding process? There are no plans as far as UCET knows, to return to an allocations process/model of recruitment.
* Lamentably, the quality in some small provision will be allowed to disappear and there is a ‘survival of the fittest and/or compliant’ approach to ITE, rather than any focus upon teacher professionalism and the intellectual basis of teacher education.
* It was suggested that the DfE might be exploiting a generational divide, with younger ITE professionals more likely to be compliant with any DfE policy, rather than older colleagues. Pragmatism versus intellectualism appears to be pitted against one another. It is important to remember that UCET is the voice of all in ITE and that underscoring the integrity and importance of the intellectual status of the profession is key.
* Another point raised was will the MR proposals lead to a more fulfilled and professionally-satisfied teacher workforce? If the intellectual aspects of the profession are retreating, it is hard to see how this will be the case. The ‘revolving door’ of teacher supply problems will continue.
* It was asked if more might be done to have a united front with the professional subject associations. The Maths Association is particularly concerned about the MR ideas.
* The EC agreed that they were happy for UCET to issue the skeleton response to the MR proposals once published, and to issue public responses as soon as possible. KM thanked JNR for his work and leadership; JNR thanked EH and others for their input.
1. Regulatory issues
* The research report bears no relation to the visits; UCET has considered putting in a Freedom of Information request for any correspondence between the DfE and OfSTED on the visits. KM asked the EC if they would like to do this. It was agreed that UCET would submit an FOI to see whether or not the report is a rigorous account of the evidence that OfSTED have received, .e.g. is there any inconsistency in what was given as feedback rather than what was in the report.
* No reports have been published yet on inspections that have resumed. Feedback suggests that these have been ‘adversarial’ in their approach, with one member of the UCET Executive reporting that staff at their institution have been off sick with stress. It would seem that OfSTED are trying to find providers to fail.
1. Post Compulsory Issues
* New standards have been introduced for the FE sector – the DET component is no longer part of the apprenticeship. The Education and Training Foundation is meeting with the ITT advisory group about this.
* The Secretary of State could use reserve powers instead to re-regulate the sector instead.
* It was noted that there could be damage to DET by driving the apprenticeship.
1. Diversity
* The Equalities Group has met three times and asked:
	+ What data is held around equalities within individual institutions? There are gaps in the data.
	+ A survey has been send to providers asking how many teachers are from a Black and Global How many apply/are successful/stay in the profession and for how long; where are they in the ‘pipeline’.
* The Equalities Group will be hosting 2 symposia at this year’s UCET annual conference. The topics will be on 1) LGBTQ+ trainees and 2) challenging policy around equalities.
* It was noted that the MR/CCF and ECF will affect ITE providers with respect to how they implement equality and diversity.
* How will student teachers understand the pressures on those from different backgrounds/models of learning/ race/class/locality etc. The CCF does not mention race or social class at all and does not reflect the real life/world problems and issues.
* It was noted that Black and Global Majority is now the preferred term to BAME.
* KM thanked VL for all her work
1. Items for Information
* For information
1. AOB
* JNR and MF left the room while the EC made a decision on a pay increase for UCET officers.

10.  Date of next meeting: 10:00 am 28th September 2021