

## UCET DECEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER

The most significant event of the term, and probably the whole year, was the publication on 1 December of the government's response to the consultation on the **ITE Market Review**, full details of which can be found at

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/999621/ITT\\_market\\_review\\_report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/999621/ITT_market_review_report.pdf). UCET's formal response to the

consultation can be found at [www: https://www.ucet.ac.uk/13249/ucet-market-review-response-july-2021](https://www.ucet.ac.uk/13249/ucet-market-review-response-july-2021).

Because of the arguments made, it seems as if the government might have moved away from the nightmare scenario of a massive reduction in the number of accredited ITE providers and overly prescriptive mandatory ITE curricula. The response to the consultation does also include some relaxation of some of the detailed quality criteria relating to, for example, programme structures, intensive placements and mentor training. There is a commitment to space for providers of all type and size having a place in the new market, and there will not be a maximum number of providers that are accredited through the new accreditation process, which will take place in two rounds in February and June 2022, with programmes operating under the new Quality Requirements beginning in September 2024. But there is still much to play for. Care will have to be taken that the accreditation process is not used as a backdoor way to introduce changes (e.g. in relation to the number of accredited providers and the prescribing of detailed ITE curricula) that were not explicitly referenced in the consultation proposals and we remain concerned that parts of the draft ITE criteria that will apply from 2024/25, and some of the information to be requested as part of the accreditation process, imply that this might be an issue. UCET has been pressing for the process to be equitable, transparent and clear, with all providers demonstrating that they will be able to, or be likely to be able to, meet the new criteria to be accredited. This was covered during a recent House of Lords debate on the Market Review, which can be seen at: <https://parliamentlive.tv/event/index/700ce9be-ce88-4e37-a6ed-f028e27672a3?in=16:16:09>

The DfE will be holding a number of information-sharing events for providers at which details of the accreditation process and requirements will be shared. UCET and NASBTT will facilitate events at which their members can discuss the accreditation process with DfE officials. We will also be holding our own workshop and information-sharing events.

After more than a year's intensive activity, which has involved countless meetings with DfE officials and ministers, as well as with politicians and education leaders from all sectors, and the high profile Teach Best campaign, our focus now will be on making sure that the accreditation process, and subsequent DfE 'support' is properly and professionally done and that as many UCET members as possible, should they choose to apply for accreditation, are as successful as possible. We would like to thank the huge

number of people from within the UCET membership, from across the education sector and the political spectrum, for their support on the Market Review.

UCET has written to **Robin Walker** about the unprecedented pressure that the ITE sector is currently under. A copy of the letter can be found at:

<https://www.ucet.ac.uk/13641/ucet-letter-to-robin-walker-mp-december-2021>

It is not only QTS programmes that are subject to review. In the **FE and skills sector**, a new teaching apprenticeship has been introduced, details of which can be found at <https://www.instituteforapprenticeships.org/apprenticeship-standards/learning-and-skills-teacher-v1-0>. This includes revised teacher standards, which will also be reflected in new requirements to which all publicly funded teaching qualifications for the sector will have to adhere. DfE has commissioned the Education and Training Foundation (ETF) to take this work forward. The ETF has established a working group, which includes significant UCET representation, to develop new programme requirements. DfE has yet to approve any of the emerging proposals, but at the moment we are pleased that the process has been open and collegiate in a way that the Market Review, at least in its early stages, was not.

Although no ITE inspections took place during the current term, UCET was nonetheless engaged in a number of **OfSTED** related activities, and received significant media coverage: <https://schoolsweek.co.uk/from-worlds-finest-to-inadequate-teacher-trainers-fail-new-ofsted-test/> and <https://www.tes.com/news/ofsted-integrity-under-fire-over-itt-reports-teacher-training>. In the light of the hostile nature of OfSTED ITE inspections, UCET issued advice to its members about the handling of inspections. The document is available at: <https://www.ucet.ac.uk/13451/ofsted-inspections-of-ite-a-briefing-paper-for-ucet-members>. A number of FOI requests were also submitted to OfSTED, one of which related to the evidence to support the conclusions of the May 2021 'research' report into ITE. The first of these was rejected on what appeared to be rather dubious 'confidentiality' grounds. UCET asked for this decision to be reviewed, and the OfSTED response (which includes the following revealing statement: *'it is very difficult to make a precise read across between the raw evidence gathered during the visits and the high level findings'*) is available at: <https://www.ucet.ac.uk/13539/ofsted-response-to-internal-review-of-foi>. A further FOI request forced OfSTED to reveal that, of 8,503 student teachers who responded to the relevant question, 96% felt that their ITE was preparing them well for their first teaching role. Needless to say, OfSTED have not publicised this or congratulated the sector on the success that it demonstrates.

The report on the outcome of the **iQTS** consultation was published in August. The general consensus was in favour of keeping as many of the requirements relating to English QTS programmes as possible. 57% of respondents (but not UCET) were against having separate qualifications for those training to teach in 'local' rather than UK overseas schools. Five pilot programmes (including both SCITTS and HEIs) will run from September 2022. A procurement exercise will take place to select the plot providers. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1012646/IQTS\\_consultation\\_response\\_August\\_2021.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1012646/IQTS_consultation_response_August_2021.pdf)

The annual **UCET conference** took place on 2-3 November and attracted nearly 300 delegates. We are very grateful to the following people for delivering or contributing to excellent plenary sessions: Sarah Steadman; Rachel Lofthouse, Jan Rowe, David Leat, Christine Harrison, Shabnam Cadwallander, Victoria Crooks, Jack Worth, Leigh Hoath, Lewis Morgan, Ian Thompson, Harry Daniels and Berry Billingsley. We are also very grateful to all those who led excellent workshops and symposia. Highlights of the conference can be viewed at: <https://www.ucetconference.com/keynote-showcase>

We hope that next year's conference will be face to face at our previous venue in Stratford upon Avon. As for other meetings, UCET committees and forums are deciding whether to continue with on-line meetings, return to face to face or take a blended approach from January 2022 onwards.

We are continuing to get reports of many providers experiencing difficulties in securing **placements** for ITE students, and we are keeping DfE briefed about the ongoing situation. The difficulties appear to mostly result from the continuing impact of Covid, and the pressures faced by schools because of their ECF-related mentoring responsibilities. DfE have written to schools to encourage them to offer places to student teachers, and have reminded the sector that requirements relating to the number of days students spend in school relate to programme design rather than to the experiences of each and every student teacher. A copy of the latest ITE requirements and guidance can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-criteria/initial-teacher-training-itt-criteria-and-supporting-advice>. It is extremely important that you have a detailed understanding of these requirements and that all of your programmes comply. UCET has requested some changes to the criteria (e.g. in relation to references to assessment) and we expect these to be incorporated soon.

All ITE applications in England are now made through the **DfE Apply service**. We would welcome feedback from UCET members about the new system which we can then discuss with DfE.

On the **CPD** front, a sub-group of the CPD forum has been established to draft a follow-up paper to the earlier 'Effective CPD' paper that would cover, amongst other things, gaps on what is covered through the ECF and NPQs. It is hoped that something will be published by the end of the year. The sub-group of CPD forum looking at the **contribution of teacher education to higher-education institutions** has identified a number of key themes based on responses to a recent survey. These are: (i) the mixed identity of teacher educators, many of whom are recruited from senior positions within schools into new HE environments and do not always have the support provided to academics in other disciplines; (ii) the role of education departments and staff in local communities and with schools and pupils in schools; (iii) the inapplicability of many standard HE metrics (e.g. research profiles, doctoral students) to teacher education, and (iv) the possible diminution of HEI influence over teacher education, and its high cost, and the impact this might have on the attitude of senior HEI staff. It would be helpful if other colleagues could respond to the survey, which can be found at: <https://dundee.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/an-exploration-of-the-contribution-that-teacher-education>. Finally in CPD, we are delighted that CPD forum Chair Paul Vare has been invited by DfE to represent UCET on the government's Sustainability and Climate Change **Working Group 1- Climate Education**

UCET is of course a UK-wide organisation with members in all four jurisdictions. In **Wales**, USCET is continuing to meet regularly with colleagues from Welsh Government, the Education Workforce Council and Estyn to discuss issues relating to placements, Covid, equivalency testing and much else besides. Recent discussions have also focussed on the streamlining of the regulatory functions carried out by EWC and Estyn in order to minimise the burdens these place on ITE providers. In **Northern Ireland**, in addition to regular NIHELG meetings, members of UCETNI (including JNR) continue to attend meetings of the Department of Education's ITE Working Group, which was established to meet the challenges presented by Covid but is continuing to meet to discuss a broader range of issues. JNR has, on behalf of UCETNI, recently written to the Minister of Education in Northern Ireland asking that a review be carried out into teacher

supply needs. The response from the minister confirms that such action needs to be taken. In **Scotland**, we are pleased that colleagues from Scottish member institutions continue to attend UCET forum meetings, and that Jackie Moses represents UCET and the Council of Scottish Deans.

The **Equalities Group**, which is chaired by Professor Vini Lander (Leeds Beckett University) and is a sub-group of the Research & International Forum, is continuing to meet regularly. UCET has also been represented at a number of meetings relevant to equalities' issues, covering for example diversity in ITE and decolonising the curriculum. We were also pleased to have a number of equalities-related workshops at the annual conference. Also on research, it has been announced that the results of the **REF** will be published on 12 May 2022. The date of the R&I forum in May has been changed to accommodate this and for the results for education to be properly discussed.

We hope that you all have a restful and enjoyable Christmas. Next year will again be a challenging one. We will, collectively, come through it together.

UCET  
December 2021