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**Note of the meeting of the UCET Management Forum held on-line at 1pm on Tuesday 30 November 2021**

Welcome, introductions and minutes of the previous meeting

Colleagues were welcomed to the first meeting of the academic year. The note of the meeting held on 22 June 2021 was agreed. There were no matters arising not included elsewhere on the agenda.

Discussion

A range of issues was discussed, including:

* An update from JNR on non-MF related issues, including the publication date of 11 May 2022 for the results of REF 2021; the development of a new teaching qualification for the FE and skills sector; and the recent on-line UCET conference.
* Regulatory issues, covering:
  + OfSTED inspections, building on discussions at that morning’s morning symposia which had been led by Diana Banister, Alex Ford and Ed Podesta. Inspections carried out under the new ITE inspection framework had found that more than 40% of provision had be found to be either ‘inadequate’ or ‘requires improvement’. Concern had been expressed about the nature of the inspection visits, and questionable suggestions made by inspectors about compliance issues. Some inspectors were reported to have a limited understanding of how HEIs operate, and the impracticability of aligning centre based training with the teaching experiences of student teachers in a large number of partner schools. The importance of ITE providers having a detailed knowledge and understanding of the ITE requirements, the CFF, and the OfSTED inspection framework was stressed. A report was also given about FOI requests made by UCET in relation to the May 2021 OfSTED ITE ‘research’ report, in response to which OfSTED said that *‘it is very difficult to make a precise read-across between the raw evidence gathered during the visits and the high-level findings’.* A further FOI request had led to OfSTED revealing that, of those student teachers who answered the relevant question, 96% felt that their ITE was preparing them well for their first teaching role. Another FOI request, submitted by Warwick Mansell, led to OfSTED reporting that ‘some’ (in the context of some ITE providers basing their curricula on un-identified ‘*out of date and discredited’* theories) referred to *‘more than a few ’*but *‘less than many’.*
  + The ITE requirements, where relaxations made in respect of Covid had been removed. An FAQ document on the requirements had been withdrawn and would be reissued soon. The requirement that student teachers spend 120 days in school was, it was pointed out, a programme design requirement and did not apply to the individual experiences of each and every student. This was not true, however, of two school and age-phase requirements which did apply to all student teachers. In respect of undergraduates, those on programme when requirements had been relaxed would not be expected to play catch-up in respect of age-phase experiences in subsequent years, although ITE providers should do what they can to achieve this.
* It was agreed that the topic for the next morning symposia would be: *‘how to ensure the progressive acquisition of knowledge and skills of student teachers’.* Volunteers to help lead the session would be invited.
* An update of the DfE review of the ITE Market, the results of which were expected to be published the following day.
* Working with teaching school hubs, where the potential benefit to providers of developing relationships with TSHs in the context of any Market Review related ITE accreditation process was stressed. Several colleagues reported the development of good partnerships with TSHs, while others reported that hubs would take decisions on their ITE involvement in the context of the outcome of the Market Review, and once they had got to grips with their ECF and other non-ITE responsibilities. Some TSHs were apparently unclear about what was expected of them in regards ITE. Others were thought to be operating a ‘fiefdom’ mentality where, for example, they might only work with one ITE provider, possibly their own SCITT, with a detrimental impact on net placement availability.
* The shortage of school placements because of, for example, Covid and the pressures being placed on mentoring capacity because of the ECF. Feedback on placement issues received by UCET was being shared with DfE, who were monitoring the situation closely and were expected to encourage schools to offer placements and remind schools about the ‘key-worker’ status of student teachers.
* Recruitment to ITE, where the Covid application bounce had come to an end, although in some cases applications were still above pre-Covid levels. Recruitment to MFL was suffering because of bursary changes and the liability of students from EU countries to pay fees at overseas students’ rates. The impact of bursary changes, and the ongoing ‘second science’ SKE issue, were also noted. Some colleagues reported a shift from SD to core applications.
* The new DfE Apply system, from which applications and recruitment data was not being published as regularly as UCAS data had been. It was confirmed that the ’10 day’ rule, which meant that applicants had 10 days to accept an offer after their *final* offer had been received had not been changed. Apply might, it was suggested, be used to collect data o gaps on applicant’s employment or education history.
* iQTS, where an invitation for accredited ITE providers to apply to deliver pilot programmes from September 2022 had been issued the previous week.
* Post-compulsory issues, including the development of a new teaching qualification for the sector.

Items for information

The summer UCET newsletter was noted.

Any other business

An update was received on the QTS teaching apprenticeship, where a new standard was being developed. Significant issues remained over the timing of end point assessments, costs and bureaucracy. The tension between apprenticeship rules on ongoing assessments against the relevant standards and OfSTED rules on assessments was also noted.

Future meetings

The next meeting would take place on Tuesday 15 March via Zoom. Opinions on whether the subsequent meeting should be face to face or on-line would be invited.
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