

*Promoting Quality in Teacher Education*



**Note of the UCET Executive Committee meeting, held on 6th December at 10:00 am – 12:00 pm**

**Virtual Online Meeting**

Claire E. Ball-Smith; Sean Cavan; Caroline Daly; Max Fincher; Spencer Hennessey; David Littlefair; Vini Lander; Rachel Lofthouse; Kevin Mattinson (Chair); Jackie Moses; Lisa Murtagh; James Noble-Rogers; Tanya Ovenden-Hope; Cat Scutt; Paul Vare; Jenny Wynn.

Apologies:

Jan Ashbridge; Pat Black; Clare Brooks; Hazel Bryan; Jake Capper; Emma Hollis; Margaret Mulholland; James Nelson; Lynn Senior; Stefanie Sullivan; Roger Woods.

1. Welcome and Introductions
* Noted.
1. Declarations of Interest
* None.
1. Minutes and Matters Arising
* The minutes of the last meeting were approved.
* JNR/SS/LM/RW and KM will be meeting the following day to discuss the UCET strategy and organizational structure in the light of the ITE Market Review.
* The EC thanked JM for her work on the new UCET DBS paper, and agreed that the paper should be sent to DfE and NASBTT for clearance.
* It was agreed that it was safer to assume that the ‘disqualification by association’ rule applies to ITE Secondary as well as Primary.
1. Equalities issues & report from the Equalities sub-group
* VL gave the background to the establishment of the equalities sub-group and the spectrum of the work and projects currently in progress. These include:
	+ The anti-racism framework;
	+ The student census project;
	+ Open University, Open Learn Create short course for excluded groups;
	+ The universities of Sanctuaries ITE course on equality.
* The overall aim of the group is to identity and monitor issues of equality (whether race/sexuality/class/gender/trans etc.), to highlight good practice in ITE, and to effect institutional and organizational/structural change through learning and pedagogy.
* There will be a conference on the 29th March at Leeds Beckett University on the anti-racist framework, which will share good practice.
* The anti-racist ITE/T framework is on the UCET website (see under [‘Guidance’](https://www.ucet.ac.uk/14635/anti-racism-itet-framework)) and can also be accessed via Newcastle University’s website [here](https://www.ncl.ac.uk/social-science/research/anti-racism-framework/).
* VL thanked JNR, JM and MF for supporting the work of the equalities group as well as those colleagues who are engaging in extra work outside of their day job.
* **UCET to organize a Zoom event for the whole of the membership to raise the profile of the work of the EQ group.**
* **PV and JNR to raise the issues of the equalities group at the next DfE review meeting of the ECF/CCF. VL to send JNR some text.**
* It was noted that the framework is an organic document that can also be applied to other equalities’ vectors (class/sexuality/gender etc.) and to non-ITE disciplines, e.g. nursing and social care. The framework is a good example of actively taking ownership of ITE rather than having it dictated to universities by central Government.
* It was also noted that it is important to challenge the kind of promotional material that is used by institutions around equality and diversity, which does not in fact reflect the actual cohort of trainees or the professional TE community more generally.
* An example was given of how international practice and collaboration with others from overseas, can help to give a different perspective on how to make ITE more diverse.
1. ITE Market Review
* JNR noted that none of the appeals for Round 1, Stage 2 had been successful, which was very disappointing.
* There is at least one institution which is pursuing a judicial review.
* Non-accredited providers are meeting as a group.
* JNR continues to raise the concern about the impact upon teacher supply with the DfE.
* The DfE Sufficiency group has now resumed and JNR has been invited back as a member.
* UCET is holding a meeting to discuss new partnership arrangements after the DfE guidance on partnerships issued in December; it was noted that the DfE are trying to encourage some successful providers to be ‘dormant’, and that the partnerships grants on offer are minimal.
* It will be important to be vigilant about how the new DfE associates assigned to successful providers behave, in particular whether they are genuinely supportive or if they adopt an OfSTED/compliance checking -style approach to partnerships.
* There was discussion about how these partnership arrangements raise a whole host of complex issues and risks, including who is responsible for academic awards, QA, liability, especially the financial and capacity implications of any such arrangements, and how long university internal approvals’ processes take for such structures to be approved and put into practice.
* The recent UCET survey on whether schools are aware of the implications on placement mentoring capacity under the new quality requirements, revealed that most partner schools are not aware of this; the question remains whether such schools will want to withdraw from ITE altogether. JNR and KM keep reinforcing this risk to DfE.
* There was discussion about how some head teachers are already not recruiting new trainees because they cannot commit to the cost/capacity of implementing two years of the ECF and mentoring. It is also important to differentiate between the needs of Primary and Secondary mentoring.
* It was agreed that **UCET would do a survey to discover which placement schools are not taking on ECT for these reasons.**
* It was agreed that HEIs do not want a DfE approved mentoring programme, but should be free to provide mentoring that is specialized and distinctive as universities, programmes informed by the priniciple of the IBTE paper and research-informed practice.
* **The EC agreed that UCET should ask the DfE to extend the deadline for submission of information about partnership arrangements.**
1. National Institute for Teaching
* JNR stressed the importance of keeping a watch on the NIT’s activities, especially as there is evidence of individual schools being poached.
* It was asked who the designated associate was for the NIT;
* In the interests of equity, UCET needs to share intelligence between members on how what each associate advises on partnerships, as each person will have a different knowledge-base, influence and expectations. A regional comparison will be important.
* JNR agreed that to the idea of asking the DfE a series of questions about how associates will operate.
1. UCET December newsletter
* Noted for information.
1. Any other business
* Teacher strikes: DfE have stated that there should not be any ITE compliance issues if students miss a limited number of days in school because of industrial action, because the ‘days in school’ requirements relate to programme design rather than to the experiences of individual students. Should any industrial action have a longer term impact on placements, UCET are discussing with DfE the options for re-introducing some of the relaxations made to the ITE requirements during the peak of the Covid pandemic; **JNR to send out a statement to members summarizing UCET’s guidance on this.**

Date of the next meeting:  **21st March 2023**