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**ITE primary and early years forum: note of the meeting held via zoom at 1pm on Tuesday 28 February 2023**

Colleagues were welcomed to the second meeting of the academic year. The note of the meeting held on 15 November 2022 was approved. There were no matters arising not included elsewhere on the agenda.

A number of issues were discussed, including:

* An update from JNR on non-primary related issues, including: the UCET CPD paper, *'Golden thread or gilded cage*' and subsequent discussions with DfE; details of the 2023 UCET conference which would take place in Leeds on 14-15 November; developments in regards teacher education for the post-compulsory sector, including the imminent publication of a DfE ‘expectations’ document; and issues in Northern Ireland and Wales.
* Feedback from that morning's symposium on Intensive Training and Practice (ITAP) which had been led by Des Hewitt and Michelle Pearson, with key points including: parts of ITAP can take place as part of general school placements as long as the time iis in addition to the normal placement weeks ; the subject of ITAP should be precise and focussed, and not overly broad (e.g. a specific aspect of behaviour management, not BM generally); consideration could be given to which aspects of ITAP might be subject specific; mentors should have a role in planning ITAP and should have a good understanding of what it covers; ITAP should be an integrated part of a planned and sequenced ITE curriculum, not a ‘bolt-on’; students should be helped to be resilient in respect of their ITAP experiences and workload issues for both students and mentors should be addressed; the use of technology, including its potential shortcomings, should be considered; contingency plans should be put in place (e.g. if a student or mentor misses an ITAP experience); strategies were needed on how to assess student learning through ITAP; the division of ITAP responsibilities across accredited providers, delivery partners and others should be planned and documented; aspects of ITAP should if possible be piloted during 2023/24; providers should ensure that ITAP is financially and organisationally sustainable; and links between ITAP and subsequent ECF learning should be identified.
* Other aspects of the ITE Market Review Stage 2 accreditation process, including:
  + Curriculum issues, where it was noted that delivery partners could be engaged in the co-construction of curricula, and have limited scope (with the agreement of the accredited provider) to contextualise curricula to meet local needs.
  + Mentoring, where the lack of understanding of schools about the responsibilities they would have in respect of ITE mentoring from 2024/25 was noted. The scope to deliver cross-provider mentor training in particular geographical areas (while taking due account of the need for all mentors to have a deep understanding of their accredited provider’s ITE curriculum) and the possibility of including a range of relevant activities to count towards mentor training requirements were both discussed. In answer to a question, it was confirmed that it was an ambition rather than a requirement of government that all lead mentors take the NPQTLD, and that lead mentors employed by HEIs could access funding for NPQTLD qualifications (the absence of any ITE specific components to the NPQTLD was also noted).
  + Partnerships, where reconfigured partnerships were being developed and clarification from DfE about the scope for accredited providers to delegate responsibility for recruitment and the collection of fees was noted. It was suggested that funding might on occasion be passed from accredited providers to delivery partners on the basis of activities undertaken rather than as a flat amount per student teacher.
* The development of the new undergraduate teacher apprenticeship, which might present both threats and opportunities to the HE sector, but in any case was likely to take some time to develop.
* Inspection issues, where it was noted that the timetable for OfSTED inspections had on occasion be adjusted in the light of industrial action.
* New UCET guidance on DBS and Keeping Children Safe in Education, which was awaiting final sign-off by DfE.
* Recruitment to ITE, where nationally applications to primary postgraduate programmes were down, but with a mixed picture reported in respect of both undergraduate and postgraduate by those at the meeting. The increase in overseas applications was also identified as an issue.
* Early years, which was a focus for a significant amount of Covid recovery work by government, including attempts to increase recruitment to EYTS programmes. Clarity was required from government about what EYTS holders were qualified to do in both maintained schools and academies & free schools.

Items for information

The group noted:

* The December UCET newsletter
* The forthcoming review of UCET’s strategy, vision & mission, governance, ways of working and organisational structure in the light of Market Review outcomes. .

Any other business

It was agreed that the topic for the next morning symposium would be QA and risk-management of ITE in the new context, with possibilities for other symposia including: supporting students with disabilities & neuro-diverse students; and recruitment to ITE.

Date of next meeting

6 June 2023 (format to be decided).