

# The framework for the inspection of initial teacher education 2012

Consultation document – proposals for revised inspection arrangements for initial teacher education partnerships from September 2012

---

The consultation runs from 31 October 2011 until 31 January 2012.

If you would like a version of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231 or email [enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk).

**Published:** October 2011

---

**Reference no:** 110115



Corporate member of  
Plain English Campaign  
Committed to clearer communication

**361**

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, work-based learning and skills training, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email [enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk).

You may reuse this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/), write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This publication is available at [www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/110115](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/110115).

To receive regular email alerts about new publications, including survey reports and school inspection reports, please visit our website and go to 'Subscribe'.

Piccadilly Gate  
Store Street  
Manchester  
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 1231  
Textphone: 0161 618 8524  
E: [enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk)  
W: [www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk)

No. 110115

© Crown copyright 2011



# Contents

---

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Background to the consultation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of the main proposals</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Proposals to revise the framework for the inspection of initial teacher education</b>	<b>7</b>
Overall effectiveness	7
The three contributory key questions and judgements	9
Risk assessment	13
Inspection arrangements	15
Awarding body provision leading to qualifications to teach in the further education and skills sector	17
<b>The consultation process</b>	<b>17</b>
What happens next?	17
Sending back your questionnaire	18
<b>Questionnaire for the framework for the inspection of initial teacher education 2012 consultation</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>What did you think of this consultation?</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Additional questions about you</b>	<b>33</b>

## Introduction

The Education Act 2005 provides the remit for Her Majesty's Chief Inspector (HMCI) to inspect initial training of teachers for schools and, when requested by the Secretary of State, a duty to do so. The Post-16 Education and Training Inspection Regulations 2001 extended the remit of HMCI to cover the inspection of any publicly funded training of further education teachers. These remits were reinforced within the Education and Inspections Act 2006.

As a result, the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) is responsible for conducting inspections of all providers of training programmes leading to qualified teacher status (QTS) for teaching in maintained schools, and of further education teacher education programmes validated by higher education institutions (HEIs).

The current framework for the inspection of initial teacher education (ITE) has been in place since September 2008. Between 2008 and 2011, with the exception of provision leading to an awarding body qualification to teach in the further education and skills sector, all providers of ITE have been inspected under the same framework. The awarding body courses were not part of the process between 2008/11. However, in 2011/12, a sample of providers will be inspected and the new inspection framework will need to incorporate inspection of this provision.

Feedback on the current framework from users, stakeholders, providers and inspectors has been positive but also suggests the need to continue to raise the bar. We propose to take the opportunity to raise expectations and ensure that more trainees are better prepared with the practical skills that teachers need most, such as behaviour management and the effective teaching of reading. In the light of this feedback, and of the government's intention for schools to play a greater role in the recruitment, selection and training of the next generation of teachers, as well as for inspection to be more proportionate to risk and targeted where improvement is needed most, we propose to introduce a new inspection framework from September 2012.

We welcome your views on the proposals outlined in this consultation document.

The consultation runs from 31 October 2011 until 31 January 2012.

## Background to the consultation

In developing the new inspection framework, we are taking into account our own inspection findings and changing government policy, including the proposals highlighted in the schools' White Paper 2010 *The importance of teaching*,<sup>1</sup> which are

---

<sup>1</sup> *The importance of teaching*, DfE, 2010;  
<http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/schoolswhitepaper/b0068570/the-importance-of-teaching/>.

now being incorporated into a new Education Bill, and the Department for Education's (DfE's) improvement strategy document *Training our next generation of outstanding teachers*.<sup>2</sup>

In particular, our proposals are informed by the following changes:

- the creation of a national network of 500 teaching schools that has begun with the first 100 in September 2011
- a move towards schools taking more responsibility for training the next generation of teachers
- the proposed creation of university training schools
- the introduction of the new professional standards for teachers in 2012
- the review of the professional standards and qualifications for teachers in the further education and skills sector
- the expansion of the Teach First training programme
- the establishment of more academies and the opening of free schools
- revisions to the curriculum for all key stages and the Early Years Foundation Stage
- the introduction of new teacher education programmes including, for example, Troops to Teachers and Teach Next
- more rigorous recruitment and selection, including the raising of entry qualifications and a greater focus on the employability of trainees
- simplifying the process for applying for a place on an ITE programme and targeting bursaries to attract the best trainees
- a greater emphasis in ITE programmes on teaching reading using systematic phonics, and on training in behaviour management and meeting the needs of pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities.

In developing proposals, we have also taken into account users', providers', inspectors', Inspection Service Providers' (ISPs') and other stakeholders' evaluations of the current inspection framework, which highlight the need to:

- raise the bar further by drawing up clearer and more challenging criteria for judging a partnership to be outstanding or good
- replace the judgement on attainment with a judgement on trainees' outcomes
- make an overarching judgement for overall effectiveness for each age phase of training and reduce the number of sub-judgements

---

<sup>2</sup> *Training our next generation of outstanding teachers*, DfE, 2011; <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/careers/traininganddevelopment/a0078019/training-outstanding-teachers>.

- adopt a more proportionate approach to inspection that is informed by a robust risk assessment process
- target inspections where improvement is needed most
- extend the length of the inspection cycle to six years from the current three years for good and outstanding providers
- gain more evidence of trainees', former trainees' and employers' views by introducing an online questionnaire
- give a higher priority to the direct observation of trainees and former trainees – including newly qualified teachers, recently qualified teachers and those who have recently completed their training in the further education and skills sector – in order to gain more evidence of the impact of training on outcomes, for example, on trainees' knowledge of and skills in using systematic phonics to teach reading
- consider incorporating a thematic element into the inspection framework in order to gain more evidence on the quality of trainees' outcomes in teaching specific subjects and aspects, and on the impact of national initiatives, including the teaching of reading and systematic phonics
- reduce the eight-week notice period to three weeks
- incorporate the inspection of provision leading to awarding body qualifications to teach in the further education and skills sector.

## Summary of the main proposals

From September 2012, we propose that ITE inspections will:

- retain the focus on trainees' outcomes at the heart of the inspection
- be underpinned by clear and more challenging criteria for judging partnerships to be outstanding or good
- place a stronger focus on inspecting the selection of trainees and the quality of partnerships
- be more streamlined with fewer judgements
- result in one overarching judgement for the overall effectiveness of the partnership in each phase inspected, which is informed by judging the quality of the outcomes for trainees, the quality of training across the partnership and the effectiveness of leadership and management across the partnership
- focus on the quality of training and trainees' knowledge, understanding and competence in developing pupils' literacy skills, including using systematic phonics within the teaching of reading
- focus on inspecting the national priorities, including behaviour management and training to teach those who have special educational needs and/or disabilities

- incorporate the inspection of subjects and aspects as part of a rolling programme of inspections
- integrate judgements on equality and diversity throughout the report, including reporting on the performance of different groups of trainees
- be more proportionate to risk and informed by a robust annual process of risk assessment to ensure that resources are targeted where improvement is needed most
- reduce the eight-week notice period to three weeks
- introduce the monitoring of all satisfactory provision to promote faster improvement
- introduce a focused monitoring inspection on the provision of phonics training where trainees' responses to the newly qualified teacher survey question 'How good was your training in preparing you to teach reading, including phonics and comprehension?' indicates significant dissatisfaction with the quality of provision in two consecutive years
- introduce a monitoring inspection of inadequate provision prior to a re-inspection within 12–18 months of the previous inspection
- take account of the views of users, trainees and former trainees, including newly qualified and recently qualified teachers, via an online questionnaire
- continue to involve leaders, managers, tutors, mentors, trainees and former trainees in discussions during an inspection
- give greater priority to the direct observation of trainees' practice and the practice of those who have recently completed their training, to focus more on the quality of their teaching
- continue to take account of a partnership's self-evaluation
- continue to drive improvement in the sector by providing an external evaluation of strengths and weaknesses.

## **Proposals to revise the framework for the inspection of initial teacher education**

### **Overall effectiveness**

1. In the following sections, we discuss and seek views on proposals to judge the overall effectiveness of ITE partnerships.
2. The current ITE inspection framework leads to two overarching judgements for each phase inspected: one for overall effectiveness and one for capacity to improve. Age-phase ITE provision is inspected and reported on separately under the same inspection framework. The two overarching judgements are informed by nine contributory judgements on: attainment; recruitment and selection; training and assessment; the effective and efficient use of resources; the quality of provision across the partnership; promoting equality and

- diversity; how well the provider assesses its own performance; anticipating and responding to change; and planning and taking action.
3. Under the new inspection framework, we propose that there will be one judgement for the overall effectiveness of the partnership for each phase of ITE inspected, which will incorporate a judgement on its capacity to improve.
  4. The overarching question will be:  
How well does the partnership secure consistently high-quality outcomes for trainees?
  5. By partnership, we mean all those involved in the training, for example, higher education institutions, schools, colleges, and employers.
  6. The overall effectiveness judgement will be informed by three contributory judgements on:
    - the outcomes for trainees
    - the quality of training across the partnership
    - the quality of leadership and management across the partnership.
  7. We define outcomes as:
    - how well trainees can teach by the end of their training (trainees' attainment)
    - timely and successful completion rates
    - employment rates
    - retention in the teaching profession.
  8. The outcomes determine the employability of trainees. For in-service trainees in the further education and skills sector, employability refers to those who go on to achieve licensed practitioner status.
  9. In line with practice in other inspection remits, we intend to continue to use the Ofsted four-point scale:
    - grade 1 – Outstanding
    - grade 2 – Good
    - grade 3 – Satisfactory
    - grade 4 – Inadequate.
  10. We propose to strengthen the criteria for judging outstanding and good. It is likely that to be judged outstanding for overall effectiveness, all the three contributory judgements will need to be outstanding.

11. If any one or more of the three contributory judgements is inadequate, it is likely that the overall effectiveness of the provision will be judged to be inadequate.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to judging overall effectiveness?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

## The three contributory key questions and judgements

### Outcomes for trainees

12. The current inspection framework defines outcomes as:

‘trainees’ attainment, trainees’ progress, the proportion of trainees who successfully complete the course and the proportion of trainees who secure employment or acquire licensed practitioner status in the further education system.’

There are separate judgements on attainment, and on recruitment and selection. The judgement on recruitment and selection is underpinned by evidence on the suitability of trainees recruited, successful completion rates, the recruitment of trainees from under-represented groups and employment rates.

13. In the new inspection framework, we propose to replace the judgements on attainment and on recruitment and selection with a single judgement on trainees’ outcomes.

The proposed key inspection question is:  
What is the quality of outcomes for all groups of trainees?

14. Inspectors will evaluate:

- how well trainees teach<sup>3</sup>
- selection and its impact on the three key outcomes: attainment, completion rates and employment rates
- attainment trends, in particular over the past three years, including notable differences between identifiable groups of trainees
- timely and successful completion rates
- employment rates
- retention in the teaching profession.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> This means attaining the professional standards for teachers or the assessment requirements of the relevant qualification to teach in the further education and skills sector.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to judging the quality of outcomes for trainees?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

### **Quality of training across the partnership**

15. Currently, inspectors make separate judgements on:
  - recruitment and selection
  - training and assessment
  - quality across the partnership
  - efficient and effective use of resources
  - promoting equality and diversity.
16. We inspect and report on the quality of training by sampling training in a range of subjects and aspects, and inspecting national priorities. However, we do not gain in-depth evidence on the quality of training in individual subjects and aspects.
17. In the new framework, we propose that there will be a single judgement on the quality of training across the partnership. The focus will be on the impact of the training on the quality of outcomes for all groups of trainees. This will be determined through a range of inspection activities including interviews with trainees, direct observations of trainees teaching and the analysis of data. We also propose that inspections will include a subject/aspect element on a rolling programme throughout the inspection cycle. Partnerships will receive feedback on the quality of training in the selected subjects and/or aspects and on the impact of training for national priorities on trainees' outcomes. The choice of subjects/aspects would be communicated to partnerships before the inspection year begins and would be informed by national priorities. All partnerships offering primary and early years training programmes will be judged on the effectiveness of their training to teach reading, including trainees' knowledge of, and skills in, using systematic phonics.
18. The proposed key inspection question is:  
How well does the partnership prepare trainees to teach learners in the age range and subject(s) for which they are being trained?

---

<sup>4</sup> For in-service provision, inspectors will evaluate how well the partnership monitors trainees during the period of professional formation.

19. Inspectors will evaluate the extent to which:

- the partnership uses information gathered from selection to inform pre-course activities and individual training plans that enable trainees to achieve high-quality outcomes
- the quality of training, by all trainers, and its impact on the outcomes for trainees is consistently high across the partnership
- the training enables trainees to improve their teaching by integrating their understanding of how children and adults learn with their practical experience of teaching
- the partnership provides accurate assessment, feedback and precise developmental targets to support trainees' critical reflections and continual improvement towards achieving high-quality outcomes
- trainees are supported to develop effectively their pedagogical subject knowledge
- the training enables trainees on primary and early years training programmes to develop their knowledge, understanding and expertise in using systematic phonics to teach reading so that they are confident and competent in teaching reading and language skills by the end of their training
- the training prepares trainees to promote good behaviour through their teaching and manage challenging behaviour
- the training prepares trainees to develop learners' numeracy and literacy skills
- the training prepares trainees to assess learners' achievement and plan and teach lessons that ensure that all learners, including those who have special educational needs and/or disabilities, make good progress
- trainees gain sufficient high-quality practical experience to develop their teaching for the full range of learners
- the partnership provides high-quality support for all trainees to secure their timely and successful completion of their training programme.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to judging the quality of training across the partnership?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

### **Leadership and management of the partnership**

20. In the current inspection framework, we judge the extent to which the leaders and managers at all levels have the capacity to secure further improvements and/or to sustain high-quality outcomes. A judgement is made on 'capacity to improve' and this is informed by three contributory judgements: how effectively the provider evaluates its own performance; how well the leadership, at all

levels, anticipates change and prepares for and responds to national and local initiatives; and how effectively the provider plans and takes action for improvement.

21. In the new inspection framework, it is proposed that there will be one judgement on the leadership and management of the partnership. The focus of inspection will be on the impact of leaders and managers at all levels across the partnership in achieving and sustaining high-quality outcomes for trainees. This focus will include judging the quality and impact of the process of review, self-evaluation, improvement planning, taking action and responding to local and national priorities, including teaching reading using systematic phonics, behaviour management and meeting the needs of pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities.
22. The proposed key inspection question is:  
How well do the leaders and managers at all levels of the partnership ensure that the best outcomes are achieved and sustained?
23. Inspectors will evaluate the extent to which:
  - the partnership meets institutional, local, regional and/or national needs to attract, train and retain teachers
  - all partners contribute to and ensure the selection of trainees who have the potential to successfully complete the training and secure a teaching post or to complete the period of professional formation to achieve licensed practitioner status
  - all partners contribute to and ensure consistently high-quality training across the partnership so that all trainees and groups of trainees gain the skills, knowledge and understanding to become good teachers
  - the progress of trainees and groups of trainees is monitored and used to promote their progress and ensure high-quality outcomes
  - partnership resources are deployed efficiently and effectively to support high-quality outcomes for trainees and to secure improvement where necessary
  - all partners evaluate their contribution to ITE and are involved in course development, review, self-evaluation, improvement planning, implementing actions and monitoring the impact to improve or sustain high-quality outcomes
  - improvement planning is based on the rigorous and systematic analysis of comprehensive and robust trend data about all of the outcomes for all groups of trainees
  - the partnership meets all relevant current ITE requirements and legislation, including those related to promoting equality and diversity and for eliminating discrimination.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to inspecting the leadership and management of the partnership?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

## Risk assessment

24. Under the current inspection arrangements, all providers were inspected within a three-year cycle. The timing of inspections and the size of the team were largely dependent on an annual risk assessment of individual providers, which took account of:
- the size and complexity of the provider
  - providers' self-evaluations
  - provider information and data submitted to Ofsted each year
  - previous inspection grades
  - Training and Development Agency (TDA) outcomes data
25. We propose to continue to carry out an annual risk assessment of all ITE partnerships as part of the process of selecting provision for inspection. This will include taking account of the outcomes of the previous inspection, the providers' self-evaluation of provision, and data on trainees' outcomes including the newly qualified teacher survey.
26. We intend to take greater account of users' and other stakeholders' views in helping us to decide when a partnership should be inspected. We are currently considering new ways in which views about the quality of training and its outcomes will be gathered regularly and not just at the time of inspection. We propose, therefore, to gather the views of current and recent trainees by inviting them to complete an online questionnaire via Ofsted's website. These findings will be considered as part of the annual risk assessment process.
27. We shall continue to inspect a sample of outstanding and good partnerships in each year of the inspection cycle. New partnerships will be subject to the same risk assessment process but are unlikely to be inspected in their first year of operation.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our approach to risk assessment?

Do you have you any comments or suggestions?

## Partnerships previously judged to be outstanding or good

28. We are proposing that all partnerships will be inspected at least once during the six-year cycle of inspection. The timing of the inspection of outstanding and good partnerships will be determined by the annual risk assessment process. In

each year of the cycle we will continue to inspect a sample of outstanding partnerships.

### **Partnerships previously judged to be satisfactory**

29. We propose to inspect partnerships previously judged to be satisfactory at an early stage in the new cycle. Those partnerships that continue to be satisfactory will be subject to a monitoring inspection, which will take place 12–18 months after the inspection. A full inspection is likely to take place within three years of the previous inspection.
30. We propose to focus our monitoring of satisfactory provision where one or more of the following factors is present.
  - The partnership has been judged satisfactory in each of its last two inspections.
  - No aspect of the partnership’s work was judged to be better than satisfactory at its last inspection.
  - The quality of leadership and management across the partnership were judged to be satisfactory at the last inspection.
  - Outcomes are variable across cohorts and groups of trainees.
  - Responses to the online trainee questionnaire indicate possible concerns about the training, especially in the teaching of reading and meeting the needs of pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities.
31. We propose to bring forward a full inspection if the monitoring inspection suggests that the partnership has made limited progress in improving its performance.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposals to inspect outstanding and good partnerships?

To what extent do you agree or disagree that our inspection of satisfactory partnerships should be based on the factors set out above?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

### **Partnerships previously judged to be inadequate**

32. Partnerships previously judged to be inadequate are currently re-inspected within 12–18 months of the previous inspection. We propose to continue with this model. Should the re-inspection result in a judgement that the partnership is satisfactory, the arrangements described above will be applied.

## Inspection arrangements

### Pre-inspection

#### *Inspection planning*

33. Currently, Ofsted asks partnerships each year to update their information on partnership contact details, links with other providers and the ITE programmes offered. We propose to continue to ask for this information from partnerships annually. In addition, we propose to ask partnerships to return annual headline data in relation to three key trainee outcomes: attainment; timely and successful completion; and employment rates.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to gathering inspection planning information?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

#### *Self-evaluation*

34. Partnerships have previously agreed to complete a common self-evaluation document. This is currently submitted annually to the TDA and to Ofsted for further education provision. Inspectors will continue to take account of the quality of self-evaluation when judging leadership and management. We expect that partnerships should always be able to provide some summative evidence of self-evaluation, in whatever form they choose to make it available, which might include an evaluation of performance against the key inspection judgements.

#### *Notice period and pre-inspection contact*

35. Currently ITE partnerships are given eight weeks' notice of an inspection. It is proposed that in the new framework this should be reduced to three weeks. Currently, lead inspector(s) discuss the provider's self-evaluation, preliminary hypotheses and the outline of the inspection programme with the provider during a preliminary on-site visit. We propose that the preliminary visit will be replaced by an initial telephone discussion. The lead inspector will normally make an initial phone call to discuss arrangements within 24 hours of the provider being notified of the inspection.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to replacing the preliminary on-site visit with telephone discussions?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the eight-week notice period to three weeks?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

## During the inspection

### *Inspection teams and tariff*

36. Inspections will continue to be carried out by Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) and/or additional inspectors. In line with Ofsted's overall budget restrictions, we intend to reduce the number of on-site inspection days for good and outstanding partnerships, although the tariff will depend on the annual risk assessment.

### *Inspection activities*

37. Inspectors may gather first-hand evidence related to outcomes by visiting trainees to observe teaching towards the end of their training programme or soon after the end of their training.
38. Inspection activities will continue to include: interviewing members of the partnership involved with training; assessing trainees and management and quality assurance; talking to trainees, former trainees and key staff in the institutions where they are employed; scrutinising trainees' files, tasks and assignments and information relating to the assessment of their progress; scrutinising data; gathering evidence of how trainees are selected and how equalities issues are addressed; analysing trainees' records; tracking pre-determined case studies of individual trainees and groups of trainees; and observing the teaching of a sample of trainees.
39. Throughout the inspection, there will continue to be professional dialogue between inspectors and staff across the partnership about the context of its work and the emerging inspection findings. Formal feedback will be provided orally at the end of the inspection.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to inspection activities?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

## Post-inspection

40. At the end of an inspection, the partnership will receive an inspection report. Reports will continue to include graded judgements for the phases inspected. Inspection reports will indicate clearly the strengths of the provision and what the partnership needs to do to improve. We propose to continue to publish inspection reports on Ofsted's website.

## **Awarding body provision leading to qualifications to teach in the further education and skills sector**

41. As in previous frameworks, it is proposed that we will not undertake institutional inspections or report on individual centres offering awarding body provision. Evidence about the outcomes for trainees on courses leading to these qualifications will be gathered from centres alongside inspections of HEI-led partnerships providing training to teach in the further education and skills sector.
42. It is proposed that additional evidence will be gathered from inspection visits to some centres not involved in these HEI-led partnerships. This will include a sample of centres other than further education colleges such as: sixth form colleges; local authority, adult and community learning centres; and private training providers.
43. The quality of the provision will be evaluated using the same set of inspection judgements as for all other ITE provision. Each centre receiving an inspection visit will receive oral feedback at the end of the inspection, followed by a feedback letter, which will be published. The letter will make clear the inspection judgements, the strengths and areas for development.
44. It is proposed that the evidence from all inspection visits will be used to publish an overview report in each year of the inspection cycle and summary reports every three years.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to inspecting awarding body provision?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

## **The consultation process**

We welcome your responses to the consultation questionnaire below. Please use the comments section in the questionnaire to raise any additional points not covered by our questions. The consultation remains open until 31 January 2012.

We will meet with representative groups from the sector and trainees, former trainees and employers.

## **What happens next?**

During 2012, we will pilot our proposals, evaluate them and publish regular information on our website as we develop the revised arrangements. We aim to ensure that the process is as clear and open as possible, so that people can see that their views have been considered and are aware of the changes that we decide to make.

We will publish a revised framework and evaluation schedule for the inspection of initial teacher education, taking full account of the responses to this consultation. We will publish a report on the responses to this consultation.

## **Sending back your questionnaire**

There are three ways of completing and submitting the questionnaire in the next section and/or sending us your comments.

### **Online electronic questionnaire**

You can complete and submit an electronic version of the questionnaire:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-ite2012>.

### **Print and post**

This document can be printed and completed by hand. When you have completed the questionnaire, please post it to:

Ofsted ITE Development team  
Floor 7  
Aviation House  
125 Kingsway  
London  
WC2B 6SE.

### **Download and email**

This document can be downloaded and completed on your own computer. When you have completed the questionnaire, please email it to: [ite@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:ite@ofsted.gov.uk). Please put 'ITE framework 2012 consultation' in the subject line.

## Questionnaire for the framework for the inspection of initial teacher education 2012 consultation

### Confidentiality

The information you provide will be held by us. It will only be used for the purposes of consultation and research to help us become more effective, shape policies and inform inspection and regulatory activity.

We will treat your identify in confidence, if you disclose it to us. However, we may publish an organisation's views.

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes  please complete Section 1 and the following questions  
 No  please complete Section 2 and the following questions.

### Section 1

If you are completing the consultation on behalf of an organisation and would like us to consider publishing the views of your organisation, please indicate this below.

Organisation: TACTYC\_\_\_\_\_

I represent:

a higher education institution-led partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	a school-centred initial teacher training partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>
an employment-based initial teacher training partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	a school	<input type="checkbox"/>
a further education college	<input type="checkbox"/>	a sixth form college	<input type="checkbox"/>
an independent training provider	<input type="checkbox"/>	a local authority	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please tell us) See below	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Section 2

Which of the below best describes you? I am:

a trainee	<input type="checkbox"/>	a former trainee	<input type="checkbox"/>
a teacher/lecturer	<input type="checkbox"/>	an employee of an initial teacher education provider	<input type="checkbox"/>
a member of the public	<input type="checkbox"/>	an inspector	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>other (please tell us) TACTYC is an internationally acknowledged association with a worldwide membership of 450. TACTYC aims to promote the highest quality professional development for all UK early years educators in order to enhance the educational well-being of young children. To do this, TACTYC engages in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> advocacy and lobbying – providing a voice for all those supporting the development of early years professionals</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> informing – disseminating knowledge about research, practice and policy</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> supporting – facilitating reflection, informed discussion, evidence-based practice and research</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Overall effectiveness

Q1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to judging overall effectiveness?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(1-8): We propose a universal requirement for EYs ITE provision to cover the 0-7 age-range: this should be recognised within the inspection framework. As the 0-7 age-range includes 0-5 years, inspection of EYs ITE provision should be required to take full account of the distinct, yet complementary roles of EYs teachers and EYs Professionals (EYPs). (3): The proposed streamlining of ‘overall effectiveness of the partnership... which will incorporate capacity to improve’ seems appropriate. (5) We regard the definition of partnership as appropriate. (10 & 11): If all three contributory judgements must be judged ‘outstanding’ to achieve ‘Grade 1’, it is inconsistent for only one ‘inadequate’ judgement to result in an overall ‘Grade 4’. In the final version of the inspection framework, this should be addressed to secure consistency.

N.B. Further comments relating to Q1 are made on page 29.

### The three contributory key questions and judgements

Q2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to judging the quality of outcomes for trainees?

Strongly agree  <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree  <input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree  <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree  <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly disagree  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Don't know  <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(6 & 7): The definition given for outcomes is problematic. Initial selection of trainees may be a factor in successful ITE completion and teacher retention, but many factors outside the providers’ remit also affect these ‘outcomes’, often more significantly than ITE provision. These factors include trainees’ health, family commitments and financial status, teachers’ current settings and leadership and external pressures such as frequent macro policy changes, over-regulation and burdensome workload. Employment rates are also affected by many issues outside providers’ scope, including regional and demographic variance, generic employment rates and global and national economic status. We contend that macro policy decisions are also more likely than ITE provision to affect teacher employment rates, for example, the change from children’s centres’ requirement to employ both an early years teacher and an EYP, removal of local authority ring-fenced funding for early years provision and the proposal to revert to higher infant class sizes. Given that ITE providers have little or no autonomy over such matters, it is not appropriate that ITE providers be held accountable for them.

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to judging the quality of training across the partnership?

Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----------------------------------	--	---	---	--

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(17a): Learning to read in English is a far more complex process than merely using systematic phonics and for this reason the following phrase should be removed: 'including trainees' knowledge of, and skills in, using systematic phonics'. (17b): For EYs ITE inspections, we strongly contend that the inspection framework be developed further to recognise the rich contribution that varied types of play - including children's self-initiated play - make to children's development and learning. To accommodate such recognition will require inspectors with appropriate understanding and expertise within the EYs field (see Q1 'Further Comments': p.29)

(19): There is insufficient focus on trainees' understanding of children's global development, growth and learning, as well as children's well-being and the role of play in their development and learning. Furthermore, there is lack of focus on vital aspects of an early years or primary teacher's role such as play, parent partnership, safeguarding and supporting SEND. These issues should be addressed in the final version of the inspection framework. (2nd point): Define 'trainers'.  
 N.B. Further comments relating to Q3 are made on page 29.

Q4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to inspecting the leadership and management of the partnership?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(22) Define 'leaders and managers' in this context.

(23): (1st point): Replace 'retain' with 'provide support towards initial employment of...'. (3rd point): Here, the notion of a 'good teacher' should differentiate the 'good novice teacher' from the 'good experienced teacher'.

## Risk assessment

Q5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our approach to risk assessment?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

The proposed methodology is too narrow; it should include wider triangulation and sources of 'hard evidence', rather than relying so heavily on testimony. (25): By definition, newly qualified teachers (NQTs) experience aspects of the teacher's role for the first time. Additionally, for the first time, NQTs lack the level of support they have been used to from their provider during ITE. Equally, NQTs are likely to be working with more experienced colleagues, but see themselves - and are often perceived - as qualified, rather than the novice still learning. In this context, NQTs often 'compare and despair' and thereby lose confidence in their abilities. These - and other - NQT experiences mean that NQT survey data are likely to be subjective and therefore unreliable. NQTs' views should be secured but as one of many data sources. (26): The proposed website survey is highly likely to elicit unreliable data reflecting the mood of the trainee or NQT at the time of the response, rather than providing objective data. For risk assessment, views of trainees and NQTs should be sought but should be no more or less valued than those of other stakeholders and should, as outlined in the previous point, be one of many data sources.

Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposals to inspect outstanding and good partnerships?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q7. To what extent do you agree or disagree that our inspection of satisfactory partnerships should be based on the factors set out above?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(30): The proposed methodology lacks rigour because it relies too heavily on trainee testimony. Equally, notwithstanding fastidious selection and monitoring by providers, cohorts vary. As previously stated, trainee testimony is not robust without wider triangulation; the foci on the teaching of reading and meeting the needs of children with SEND are important, but do not accurately reflect the breadth of content that trainees must learn. Therefore, based on trainee testimony alone, the assumption that an 'outstanding' or 'good' partnership might maintain the same or better level of quality for six years is flawed.

### Inspection arrangements

Q8. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to gathering inspection planning information?

Strongly agree  <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree  <input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree  <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly disagree  <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know  <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---------------------------------------	--	---	---	--

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(33 and 34): We consider that information including partnership contact details, links with other providers and the inspected provider's ITE programmes, together with the SED and annual headline data relating to trainee outcomes and attainment will go some way to providing much needed triangulation. Attainment and completion data are appropriate foci, although reasons for trainees suspending their studies are usually personal, so 'timely' completion is often outside providers' jurisdiction. Equally, as noted, employment data are affected by many issues outside providers' scope, including regional and demographic variance, generic employment rates and global and national economic status. We reiterate that, whilst trainees' views should be sought, current proposals lend too much credence to trainees' and NQTs' views.

Q9. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to replacing the preliminary on-site visit with telephone discussions?

Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly disagree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	--	--

Q10. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the eight-week notice period to three weeks?

Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----------------------------------	--	---	---	--

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(35): A telephone conversation would not be an appropriate replacement for the preliminary visit as it will limit the information that the lead inspector (LI) currently gathers. Equally, given providers' prime role, three weeks is highly unlikely to be a sufficient period of time for providers to accommodate the specific requirements of the inspection that are identified by the LI at the preliminary visit.

Q11. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to inspection activities?

Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--	--------------------------------------	---	--

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(37, 38, 39): Provided that observed trainees' novice status is taken into account and there is not an expectation that they will already be operating as 'experts', we consider it appropriate that a sample of trainees is observed in the teaching role. For inspectors to gain the fullest possible data relating to provision, we contend that such observation should take place during the final stages of training. In respect of early years' trainees, we strongly advocate that such observations be undertaken by inspectors with early years' expertise and experience whose informed judgements should be required to include recognition of the value of play and child-initiated experiences for children's development and learning. Proposed inspection activities appear to offer sufficient triangulation to secure robust findings.

**Awarding body provision leading to qualifications to teach in the further education and skills sector**

Q12. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to inspecting awarding body provision?

Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Neither agree nor disagree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	---	--

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

(41, 42, 43): In respect of EYs ITE provision, we strongly advocate a minimal requirement that AT LEAST one inspector on each team has a Level 7 or 8 qualification AND substantial experience in the EYs field. This requirement should be framed in such a way that it ensures secure capability on the part of the inspection team to make judgements appropriate to the field (for further details of 'judgements appropriate to the field', see p.29: 'Further Comments' relating to Q1, Points 2,3,4,6,7,8).

### **Further comments**

If you have any further comments or suggestions, please include them here.

We reiterate that risk assessment should be developed to include wider triangulation.

We contend that inspection of Early Years ITE provision should be conducted by inspectors with significant expertise and experience in the field of Early Years.

It should be borne in mind that testimonies of trainees and NQTs can only provide subjective data which will, on its own, or with minimal triangulation, lack reliability.

Whilst it is wholly appropriate that the views of trainees and NQTs should be collected, it should also be noted that trainees' and NQTs' experiences in the teacher role are, by definition, limited, in comparison with those of partnership staff, leaders, experienced teachers and headteachers. Equally, these more experienced colleagues may sometimes provide training opportunities which trainees and NQTs find challenging or unpalatable whilst undertaking them, but which nevertheless prove valuable in scaffolding their successful transition into the profession. The framework should acknowledge that it can often take several years before trainees and NQTs are sufficiently experienced to recognise the value of such experiences to

their career and to the lives of children.

#### FURTHER COMMENTS RELATING TO Q1:

(2,3,4,6,7,8): Given the complexities of the EYs teacher's role, we contend that EYs ITE provision should be at Master's level. This should be instated as part of a structured national programme, commencing with those in leadership roles. Equally, therefore, we contend that the inspection framework should recognise the potential value of Level 7 EYs ITE provision to the outcomes of trainees and children.

(2,3,4,6,7,8): We propose a minimum requirement that all teams inspecting EYs ITE provision will always include AT LEAST one inspector who has a Level 7 or 8 qualification AND substantial experience in the EYs field. This requirement should be framed in such a way that it ensures secure capability on the part of the inspection team to make judgements appropriate to the EYs field. These judgements should include recognition of the value of play and child-initiated experiences for children's development and learning 0-7 years, as well as other aspects of high quality early years practice, inter alia, the symbiotic relationship of care and education, practitioners' understanding and applications of attachment and child development theory and the role of the environment as a tool to support development and learning. Furthermore, to ensure ITE provision makes secure links between EYFS and Primary phases, we propose a requirement that all teams inspecting Primary ITE provision will also always include AT LEAST one inspector who has a Level 7 or 8 qualification AND substantial experience in the EYs field.

#### FURTHER COMMENTS RELATING TO Q3:

(19): (5th point): Trainees' '...knowledge, understanding and expertise in using systematic phonics' will not be sufficient for them to develop confidence or competence in 'teaching reading and language skills'. Supporting young children to develop and learn communication, language and literacy skills is an extremely complex process which cannot be reduced in the proposed manner way if it is to be successful. (8th point): Add: '...in the context of a broad and balanced curriculum'. (10th point): Should read: 'Trainees gain sufficient high quality practical experience to develop their teaching for the full range of learners in the phase for which they are

training'.

## What did you think of this consultation?

One of the commitments in our strategic plan is to monitor whether our consultations are accessible to those wishing to take part.

Please tell us what you thought of this consultation.

	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Don't know
I found the consultation information clear and easy to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I found the consultation easy to find on the Ofsted website.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had enough information about the consultation topic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would take part in a future Ofsted consultation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## How did you hear about this consultation?

- Ofsted website
- Ofsted News*
- Ofsted conference
- Another organisation (please specify, if known)
- Other (please specify) colleague.

Is there anything you would like us to improve on or do differently for future consultations? If so, please tell us below.

The form is cumbersome. To ensure full consultation, boxes should expand automatically to accommodate respondents' needs. The range of MS Word tools should also be enabled.

## Additional questions about you

Your answers to the following questions will help us to evaluate how successfully we are communicating messages from inspection to all sections of society. We would like to assure you that all responses are confidential and you do not have to answer every question.

Please tick the appropriate box.

### 1. Gender

Female	<input type="checkbox"/>	Male	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------

Are you living as the same gender as you were born in?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

### 2. Age

Under 14 <input type="checkbox"/>	14–18 <input type="checkbox"/>	19–24 <input type="checkbox"/>	25–34 <input type="checkbox"/>	35–44 <input type="checkbox"/>	45–54 <input type="checkbox"/>	55–64 <input type="checkbox"/>	65+ <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

### 3. Ethnic origin

(a) How would you describe your national group?

British or mixed British	<input type="checkbox"/>	Northern Irish	<input type="checkbox"/>
English	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish	<input type="checkbox"/>
Irish	<input type="checkbox"/>	Welsh	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(b) How would you describe your ethnic group?

Asian		Mixed ethnic origin	
Bangladeshi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Asian and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indian	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black African and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Caribbean and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other Asian background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other mixed ethnic background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Black</b>		<b>White</b>	
African	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any White background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Any other ethnic background</b>	
Any other Black background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Chinese</b>			
Any Chinese background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>		

#### 4. Sexual orientation

Heterosexual <input type="checkbox"/>	Lesbian <input type="checkbox"/>	Gay <input type="checkbox"/>	Bisexual <input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

#### 5. Religion/belief

Buddhist	<input type="checkbox"/>	Muslim	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christian (including Church of England, Catholic, Protestant and all other Christian denominations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sikh	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hindu	<input type="checkbox"/>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jewish	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other, please state:	

#### 6. Disability

Do you consider yourself to be disabled?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

Thank you for taking part in our consultation.