

APPG for the Teaching Profession | The Apprenticeship Route

Monday 4 December 2017

1. Welcome

Ian Mearns MP welcomed attendees to the meeting. Ian Mearns MP advised of the recent resignation of social mobility representations and reminded people of the key areas for social mobility.

Ian Mearns MP advised it was hoped that APPG could provide a report regarding apprenticeships, making recommendations of what needs to be considered to address the teacher supply issue.

2. Introductions

Ian Mearns introduced Sir Andrew Carter, Anne Bamford from the City of London and Steve Pinches from the TES.

Mr C Waterman further advised that additional papers had been provided to attendees and noted that John Howson had published a report outlining the latest numbers for the recruitment of teachers.

3. Apprenticeships in Teaching – the story so far: Sir Andrew Carter

Sir Andrew Carter reported that he had chaired the apprenticeships group tasked at considering employers groups for teaching. He reported that the group had met with employers from range of schools, and suppliers from NASBTT, UCET etc.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that the apprenticeship levy already applied to schools with the education sector being the biggest contributor to apprenticeships, however there was no current provision for teachers.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that apprenticeships should provide the same standard of programme across all providers. This was complicated by the large number of HEI/SCITT established providers. He reported that there would only be one qualification, that of QTS.

Sir Andrew Carter outlined the structure of the apprenticeship, which would be delivered over four school terms. He advised that applicants must already hold a degree and that this had been made clear by Mr Gibb. This was proposed to ensure that there was no lowering in the value of teachers

Sir Andrew Carter advised that trainees would be required to identify a school prepared to support their apprenticeship and that places allocated by the NCTL for the Schools Direct Salaried could be converted to this route in 2017/18.

Sir Andrew Carter reported that the apprenticeship model was similar to School Direct Salaried, with the trainee being an employee of the school and receiving a salary. He reported that at the end of the third term, the trainee would be recommended for QTS. He stated that this would then be followed by a fourth term when an end-point assessment would be carried out. Sir Andrew Carter advised that it was possible for the employee to be

located in a different school for the end-point assessment, however it was anticipated most would remain with their training school.

Sir Andrew Carter reported that 20% of monies would be held back from the ITT provider delivering training until the trainee successfully completed the end-point assessment.

Attendees highlighted that the end-point assessment presented a big issue for QTS as this could not be over-ridden. It was stated that the end-point assessment would consist of observations and a portfolio.

It was reported that NASBTT/UCET would offer to play a quality assurance role, with responsibility for overseeing accredited providers of ITT to ensure that standards were met sufficiently.

Sir Andrew Carter reported that a register of apprenticeship providers would continue to be maintained by the Institute of Apprenticeships. Sir Andrew Carter noted that in 2017/18 two routes of employment-led ITT delivery would be in place however it was anticipated that should School Direct Salaried disappear, the apprenticeship route would replace the funded employment led route.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that a number of people had expressed an interest in an Undergraduate version and that discussions are ongoing and open for debate. However, it was noted that no working party had been established to date.

Lord Jim Knight highlighted that current policy meant that the Institute of Apprenticeships did not allow for more than one entry route into a teaching position and therefore, it would currently not be possible to offer an Undergraduate route.

Sir Andrew Carter further advised that ITT providers would be unable to offer the apprenticeship route if approval had not been granted by the Institute of Apprenticeships. It was noted that it was a process driven organisation and did not taken into account that all ITT providers were already approved to make QTS recommendations.

Ms Jackie Moses advised that the application of rules carried out by the Institute of Apprenticeships would need to incorporate flexibility or it would be difficult to implement the new training route.

Ms Pat Black reported that the Undergraduate route may be more attractive to younger applicants considering a teaching career and that there was potential to attract a younger cohort into the profession.

Sir Andrew Carter acknowledged that the Institute of Apprenticeships did not appear to have a substantial understanding of teacher training.

Lord Listowel reported that there had been a previous drive towards Teacher Education being at Masters Level and that the apprenticeship route would result in a lowering of the standards in the longer term.

Lord Jim Knight advised that the current issue with recruitment and retention of teachers meant that the profession no longer had the luxury of being able to maintain M Level standards as it was required to address the shortage of teacher supply in a range of subject. He felt that a range of abilities and levels should now be considered important for schools.

Anne Bamford reported that it was not feasible to have different levels of entry into the same job and therefore there may be a need to look at different levels within the teaching profession. She reported that we needed to get smarter about how the profession thought about teaching and that the profession may be required to determine better differentiation. She advised that Finland were revisiting their Teacher Education and proposing to provide a life-long approach and that this may be something to consider within the UK system, with an emphasis on ongoing learning and development within the profession.

Sir Andrew Carter reported that QTS was due to be revised, with proposals likely to include the introduction of provisional QTS at end of the first year followed by 1-2yrs for NQTs to gain confirmed QTS, incorporating elements of CPD.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that apprentices were expected to be paid as an unqualified teacher with schools accessing funding of £9K. He reported that it was anticipated that 1-2 apprentices would work under the direction of a qualified teacher and would be supernumerary.

Ian Mearns MP advised that where apprentices or unqualified teachers were working towards QTS that people were happy for people to be in the classroom

Lord Jim Knight reported that Teach First was an example where trainees were working towards QTS however, they were expected to complete pre-summer experience and asked whether the apprenticeships route would also offer pre-training experience, noting that most apprenticeships require apprentices to complete 1 day per week of training.

Sire Andrew Carter advised that it was proposed trainees would complete 2 days of release within a school or similar setting to complete training. He also acknowledged that the summer break could be used to prepare apprentices and was a model worth considering.

Anne Bamford advised that other industries did not require apprentices to carry out training away from the workplace. She further noted that salaries were less clear in other professions and that this may be an option to use to attract people to gain higher level qualifications and therefore, the apprenticeship could be treated as an entry level qualification

Ian Mearns MP advised that the levy was not intended to support higher level studies or higher degrees.

Ian Mearns MP advised that there were ministerial concerns that the apprenticeship could be undermined by some tactics used by organisations to attract people.

Ms Kate Ireland reported that members must consider the demise of school budgets, noting that schools were committed to training teachers but that the resource model was

diminishing in schools and therefore ITT providers needed to be careful in supporting schools to find solutions. Ms Kate Ireland sought clarification around the differences in the QTS assessment and end-point assessment.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that the end-point assessment had been discussed at length, and discussions had considered what value would be added in the fourth term. He reported that it had been proposed that an SKE or further training may form a requirement. He also reported that discussions had identified an opportunity for trainees to work around key areas of concern i.e. behaviour for learning or work-life balance.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that there was now a need for schools to rethink the system, with a greater emphasis on schools managing their workforce rather than reacting to it, therefore they should look at considering the recruitment of surplus teachers.

It was reported that the rigour of day-to-day, relentless teaching and the workload, meant that teachers needed the ability to take time out. It was further reported that there was currently not enough opportunities for teachers to learn.

Jackie Moses noted that there was a danger that schools will apply to complete end-point assessment before enhancements can be enacted for teachers.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that the assessment only route remained available for experienced people and

Ms Georgina Newton reported that there were high drop-out rates in teaching profession at present and sought clarification about how the apprenticeship model could prevent this happening. She further noted there was a requirement to establish a strong drive to retain teachers in the profession in Years 3 and 4.

Lord Listowel reported that, in care homes, there was an inflexible job market on the continent, whereas within the UK there were flexible routes but that this resulted in lower qualified staff and would have a long term impact on the professional status being lowered down.

Sir Andrew Carter reported that there must not be a lowering of the bar and that the apprenticeship route was seen as raising it. The apprenticeships model was designed to convert as many as possible to become graduates, with inducements from government being used, and therefore he was optimistic.

Ms Pat Black advised that the TeachFirst model ensured trainees were well supported in summer institute and not left to fly solo with them continuing to receive support from HEIs. She reported that TeachFirst have to delivering the PGDipE, thereby raising the standards. She further reported that the Undergraduate ITT funding model was being removed.

Lord Jim Knight reported that £1.3 billion had been spent on supply teachers and that this creates worry that some schools have fewer numbers to recruit from whilst other schools may be over subscribed. Lord Jim Knight sought clarification as to whether the fourth term become a year and dovetail the 3 year training.

Mr Chris Waterman advised that ITT needs to describe the system accurately before people could fully understand it and that the USP needed to be defined for apprenticeships. There were a range of ITT options available to those considering teaching and it was difficult for them to make a sensible choice

Sir Andrew Carter stated that every school is an advocate for ITE and could support the recruitment of trainee teachers. He advised that whilst there was benefit in making it similar there was also a need to make it more relevant. Sir Andrew Carter had recommended that government be asked to make it a statutory requirement for school websites to provide information regarding entering the teaching profession but that this had not taken up.

Ms Georgina Newton advised that some schools were really proactive, however others had priorities that did not focus on ITE. Ms Georgina Newton advised that clarification on what had been learnt from the return to teaching pilot, developed to engage with communities and offer to retrain or re-engage former teachers, should be sought.

Ms Pat Black – England no responsibility to train new teachers, Scots – legal responsibility, NI – moral responsibility. Problem getting people into but also retention and need to ensure don't under value profession, need to provide commitment to professional development and can't be just delivery. Have knowledge curriculum but need to challenge knowledge

Lord Jim Knight advised that people have different starting points and technology can aid trainees in finding the right routes for people.

Mr Nick Brakewell advised that the apprenticeship route definitely has potential, and noted that many graduates were interested in teaching applying via other routes to UCAS.

Ms Deborah Outhwaite reported there were a range of levels in the system, and range of ways to navigate the system, noting that everyone has different needs but that the fourth term should focus on a CPD element.

Caro Garrett sought clarification on who would provide CPE training, noting that not every school was involved with ITE.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that it was anticipated the apprenticeship training provider would deliver CPD in the fourth term.

Ms Anne Bamford reported that apprenticeships were expensive to the organisation, and required significant resource. Therefore, the economies of looking after apprentices needed to be considered, and meant smaller companies in industry normally worked together. She suggested that schools would need to consider how areas or types of schools could work together. She further advised there was a cash flow issue, as schools would be required to pay out expenses before they could recoup and therefore, there was sense in having a group to invest collectively. She stated there were real advantages in having different entry points in people's career, and therefore this required a holistic view. She noted that the accreditation process will present challenges because there were different types of

accreditation that may or may not have recognition and therefore the apprenticeship needs to be a mobile qualification to make it more attractive.

Lord Jim Knight advised that middle-leadership development could be provided via management training through apprenticeships, however there was an issue with teachers unwilling to carry out training due to a culture that viewed apprenticeship-level training was viewed as stepping down to a level 5 qualification.

Ms Deborah Outhwaite sought clarification as to why teachers should be required to complete apprenticeship level qualification, when this did not compare with the medical and other professions: to do so could affect the status of teaching.

Lord Jim Knight stated that training enabled people to develop their skills and may have unintended consequences.

Ms Emma Hollis advised that only accredited training providers could offer the apprenticeship route and that the route would still be subject to Ofsted and NCTL requirements. She advised that established ITT were likely to run programmes very similar to current provision.

Mr Stephen Pinches reported that it was important that pilots were completed and noted that Christchurch had already highlighted there was a financial problem with the apprenticeship model therefore it was unclear what the financial incentive was for people to follow this route.

It was noted that the apprenticeship was a pilot, and that 90% of apprentices in other industries remained with their employer. However, it was also reported that deliverers of apprenticeships could be changed and apprentices had the option to move to as many employers as they wish if they were unhappy with current provision.

Lord Earl Listowel expressed thanks for the consideration of deprived areas and how these could be incorporated, seeking clarification as to whether there were incentives for working in challenging areas.

Sir Andrew Carter acknowledged there was a challenge for ITT as trainees could not train in inadequate schools but there were incentives for HEIs to form hubs in challenging areas.

Mr Jean-Louis Dutaut advised that many trainees wanted to enter the profession to teach, and therefore, incentives can't always be about leadership development. He sought clarification on what incentives are there for people who do not wish to follow the pyramid hierarchy but recognise the practice of teaching as professional recognition, stating that more policy changes needed to be made to consider retention of these people.

Lucy Rycroft-Smith questioned how much was based on current research and how research could be used to move towards an approach that worked with teachers rather than to teachers, noting that the profession was currently losing really good experienced people

Mr Christopher Jones stated that apprenticeships are employer-led and therefore they needed to look at employer needs and subsequently develop programmes at appropriate levels for employers.

Ms Grainne Grabowski advised that there needs to be qualifications that are meaningful and are powerful for teachers, therefore whatever is developed needs to be meaningful to teachers and schools and not just about leadership.

Lord Jim Knight questioned that if worse fears of completion were realised, is there any protection?

Mr Christopher Jones advised that achievement rates were important and schools needed to ensure they were recruiting for the right reasons, ensuring recruitment was relevant and rigorous. It advised that apprenticeships could not just be used for cheap labour recruitment and must therefore lead to a substantive post.

Ms Pat Black advised that there could not be a lowering of the base, as all providers would be required to be assessed by Ofsted

Lord Jim Knight advised that the assessment of QTS before assessment of end point created issues and the impact on the incentive to complete the apprenticeship is a potential problem.

Mr Christopher Jones advised it was unclear why the award of QTS and end point assessment were different, noting that from a trainee perspective if they have obtained QTS the apprenticeship becomes irrelevant.

Sir Andrew Carter advised that the Institute of Apprenticeships has a problem with understanding the relevance of endpoint assessment. He advised that working together is the solution and when schools create their own teachers with ITT providers they are more likely to nurture and support trainees.

Ian Mearns MP reported that the ITT sector was a diverse system, managed in many different ways and with different sets of management issues and who is accountable for schools. He stated that the overarching problem was with recruitment into the right schools, in the right places. Schools were very diverse and some had capacity others did not. Therefore, it was stated there needs to be good quality training, experience and qualifications if they were to have currency more widely.

Mr Chris Waterman noted that the diverse group in attendance had raised a number of questions and that it was still unclear who is taking responsibility. He stated that the School Direct pilot had been implemented without full evaluation being carried out.

Ms Jackie Moses stated that UCET and NASBTT were working very closely with the DfE to develop detailed information and would be disseminating this when available.

4. Opportunity areas

It was reported that the dozen areas identified had captured and crystalized some of the discussions being held regarding apprenticeships. It was noted that the opportunities areas were not defined by local authorities or Ofsted regions. It was reported that the opportunities areas presented a new way of looking at where the critical problems are and where the best teachers should be going. It was reported that comments and feedback were welcomed with information being gathered for the next term. It was noted that the opportunity areas was a pilot of 10/500 authorities and likely to be rolled out

Ian Mearns MP requested that any burning thoughts from discussions please be fed back for the paper that will be drawn up after the meeting.

Stephen Pinches advised that TES were looking at opportunity areas, and advised that money going to one school could negatively impact on others in surrounding areas.

Pat Black noted that the opportunity areas only appear to consider from a Secondary perspective and therefore was problematic.