

APPG for the Teaching Profession: Monday 13th September 2021

Market Review

Ian Bauckham Audio – Chair, Expert Group

IB

Thank you very much Ian and good afternoon everybody. It's great to have the opportunity to speak with you. As Ian has said, what I plan to do is just talk for maybe up to about 15 minutes, I'm not quite sure exactly how long, but something of that sort around some of the issues and themes that we've been grappling with here and then very happy to listen to what people have got to say. If there are specific questions, if they're within my gift to answer, I will, and if they're not, if they're just points that you would like to have heard, then we've got a couple of colleagues from the team in the BFE here as well, to halve the comments and thoughts that people make, or points that they raise.

So, just a quick tour through some of the issues to begin with. As Ian has said in his introductory remarks, I know there has been some anxiety and negative feeling about the consultation and the timing of the consultation, particularly with part of it coinciding with the school summer break. As Ian's already said at the beginning, I understand why people feel the way they do about that. I guess the most important point that I can make at this stage on that is that work is continuing pretty intensively at the moment, despite the fact that the formal consultation has now closed with engagements with stakeholders across the sector as the Government's response to the review is worked on and prepared and I know that thinking that has come out of the consultation is being tested, including with individuals that didn't necessarily themselves have the opportunity to respond. So, just because the consultation was closing on the 22nd August doesn't mean that all conversation about this has ended, that is far from the case.

So, our brief, as the ITT Market Review which, as Ian has said, I chaired was to take an overview of the ITT Market in England as it is currently configured and as it's currently operating to consider the extents to which it is configured to be able to meet the needs that we needed to meet as we prepare the teaching workforce of the future and we spent a significant proportion of our time looking at areas like, for example, the training curriculum. So, what trainees learn, placements, the role of different kind of placements, mentoring, assessment, quality assurance within partnerships and the structures of partnerships themselves which obviously are not unfamiliar themes or topics that anybody who operates in the ITT world. There's obviously also a synergy here with the work that Ofsted have been doing on Initial Teacher Education as they call it, ITE, and the new inspection framework in that space started operating before the summer break with a proportion of IT providers being inspected. But, above all, the work that we did was intended to reflect the evidence-base that we have that is relevant to Initial Teacher Training and two kinds of evidence-base really. The first is that around what teachers need to know in order to be maximally effective in the classroom, what the evidence tells us that is and, secondly, the evidence-base that we have for the construction and structure of the most effective training for teachers, a skill acquisition and trainee and that whole piece of work as well. So, two kinds of evidence really underpinning what we considered.

We took an approach that led to us recommending that ITT providers should be accredited to offer courses leading to qualified teacher status and should be accredited against a set on criteria, standards, requirements, whatever you want to call them, that reflect the best evidence-base that we have in those two fields that I've just outlined.

The qualified teacher status is important, there's obviously an interaction between QTS and PGCE. I wasn't planning on saying a lot about PGCE at this stage, but I'm very happy to comment on it later if people want to raise it. We were principally, however, looking at courses leading to QTS. I think the other relevant thing that's been happening in this space, obviously, is that beginning this September, people who are coming out of one year courses leading to QTS and indeed longer undergraduate courses leading to QTS will be embarking on a two-year new evidence-base induction program. So, one of the things we wanted to do was make sure that there was synergy between the approach that Initial Teacher Training and the induction program that trainees will be embarking on when they begin their teaching careers in September.

So, what I'm going to do next is just comment briefly on some of the key issues that I think people may want to hear me talk about and just to give you the heads up of what they are, the accreditation process, something specific on the intensive placement, on mentors and mentoring, on the curriculum and what we said about the curriculum. I want to say something about subject specificity and I want to say something also about the wider architecture, including, for example, things like the Institute of Teaching and teaching school parts, because I know these have been raised as particular issues and concerns.

So, relatively briefly on each of those in the interests of succinctness, well, let me just begin by talking about the accreditation process which I've already alluded to. We thought it would be helpful, just to explain why we think accreditation is necessary. We know a number of stakeholders have queried why Ofsted inspections themselves aren't sufficient and I suppose I want to make a distinction here between the purpose of inspection, which is something that happens obviously in the light of an organisation's operation after the fact, if you like. The view that we took is that, in the interest of coherence, providers that are accredited to offer the courses which are then subsequently inspected ought to be accredited against criteria which have synergy with the approach taken to inspection.

I know that some people have raised concerns of the accreditation process might undermine existing partnerships, perhaps in favour of some kind of rigid or one size fits all model and this is an opportunity for me to assure people that the review doesn't propose that all existing partnerships would need to be completely reformed from scratch at all. There is absolutely nothing to stop providers applying for accreditation with existing partnerships and working with partners who they currently work with, as they do now, and, in fact, if I can quote some of the report for a moment, we said, *"We do not consider that there is likely to be a one size fits all partnership structure which is optimal to cover every type of provider."* So that's, hopefully, a bit of reassurance in that space.

I know, likewise, while we're on accreditation, that concerns have been raised about the timeline for the implementation of this, the accreditation timeline which was suggested in the consultation document and the Department is working currently with stakeholders to gain insight into how this can best be worked out in practice as they prepare the response on behalf of the Government. So, it's really important for people to understand that work is continuing in that space, the consultation is being analysed and discussions are continuing to take place with stakeholders, particularly, on that issue of the implementation of accreditation timeline to see what we can do to reflect what people have said and the concerns that they have.

I'm going to move on to say something about the intensive placement. I thought it might just be useful to help clarify the vision for intensive placements, that there has been some concern expressed by some stakeholders. I think, firstly, a concern that the requirement was to add on to existing placement arrangements and we just wanted to be clear that that isn't the case in quite that way. The intensive placements are designed to be a different kind of learning opportunity, a different kind of integration between theory and practice, that they're not designed to extend the current placement and there is a lot of flexibility for providers to take alternative approaches to the intensive placement vision.

We're going to clarify in the Government response what that is, adding additional flexibility, explanation, exemplification, hopefully, to make clear that this is perhaps not something as daunting as it might have seemed at first sight and get to the point where we can communicate the message that the intensive placement is something that can be well integrated into current approaches to structuring both the taught elements of ITT courses and also the in-school placement. So, that's hopefully just to soften a little bit what we're saying about the intensive placements and to assure you that discussions are still ongoing with a view to getting some messages about that which are more helpful than perhaps the messages that were taken from the original report.

I want to just move on and say something briefly about mentors. I think a lot of the engagement that we've had with providers leads us to believe that there's a strong consensus actually about the critical importance of mentors and mentoring in ITT training. Very few people are disagreeing with that and we think, because of the centrality of mentoring, effective mentoring for successful training, it probably is right that some benchmarks are set, in terms of expectations that apply across providers on mentoring and none of this is to say that this good practice doesn't exist at all in the sector at the moment. Absolutely it does, not only in mentoring, but in many of the other areas that I'm talking about, but it's a question at system level of having some criteria that just makes clear that there is a high expectation on mentoring right across the ITT sector but recognizing, absolutely, that there is, in many places already, a brilliance, a practice going on, but there is also some variation and I think it's right that we continue to consider the setting standards for mentors is something central that we ought to be doing if we're taking an overview of the ITT market as a whole.

So, as in other areas, we're continuing to engage with stakeholders on mentoring to make sure that we can further refine our approach in the light of what people have said in the consultation but it's highly likely there will still be something on the centrality of mentoring and that includes, in particular, mentor training and I know that one of the things that the team and the Department is talking intensively to stakeholders about in this space, are some of the concerns that have been raised about the capacity, capacity of schools in particular, to release people for longer periods of time for mentor training with more intense content, potentially, and also the issue of the perceived overlap between the content of mentor training for ITT on the one hand, and for the ECF on the other, and they're issues that we're very alive to and are working to find good ways forward on.

Just move on now and say something briefly about the curriculum, so this is the training curriculum I'm talking about here, the ITT curriculum itself. I mean, in fact, the only thing the Review said was that the key criteria for the curriculum should be that it should deliver the entirety of the CCF. As everybody will know, the CCF is not itself presented as a curriculum, it's a codification or taxonomy of core evidence-base insight, but it's not designed to be a curriculum and there is no intention to have a centrally-designed or prescriptive curriculum that will be imposed on everybody. It is still absolutely the case and the Review, I hope, made this clear that it is up to providers to develop their curriculum. Of course, already, since September 2020, so over a year now,

the CCF has been mandatory and curricular do have to include that, but there is also scope to include other relevant linked evidence-base content as well and provide us will continue to have the freedom to shake the curriculum providing it includes that core mandatory content around the CCF. So, the view that we took is that we're not actually imposing any additional inflexibility on the curriculum, just simply making it clear what the requirements currently should be. There will be no single sequence ITT curriculum imposed on everybody.

I wanted to say something on subject specificity. This is one of the areas where some people who commented, both in the consultation itself and also in the debate around the consultation, that they thought we might not have gone far enough. Of course, as with all these things, others felt that we'd gone too far by saying even what we did about subject specificity, but there were certainly some views enunciated that we could have been a bit more specific in that space. Of course, the CCF itself contains a section on subject and curriculum and the view that personally I would take is that that should be a trigger for providers to scope out a curriculum that would reflect the non-subject specific evidence-base insights in that section of the CCF and translates them into the language of specific subjects where trainees are being taught to teach specific subjects.

So, again, we're engaging with respondents more intensively in that space as well, because we've known subject specific pedagogical knowledge correlates well with teacher effectiveness and we want to just make sure that we've gone far enough in that space to make sure that we get that right as we develop the Government response.

And then just, finally, really, something about the wider architecture issue. So, very briefly, on the Institute of Teaching. So, as colleagues will know here, the procurements for the Institute of Teaching is still ongoing, so I'm not going to be able to comment in any detail and that's exactly what that will look like but I do just want to offer the assurance that there is no policy intention that the Institute of Teaching somehow to take over the entirety of Initial Teacher Training in England. It will be expected to play a part as a provider and, obviously, we'll be expected to pick up the policy directions have been merged from this piece of Review work that we've been doing in the ITT Markets Review but many many many other providers will continue to operate alongside it. It's not taking over the landscape at all, it's intended to be an operator alongside other operators in the ITT space and have some other distinctive roles as well.

I know, also, that in debate, concern has been raised about the capacity and preparedness of teaching school hubs, another feature of the architecture, to step forward and take a leading role in Initial Teacher Training. I think that is a right concern to raise. I think that teaching school hubs were, of course, only relatively recently designated and had roles, including being key delivery partners in most cases for the early career framework and also several other aspects of the Government's golden thread of investment in teacher development, so, they also won't simply be jumping into the ITT space and taking it over. Teaching school hubs will be at difference stages of preparedness ability to support with ITT work but it did seem rational to us, considering that this is a piece of architecture that is designed to support the big investment in teacher development that it's Government policy, rightly in my view to make, it did seem important that we suggested that teaching school hubs should have a role to play and a role that will vary in weight and significance, depending on how well prepared teaching school hubs are to step up to the mark. At this early stage in their life, they should have a role in Initial Teacher Training if only as lead partners to other designated providers.

So, I promised I'd speak for 15 minutes, I have managed to speak for 27 minutes, so there's more I could say, but I'm just going to stop there because I don't want to crowd up the space. I'm sure colleagues here will have plenty of things they want to say for themselves, so, Ian, if it's okay, I'll pause there and switch into listening mode for a bit.

IM

Thank you very much, Ian. I think that's been very useful, in terms of selling out the way in which things have developed from your perspective. We've got a couple of people have indicated, Lord Puttnam is certainly one of them and if Lord Puttnam would like to make a point or ask a question, please?

DP

I would, Ian, thank you very much. Two questions really of Ian. One is, as you will have heard already from debates in the House of Lords, there is a lot of concern. First thing, Government policy overall is being to increase the professionalism and graduate competence, if you like, of the police and the nursery profession. Why on earth would you choose this moment to allow a message to go out, that some how or other, we're de-professionalizing the teaching profession. This is very bizarre and I'm afraid it's [unclear 00:33:28] that the Government's apparent behaviours of saying one thing and doing another, so that's number one concern.

The other is, open a whole can of worms over academic freedom and the truth is, these will be selected providers and will the decision of the chosen curriculum be made before or after selection? And I think that concerns a lot of institutions. Those are my two questions, Ian. Thank you for giving me the chance to ask them.

IM

David, thank you very much indeed. Ian, do you want to make a quick response to that?

IB

Yeah, I'm happy to handle the formats as you see fit, Ian, either gather up some questions and I'll answer some together or I'm happy to take particular ones as they come. Shall I pick those two up as we've got ...

IM

Yes please.

IB

I mean, first of all, I just want to say that this is absolutely not about de-professionalizing the teaching profession. I am a teacher myself and have been so for, I think, 38 or 39 years, and what I have absolutely always believed in, is giving teachers and those who work with and train teachers the access to best possible research and evidence precisely to give them the maximum opportunity to be professionalized, so this is absolutely the

opposite to de-professionalization as you dubbed it, and if that impression exists in some quarters, then it's something that I think we have a responsibility to address, because the underlying aim of this is to do precisely the opposite. It's to professionalize the teaching professional and increasingly scope out a shared consensual body of knowledge and expertise based on good quality and research evidence that teachers too often, I'm afraid, have simply not been given access to and this piece of work, it is a cap to that [unclear 00:35:34] knowledge is power and what I want to do is empower teachers with that knowledge, that's what we need to do.

And on academic freedom, I mean, the only thing I will say about that is what I've said already, that, in terms of the training curriculum itself, the only thing that is mandatory is the core content framework which is itself rooted in evidence and validated by the Education Endowment Foundation. There are no other core prescribed elements to the curriculum and it is for individual providers to work up their own curriculum and make sure that, obviously, it's based in good quality evidence and that it includes the CFF, but there are many many different ways to do that. So, I think we might find ourselves having to disagree on that, but they're the points [unclear 00:36:34].

IM

Okay. Thank you very much. Nick, please?

NB

Thanks, Ian, and thank you. I don't think you'll find a single person on this call who doesn't strive to find ways of increasing professionalism and put in place systems to support continuous improvement in our sector. I think, let's focus on what unites us rather than divides us to start off with. But therein is the point which causes us most concern, I believe, and that is perhaps what has been set out seems to suggest that there's significant unintended risk, I suppose, of rushed reform here and the risk primarily to not just the, I suppose, the profile, the professionalism of teaching, but also, more importantly and perhaps more urgently, the supply of teaching. We've heard over the last few months a number of very highly regarded large providers that have said that they'll withdraw from teacher training should these proposals go forward around accreditation and that causes us in the NAHT enormous cause for concern, that we've got a teacher supply issue as it stands and we're making that situation immediately that much worse, as well as disrupting the really important local SCITT provision that many schools have become reliant on in recent years as well. So, we're deeply concerned at the speed of this, that it could immediately disrupt that.

Equally, though, we've been very concerned that we haven't had the chance to properly engage the profession on the aspects which where they'll have an immediate view as well, not least around the, how realistic the expectations around mentoring are and intensive placements too. What I'm concerned by here is that you might find many schools will be looking at the raised expectations on themselves as well as providers and determining that, with everything else going on at the moment, that they're not able to be offering placements and that could further the risk to supply.

And, finally, actually, I think it's been really interesting the debate that's been had over the last few months, there hasn't been a lot said about what the potential and intended consequences could be for those very people that we're wanting to come into to teacher training, when we raise expectations across the system. Those expectations will filter, of course, down to those trainees. We're talking about longer courses, greater expectations. Do we know whether or not it's going to make teacher training more attractive? Do we know if it's going to make it less attractive, or it's not going to make a jot of difference? All of these suggest to us that there's a really compelling argument now for just taking our foot off the reform, to just start exploring and engaging various parts of the profession and schools and trainees themselves in understanding this before we rush forward too quickly and find that we create ourselves more problems than we actually solve?

IM

Thanks, Nick, and can I add to that, Ian, in answer to the questions that I was putting to them last week, Nick Gibb suggested that the consultation process from the 5th July to the 22nd August, it was important that that was concluded in a timely manner, because if we didn't conclude it in a timely manner, this would put off implementation of the Review for a whole year. So that seems to me that the timescale being suggested here is really rather short indeed?

IB

Would you like me to jump back there, Ian, or do you want to move on to others? I'm happy either way.

IM

I've got no-one else who have indicated in the way that I've asked them to do so, but if anyone does want to indicate by putting up their hand *[unclear 00:40:03]* please?

IB

Shall I just fill the space and say something? So, thank you for those comments, Nick, there, they're very helpful and characteristically constructive. I'm delighted that you focus, Ian, on what unites us rather than divides us and that emphasis on empowering and professionalizing further the teaching profession is certainly hopefully one.

I mean, I won't respond to the points that you made about rushed reform and the supply of teachers, I think those have been recorded by colleagues in the team here. I will simply take those away and, Ian, you'll forgive me if I don't speak on behalf of the Minister, the Minister obviously in Select Committee said what he said and that's something that I suggest is taken up with the Minister, but what we are doing, just to repeat, is engaging intensively with a wide range of stakeholders to find the best ways forward in some of these areas which have caused concern. So, thank you for continuing to raise them and explain them, it's genuinely helpful.

IM

Thank you, Ian. Although he hasn't actually raised his hand in the box, Chris Waterman has whispered over my shoulder, he would like to ask a question. So, Chris?

CW

Thank you very much and good to see you Ian and thank you for coming, and also to your colleague from the DfE. Two questions really. When will we know how many school governing bodies have responded to the consultation? And, how ... you speak about lots of bilateral and other meetings, how many are involving school governors, 'cause they're critical for appointing head teachers and teachers and the second question, in terms of the mentoring, has anyone quantified how many mentors will be needed and how many will be trained? I'd quite like to see a diagram showing how this process is going to work. Thank you.

IB

Thank you, Chris. I don't know if we can oblige with a diagram, but certainly quantification of mentors and mentor capacity, I know is a piece of work that is occupying teams in the DfE. Governors, Ruth, I'm going to ask you whether you can come in and give us any clues about Governors, that would be really helpful if you are able to. Ruth Talbot from DfE.

RT

Hi. I have had conversations with the NGA, so we have spoken to representatives of school governing bodies, Chris.

CW

Thank you, Ruth. That's good as far as it goes, but if you've talked to Emma Knights and her chums, that is slightly less effective than giving 25,000 governing bodies a chance to respond, but I'll leave it there.

IM

Rachel, please?

RL

Yes, thank you. It's probably not really a question, but I do feel that I need to say something. You talked about the fact that you're doing this in order to treat teachers as true professionals, and yet you've done this at a time when most teachers and most school leaders really don't have the capacity to engage fully with a fundamental review of the system, that will create the colleagues that they're going to be working with into the future and that they are going to be expected to support and that will generate the new leaders. I also think it feels very much, to many of us in the profession, of teacher education, whether we're university-based or school-based, that you haven't actually treated us like professionals. So I know that's not a question and I know that sounds really emotive, but I just wanted somebody to say that and I think it had to be me right now.

IB

Can I just assure you that you've said it, Rachel, and it's been heard. Thank you.

IM

Paul Vare, please?

PV

Thank you and thank you, Ian, for taking the time again. I have heard you before speak about these and always with a reassuring tone, I must say, but I've read the Review and I commented on it and I'm not reassured and I just wonder, when we talk about de-professionalization or professionalization as you say it, there seems to be a missed match between the reassuring words that you share about ... and I really believe that you as a head teacher, a teacher, want to see this professionalism. My question, I guess is, does it concern you, are you ever worried at night that the Review you have led is somehow a front or is likely to be used for a process which you would not approve of? I mean, I think you are being fielded often as the front man, I think you're very good at it, and I admire you for it, but I just think there's something going on here, it doesn't seem to match the inevitable consequences of that Review. I mean, Cambridge University isn't pulling out because you want to see more professionalism in teaching, something else is going on here. I just wonder if it concerns you?

IB

So, that's a really interesting comment, Paul, and thank you for making it. I mean, I tend to be fairly straight board and say and do what it says on the tin and what is written in the Review report is what my intention as Chair of that group should be recommended to Government and consulted on. There is no agenda beyond that. This is absolutely about creating a market by which I mean a totality of providers in the country that is able consistently to offer the standard of training that all of us would want for all of the future of the teaching profession and if there is some other agenda going on here under the surface, it's not one that's been shared with me, so I don't know what it would be, other than the words in black and white in the Review report. Sorry, if that ... I can almost read your mind, read you saying, that sounds disingenuous but it's not intended to be, it's intended to be entirely honest because that's who I am.

IM

Thank you, Ian. I mean, the cynic within me would say that the Government have, in recent months, been severely criticized over a number of different procurement exercises and who's ended up getting contracts and why and to many, I think, this might seem like another human exercise which could go awry and people getting contracts to do things paid for by the taxpayer for potentially the wrong reasons, rather than the expertise but because it's a political outcome that is required rather than the best one for the professional. That's the cynic within me saying that. So please quell the spirit of the cynic and put me right, if that's totally wrong.

IB

Well, I mean, first of all, this is not a procurement exercise, I know that might sound as if I'm playing with language, but this is not a procurement exercise. This is what is being proposed is an accreditation exercise, so it will be transparent and open and it will be about the ability to deliver against, I think, reasonable evidence-

base expectations for Initial Teacher Training and no more than that and no less than that, and I don't see that this is a recommendation to do anything other than that. This is about having a way to gatekeep the market, the totality of providers to make sure that for the offering of qualified teacher status which is, at the end of the day, a recognized status permitting providers to offer a qualification that qualifies people to teach in state-funded schools should have an element of quality control fronting as well as inspection post-hoc, but that's all this is about as far as I'm concerned, it's not about the awarding a contract. There are no commercial contracts being proposed in this space.

IM

Thank you. I've got Pinky Jain and Susan Robertson, did you want to come in?

SR

Can I go after Pinky, if that makes sense?

IM

Yes, Pinky?

PJ

Thank you. Ian, I guess I'm still quite confused by the deficit model position that you're starting with in this Review, is making some assumptions that the system's not working and that it needs complete overhaul, which is not the case, so, in a way, accreditation implies that we don't have accreditation at the moment which we clearly do, so I'm still not sure where this expensive model is coming from or what is hoped to be achieved from a system ... I mean, I think I've just read the comment, you know, it's about working with the sector, but we seem to be starting from this review in a position of things not working well, which are absolutely not the case. So I'm still concerned about that the cost and the huge implications at a time where people have echoed the fact that actually there are better resources that could be spent. We already produce great teachers working the system, we have done for years, so I'm really not clear as to what the purpose of the Review is, so if you could clarify that, it would be really helpful?

IB

I think the only thing I want to say in response to that is, we are absolutely clear that there is a very excellent practice in the sector already. As I said in my opening comment, this is not an implication that good practice does not already exist. What this is doing, is adopting a recommendation about an approach to ensuring consistency and universality of that high quality provision that, as I've said, already exists in many places.

Commented [C1]:

PJ

Sorry, can I just come back on that. But in order to do that, it doesn't need an overhaul and reaccreditation of the system, it probably needs a much ... you know, it's a bit of a quality assurance process to work with the

sector, rather than ... if it's about consistency, then it's working with good practice within the sector to, kind of, work across rather than starting all over again and it feels like baby and bath water somehow.

IB

I think, probably the best thing for me to do, Pinkie, is get colleagues to note that point that you're making and take it away as they develop the Government's response on behalf of Ministers. Thank you.

PJ

That's appreciated, thanks.

IM

Right, Susan, please?

SR

No, I agree with Pinkie's question. I mean, it's the problem of teacher quality in the sector is in a particular place, why don't we address those issues? That's the first point. I think there's a number of issues we'd still like to raise and have addressed. In other words, the Expert Advisory Group didn't represent the sector, so that's the first kind of issue. I think the second issue is, there's a statement about assurances to us that you're listening and things might be different, but a good lawyer will always tell you that what you're reading on paper is what you're likely to be committed to, so [unclear 00:53:27] is, what kinds of rewordings might we be able to look at that enable us to feel confident that what we're not being offered is what I will describe as a confusion between standards and standardization and so, Ian, well, you, kind of, did say, if there's no, kind of, curriculum, you actually nevertheless did describe the CCF as a curriculum. So there's too much, kind of, double speak at the moment for us to feel really really confident about what it is that's on the table that we should get behind, like, you were concerned with outstanding teachers for every child, that's why Cambridge University is involved in this, it has also outstanding PGCE programs, and we want to remain as a provider, but actually with something else on the table, what we're looking at, at the moment, like David mentioned earlier, isn't the kind of thing that we say actually even reflects the practices that we're familiar with that give rise to outstanding teachers and, for us, across the Cambridge region, it's incredibly important, working with often challenged schools to get terrific teachers, using terrific programming in order to get them into schools.

IM

A number of other people who've indicated as well, Ian, are you happy to take them together?

IB

Yeah, happy to take them together. Sorry, I wasn't making notes while Susan was speaking, so I'll just quickly jot something down, so I've got this, so, thank you.

IM

Lisa-Maria has got her hand up with CCT Research Team, Chartered College, sorry.

L-MM

Yes, apologies, I can't change my name on this. My name's Lisa-Marie Muller, I'm from the Chartered College of Teaching Research Team and my question very much relates to what previous speakers have said around the evidence and the question you've suggested that ITT providers will be free to teach beyond the core content framework. However, the question is, how realistic it is that they will actually have the time to do so, given the suggestions and also how much time there will be to critically reflect and somebody suggested that in a chat as being a core component of ITT, having teachers to critically reflect on research evidence which, in light of the most recent EF Review around limitations of cognitive science research is becoming increasingly important, and so the question is, is there going to be sufficient time, given the limitations around and the theoretical aspect of ITT that is suggested or proposed in the current Review to foster that critical reflection go beyond the core content framework, where ITT provide this deemed that necessary?

IM

And Tanya, please?

TO-H

Thanks, Ian, sorry about that. I'm just trying to get that back up. Yeah, it's really interesting hearing about the ambition of the ITT Review to be professionalizing teaching, because, we need our profession to be attractive in order to get trainees to become teachers in the first place, for us to be a go-to profession and I was going to speak about this later, but I'm going to say it now. The Institute for Fiscal Studies, their report that came out last week demonstrated that school spending in England is the lowest it's been for 40 years, it's had the largest cut. In real terms, we've had no pay rise for teachers which was promised in the Manifesto commitment to schools. We know that teaching as a profession is becoming more challenging, particularly for schools in deprived areas and the work that I do demonstrates that the most unqualified teachers tend to be in the most deprived schools in rural and coastal areas. So, if we want to create an attractive profession or graduates to enter and it would be great if they were graduates, and it would be great if they were qualified, how is the ITT Review going to be relevant to this, if actually, what we need to do is spend money on schools. So this lack of funding that's going into schools, why spend money on the ITT Review now, when actually, we should be investing in schools and investing in teachers?

So, I would say, the timing isn't great for this, regardless of where we go with why do it in the first place, because the quality was evidenced prior to the ITT Review for teacher training, so how are we going to create a profession that's the go-to profession for graduates if schools themselves are struggling to acquire the resource that they need to be attractive as a source of employment?

IM

Ian, thank you very much indeed.

IB

So, thank you, two or three comments there just to pick up some aspects of. I mean, Susan, I'm sorry if I mis-spoke during the course of my opening comments. I thought I had been clear that the CCF is not a curriculum and if I wasn't clear about that, let me just do that once again. The CCF is not a curriculum, it's a taxonomy or codification of evidence-base insight about effective classroom practice, but it's not itself a fully designed curriculum and that piece of work needs to be done by providers and will not be mandated centrally by the Government. So, I hope that is absolutely clear. I absolutely share your ambition to get potentially outstanding teachers into schools, but, you know, outstanding teachers are, to a large extent, made, not born and what outstanding teachers need is outstanding training which, in many many cases they get, but the aspiration I have and the rest of the group I know, is to make sure that that outstanding training that makes aspirationally outstanding teachers, actually outstanding is available consistently to everybody that goes into the teaching profession, and if I can just tie that in with the comments that Tanya was making towards the end there, I absolutely share your ambition that teaching needs to be an attractive profession and the best quality Initial Teacher Training and the best quality investment, the continuous teacher development and professional growth, I think, has a significant contribution to make to making it an attractive profession.

I'm going to pass on your comments on school funding, but I know that colleagues from the team will have noted them and they've not been lost.

If I can just come back to the comments that were made by the colleague from the CCT, whose name, I'm afraid, I didn't catch and it just said CCT on the screen, but just to pick those up, and that was on time. So, I think the point being made was, will trainees or providers have time to go beyond the CCF? And this is just to remind that the CCF was not made mandatory by this Review, that that is already there and it is already at this point before we say anything about the ITT Market Review, it is already an obligation on providers to ensure that they deliver the content within the CCF as part of their all round curriculum. So, whether or not there is time to do more than CCF, you know, that's a challenge that already providers, I think, are meeting and in many cases addressing successfully. I'll pause there.

IM

Nick, did you want to come back in? Just, for reference, Ian, I think it was Lisa-Maria Muller from the CCT.

IB

Thank you very much, Ian, that's helpful to have for the record.

IM

Nick, did you want to come back in? I thought I saw ... no, you've scrubbed that. I've got no-one else who's indicated, Ian, but we've had nearly an hour, so I do want to thank you for your time. I think, what I take from the input that we've had this afternoon is that, and I hope that you will take this in the best spirit, but I think that there is some significant concern out there about the Review and I think the sector really do need to be, kind of, made more confident that the baby isn't going to be thrown out with the bath water in doing all of this. So, but, Ian, I do appreciate you coming along to the All Party Group this afternoon and thank you very very much for your time, and, please, if you want to stay with us for the remainder of the agenda, please, by all means, please do so.

IB

That's very kind, Ian. If I can just thank colleagues for their constructive participation, it is always useful. I know these things are difficult but it is really helpful to hear from people first hand and if there are comments that you want fed into the process, please do pass them to the Department, because they are interested in continuing to engage with people and particularly as the Government response to the consultation is shaped if there are constructive suggestions that can be made to move this process forward, are absolutely open to hearing those.

IM

Thank you very much.