

What **We Say** about OFSTED’s consultation on the proposed new framework for Inspecting Initial Teacher Education

We agreed enthusiastically with all of OFSTED’s proposals, although we added quite a lot of comments, some of them of particular importance for mathematics.

This is the MA’s full response, including the questions asked, but excluding the purely administrative questions such as “What is your name?”. All the questions had a choice of 5 responses from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”, and a space for comments.

Proposal 1: introduction of two key judgement areas only

We propose to introduce two key judgement areas only: 'the quality of education and training', and 'leadership and management'. We propose to consolidate our inspection of the quality of the ITE training programme and ITE curriculum within a single key judgement: 'the quality of education and training' (QoET). This will replace the current 'outcomes for trainees' and 'quality of training across the partnership' judgements.

For more details please refer to consultation text about [proposal 1](#) (opens in new window).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce two key judgement areas only?

Strongly agree

Comments:

The focus on what ITE providers are responsible for rather than outcomes that are potentially affected by factors out of their control is good.

The leadership vision should be clear and ambitious and engage with all. Leaders should be assessed on their approach to developing and improving their programme over time.

Proposal 2: a new methodology for gathering inspection evidence

We propose to apply a new methodology of gathering evidence during an inspection of an ITE partnership. The new focused review method of gathering evidence is relatively in line with the ‘deep-dive’ methodology applied in the EIF. This is an approach with which many early years settings, schools and further education colleges will now be familiar. However, the focused review approach is tailored to the ITE context in terms of the logistical arrangements required to ensure that inspectors are able to gather sufficient evidence that will help to establish the quality of the ITE curriculum.

For more details please refer to consultation text about [proposal 2](#) (opens in new window).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to change the evidence-gathering approach for inspection evidence?

Strongly agree

Comments:

Research makes it clear that good mathematics teachers not only need to have excellent personal mathematics subject knowledge in terms of both depth and breadth, but also that they need mathematics-specific pedagogy. Under the new framework, Ofsted will be able to inspect this aspect of provision.

ITE should prepare trainees not just for their first job, but for a teaching career in which they will encounter changes in curriculum, and different school environments. Providers should be assessed on how well they prepare trainees for such changes.

Providers should be assessed on their support to mentors, especially as in shortage subjects such as mathematics, there is often turnover of mentors during the school year.

Inspectors need a broad range of evidence from different sources. Inspection visits must do more than “see how trainees are implementing the centrally taught ITE programme”, for example to test how well trainees are prepared to handle conflicts between what they have been taught and policy in a placement school.

Proposal 3: the one-stage model of inspection

We propose to carry out ITE inspections under a new one-stage model of inspection, with the intention of creating a flexible inspection model for both ITE partnerships and Ofsted. This means four days of on-site inspection within a single week, including time for inspectors to visit partnership settings, schools and/or colleges.

For more details please refer to consultation text about [proposal 3](#) (opens in new window).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed new inspection model of a one-stage inspection process for ITE inspections?

Strongly agree

Comments:

Inspecting NQT's in their first term is not sensible, and unduly stressful for the NQTs.

Proposal 4: short and long telephone calls prior to inspection

We propose a new approach to how our inspectors prepare for and begin inspections. The introduction of variety in the telephone conversations will allow the partnership representative to set out the partnership's context, challenges and progress since the last inspection.

For more details please refer to consultation text about [proposal 4](#) (opens in new window).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce a short and longer telephone call with the ITE partnership representative, prior to the inspection?

Strongly agree

Comments:

Good preparation and planning allows inspectors and leaders to understand each other's context, and avoids the waste of time that can arise from having to re-plan on the hoof.

Proposal 5: spring and summer term inspections only

We propose that inspections of ITE partnerships, under a new framework and cycle of inspections, will begin in the spring term 2021 and will only take place across the spring and summer terms of an academic year.

For more details please refer to consultation text about [proposal 5](#) (opens in new window).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal that Ofsted will inspect ITE partnerships at any point within the spring and summer terms only (excluding autumn term) of any given academic year?

Strongly agree

Comments:

(no comment)

Additional comments

ITE needs to be inspected by specialist tutors who understand ITE and who are also subject specialists. ITE is not secondary school teaching, and good pedagogy for mathematics looks very unlike good pedagogy for English.