

# **If It Ain't Broke, Handle with Care**



**Report by the Special Interest Group on Initial Teacher Training (ITT)  
All Party Parliamentary Group for the Teaching Profession**

Chaired by  
**Jim Knight, Rt Hon Lord Knight of Weymouth**

**IRIS Press**

# **If It Ain't Broke, Handle with Care**

**Report by the Special Interest Group on Initial Teacher Training (ITT)  
All Party Parliamentary Group for the Teaching Profession**

Chaired by  
**Jim Knight, Rt Hon Lord Knight of Weymouth**

**IRIS Press**

**ISBN: 978-0-9956205-7-5**

## **Foreword**

The All-Party Parliamentary Group for the Teaching Profession is one of the most active APPGs, with meetings regularly attracting over 80 attendees, drawn from the Lords, the Commons and professionals across the whole of the education sector.

The Special Interest Group on Initial Teacher Training (ITT) was established to ensure that proper attention was given to the initial training of teachers.

Teachers are the most valuable asset of any education system. How the teaching profession is trained and retained is of critical importance to the future of children and young people in England.

This contribution to the debate on the future of initial teacher training, written by experts from across the sector, must be taken account of by those developing the reforms to the system.

**Chris Waterman**

Secretary, APPG for the Teaching Profession

PRINTER'S PROOF

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

- SECTION 1** Is there a quality problem with ITT that needs addressing?
- SECTION 2** Are there potential economies of scale that justify reducing the number of training providers in terms of quality and cost?
- SECTION 3** How could schools be better incentivised to be more involved in ITE?
- SECTION 4** How can initial teacher education be further improved?
- SECTION 5** If it is decided to implement significant change in the provision of ITE, what should be the best timing for any change?

### **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **APPENDIX 1** Contributors

# If It Ain't Broke, Handle with Care

## INTRODUCTION

This report was commissioned by the APPG for the Teaching Profession. It was written based on written evidence submitted to the group by training providers, school leaders and organisations representative of teachers and school leaders<sup>1</sup>. This evidence was followed by an oral evidence session held as a roundtable discussion.

The review was chaired by Jim Knight, Rt Hon Lord Knight of Weymouth, and a core group of members assisted with the writing. They are Dr Aimee Quickfall (Head of Programmes for Primary and Early Years Development, Bishop Grosseteste University, Lincoln), James Noble-Rogers (Executive Director, Universities Council for the Education of Teachers), Emma Hollis (Executive Director, National Association of School-Based Teacher Trainers), Professor Clare Brooks (Pro-Director: Education, UCL Institute of Education) and Dr Mick Walker (Vice-Chair, Chartered Institute of Educational Assessors).

The background to carrying out this report is the Department for Education (DfE)'s review of the ITT<sup>2</sup> market (Market Review), chaired by Ian Bauckham. The stated aims of the review are <sup>3</sup>:

- all trainees receive high-quality training.
- the ITT market maintains the capacity to deliver enough trainees and is accessible to candidates.
- the ITT system benefits all schools.

The review is expected to report in summer 2021, with implementation of any changes from September 2022. This is also the date when the Government intends that the Institute of Teaching "will become England's flagship Lead Provider".<sup>4</sup> This report largely focusses on the Market Review, but the group notes the further disruptive effect of a new unproven provider entering the market with a status pre-judged by the DfE. This development adds considerable further uncertainty to providers.

---

<sup>1</sup> In total, there were 16 submissions, representing 100s/1000s of members - with responses from a broad range of stakeholders, including school leaders, SCITT and HEI ITE providers, academics and researchers. The two surveys by TeacherTapp and TES together engaged 9,400 teachers and school leaders.

<sup>2</sup> The DfE documentation refers to Initial Teacher Training (ITT). However, Ofsted and much of the sector prefer the term Initial Teacher Education (ITE). This report will use ITT in reference to DfE documents, and ITE in relation to the feedback provided to the Special Interest Group.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-itt-market-review>

<sup>4</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/991390/Delivering\\_World-Class\\_Teacher\\_Development.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/991390/Delivering_World-Class_Teacher_Development.pdf)

This report is presented in five sections, each focussing on answering one of five core questions:

- Is there a quality problem with Initial Teacher Education (ITE) that needs addressing?
- Are there potential economies of scale that justify reducing the number of training providers in terms of quality and cost?
- How could schools be better incentivised to be more involved in Initial Teacher Education (ITE)?
- How can Initial Teacher Education be further improved?
- If changes are necessary, what is the best timing for their introduction?

PRINTER'S PROOF

## SECTION 1

### **Is there a quality problem with ITT that needs addressing?**

All respondents to the APPG call for evidence responded to this question and were almost unanimously in agreement that there is no quality problem with Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs). Representatives of head teachers, teachers and schools responded and reported that they do not perceive a widespread or systemic issue of NQT quality.

Most respondents then went into detail about why a problem may be perceived.

The notion of 'quality' was questioned and how this might be defined and measured. A concern was expressed that notions of 'quality' and 'consistency' are being confused, and that there is an assumption that a uniform approach to teacher training and early career support would lead to better quality early career teachers. The idea that one teacher training method and curriculum could prepare teachers to work in diverse communities and schools was described as 'deeply flawed'.

Over half the respondents made reference to specific evidence, pointing out data and their own experiences that would suggest there is no quality problem with NQTs. Research and other supporting data cited included Ofsted inspection summaries, Department for Education NQT data, 'Teacher Tapp' surveys, a TES survey, current ongoing research and 'in house' surveys of trainees and NQTs. Contributors expressed a concern that a large body of research on teacher education is not being considered.

Respondents identified expectations of NQTs as an issue for consideration, including a concern with the perception that an NQT is the 'finished article' after ten months of training. The short duration of postgraduate training, whilst an accepted part of ITE, was reported as not being sufficient, not to 'quality' but to the confidence and wellbeing of those in training. It was noted that most high quality teacher education systems internationally focus on a course that spans two years, and is targeted as Masters-level. It was also noted that unrealistic expectations can lead some schools to judge NQTs as ill-prepared for a qualified teacher role, with the short duration of training not taken into account.

NQT support was also identified as an issue when considering issues of quality. Comments on the limitations of NQT support included a lack of understanding around the wellbeing of NQTs in some schools, with reports of 'burnout' in the first years of teaching due to excessive workloads and overwhelming challenges. School context, culture and management can have impact on the quality of NQT support, with a mixed picture reported, from excellent support to poor provision. One response suggested that there may also be an issue with some individual Appropriate Bodies not challenging poor induction and support when this is raised with them.

Perhaps, unsurprisingly, many respondents commented on the impact of COVID. Comments described experiences of teacher training and the NQT year that have been severely impacted by the pandemic, as well as recounting incidences of individual teacher trainees and NQTs who have suffered personal tragedies and challenges during this period. In terms of opportunities to engage in planned placements and experience 'normal' practice, COVID-19 has had wide ranging levels of impact, despite efforts by ITE providers, partnerships and mentors to provide excellent support. It is recommended by our respondents that the impact of COVID-19 and general question of quality of NQTs should be separate considerations.

Some respondents identified issues with ITE. Specific subject areas were noted as problematic in some areas, for some trainees. More generally, respondents reported that ITE postgraduate programmes are limited by a ten-month duration, with the short training period having detrimental impact; for example, trainees not having sufficient time to gain an in-depth understanding of child development. Other

comments on the limitations of ITE included the suggestion that in some cases, ITE trainees are used as classroom 'supply cover' with little support in place.

One respondent stated that the ITE curriculum is weighted towards core subjects and behaviour management, to the detriment of other areas of the curriculum and pedagogy. Some responses mentioned issues around the development of specific subject knowledge: one identified gaps in the arts and cultural education, and another noted specific subject shortages for Secondary, including Science, Languages, Maths and Geography. A lack of confidence to teach pupils with SEND was also identified by one respondent. There was no clear consensus on what the specific issues in ITE training could be.

It was recognised that several recent government-led initiatives, such as the Early Career Framework (ECF) and Core Content Framework (CCF), have yet to show any impact. Any planned improvements should be delayed in order that they could build upon these initiatives and be based on a robust analysis of where they have fallen short and need to be supplemented, for example, in gaps on the research basis of the content of the ECF and CCF, theoretical dimensions of teaching and the forms of professional learning not included in these initiatives.

With regards to the proposals discussed at the Market Review engagement activities, respondents identified three significant risks that these posed to the efforts to continually improve ITT.

The first is a threat to the quality of provision, if based around a narrow curriculum and a limited model of professional learning.

Concerns were raised that the proposals appeared to be orientated around a narrow prescriptive curriculum, and a model of design and delivery that would substantially narrow the experiences offered to new teachers. This would increase 'technicist' approaches to teaching which were lacking in developing teachers' ability to critique educational initiatives and were short-term in scope and ambition for teachers. This was considered a major threat to the quality of the current provision, the professional status of teaching generally (and therefore its ability to attract and retain high quality graduates), but also to the future quality of education and schooling in this country.

A narrowly-conceived curriculum, based on a limited and partial evidence base was considered to be a significant threat to quality and resilience of the education system as a whole.

The second threat was to the supply of new teachers.

It was noted that recent data indicates that the number of applications for teacher training is now trailing off, and there are concerns about the number of job vacancies for current trainees in the system. Organisations representing both School-Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) and university providers reported concerns about the proposed partnership model that are causing all providers to consider their position, and potentially withdraw from the market early.

For SCITTs, there was a concern that with limited scope for providers with smaller numbers to become lead providers, some will be looking to withdraw from the ITT market before capacity had been found elsewhere. This potentially creates gaps, particularly in isolated, rural and coastal communities that are not served by larger-scale organisations.

Some Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) were seeing the Market review delivery model proposals as an existential threat and are considering the reputational risk of potentially being refused reaccreditation as an ITT provider (due to scale rather than quality). Coupled with concerns about the loss of curricular autonomy, and financial arrangements, there is a concern that many universities (who are small in scale but central to local communities and vital in ensuring a through-flow of teachers from their undergraduate



provision) are considering their future involvement in ITE. It was categorically stated that the current proposals were seen as a threat to current partnership arrangements (for all providers) that would substantially threaten established partnerships and placement opportunities for trainees.

The third threat was to the longer-term attractiveness of the profession to high quality graduates. If the only option to becoming a teacher was relegated to a narrow range of lead providers, rather than improving ITT, this could result in a series of 'Stepford Wives' teachers with a narrow skill set and knowledge base, who were not well equipped to adapt and innovate in the face of future challenges that may face schools.

It was noted that previous reforms to the market created widespread disruption and problems with teacher supply, which have now worked their way through into what is now a mature and stable market. Many responses quoted evidence from Ofsted about the already highly-rated nature of the current provision (as Good or Outstanding), and survey results which show high levels of trainee satisfaction with their experience. Feedback from ITE providers (HEIs and SCITTs) and representatives of schools and teachers were clear that there was no widespread dissatisfaction with ITE in terms of quality, consistency or partnership arrangements.

In the light of the lack of evidence that there is a substantial issue with ITE, concerns were raised that the proposals submitted as part of the Market Review would, in themselves, represent a significant risk to current provision. Respondents were unanimous that recommendations for change to the ITT Market should not be at the detriment of what is already a high quality and highly respected provision.

In summary, there is no evidence that there is a substantial quality problem that justifies a significant change. The bulk of quality-related concerns relate to the first years of teaching. There are widespread concerns that the proposals outlined in the most recent Department for Education (DfE) publication <sup>5</sup>will damage quality.

---

<sup>5</sup>[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/991390/Delivering\\_World-Class\\_Teacher\\_Development.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/991390/Delivering_World-Class_Teacher_Development.pdf)

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Given that the premise for the Market Review is flawed and that it presents an existential threat to teacher supply in the short term, and teacher quality in the long term, we recommend that the Government immediately halts the review of the ITT market.
2. We recommend that any government-led change or development in the way we recruit, educate, and continuously support the teaching workforce should be based on a clear and broadly accepted rationale, draw on robust research and reflect the needs of a high-quality system of education.
3. The government's focus on quality improvement should be on the successful implementation of the Early Careers Framework (ECF) and a thorough independent review of its efficacy.

PRINTER'S PROOF

## SECTION 2

### **Are there potential economies of scale that justify reducing the number of training providers in terms of quality and cost?**

The existing market structure, with a variety of types and size of provider, is a strength of the current system. It gives both applicants and partner schools choice about the type of provider that best meets their needs and has proved effective in supplying schools with some 30,000 new teachers each year.

HEIs tend to recruit the largest number of student teachers. Larger providers are well-placed to give specialist and subject-specific support to student teachers and to mentors, to ensure access to central support services such as library provision, support for student teachers with particular needs and pastoral services. Larger cohorts might also facilitate the scope for students to experience ITE across different phases and subject areas, including SEND, and benefit from peer learning and communities of practice. Larger providers are sometimes based in areas of high population density (where the demand for new teachers can be greater) and are in closer proximity to large numbers of partner schools and to potential student teacher recruits, which might explain why better qualified students tend to be recruited by the larger providers.

Smaller providers are however able to target their provision to meet the teacher supply needs of particular schools and to tailor provision to meet the educational and teacher supply needs of local communities. Quality and consistency might sometimes be easier to maintain in smaller partnerships.

From the submissions we received, there is no evidence that significant financial economies would be achieved by reducing the number of accredited ITE providers.

Many costs are fixed regardless of the size of the provider. While larger provision might allow for cost savings in some areas, smaller providers might be more adept at adapting how they do things and exploiting opportunities to make any savings as they arise.

The existence of larger providers sometimes allows smaller-scale provision to be sustainable. Partnership between different types of providers and their provision was suggested as an alternative to rationalisation.

Rationalising the number of routes into training might, however, yield benefits. School Direct, for example, could sometimes add costs because of the need to duplicate administrative procedures for core and School Direct provision, such as in regard to recruitment procedures.

In summary, there is little evidence to suggest that the number of accredited providers should be reduced for either quality or financial reasons. The many routes into teaching might usefully be reviewed and simplified. The distinction between larger and smaller providers can be misleading, as many work in partnership with one another.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

4. We recommend that the government ensures that the structure of the ITE market offers prospective teachers a choice about the kind of ITE provider, in terms of scale and ethos, they train with.
5. The government should also make it possible for prospective teachers to undertake ITE (including placement activities) within a reasonable distance from their homes should they wish to do so, to make it easier for people from disadvantaged communities to join the profession.

PRINTER'S PROOF

### SECTION 3

#### **How could schools be better incentivised to be more involved in ITE?**

Three key themes emerged from the responses to this question: resourcing the development of mentoring capacity, ways of requiring engagement, and cultural change.

The strongest theme was the need to appropriately recognise the time and professional development commitments that are needed to develop a highly skilled mentor workforce. This is seen as being a central factor to the success of both ITT provision and the ECF.

Often, cost and time/capacity limitations are cited as a reason that schools cannot engage in ITE, or a reason that they engage less fully than would be desirable. Several solutions to this were suggested, the most popular being financial support, over and above existing funding agreements that providers have with schools for hosting placements. Mentoring needs to be funded by the government, and there should be safeguards in place to ensure that the money is not reallocated elsewhere by schools.

Generally, it was suggested that funding needs to be used to support appropriate release time for the mentors, rather than a direct payment/salary uplift for mentors. It was felt that appropriate release time, both to undertake professional development opportunities and to carry out the role of the mentor effectively, was more likely to have an impact on capacity and quality.

A popular suggestion was the introduction of national, funded, mentor development. This would raise the profile of the role. One respondent suggested that this could potentially be linked to Master's Level credits; another suggested this is taken even further with a dedicated 'teacher educator' role in every school/trust, which would carry equal standing to roles such as Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Co-ordinator (SENDCO) and safeguarding lead and which would be a senior leadership position with suitable release time allocated to the role. This person would, in turn, be responsible for developing the mentor workforce (and an understanding of the collective responsibility of all staff in school: mentorship) across the school/trust in the same way as a safeguarding lead educated the entire workforce on its safeguarding responsibilities.

The second strong theme was a lever by which schools might be required to engage in ITE.

By far the most popular suggested lever was inclusion in the Ofsted framework. There were nuances around how this might be approached, with some respondents suggesting it could be a feature required for schools to obtain (or retain) an outstanding grade, rather than an expectation across all schools (many of which may, for legitimate reasons, not be suitable to support trainee teachers). Other suggestions included that it be a DfE funding requirement, and that evidence of mentoring initial teacher trainees and Early Career Teachers (ECTs) could be included in the requirement for teachers to move to the Upper Pay Scale (UPS).

It is important to note that a number of stakeholders, and the teacher unions, in particular, have significant concerns over any lever which mandates school involvement in ITE. There is a concern that this could affect the quality of placements offered and could prove to be a bridge too far in terms of schools' capacity to manage within a system which already places high demands on their time and staffing.

The final theme was around supporting schools to change their culture and approach to ITE, and helping them to see the huge benefits that come from being involved in the training and development of early career teachers.

Providers reported that where schools are engaged successfully with ITT provision, it is often because of close collaborative partnerships where schools support trainees over long periods of time, feel a sense of

agency over the programmes that are delivered and are, in return, offered access to high quality research and development linked to school priority areas.

Supporting schools to understand how these successful partnerships work could be used as a softer incentive to build wider partnerships. There was some hope that, as schools come to realise the additional requirements that the ECF makes of them and their approach to mentoring, they may see the benefits of a closer working relationships with ITE partnerships who could support them in meeting this requirement.

PRINTER'S PROOF

## RECOMMENDATIONS

6. We recommend that the government ensures that schools have a choice about the kinds of ITE provider(s) they work in partnership with. There should be a sufficient number of accredited ITE providers to allow all schools who wish to do so to be involved in teacher education.
7. The government should bring forward proposals to ensure that the mentoring of trainees is properly resourced and consult on how to use accountability mechanisms at a school or school group level to incentivise schools to partner with training providers.

PRINTER'S PROOF

## SECTION 4

### **How can initial teacher education be further improved?**

Submissions recognised that there is always an opportunity to improve ITE, but there was a strong view from all organisations that there was not currently a substantial problem with ITE that necessitated whole-scale market reform.

Many respondents noted that any priorities highlighted for improvement would need to recognise the varied and diverse nature of ITE practice and provision (which was mostly considered to be a strength), and how this has been developed in response to local needs and variation (for example with coastal or inner-city communities). One respondent commented that new policies and initiatives should represent the full spectrum of providers to ensure they can produce the most effective outcomes, and another indicated that they should not be based on unsubstantiated assumptions about ITE practice. It was noted that a great deal of quality already exists in the system, and further developments would need to build on these.

It was widely recognised that the main block to improvement in ITE was the time allocated to initial teacher education. Within this narrow window of opportunity, it was challenging for teachers to develop the requisite subject expertise (an area with potential for improvement) and the ability to turn that expertise into high quality educational experiences and curricula, and sufficient understanding of areas such as the Arts and creativity and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).

The short training period also presented challenges for trainees to develop the breadth of experience required (improving the range and variety of school engagement was considered key here), and to realise the opportunities afforded by technology. It was reported by some respondents that the limited time available for teacher training has an impact on the wellbeing of trainees, but also on the ability of new teachers to cope with the demands of teaching, and a longer training period would support longer-term teacher retention and teacher wellbeing. The short training period also meant there is limited time for teachers to engage critically with research and literature.

This problem cannot be fixed by extending the PGCE course by a few weeks. International respected programmes tend to allocate two years for initial training. It would also be tempting to regard the new Early Career Framework as resolving this issue through what could be described as a three-year apprenticeship. This ignores the time needed for reflection on practice across the full range of the initial training curriculum.

There is a need to improve the status of teaching and teacher education.

The involvement of universities was seen as central here, in particular with the recognition of teacher education as a Master's level profession, with a strong emphasis on research needed. This was articulated by one respondent: "Encourage rather than stifle university-led academic research into good teacher training methods and content".

Evidence was also presented about other highly rated education systems where ongoing professional learning, and teachers critically engaging with research, were standard features. This recognises the importance of collaborative practices which are conducive to teacher career development and progression. It was also felt that high quality mentoring and high-quality teacher education should be recognised and rewarded. As specialist occupations, there should be a higher bar set for those who mentor and educate new teachers, and that future policy development should seek support from a wider range of specialists and experts. However, it was also noted the lack of current capacity in the system to provide the high levels of quality mentoring provided for both ITT and early career teachers, through the demands of the ECF.



Moreover, many respondents noted that it was important to view ITE as the start of a teacher's professional development, and that it should be recognised that teachers will still develop in their practice beyond the completion of their ITE. Future improvements should also canvas the view of new teachers, teacher educators, mentors and schools, and relevant professional bodies and associations, independent of political oversight.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 8. We recommend that the government should put developing teacher professionalism and the raising the status of teachers at the heart of their thinking. This requires that universities, as centres of research, and schools, as centres of practice both continue to be involved in partnership.**
- 9. We recommend that the government ensures that all providers of initial and on-going teacher education should be required to demonstrate a high level of expertise in the particular fields in which they operate and demonstrate their commitment to the continuous development of their staff and contribution to research and development.**
- 10. National frameworks and regulatory systems for ITE should be flexible enough to allow ITE programmes to be contextualised to meet the particular needs of individual student teachers, schools and communities.**

## SECTION 5

### **If it is decided to implement significant change in the provision of ITE, what should be the best timing for any change?**

The majority of responses questioned the urgency for change. Over one third asked for clear evidence that any change was required, with others advocating no change at a time when the system was undergoing high levels of adaptation and fluctuation in responding to the pandemic.

Whilst there was support for the APPG Enquiry as a means of assisting in determining the future of ITE, there was a clear majority citing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic as presenting significant challenge and strain on the sector, raising questions about the need, appetite and timing of further disruption. A third of respondents also noted that we are still in the pandemic which is likely to have a long tail and that the eventual effects are as yet unclear. For example the impact on teacher recruitment and retention. These respondents urged caution before implementing any further change and called for a clear rationale and evidence base for any intended reforms.

A clear majority of respondents expressed the view that any review should not be rushed and conducted through dialogue and careful consultation with key stakeholders so as to evaluate the impact of COVID-19, the effect of other more recent reforms and be informed by evidence. In this context, the more recent changes most commonly be cited by respondents were the Early Careers Framework (ECF) and changes to the Ofsted inspection approach. This led to calls for a period of stability in order for these changes to settle and a period of time to evaluate their impact on the system. It was noted that adding even further change would make it difficult to evaluate the impact of the ECF and inspection framework, as it would not be clear which change was having what level of impact.

It was also clear from most submissions, that if there was to be change, the period of implementation should not be rushed and be carefully evaluated for impact. There is concern that the welcome announcement of a public consultation on these proposals would be carried out during July and August, during the school holidays.

Only a minority of respondents provided a clear sense of timing for any proposed change. These included those advocating no change for at least a year, to those calling for a planned phasing of any change over at least eighteen months, a two-to-three-year period or 'over a long period time' and conducted in partnership with the sector.

Those expressing the latter point noted that change however well intended or needed, causes disruption and for some institutions, more time to implement than others. For example, it was stressed that managed change is required to ensure good quality outcomes and that if the timetable set for change is too rapid and complex, it may result in the loss of some providers, in particular the withdrawal of universities offering Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) provision.

The need to ensure quality provision was also cited by another participant noting that the 'plethora of routes' into teaching was addressing a quantity issue rather than a focus on quality of provision. The need for time to engage in consultation and meaningful dialogue with the sector, together with drawing on previous experience to prevent the replication of previous mistakes, was further endorsed. Warnings were also sounded that without sufficient time for planning, there is clear potential for unintended consequences in regard to teacher supply in what one other respondent referred to as the 'fragile' ITE market.

Having said this, there were respondents who, although citing the unprecedented disruption of the pandemic, saw the coming period as one presenting an opportunity to reflect on the recent and on-going experience in order to inform future developments. It was noted by one respondent, for example, that the

pandemic had strengthened ITE partnerships and boosted recruitment, and whilst now may well be a time to consider the strengths of the current system, there is still the danger that implementing change at this point may be the cause of continued disruption, a point supported by other respondents. However, this was countered by another respondent who commented that other impacts of the pandemic on the curriculum and approaches to assessment should be considered before making any change to ITE provision. One respondent called for the process of becoming 'providers for ITE opened up as soon as possible' with SCITT accreditation as 'always on'. As for wider reforms, the same respondent called for at least one term's notice and alignment with the academic year adding that more technologically-based and less geographically constrained approaches should be introduced as soon as possible.

The scale and financial cost of change was also a concern for some of the respondents. Without details of any proposed change, it was noted that it is difficult to gauge the amount of time or resources needed to make any proposed changes. Such comment was accompanied by referring to the view that ITE is already fit for purpose and that providers are continuously looking to innovate and improve their offer as standard practice.

Although the points above were made in response to the question about the best timing of any significant changes to the structure of ITT provision, it was stressed that the call for further consultation and discussion should not be interpreted as any form of acceptance for the need of change. On the contrary, the general response to timing was to first ask why any change was required and on what evidence base: this reflects the responses found in Section 1 of this report and the underpinning of Recommendation 1.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11. We recommend that, in accordance with the Code of Practice on Consultation,<sup>6</sup> the government carries out a full twelve-week consultation on any proposals for change and seeks to avoid any significant overlap with the long summer break in the normal academic year.**

---

<sup>6</sup>[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/100807/file47158.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/100807/file47158.pdf)

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Given that the premise for the Market Review is flawed and that it presents an existential threat to teacher supply in the short term, and teacher quality in the long term, we recommend that the government immediately halts the review of the ITT market.
2. We recommend that any government-led change or development in the way we recruit, educate, and continuously support the teaching workforce should be based on a clear and broadly accepted rationale, draw on robust research and reflect the needs of a high-quality system of education.
3. The government's focus on quality improvement should be on the successful implementation of the Early Careers Framework (ECF) and a thorough independent review of its efficacy.
4. We recommend that the government ensures that the structure of the ITE market offers prospective teachers a choice about the kind of ITE provider, in terms of scale and ethos, they train with.
5. The government should also make it possible for prospective teachers to undertake ITE (including placement activities) within a reasonable distance from their homes, should they wish to do so, to make it easier for people from disadvantaged communities to join the profession.
6. We recommend that the government ensures that schools have a choice about the kinds of ITE provider(s) they work in partnership with. There should be a sufficient number of accredited ITE providers to allow all schools who wish to do so to be involved in teacher education.
7. The government should bring forward proposals to ensure that the mentoring of trainees is properly resourced and consult on how to use accountability mechanisms at a school or school group level to incentivise schools to partner with training providers.
8. We recommend that the government should put developing teacher professionalism and the raising the status of teachers at the heart of their thinking. This requires that universities, as centres of research, and schools, as centres of practice, both continue to be involved in partnership.
9. We recommend that the government ensures that all providers of initial and on-going teacher education should be required to demonstrate a high level of expertise in the particular fields in which they operate and demonstrate their commitment to the continuous development of their staff and contribution to research and development.
10. National frameworks and regulatory systems for ITE should be flexible enough to allow ITE programmes to be contextualised to meet the particular needs of individual student teachers, schools and communities.

- 11. We recommend that, in accordance with the Code of Practice on Consultation,<sup>7</sup> the government carries out a full twelve-week consultation on any proposals for change and seeks to avoid any significant overlap with the long summer break in the normal academic year.**

PRINTER'S PROOF

---

<sup>7</sup>[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/100807/file47158.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/100807/file47158.pdf)

**CONSULTEES 1**

PRINTER'S PROOF

**CONSULTEES 2**

PRINTER'S PROOF

**INSIDE BACK COVER**

PRINTER'S PROOF



**BACK COVER**

PRINTER'S PROOF