



Department
for Education

Government response to the initial teacher training (ITT) market review report

December 2021

Contents

Foreword by Robin Walker MP, Minister of State for School Standards	4
Introduction	6
Part 1: Government response to the ITT market review	7
Timelines for implementation	7
Quality Requirements for ITT providers	7
Curriculum and intensive training and practice	8
Mentoring and guidance	10
Assessment of trainees	14
Providers' quality assurance	15
Structures and partnerships	15
Quality assurance of ITT provision	16
ITT routes, QTS and PGCE	18
The wider ITT system	20
Conclusion	22
Part 2: Question-by-question analysis of responses	23
Summary of responses received	23
Case for change	27
Quality Requirements for ITT providers	30
Curriculum	30
Mentoring	34
Assessment	35
Quality assurance	36
Structures and partnerships	37
QTS and the PGCE	38
Routes into teaching	39
Accreditation	41
Teaching school hubs	47
ITT as a system-wide responsibility	47
Recruitment and selection	49
Impact assessments	50

Final thoughts	51
Annex A: Quality Requirements for ITT providers	53
Annex B: Methodology of consultation analysis by York Consulting	69

Foreword by Robin Walker MP, Minister of State for School Standards

While many factors contribute to making a school great, it can ultimately only ever be as good as the people that work there. It is therefore vital that teachers and school leaders get the support they need to change the lives of the children they teach.

With the help and insight of those currently working in the sector, the Department for Education (DfE) is creating a world-class teacher development system that builds from initial teacher training (ITT) through to early career support, specialisation and then onto school leadership. Our vision is that a golden thread of evidence-informed training, support and professional development will run through each phase of every teacher's career. The ambition is excellence; teachers and their pupils deserve nothing less.

We have already made good progress. Since September 2020, all courses offered by accredited ITT providers have been aligned to the [ITT core content framework](#) (CCF), which sets out an ambitious minimum entitlement for trainee teachers. We have thousands of schools working with DfE-funded organisations that are delivering comprehensive programmes of training as part of the [early career framework](#) (ECF) reforms. As a result of these reforms, around 50,000 new teachers per year will undertake a mixture of online and face-to-face training with the support of a well-trained mentor. Together, these frameworks entitle all new teachers to at least 3 years of high-quality training, giving them a strong foundation on which to build a successful career in the profession.

Teachers need opportunities to develop their skills throughout their careers, not just in the first few years. We have launched a reformed suite of [national professional qualifications](#) (NPQs) that provide training and support for teachers and school leaders at all levels, from those who want to develop expertise in high-quality teaching practice to those leading multiple schools across trusts. For the next 3 years, all teachers and leaders employed at state-funded schools and organisations that offer 16-19 places can access one of 150,000 fully funded scholarships to start one of these NPQs.

There is clearly much to be proud of in our system of ITT, with areas of truly world-class practice delivered by providers of all types. However, to level up standards in every school, and for every child, we need to strive for excellence in all corners of the country. The evidence we have available suggests that we can do more to make sure that high-quality training is being consistently delivered across the whole system. That is why Ian Bauckham CBE, supported by other sector experts, was asked to chair a review of the ITT market for courses leading to qualified teacher status (QTS). This expert advisory group was tasked with making a set of recommendations that, building on our reforms to date, increase the quality, consistency and coherence of ITT, while protecting sufficiency of training places.

This document, the government's response to the ITT market review and the consultation on its recommendations, is the first step in defining what the new ITT market will look like. I am grateful to the members of the expert advisory group for their hard work in producing their recommendations, as well as to the many ITT providers, school leaders and teachers who, through responding to the consultation and engaging in discussion with the department, have helped shape this response. For the reforms to be a success, we need ITT providers and schools to continue to work with us to make sure that they are implemented with the quality that teachers deserve.

These reforms will make a real difference to teachers and the pupils they serve across the country. We need to make sure that all of our children and young people get the very best education. This relies on well-trained, well-supported teachers with the expertise needed to deliver great teaching every day, and there is no area more important to get right than the initial training of new entrants to the profession. As we implement these reforms, I will keep listening to the views of ITT providers, schools, pupils and parents. Together, we will create a truly world-class teacher development system that makes England the best place in the world to become a great teacher.

Robin Walker MP

Minister of State for School Standards

Introduction

The [ITT market review report](#) was published in July 2021. The report contains the expert advisory group's conclusions on the features and characteristics of world-class ITT, which were informed by evidence and practice from the UK and overseas. Its central recommendation is that all ITT courses leading to QTS should have to adhere to a set of Quality Requirements, and that all providers of these courses should go through an accreditation process to ensure they can meet the new requirements on an ongoing basis.

Alongside the publication of the review report, we launched a 7-week public consultation to give anyone with an interest in ITT an opportunity to share their views on the expert advisory group's recommendations and other aspects of the ITT market addressed in the report. Before, during and since the consultation, we have also been running stakeholder events focused on discussing the expert advisory group's recommendations.

Part 1 of this document is the government's response to the ITT market review report, setting out our decisions on which of the recommendations from the report will be accepted and how they will be implemented. Part 2 summarises the feedback received in answer to each question asked in the public consultation and describes how it has informed the response set out in part 1.

Annex A sets out the final Quality Requirements for ITT providers. The methodology used by York Consulting, the organisation contracted to independently analyse the consultation responses, is described in Annex B.

Part 1: Government response to the ITT market review

This section sets out our response to each of the 14 recommendations made in the ITT market review report. In reaching these responses, we have taken into consideration the views expressed by the sector through the public consultation and other engagement.

Timelines for implementation

We recognise and are grateful for the effort and dedication shown by the sector in response to the significant challenges posed by COVID-19. Our teachers will have a vital role in supporting pupils to get back on track with their education, so it is a key part of our education recovery strategy to improve the training and support that all teachers receive.

We want to see the reforms set out in the subsequent sections of this document implemented as soon as possible. The sooner we have an ITT system of the highest possible quality, the sooner new teachers and their pupils will benefit. However, we understand that for these reforms to be successful, we need to give schools and ITT providers enough time to prepare for their implementation. Having listened to the feedback from the sector, we have decided to extend the implementation timeline by one year, meaning that all ITT programmes leading to QTS will need to comply with the requirements set out in this document starting from the 2024/25 academic year.

Quality Requirements for ITT providers

Recommendations 1 to 7 relate to the proposed Quality Requirements, which the expert advisory group developed using current evidence for best practice in ITT and its members' knowledge of the sector.

Our responses to recommendations 1 to 7, set out below, do not discuss the expert advisory group's proposal that adherence to the Quality Requirements should be a condition of accreditation. This has been addressed separately in our response to recommendation 11.

The final text of the Quality Requirements for ITT providers can be found at Annex A. These Quality Requirements will be incorporated into the ITT criteria for the 2024/25 academic year onwards.

Curriculum and intensive training and practice

Recommendation 1: providers of ITT should develop an evidence-based training curriculum as a condition of accreditation which allows trainees to understand and apply the principles of the CCF in a controlled, cumulative and logical manner, as set out in the Quality Requirements.

The government accepts this recommendation with some clarifications.

Having considered the evidence set out in the review report, we agree that every ITT programme should be centred on a carefully sequenced, evidence-based curriculum that prepares trainees for success in the teaching profession.

These curricula must continue to cover all aspects of the CCF, which draws on the best available evidence from the UK and abroad on what makes for great teaching.

As set out in the CCF section on ‘Subject and Curriculum’, both trainee curricula and mentor training curricula will need to have strong subject-specific content that enables trainees to apply the evidence-based principles of effective teaching in the context of the subjects in which they are training to teach.

We are clear that the CCF is a minimum entitlement, not a full ITT curriculum, and providers should continue to exercise their autonomy in designing curricula appropriate for the particular subjects, phases and age ranges that their trainees will teach. Relevant subject-specific content, alongside critique of theory, research (including, where appropriate, their own) and expert practice, should be integrated into a sequenced and coherent curriculum that supports trainees to become effective teachers of their subjects and well-informed users of research and evidence in their classroom practice. We will not define an evidence base beyond that set out in the CCF but will use our quality assurance processes to ensure that evidence used is coherent with the framework.

We expect that, given the extension to the implementation timeline, providers will have sufficient time to develop their curricula as needed.

The evidence underpinning the CCF and ECF (and the new NPQs) was independently assessed and endorsed by the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) before publication of the frameworks. During our engagement with the sector, it was suggested that this evidence should be regularly reviewed. We accept the need for this as part of the ongoing evolution of all the frameworks that underpin our teacher development system and will work with the EEF and sector representatives to consider how it can best be achieved.

Recommendation 2: providers should design and deliver an intensive placement experience of at least 4 weeks (20 days) for single-year courses and 6 weeks (30 days) for undergraduate, over the duration of their course, as a condition of accreditation, that allows opportunities for groups of trainees to practise selected, sequenced components of their training curriculum, and receive highly targeted feedback, as set out in the Quality Requirements.

The government accepts this recommendation with some amendments.

There is a growing collection of evidence to support the value of practice-based teacher training; an approach to teacher training that emphasises the importance of neither knowledge nor practice alone, but the use of knowledge in practice. Practice-based teacher training underpins the model of intensive practice placements developed by the expert advisory group. Through this model, expert practice is demonstrated to trainees, who should be supported to understand exactly what it is that makes this practice effective and to think about how it could be embedded in their own teaching. Trainees should then have the opportunity to apply what they have learned through rehearsal or live practice, receiving constructive feedback on their delivery. The intention is to consolidate trainees' understanding of how the evidence base should shape teaching practice, which is a concept that can be applied to any subject, phase or age range. Use of this model should also increase coherence between the theory that is taught and its practice in schools.

We have made some changes to the model described in the review report in response to the feedback we received from the sector. While the vision and intent of intensive practice placements remains the same, these changes are intended to give providers greater flexibility in their delivery. We have also renamed this element to 'intensive training and practice', which we think better reflects the different ways in which it can be delivered without compromising the underlying principles.

We accept the expert advisory group's suggested minimum of 4 weeks of intensive training and practice for postgraduate trainees and 6 weeks for undergraduate trainees. However, we will give providers some discretion as to where and how this is delivered. The intensive training and practice element does not need to take place in consecutive weeks and, while trainees should be given the opportunity to apply what they have learned in a school, other parts of intensive training and practice could be delivered virtually, be pre-recorded or take place at the location of their training provider. If appropriate, trainees could also undertake intensive training and practice in one of their general placement schools, although this would need to be distinct from the general placement.

Given these amendments, we have not increased the minimum programme design requirement for school placements. This will remain at 120 days (24 weeks) for postgraduate and 24 or 32 weeks for undergraduate, depending on course length (see

page 58 for detail). The intensive training and practice element will have to take place in addition to this, but the settings in which it is delivered is up to the provider. We have accepted the other minimum time allocations relating to intensive training and practice (25 planned and supported hours per week and 4 or 5 hours of expert support per trainee per week, depending on course type).

To support the implementation of intensive training and practice, we will give providers up to £5.7 million in financial year 2024-25 to help meet the expert time needed to deliver this element and administrative costs to schools of organising this activity. Funding for intensive training and practice beyond 2024-25 will be subject to future Spending Review outcomes. Further details on funding for providers and schools can be found in the ITT: how to become an accredited provider guidance, which has been published on [Jaggaer](#).

To facilitate the sharing of good practice, we will also ask the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) and the National Association of School-Based Teacher Trainers (NASBTT) to work with us to produce exemplars of intensive training and practice.

Recommendation 9: single-year ITT courses that lead to QTS should be required to be of 38 weeks' duration, as a condition of accreditation, of which the minimum spent in schools should be 28 weeks.

The government accepts the recommendation with some amendments.

We agree with the expert advisory group's position that all ITT programmes should meet a minimum course length. We have considered the practical implications of a 38-week minimum duration for university-based courses and, following discussion with providers of these courses, have set the minimum at 36 weeks' duration for single-year courses leading to QTS. We know that many providers currently offer courses in excess of this and are clear that 36 weeks is a minimum requirement. Providers should continue to offer the course length that best meets the needs of their trainees.

As set out above, we have not increased the minimum programme design requirement for time spent in school. In addition to time spent in intensive training and practice, single-year postgraduate courses must be designed to include at least 120 days (24 weeks) of school placements. During this time, trainees should be in the classroom for an average of at least 15 hours each week. The Quality Requirements on curriculum have been amended to reflect these minimum time allocations.

Mentoring and guidance

As trainees spend at least two-thirds of their training in a school environment, the expertise of the staff that support them there is clearly a critical factor in ITT quality. Both

the current evidence base and the feedback we have had from the sector show that the quality of the mentoring received is a critical factor in trainees' development.

This means that it is essential that we focus on building mentoring capacity in schools. We expect to see more expertise develop in the system as teachers go through ECF mentor training and undertake the national professional qualification in leading teacher development (NPQLTD). We have invested £184 million to give state-funded schools and organisations that offer 16-19 places access to fully funded scholarships for the NPQLTD for their staff over the next 3 years.

Recommendation 3: providers should identify, as a condition of accreditation, sufficient 'lead mentors' who will ensure that trainees receive mentoring and support across placement schools which is aligned with the curriculum and informed by practice at all times, as set out in the Quality Requirements.

The government accepts this recommendation with some amendments.

We agree with the expert advisory group that mentor training and supervision, as well as the design and oversight of intensive training and practice, should be led by someone with deep knowledge of the training curriculum and its application in the teaching of specific subjects. We have heard that the 'lead mentor' role described in the review report already exists for some providers, sometimes shared across multiple people. We want providers to have the flexibility to continue working in this way, so have amended the Quality Requirements on mentoring and guidance to enable providers to operate a 'lead mentor' or 'mentor leadership team' model as is most appropriate.

As mentoring is such an important aspect of ITT, we agree that those who undertake the role need to have dedicated training and professional development. We know that there is some excellent training for mentors already being delivered across the system, including at master's level. We expect that lead mentors and mentor leadership team members will cover much of the same training content as general mentors, but in greater depth to ensure they are fully prepared to deliver the lead mentor functions.

We have taken into account the capacity of lead mentors and mentor leadership team members when considering the expert advisory group's recommendations on training. Having reviewed the feedback from consultation respondents, we have reduced the minimum initial training hours that all lead mentors and all members of a mentor leadership team need to undertake from 36 to 30. Given the importance we place on training and developing teachers and other professionals in this role, we will be providing schools with funding to obtain teaching cover while mentors are undertaking training.

The report suggested a 1:50 minimum ratio for lead mentors to trainees, but consultation feedback suggested that this is not sufficiently personal and so we have not set a minimum requirement. However, for the purpose of calculating funding requirements, we

have assumed that providers will have no more than one lead mentor to every 25 trainees. Grants will therefore be distributed based on number of lead mentors, up to this maximum.

Recommendation 4: providers should ensure that lead mentors take one of: the NPQLTD, one of the other 2 specialist NPQs, or training with the equivalent content and quality, as a condition of accreditation; and every school which hosts a trainee has at least one member of staff who is undertaking or has completed the course.

The government accepts this recommendation as an ambition but not as a requirement.

We want our teachers and school leaders to continue developing knowledge and expertise throughout the duration of their career. Our new NPQs have been designed to provide appropriate training and support at all levels. Every teacher and school leader at a state-funded school or organisation that offers 16-19 places can access a fully funded scholarship for any of the NPQs until 2024.

The NPQLTD is aimed at teachers with responsibility for the training and development of others, including teacher trainees and early career teachers. It has been designed with teacher wellbeing in mind and has an updated assessment process to reduce workload burden. It is our firm ambition that, in addition to their provider's lead mentor training, lead mentors and those in mentor leadership teams undertake the NPQLTD or training with equivalent content and quality. However, we recognise the reasons given by the sector as to why this may not always be possible, such as school capacity, staff turnover and mentors' prior professional development. In acknowledgement of this, while we are clear that providers should strive to meet this ambition, we will not make it a requirement.

Some respondents to the consultation also had concerns about whether placement schools have the capacity needed to ensure they always have a member of staff who has completed the NPQLTD. We believe that the NPQLTD has the potential to significantly benefit schools' ability to train and develop teachers and so strongly encourage all state-funded schools and organisations that offer 16-19 places to take advantage of the scholarships on offer over the next 3 years. Again, however, this will not be mandated.

Recommendation 5: providers should develop a detailed training curriculum for mentors at all levels, as a condition of accreditation, including elements specific to subject and phase, and minimum time allocations for delivering this should be required, as set out in the Quality Requirements.

The government accepts this recommendation with some amendments.

Given the important role mentoring plays in overall ITT quality, we agree with the expert advisory group that providers need to train both their lead and general mentors using

appropriate initial and refresher training curricula. We also agree that there should be a defined minimum length of time that mentors must spend on their training and development both initially and throughout their time in the role.

We have listened to the points made by the sector on the suggested minimum initial training times, notably the additional workload they would place on mentors and the challenge for schools in providing enough off-timetable time to meet the minimum requirement.

In response to the feedback received, we have lowered the minimum initial training time for general mentors to 20 hours from the proposed 24 and have reduced minimum mentor support for trainees during general placements from 2 to 1.5 hours per week.

We also encourage providers to think about how their mentor training might be delivered flexibly. This could include considering whether it might be appropriate for some elements to take place virtually; we know providers have been able to do this effectively during the pandemic and hope to see this built upon.

We agree that training should not be a one-off activity, so have accepted the minimum times for annual refresher training of 6 hours for general mentors and 12 hours for lead mentors. Once mentors have completed initial training, they should move to their provider's annual refresher training and development programme.

Investing in ITT mentoring will improve teaching quality and teacher retention and will create a better-supported career pathway by providing mentors with valuable professional development opportunities. This is why we are making grant funding of up to £15 million for general mentors and up to £10 million for lead mentors available to providers and schools in the 2024-25 financial year, to help secure backfill for staff taken out of classrooms for initial general and lead mentor training and to fulfil lead mentor duties (such as spending time with trainees and general mentors). Funding for both initial and refresher training following 2024-25 will be subject to future Spending Reviews. Further details on funding can be found in the ITT: how to become an accredited provider guidance.

We have also considered the views expressed by the sector about the importance of taking into account mentors' prior training and experience. We are clear that every provider must have full training curricula for mentors at all levels that meet the minimum time requirements. We will not be prescribing the content of the training; the curricula should be designed by individual accredited providers in alignment with their ITT curricula. The curricula must ensure that mentors have specific expertise in the evidence-based approaches set out in the trainee curriculum, so that trainees receive strong and consistent input on the best-evidenced ways of teaching their subject and phase. In determining the exact emphasis of their mentor training, providers will want to consider the prior learning of their mentor cohort. Providers should not require mentors to repeat any training but should adapt the delivery of the mentor training curriculum to meet

individual needs. Where specific material has already been covered, this may include a reduction in the total hours of training required. Without exception, however, providers must be able to demonstrate that all mentors have been trained in all areas of the mentor training curriculum.

The Quality Requirements on mentoring and guidance have been updated to reflect both these changes and the revised minimum time allocations.

Assessment of trainees

Recommendation 6: providers should demonstrate the capacity to develop an assessment framework reflecting the priorities as set out in the Quality Requirements for assessment, as a condition of accreditation.

The government accepts this recommendation with some clarifications.

Throughout their time in ITT, all trainees should receive purposeful, constructive feedback that supports them to refine their knowledge and skills and achieve classroom readiness. To give this feedback, providers will need to ensure they are able to accurately assess trainees' progress. For this reason, we agree with the expert advisory group that all providers should have a high-quality, curriculum-aligned assessment framework.

Our engagement with the sector indicates that there is support for this proposal. Some consultation respondents did suggest that wording of the Quality Requirements overemphasises trainee knowledge at the expense of practice. We have addressed this feedback by amending the text of the Quality Requirements on assessment. The updated wording clarifies that providers' assessment frameworks should examine both trainees' recall of the knowledge and skills set out in the curriculum and their ability to apply them to classroom practice.

We are clear that we do not want these frameworks to produce rigid assessment structures that must be uniformly applied to all trainees. As noted above, our intention in accepting this recommendation is simply to ensure that providers have robust systems in place to identify and understand trainee progress and to use this understanding to inform planning. In developing their frameworks, providers will have the freedom to tailor assessment to suit their own context, including utilising subject specialists or other sector experts in their design.

Providers' quality assurance

Recommendation 7: providers should design and implement rigorous quality assurance arrangements as set out in the Quality Requirements, as a condition of accreditation.

The government accepts this recommendation.

We see ITT providers' quality assurance of their own provision as essential to making sure the experience of their trainees is consistently high-quality. We know that the sector agrees with this principle, and many of those we engaged with told us that their current quality assurance processes already meet the proposed requirements. We think it is important that we ensure the consistency of these processes across partnerships, and therefore the consistency of programme quality across the market.

However, we want to emphasise that while overall responsibility for quality assurance sits with the accredited provider, partnerships should be engaging in joint efforts to ensure the quality of their provision.

Structures and partnerships

The proposed Quality Requirements on structures and partnerships explain how providers must demonstrate that they have the capacity, alone or with partners, to deliver an ITT programme that meets the requirements set out in the preceding 4 sections.

Although this section of the Quality Requirements is not referenced in any of the recommendations, it is important that all accredited providers have a clear plan to deliver ITT to the required standard. As such, we will be incorporating the Quality Requirements on structures and partnerships into the ITT criteria from 2024/25 alongside the other Quality Requirements.

We know that logistical, geographical or resourcing challenges might make it particularly difficult for smaller or rural providers to meet the Quality Requirements or to enter a partnership through which they can do so. Feedback from the consultation made clear how important it is that all geographical locations and contexts have access to high-quality ITT provision. We agree with this and recognise the importance of enabling providers of different types and sizes, and in different contexts, to operate in the market. The extension to the implementation timeline will give those providers with less resource more time to develop their programmes or to form or join appropriate partnerships.

We want organisations involved in ITT to have the flexibility to form partnerships that are suited to their circumstances. We do not intend to be prescriptive on the structure of the partnerships, as long as the key responsibilities of 'accredited provider' (full accountability for all aspects of training design, delivery and quality across the partnership), 'lead

partner' (operational or strategic role with responsibilities such as involvement in curriculum design, supplying lead mentors or running intensive training and practice) and 'placement school' (providing placements and general mentors) are delivered and capacity to meet the Quality Requirements is demonstrated. There are cases where this will require the formation of new partnerships, but some existing partnerships or single organisations may achieve this without making any changes.

We would expect that the accredited provider will involve their lead partners and placement schools in programme development to ensure that delivery of teaching is appropriate to the settings trainees will be working in.

Quality assurance of ITT provision

Recommendation 11: prospective accredited providers of ITT should go through a new, rigorous accreditation process to ensure that they are able to fully deliver the Quality Requirements.

The government accepts this recommendation.

To achieve our aim of giving every trainee in the country access to the highest quality ITT, we need to know that those providing ITT have properly planned to incorporate the Quality Requirements into their delivery models, courses and curricula. We believe that the best way to achieve this is for all providers to undergo an accreditation process through which they can demonstrate alignment of their programmes to the Quality Requirements.

In designing the accreditation process, we have given careful consideration to the feedback we have received about the time and resource applicants will need to prepare their applications. We will run the accreditation process in the 2021/22 and 2022/23 academic years, finishing well in advance of the 2023/24 recruitment cycle. This is a one-year extension to the timeline we consulted on, which was the length most commonly requested by consultation respondents.

Applicants will be able to apply for accreditation in application rounds taking place in 2022. There will be at least 2 application rounds, and any provider that is not successful in the first round will be able to re-apply in later round(s) if they wish to. They will be asked to demonstrate, through written answers to questions concerning their plans for curricula, mentoring and partnerships, how their proposed provision delivers against the CCF and the ITT criteria for 2024/25. We will also take financial viability to deliver ITT into account.

If applicants are awarded accreditation, they will have a minimum of 12 months to develop their curricula ahead of September 2024 delivery. A post-accreditation follow-up

process will take place between the point of accreditation and the start of programme delivery. During this process, we will ask providers to submit a number of curriculum samples and discuss their mentoring plans and partnership proposals. We will work closely with providers to ensure feedback from these and from the accreditation assessment is built into a mutually agreed action plan.

Providers that successfully pass one of the 2022 accreditation rounds will receive a grant of £25,000 to support them to implement the review's recommendations ahead of course delivery in September 2024. This grant is designed to assist with the administrative costs of designing curricula in line with the Quality Requirements and to support providers in maintaining their other courses where applicable, such as early years (EY) ITT or further education (FE) ITE. Further details on funding for providers and schools can be found in the ITT: how to become an accredited provider guidance.

Once ITT programme delivery for the 2024/25 academic year begins, accredited providers will undergo external quality assurance, as standard, via a regular cycle of assessment by Ofsted in line with the inspection handbook. Alongside this, providers must implement internal quality assurance processes as described in the Quality Requirements for quality assurance. This will ensure that all accredited providers continue to deliver against the high standards expected from ITT providers. Although we will be keeping this under review, we are not envisaging another accreditation process for the whole sector for the foreseeable future.

The extension of the delivery timeline to September 2024, and the minimum of 2 rounds in which applicants can apply for accreditation, should give those with limited capacity to dedicate to the accreditation process additional time to complete their preparations or to form or join other ITT partnerships to develop the capacity needed to meet the new requirements.

All those wishing to provide accredited ITT from the 2024/25 academic year should refer to the ITT: how to become an accredited provider guidance.

Recommendation 12: DfE formally notifies providers who do not meet aspects of the Quality Requirements, as set out in the ITT criteria. Where this is the case, DfE should mandate support between providers to ensure improvement as a condition of continued accreditation. Where a provider is unable or unwilling to improve, DfE should broker transfer of trainees to another provider.

The government accepts this recommendation in principle.

We agree that providers should be monitored post-accreditation to ensure their courses remain compliant with the Quality Requirements.

DfE already has, and will retain, the powers to formally notify underperforming providers of an improvement period before re-inspection and, if improvement is not made, to withdraw accreditation and broker the transfer of trainees to another provider.

Ofsted will continue to inspect ITT delivery. The current inspection cycle will be completed earlier than expected, by July 2024. As part of our approach to external quality assurance, Ofsted will move to a 3-year inspection cycle from September 2024. We will retain our existing powers to formally notify underperforming providers of an improvement period before re-inspection and, in line with the [provider closure and withdrawal of ITT accreditation guidance](#), to withdraw accreditation if improvement is not made. If a provider is unable or unwilling to improve, or chooses to withdraw from ITT for other reasons, we will monitor the transfer of trainees to another provider.

We intend to take a more proactive role in ensuring that there are enough high-quality training places across the country to serve the workforce needs of local schools. We will be monitoring sufficiency closely and considering the most effective ways to intervene in cases of underperformance and in areas with insufficient supply of teacher training places.

ITT routes, QTS and PGCE

We welcome the opportunity presented by the expert advisory group's recommendations to define all ITT that leads to QTS within 3 core routes of undergraduate, postgraduate fee-funded and postgraduate employment-based.

We know that some prospective trainees find the current approach to application confusing. Many of those responding to the consultation saw scope to improve the clarity prospective trainees have about the way in which the market operates. We have heard during our engagement that, as a result of the reforms to market structure, providers and their partners should be able to establish streamlined recruitment and selection processes. This will simplify the ITT landscape for applicants and improve their experience of the application process. We hope that providers will take this opportunity to share best recruitment practice within their partnerships.

We agree that the reforms described in this document are applicable to all 3 core routes. In reaching this decision, we have considered the points raised by the sector regarding implementation in undergraduate and postgraduate employment-based courses. The main concern for undergraduate courses was the limited time available for students to fulfil the requirements of their degree if the minimum weeks spent in schools were to increase as proposed. For employment-based ITT, the increased expense of losing a salaried teacher to intensive training and practice was noted. We have carefully considered these route-specific concerns and expect that they will be addressed by the

adjustments we have made to the expert advisory group's recommendations on intensive training and practice and minimum time spent in schools.

It should be noted that ITT courses that begin prior to the 2024/25 academic year and are scheduled to finish after September 2024 (for example, multi-year undergraduate courses beginning in 2022/23 or 2023/34) will not be required to comply with the Quality Requirements.

These reforms do not apply to EY ITT or FE ITE programmes. As is currently the case, however, organisations offering ITT courses leading to early years teacher status must also be accredited for ITT leading to QTS. This means that those wishing to recommend candidates for the award of early years teacher status will need to apply for accreditation through the new process, although the EY ITT courses themselves will not have to adhere to the Quality Requirements.

Recommendation 8: DfE should facilitate any accredited providers which wish to do so, to partner with an institution, such as the Institute of Teaching when it is ready, to offer their postgraduate award.

The government accepts this recommendation.

In addition to recommending candidates for QTS, accredited ITT providers that hold degree awarding powers (DAPs) are able to offer postgraduate academic awards such as the PGCE.

Providers without DAPs are still able to offer courses leading to award of the PGCE if they partner with a degree awarding organisation to do so. We appreciate that ability to combine a postgraduate academic award with QTS can be an integral part of an ITT provider's offer to candidates and so we are committed to ensuring that all accredited providers have access to such partnerships.

In future years, the new Institute of Teaching will seek to acquire DAPs and establish another avenue for providers to offer PGCE courses at a fair and manageable cost. We believe that, as the country's flagship teacher development provider, the Institute of Teaching will represent an attractive partner for accredited providers.

It will remain up to individual providers to decide whether to offer the PGCE and, if so, with which partner institution. While we appreciate the value that academic awards represent for many trainees, we are clear that QTS-only routes will remain available; as noted by the sector, these routes are more suitable for some trainees due to the increased flexibility they provide.

The wider ITT system

Recommendation 10: teaching school hubs should partner with an accredited provider to play a role in the delivery of ITT (unless they are operating at accredited provider level). DfE should place a requirement on teaching school hubs to support local ITT delivery in specific strategic ways as required, for example through building school capacity for ITT by building an active mentor network in the local area, providing specific support for schools serving disadvantaged communities to enable them to engage with ITT, or modelling high-quality intensive practice placements for other schools undertaking this aspect of ITT for the first time.

The government accepts this recommendation.

As centres of excellence for teacher development covering every region of the country, teaching school hubs are critical to our ambition of providing teachers with high-quality professional development at all stages of their career.

We think it is right that teaching school hubs have a core responsibility for the delivery of ITT. This responsibility can currently be fulfilled in different ways, depending on local context, and we wish to maintain this flexibility. However, we are clear that all teaching school hubs must be part of an accredited provider partnership. This may be as the accredited provider or as a lead partner; each hub should consider local training needs and infrastructure when determining its role in ITT.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to the inclusion of teaching school hubs in ITT. We appreciate that our vision of an easily accessible ITT market, based on quality provision, may be achieved through different partnership structures. We expect that the future market will have some accredited providers with one teaching school hub in their partnership, while others may have several and some may have none. In some cases, hubs may wish to work with multiple accredited providers.

While we strongly encourage ITT providers to form relationships with teaching school hubs, we have listened to the feedback from the consultation on the logistical difficulties associated with this. It will not be mandatory for every provider to work with a hub. Providers should, however, be able to demonstrate how they have considered existing teacher development architecture, including teaching school hubs and other specialist hubs, in forming their delivery networks.

We agree with the expert advisory group that teaching school hubs should play an active part in their area's ITT delivery beyond their role in a provider partnership, and we were pleased to see that consultation responses had an overall positive sentiment towards increased involvement of teaching school hubs in ITT.

The teaching school hub grant for infrastructure and capacity building currently stands at

between £170,000 and £220,000 for each teaching school hub per academic year. From the 2024/25 academic year, we will make it a requirement of the grant for teaching school hubs to support local delivery of ITT in specific strategic ways, such as those set out in the expert advisory group's recommendation. Some preparatory activity may be needed from September 2023.

To support teaching school hubs with any additional responsibilities arising from this recommendation, we will consider whether extra funding may be required to top up the core grant. Further information on this will be communicated to teaching school hubs in due course.

We will be monitoring the shape of the ITT market as it responds to the outcomes of the market review and will work with both the Teaching School Hubs Council and accredited providers to make sure all teaching school hubs can fulfil their ITT delivery function.

Recommendation 13: DfE and Ofsted should explore how involvement in ITT might be included in the education inspection framework.

The government does not accept this recommendation but commits to reviewing any emerging evidence on the impact of school involvement in ITT on education and to working with Ofsted to review findings from its upcoming research into effective teacher development in schools.

As the majority of ITT is spent in schools, having enough high-quality school placements is fundamental to ensuring the quality and sufficiency of teachers entering the system each year.

While all schools benefit from the pipeline of teachers, there are significant benefits for those schools that actively participate. Involvement in ITT offers professional development opportunities for the staff that support trainees in schools and can also put schools in direct contact with the latest evidence and research on what works in teaching.

We will not require schools to participate in ITT or require Ofsted to judge a school on the basis of its involvement, as we need more evidence on how involvement in ITT improves the educational outcomes of pupils. We do see this as an important area of research and, alongside Ofsted, will review any emerging evidence on this. Ofsted already plans to explore the main features of effective teacher development in schools through its 2-year independent review of teachers' professional development, starting this academic year. As this research is carried out and its findings are published, we will work with Ofsted to consider their relevance to ITT.

Recommendation 14: as trusts grow, there should be an expectation that they actively meet their responsibilities for ITT involvement in the areas they serve. Regional school commissioners should therefore consider involvement in ITT as a condition of growth for trusts. DfE should also make ITT involvement part of the eligibility for academy funding streams, such as the Trust Capacity Fund or sponsor grants.

The government accepts this recommendation in principle.

We agree with the expert advisory group's position that all high-achieving school trusts should be involved in ITT, helping to support and protect the pipeline of qualified teachers.

We know that most trusts are already involved in ITT delivery in some form, such as by providing school placements. However, we have heard through the consultation that there is support for increasing the inclusion of trusts in the ITT system.

The availability of high-quality school placements is vital for ITT. We are exploring ways to ensure that their availability is maintained and made resilient, a piece of work that will include considering how we might use funding streams, such as trust capacity funding, to support this. We will set out our final position in due course.

Additionally, we will undertake a piece of work that will consider our expectations from trusts in supporting the training of the next generation of teachers.

Conclusion

We are grateful to the expert advisory group for its recommendations and to all those who have taken the time to engage with the ITT market review. We have carefully considered the views expressed during all aspects of this engagement in formulating this response and we expect that the amendments and clarifications we have made, alongside the up to £35.7 million we are investing over the next Spending Review period, will enable providers to address the implementation challenges identified.

We are confident that, taken together, these reforms will achieve our aim of enabling all trainees to benefit from a world-class system of teacher development from ITT onwards. By ensuring our teachers have the training and expertise to deliver the highest quality teaching, we can support our pupils to achieve the very best outcomes possible.

Part 2: Question-by-question analysis of responses

Summary of responses received

The consultation ran from 5 July 2021 to 22 August 2021. It generated a total of 823 responses. This consists of 793 responses received through the online platform, 3 emailed responses in the format set out by the consultation document and 27 emailed responses that did not align to the consultation questions and were analysed separately. The 823 responses included submissions both from those responding in an individual capacity and submissions on behalf of an organisation. We also received responses from sector representative organisations with hundreds of members.

York Consulting carried out detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of all the responses received from the consultation. A summary of the methodology used can be found at Annex B.

A breakdown by organisation type of the 796 respondents whose submissions aligned with the consultation format is provided in Table 1. It should be noted that, as the consultation gave respondents the option to select more than one organisation type, each respondent was given a single organisation type to enable qualitative analysis. The organisation type assigned was based on the order of Table 1; for example, if a respondent identified as both an accredited provider of school-centred ITT (SCITT) and as a placement school, they would be coded as a SCITT only.

Respondents by organisation type	Total (n=796)	Percent
ITT providers	331	42%
HEIs providing postgraduate or undergraduate ITT	102	13%
School providers – SCITTs, School Direct lead and partner schools (salaried or unsalaried)	229	29%
Schools	135	17%
Primary or secondary placement schools	123	15%
Teaching school hubs	11	1%
Non-placement schools	1	<1%
Representative bodies	29	4%
Other	301	38%

Table 1 Consultation responses by organisation type

Respondents that identified as 'other' included those responding as an individual employed by or on behalf of FE ITE providers, education charities, subject associations,

research organisations and local authorities. This group also included those responding as individuals that are now or have previously been enrolled in an ITT programme or are current or former teachers.

Table 2 sets out which roles in the ITT system are held by those responding to the consultation.

Respondents by role	Total (n=796)	Percent
Currently undertaking ITT	5	1%
Completed an ITT programme within the last 5 years	64	8%
Currently an ITT mentor	144	18%
Currently employed as a teacher	97	12%
Interest in ITT for another reason	200	25%
None	286	36%

Table 2 Consultation responses by individual role

Respondents that identified that they were ‘interested in ITT for another reason’ included school ITT co-ordinators, ITT course lecturers and tutors, former teachers and independent education consultants. The majority of those who selected ‘none’ did so because they were responding on behalf of an organisation.

Respondents employed by or answering on behalf of an accredited provider of ITT were asked both how many trainees their organisation had and how many subjects and phases they offered in the 2020/21 academic year. Most accredited ITT providers had 100 or fewer trainees, although 22% had over 200 (Table 3).

Number of trainees in 2020/21	Total (n=283)	Percent
0-10	32	11%
11-25	36	13%
26-50	71	25%
51-100	50	18%
101-150	18	6%
151-200	12	4%
200+	64	23%

Table 3 Number of trainees hosted by providers in 2020/21

Organisations were most likely to offer between 6 and 15 subjects, while a smaller proportion offered 5 or less or 16 or more (Table 4).

Number of subjects in 2021/21	Total (n=271)	Percent
0-5	58	21%
6-10	75	28%
11-15	97	36%
16-20	36	13%
20+	5	2%

Table 4 Number of subjects offered by providers in 2020/21

The 3 phases of ITT leading to QTS recognised in the ITT criteria are 3 to 11 (primary), 7 to 14 (middle) and 11 to 19 (secondary). Providers most commonly offered 2 phases, with smaller proportions offering 1 or 3 phases (Table 5). Those that stated that they offer more than 3 phases were likely from organisations using different methods to define age phases.

Number of phases in 2021/21	Total (n=279)	Percent
1	67	24%
2	117	42%
3	64	23%
4+	31	11%

Table 5 Number of phases offered by providers in 2020/21

Finally, respondents were asked which Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) region they were based in. All regions were represented, but a larger proportion of respondents were from the South-East and South London and East of England and North-East London, while a smaller proportion of respondents represented West Midlands, Lancashire and West Yorkshire, South-West England and North of England (Table 6).

Regional Schools Commissioner region	Total (n=796)	Percent
East Midlands and the Humber	102	13%
East of England and North-East London	173	22%
Lancashire and West Yorkshire	58	7%
North of England	75	9%
North-West London and South-Central England	94	12%
South-East and South London	170	21%
South-West England	72	9%
West Midlands	50	6%
Not answered	2	<1%

Table 6 Consultation responses by RSC region

The conclusions described below regarding the views of the sector are based solely on the perceptions of this particular group of respondents; as engagement with the consultation was on a self-selecting basis, these conclusions carry an unavoidable risk of self-selection bias.

It should be noted when considering the feedback received from the sector through the consultation that there were cases where the same word-for-word answer was submitted by multiple respondents. Often, the repeated response had been published online by the organisation that originally submitted it. Approximately 16% of submissions exactly or closely followed responses from one of 13 different organisations; 4 universities, 3 university associations, 2 teacher representative bodies, 2 subject-specific organisations and 2 multi-academy trusts.

Case for change

Question 7: Which of the themes set out in the report do you particularly recognise as key area(s) where there is an opportunity to further increase the quality of ITT?

Key area	Total	Percent
High-quality mentoring to ensure that mentors both know and understand the training curriculum and have a sufficient level of influence over the progress of trainees	426	53%
A supply of enough high-quality placements with the capacity to fully support the delivery of the trainee curriculum	413	52%
Consistency across partnerships and between providers in the content and quality of the training curriculum	350	44%
Clarity about the way in which the market operates for potential trainees	318	40%
Alignment between the taught curriculum and training environments, in particular teaching placement schools	315	40%
Sufficient opportunities for trainees to benefit from highly focused practice of, and feedback on, essential components of the curriculum	300	38%
Rigorous sequencing of the training curriculum	244	31%
None of the above	227	28%

Table 7 Themes respondents indicated could increase ITT quality

The majority of respondents to the consultation (72%) identified at least one of the themes set out in the report as a key aspect of ITT where there is an opportunity to further increase quality. High-quality mentoring was the most commonly recognised area for improvement, selected in over half (53%) of the submissions received. Supply of high-quality placements (52%) and consistency of the training curriculum across partnerships and ITT providers (44%) were also frequently identified by respondents as particular challenges.

Many respondents provided comments elaborating on the reasons for their selections. For mentoring, which was widely regarded to be a critical aspect of ITT, respondents identified various issues with the current system, including high turnover among mentors, reliance on the goodwill of teaching staff, variable understanding of the mentoring role, quality of support provided (particularly for subject-specific areas) and the cost to schools of releasing mentors from timetabled classes to allow them to fulfil their responsibilities. It was suggested that financial support for obtaining staff cover, mentor training and to

support joint research and sharing of best practice would go some way to addressing these issues. Teaching school hubs were also raised as a possible route to developing a community of practice for mentors.

In reflecting on consistency of the training curriculum across partnerships and between providers, some respondents argued that consistency, while important, should not come at the expense of regard for local context. There was some suggestion that a move to larger partnerships, which was seen by some to be the intent of the review, would create distance between providers and the individual schools they work with, damaging the open and collaborative relationships that currently exist and possibly leading to those schools ceasing to offer placements. This point was repeated in comments on the theme of placement sufficiency, alongside suggestions that trainees should have a range of placements to gain experience of teaching across different settings.

Of the 28% that did not identify any of the options provided as an area for improvement, some expressed that no changes to the ITT system are required as the system is already high-quality, and the proposals outlined are either already in place or are existing best practice. Some respondents noted the recent implementation of the CCF and new Ofsted inspection framework, suggesting that time needs to be given for these to take effect before any further changes are made. Others queried the evidence underpinning the recommendations or suggested that a more bespoke system would better meet the needs of both providers and trainees. A further group raised concerns about potential unintended consequences of any changes, including increased pressure on schools and a decrease in quality of training, placement supply and autonomy of partner schools.

Question 8: Do you think that there are any other key areas for improvement in the ITT system that are not included in the above list?

Some of the areas more commonly raised in answer to this question included greater consistency in subject-specific training and pedagogical studies, greater focus on university-based studies regardless of route, adequate costing and funding of ITT delivery and a review of application processes to ensure consistency between routes and align recruitment with the market needs of the local area.

Other responses centred on areas in which improvements could be made to support teacher retention. Some suggested that more emphasis should be placed on the variety of settings that trainees gain experience in, taking into account factors such as pupil premium funding level, Ofsted rating and number of students with special educational needs and disabilities or English as an additional language. It was also proposed that there should be greater focus on equipping trainees with coping mechanisms to manage stress and improve wellbeing.

Government response to feedback on key areas for improvement

We agree with the review's assessment of the elements of ITT that have potential for improvement. Responses to question 7 identified 3 elements of particular importance: high-quality mentoring, access to high-quality placements for all trainees, and consistency in content and quality of training curricula across partnerships. We believe that the reforms set out in part 1 of the government response will make significant progress towards addressing these issues.

We acknowledge the additional key areas for improvement raised in response to consultation question 8 and would expect that some of those that were frequently raised will also be affected by the new requirements. For example, the Quality Requirements should increase consistency in curriculum quality, including subject-specific elements, across ITT partnerships. As curricula are still required to cover all principles of the CCF, providers must ensure that trainees are given the opportunity to learn how to manage their workload and wellbeing, protecting time for rest and recovery and being aware of the sources of support available. The Quality Requirements on structures and partnerships specify that providers must be clear on how they will ensure trainees are prepared to teach pupils in schools across a full range of contexts found in their local area, such as those serving disadvantaged communities or those judged to require improvement.

A proportion of respondents suggested that no changes to the current system are needed. We disagree with this view; the available evidence, supported by most recent Ofsted inspection results, suggests that there is variation in practice across the system, and that we can do more to improve quality, consistency and coherence of ITT across the system. The recommendations to achieve this set out in the review report were informed by the latest relevant national and international evidence (including the evidence on the characteristics of effective teaching that underpins both the CCF and ECF and was independently assessed and endorsed by the EEF) and the knowledge and experience of the expert advisory group and stakeholders.

Question 9: If you think that there are alternative approaches to addressing these challenges, please specify what these are.

Most respondents did suggest alternative approaches to addressing the challenges to high-quality, consistent ITT provision identified by the review. The alternative most commonly proposed was to increase sharing of best practice between providers by funding a provider-to-provider support network, helping organisations learn from examples proven to be working in the market already.

Other respondents suggested that, in acknowledgement of the challenges arising from the COVID-19 pandemic that the education system is dealing with, and the elements of the teacher developer reforms still being implemented throughout the system, any reforms should be implemented later than the proposed date of September 2023.

Some responses highlighted the importance of retaining diversity in the teacher training market, particularly with regard to maintaining involvement of HEIs. Reflecting the diversity of the market, some respondents proposed that Ofsted inspections should be utilised to identify areas of weakness in specific routes or providers and support should be targeted to these areas, rather than the market as a whole. Similarly, others called for discussion with the sector to identify issues specific to particular settings that could be resolved on a smaller scale or through a more flexible approach.

Government response to feedback on alternative approaches to addressing challenges

We know that, in some cases, providers may already be delivering a programme that meets all the new requirements. However, we think that it is right for every ITT course in the market to meet the standard set by the new Quality Requirements as soon as possible, and our firm view is that the best way to achieve this is through an accreditation process that ensures delivery to that standard by September 2024. In addition to the reforms, we continue to encourage sharing of best practice between providers and will ask UCET and NASBTT to work with us to support this.

In response to concerns around the additional burden that the changes may impose on the sector in a time when it is already facing significant workload, we have postponed first delivery of the new requirements by one year, to September 2024.

We strongly agree with the views expressed around the importance of diversity in ITT and would emphasise that these reforms are not about diminishing the role of any particular type of provision in the ITT market but about ensuring our ITT system is the best it can be by further improving quality and consistency of provision.

Quality Requirements for ITT providers

Curriculum

Question 10: Please provide any comments you have on a) the proposed approach to intensive practice placements, b) any barriers to implementation, and c) any support you would need to overcome these barriers.

There was some support for the proposed model of intensive practice placements, with respondents citing the opportunity it would provide for expert teachers to engage with a larger number of trainees per cohort. However, a recurring theme across responses was that the approach was seen to be one-size-fits-all, exemplified by its delivery in groups, and inconsiderate of the complexities of teaching and learning how to teach. Some argued that the intensive practice placements sounded inflexible, making them particularly ill-suited to teaching of subject-specific pedagogy. Other respondents felt that the way the proposed placements would be delivered is not representative of a real

school environment and questioned the evidence that the model is effective. Some suggested a pilot before wider rollout.

A number of respondents, those from placement schools in particular, raised practical considerations regarding the limited capacity and geographical disparity of schools able and, given the possible disruption to teacher timetabling and pupil learning, willing to host intensive placements. The point was raised that capacity might be limited still further as, due to the increased workload and scrutiny on their practice, delivering the intensive placements would not be seen by teachers as a desirable role. A significant proportion of respondents suggested that these capacity issues might be overcome if funding were provided to support time away from the classroom for relevant staff, or to encourage schools to offer intensive practice placements. In some cases, the argument was made that intensive placements would leave less time for trainees to focus on theory, necessitating funding to provide training for mentors to allow them to compensate.

Government response to feedback on intensive practice placements

Our response to the recommendation on intensive practice placements (recommendation 2), and to the feedback that we received on it via the consultation, is set out on pages 9-10.

The amendments detailed there accommodate the concerns listed above, by giving providers greater flexibility and making available funding to support implementation, while preserving the vision and intent of the original recommendation.

Given the evidence base that informs our model of intensive training and practice, we are confident that an initial pilot is not needed.

Question 11: Please provide any comments that you have on the minimum timings set out in the table below.

ITT minimum time allocations	Postgraduate	Undergraduate
Total weeks of course	38	N/A
Minimum weeks in school placements (including general and intensive placements)	28	40
Minimum weeks in intensive placements (not necessarily consecutive)	4	6
Minimum hours in classrooms (including observing, teaching, co-teaching, etc.) each week during general school placements	15	15
Minimum hours mentoring each week during general school placements	2	2
Minimum planned and supported hours per week during intensive placement*	25	25
Minimum hours of expert support per trainee per week during intensive placement**	5	4
Minimum hours initial training time for general mentors	24	24
Minimum hours initial training time for lead mentors	36	36
Minimum hours annual refresher training for mentors	6	6
Minimum hours annual refresher training for lead mentors	12	12
Minimum ratio of lead mentors:trainees (FTE)	1:50	1:50

Table 8 Minimum time allocations proposed by the ITT market review

The majority of feedback received in response to this question focused on the 4 minimum time allocations relating to mentor training. While there was some acceptance of the principle that mentors need training to prepare for taking on trainees, the minimum timings were widely seen to be too high for many schools to accommodate without

* This means 25 hours of the trainees' time during this intensive training & practice period must be planned activity, but that does not necessarily mean that the expert must directly lead delivery of all 25 of these hours. The 25 hours should be a full and demanding timetable, which may include expert input, group work, lesson preparation, lesson delivery, observation, and feedback.

** This expert support time does not need to be 1:1 and may take place in groups.

funding, given limited timetable capacity. This was seen to be exacerbated by the recent implementation of mentoring requirements for the ECF. It was suggested by some that this could be mitigated by making the minimum time spent in training flexible depending on the mentor's prior experience. There was also a consensus that a 1:50 ratio of lead mentors to trainees would not be sufficiently personal.

Some responses referred to the minimum time allocations for weeks spent in school placements and hours spent in classrooms. A few respondents thought that additional classroom time would better prepare trainees for their first years as a qualified teacher, although others noted that increasing time in school placements would also increase costs for schools and providers. The point was also raised that subject and phase-specific practice, pedagogical training and critical analysis were not given minimum time allocations and that, if trainees were to spend more weeks in placements, there would be less time in the programme for these elements. The allocations were seen by some to be particularly uncondusive to the timings of courses provided by HEIs.

There were also some respondents opposed to the concept of minimum time allocations in general. These respondents often described the requirements as prescriptive, arguing that providers would not have the flexibility to account for the different ways and rates at which their trainees and mentors learn and develop. Some also doubted whether the evidence behind the allocations is strong enough to support the claim that the quality of ITT delivery would improve if they were implemented.

Government response to feedback on minimum time allocations

We have addressed the points raised regarding mentors' capacity to accommodate the mentoring minimum time allocations in our responses to the 3 recommendations on mentoring (recommendations 3, 4 and 5). These responses can be found on pages 11-14.

Concerns around the additional cost to providers and schools of increasing the time spent in school placements are answered on pages 9-10, as part of our responses to the recommendation on intensive practice placements (recommendation 2) and the recommendation on minimum course duration and minimum time in school placements (recommendation 9).

A full list of the new ITT minimum time allocations can be found in Annex A (page 61).

Question 12: Please provide any comments you have on any of the other curriculum requirements (excluding those requirements relating to intensive practice placements and minimum time allocations covered above).

The main theme across responses was support for the curriculum Quality Requirements (intensive practice placements and minimum time allocations excluded). Some respondents noted that their organisation was, in their opinion, working towards or already delivering the requirements, whereas others saw them as ambitious but

necessary for an improvement in the quality and consistency of teaching across ITT programmes.

Although many respondents regarded the curriculum Quality Requirements positively, there was a view that, unless given additional funding or an extension to the proposed timescale, providers would be unable to deliver them without compromising on either curriculum quality or their other responsibilities. It was also argued that delay to delivery would allow providers time to work with schools in developing their curriculum. This was seen as a particularly important step in maintaining existing relationships and retaining school participation in ITT, as some perceived the requirements to put additional expectations on already stretched school staff.

Fewer respondents disagreed with the curriculum Quality Requirements in principle. Concerns often centred on the evidence base supporting the requirements, which some viewed as insufficient, and there was some suggestion that a pilot should be run to assess the impact of the new requirements before national roll-out. Other responses expressed opposition to what was perceived as a uniform curriculum, often emphasising the importance of having the flexibility to tailor the curriculum to local context. It was also claimed that the proposed requirements do not sufficiently focus on subject- and phase-specific training and principles and overlook the role of HEIs in delivering these aspects of the course.

Government response to feedback on curriculum requirements

Our response to the recommendation on Quality Requirements on curriculum (recommendation 1), which contains clarifications that we have made to address the points raised through the consultation, is set out on page 8.

We are confident in the evidence, including that considered by the expert advisory group during development of the Quality Requirements on curriculum, on the importance to an effective ITT programme of carefully structuring and sequencing content and graduation of tasks for trainees. Therefore, we do not believe there is a need to pilot this reform.

Mentoring

Question 13: Please provide any comments you have on a) the proposed approach [to mentoring], b) any barriers to implementation, and c) any support you would need to overcome these barriers.

There was a consensus across consultation respondents that high-quality mentoring is one of the key areas in which ITT has potential for improvement, with many responses recognising mentoring as a fundamental aspect of teacher training.

Views on the expert advisory group's proposals were mixed. Those in support noted the positive impact that mentors have on the development of trainees and expressed the

view that engaging mentors in training and development opportunities would improve the quality of support provided and ensure consistency across the market. Those opposed regarded the proposals as too prescriptive and disputed the evidence base supporting them. This was often raised in relation to the requirement for lead mentors to take the NPQLTD, with respondents noting that it is yet untested and that the proposal does not take into account any relevant previous experience or qualifications that the mentor may have.

Many respondents, including those supportive of the approach, did have concerns regarding the ability of providers to implement the proposals in practice unless additional funding is provided. The majority of these respondents referenced the cost to providers of releasing mentors from timetabled classes to allow them to perform their responsibilities and the additional workload that the recommendations would place on lead mentors, given the proposed minimum time allocations for training and the requirement to undertake the NPQLTD or equivalent. The latter was seen to be a particular concern for smaller and rural providers, with some suggestion that they could be forced to withdraw from the market due to their inability to release mentors for training. It was also mentioned that staff capacity issues might be intensified by the competing priorities of the CCF, ECF and COVID-19 recovery, potentially leading schools to think that their teachers, particularly the experienced teachers most likely to become lead mentors, would be better utilised teaching classes.

Government response to feedback on mentoring

We have responded to the 3 recommendations on mentoring (recommendations 3, 4 and 5) on pages 10-14.

In formulating these responses, we have considered the feedback from the consultation. We believe that the amendments we have made to the recommendations, alongside the funding we are providing to help secure backfill for staff taken out of classrooms for initial mentor training or to fulfil lead mentor duties, will alleviate the concerns raised while still ensuring that all mentors receive sufficient training and support.

Assessment

Question 14: Please provide any comments you have on this proposed approach to assessment of trainees undertaking ITT.

There was strong support for this recommendation from the consultation responses, with many highlighting the importance of providing trainees with regular feedback and indicating that their organisation had already implemented a similar approach to the one proposed by the review. The smaller proportion of respondents that did express opposition often referenced a perceived narrow focus of the assessment Quality Requirements on knowledge of the curriculum and argued that there is little evidence demonstrating that this form of assessment necessarily translates to good classroom

practice. Others raised logistical considerations. These included both the challenge for providers in matching their curriculum to the in-school curriculum in order to develop the assessment, particularly where they work with multiple schools, and the difficulty in achieving consistency in assessment nationally in a market where providers use different frameworks.

Some responses suggested amendments to the proposed approach. These included using the expertise of universities and subject specialists in creating assessments, using the teachers' standards to mark progression throughout the course or allowing a period to pilot and evaluate assessments. Other amendments focused on lessening provider workload by giving more time for assessments to be developed and creating assessments that are quick to mark, reducing the burden on assessors and allowing more time to be spent on meaningful feedback.

Government response to feedback on assessment

Our response to the recommendation on assessment (recommendation 6), which is on page 14, sets out some clarifications in response to the feedback we received through the consultation.

In addition to these clarifications, we have sought to address concerns around the workload involved in developing these assessment frameworks by extending the delivery timeline.

While we have heard the points raised regarding maintaining consistency in assessment, it should be noted that all trainees will ultimately be assessed against the teachers' standards, which defines the minimum level of practice expected of teachers from the point of being awarded QTS. The teachers' standards continue to be best placed to act as an endpoint assessment, while formative assessments aligned to providers' curricula should be used throughout the course to measure trainees' mastery of the curriculum and ability to apply this in a classroom setting.

Quality assurance

Question 15: Please provide any comments you have on this proposed approach [to quality assurance].

A view often expressed throughout responses to this question was that many organisations already have robust quality assurance processes in place. In some cases, respondents went on to express support for the recommendation, noting the importance of quality assurance in maintaining consistency across the market. Others, however, indicated that they saw no need for any change to existing quality assurance processes.

There were some concerns expressed regarding the role of schools in the proposed quality assurance processes and their capacity to perform it. A few respondents argued that the proposal would cause tension between schools and providers in relation to

accountability for quality assurance, particularly for the training and performance of mentors, potentially resulting in the breakdown of partnerships. To mitigate this, some respondents suggested making providers and schools jointly responsible for improving partnerships.

Government response to feedback on quality assurance

Page 15 contains our response to the recommendation on providers' quality assurance (recommendation 7) and the views expressed about this recommendation by consultation respondents.

Structures and partnerships

Question 16: Please provide any comments you have on this proposed approach [to structures and partnerships], referencing by number any of the specific requirements included in the Quality Requirements that you wish to comment on.

A subset of responses indicated that their partnership had already implemented partnership arrangements covering the accredited provider, lead partner and placement school roles proposed by the review and suggested that implementing this as a market-wide requirement would improve consistency across the market.

However, a larger proportion of responses expressed concern with the proposed approach and the potential burden placed on providers, with the most cited reason being the possibility of a disproportionate impact on smaller or rural providers as the minimum scale needed to meet the requirements would be harder to achieve in the time and with the funding available than for larger providers. The suggested consequence of this was a reduction in placement capacity and teacher supply as these providers are forced to either partner with a larger provider, losing autonomy and responsibility, or exit the market altogether. It was also argued that implementing a perceived blanket approach to partnerships, particularly one introducing contractual agreements, would disrupt those relationships already in place. A third, although less prevalent, theme among responses was that the centralisation of ITT would lead to delivery becoming alienated from local knowledge and expertise.

Government response to feedback on structures and partnerships

Our decision to incorporate the Quality Requirements on structures and partnerships into the 2024/25 ITT criteria is explained on pages 15-16.

We know the majority of ITT providers will already have well-established partnerships and governance processes in place and we believe that, through implementation of the Quality Requirements on structures and partnerships, we can establish these strong partnerships across the sector. However, we are not prescribing a blanket approach to ITT partnerships, and the clarifications set out on pages 15-16 should reassure providers of this.

On pages 16-17, as part of our response to the recommendation on accreditation (recommendation 12), we have set out how we intend to mitigate the concerns raised around the particular difficulty in delivering the reforms for providers with limited resource by holding multiple application rounds in 2022 for accreditation, providing funding for those that pass one of these rounds, and extending the timetable for first delivery of the Quality Requirements.

QTS and the PGCE

Question 17: Please provide any comments you have on [the proposal to facilitate partnering of accredited providers with institutions to offer the PGCE].

Although consultation respondents were of the view that ITT programmes should have the opportunity to offer both QTS and postgraduate academic awards if the provider wishes, the feedback given most frequently in response to this question was that the system for postgraduate awards already works. Most of these respondents still expressed support for the proposal, provided they could continue operating in their current manner following its implementation, but others argued that any changes would be a waste of resources. There was some discussion of the benefit of QTS-only routes, which were seen as having fewer barriers to entry for trainees in terms of cost and workload.

Some respondents expressed concern about the impact the proposal could have on quality of training, due to the limited funding and staff capacity available, and on wider recognition of the PGCE. HEIs were seen to be well-placed to provide postgraduate academic awards, given their associated research infrastructure and quality assurance processes. In contrast, it was argued that, as a new organisation, the Institute of Teaching is untested. Some felt that this may result in its postgraduate academic awards not being valued as highly, particularly internationally, as the perceived 'gold standard' awards provided by HEIs.

Government response to feedback on QTS and PGCE

Our response to the recommendation that we facilitate accredited providers that wish to do so to partner with an institution to offer postgraduate awards (recommendation 8) can be found on page 18.

We hope that the clarifications we have made in that section will reassure the respondents that have raised the concerns listed above.

Routes into teaching

Question 18: Do you think that there are any specific considerations that a) providers of undergraduate ITT and b) providers of employment-based ITT would need to account for when implementing the Quality Requirements?

A range of specific considerations affecting both undergraduate and employment-based ITT were raised by consultation respondents. Most focused on the employment-based route, citing the intensive practice placements as the key concern due to the additional time that salaried teachers would need to spend off-timetable and the resulting funding pressures for the school. It was also suggested that, as there is seen to be less scope for the academic side of ITT in the employment-based route, mentors should have specific training with academic experts to enable them to support salaried trainees in this area.

For undergraduate ITT courses, an issue commonly identified was the significant increase in time spent in a school setting. It was noted both that this would reduce the time available for academic study at the university (a certain amount of which is required to fulfil an undergraduate degree) and that, to accommodate it, providers would have to adopt a different model of training to that currently provided, potentially threatening existing partnerships. As with employment-based ITT, it was suggested that those mentoring undergraduate students would need particular training to prepare them to compensate for the reduced time spent on academic and pedagogical theory. A few respondents also identified that the September 2023 date proposed for implementation of the Quality Requirements is not conducive with the validation processes that HEIs must go through to make changes to their courses, potentially leading to the withdrawal of some providers of undergraduate ITT.

Government response to feedback on undergraduate and employment-based ITT

Concerns around the impact of intensive training and practice on employment-based ITT are addressed by the amendments set out on pages 9-10 in our response to the recommendation on intensive practice placements (recommendation 2).

Points raised about the effect that an increase in minimum time spent in school placements would have on undergraduate ITT are also answered on pages 9-10, which contain our responses to the recommendation on intensive practice placements (recommendation 2) and the recommendation on minimum course duration and minimum time in school placements (recommendation 9). In addition to this, as we have delayed the timeline for implementation of the Quality Requirements, HEIs will have an additional year to take their new curricula through the relevant validation processes.

We would expect providers of both employment-based and undergraduate ITT to design their mentor training curricula so that it prepares mentors to support trainees with the academic side of ITT as appropriate for their route. Pages 10-14 cover our responses to the mentoring recommendations (recommendations 3, 4 and 5), which contain further detail on the mentoring reforms.

Question 19: Please provide any comments on any indirect impacts on provision of a) early years ITT and b) further education ITE if these recommendations were to be implemented.

Feedback on the indirect impacts of the review's recommendations on EY ITT and FE ITE was limited, with most respondents indicating that they had little familiarity with either area. Some responses focused on issues that EY and FE would face in meeting the Quality Requirements, revealing a misconception that EY ITT and FE ITE programmes will be required to implement the reforms arising from the review. As this is not the case, these issues have not been included in this summary of the feedback received.

A proportion of those that did provide feedback expressed support for inclusion of both EY ITT and FE ITE in the reforms, to ensure continuity between phases and avoid disparity in the quality of teaching and, in the case of EY ITT, to enable teachers to move across the lower key stages more freely. Other responses noted that implementation of the recommendations for ITT courses leading to QTS has the potential to impact capacity of EY and FE teacher training; a provider offering EY ITT or FE ITE in addition to primary or secondary ITT would be unlikely to continue only the former if they decided to withdraw from the latter.

Government response to feedback on early years and further education

The changes described in this government response are not applicable to EY or FE provision. It will remain mandatory for those that wish to offer EY ITT to be an accredited ITT provider, however, EY ITT programmes will not have to adhere to the new requirements.

Some respondents did, however, suggest that EY and FE should be included in these reforms. While it will not be a requirement for either EY ITT or FE ITE courses to comply with the Quality Requirements, we continue to engage with both sectors to support improvement. For FE ITE, the [skills for jobs white paper](#) sets out the steps we are taking in partnership with the sector to drive up quality in the provider market.

We have listened to the views of consultation respondents regarding the potential impact for sufficiency of EY ITT and FE ITE provision if the review's recommendations were to be implemented. Each provider that passes one of the 2022 accreditation rounds will receive a grant of £25,000 to support the re-design of their programmes in line with the Quality Requirements. Where applicable, we expect providers to use this in a way that protects elements of their current provision, including, for those that offer them, EY ITT and FE ITE programmes. As the accreditation process progresses, we will also monitor the provision of EY and FE by providers that offer this in addition to ITT leading to QTS and take steps to minimise risks to sufficiency. We ask all potential providers to complete the expression of interest form to help us monitor which round of the accreditation process they will be applying for accreditation status in, should they wish to become an accredited provider. It is also essential that we are notified of any changes to EY ITT or FE ITE provision throughout the accreditation process.

Accreditation

Question 20: Please provide any comments you have on the proposed approach to accreditation and re-accreditation.

Clear concern about this recommendation was expressed throughout responses to the consultation. Much of this centred on the added resource and funding pressures that an accreditation process, particularly within the timescales proposed, might put on providers already working through the recent implementation of the ECF and the challenges resulting from COVID-19. Some referenced the consequence for teacher supply and distribution if some providers, likely those that are smaller or rural, do not apply for accreditation due to these pressures.

There were also wider challenges made to the necessity of having all existing providers undergo the new accreditation process, although other respondents did agree that this approach would increase standards and consistency in quality across the ITT market. Those questioning the value of a whole-market, perceived blanket approach to

accreditation often cited the role of Ofsted, arguing that Ofsted inspections and DfE auditing already provide quality assurance for accredited providers and that a new process may undermine those that are already in place. Along these lines, some suggested that those providers who have been identified as running weaker courses should be the focus for accreditation first, whereas providers that have achieved a high rating at a recent Ofsted inspection should be excluded or allowed to undergo a lighter-touch process.

Government response to feedback on accreditation

Our response to the recommendation on accreditation (recommendation 11) is on pages 16-17. We expect that the design of the process described on these pages, and the funding we have committed, will address some of the concerns regarding the resource and cost pressures. We have ensured that the process is as streamlined as it can reasonably be while still allowing us to make a judgement as to whether an applicant is able to deliver against the new Quality Requirements.

The accreditation process serves a different purpose to Ofsted inspections. It will give providers the opportunity to consider the Quality Requirements and determine whether they will be able to meet them in their current configuration or whether they need to consider how best they might be able to deliver against them. Accreditation will also allow us to look at the suitability of current and prospective providers of ITT in a robust, proportionate and timely fashion and ensure that they will be able to deliver the quality of provision that we need by September 2024. Following the accreditation process, Ofsted inspections will allow for review of the market in a steady state.

Question 21: Please provide any comments you have on the proposed approach to monitoring set out above.

Consultation responses suggested that views on this proposal across the sector are generally positive, in light of its potential to ensure that standards are maintained across the sector and its similarity to current monitoring arrangements, which means that it does not represent significant workload for providers.

There were, however, a significant proportion of responses that either stated that they would require more information on the proposal or expressed opposition. In both cases, concerns raised were mostly focused on the circumstances under which support or mergers between providers would be mandated. Points raised included the possibility that requiring providers to work together would result in delivery of ITT becoming too large and impersonal, and the possibility that providers, particularly HEIs, would withdraw from ITT rather than agree to a merger or mandated support, given the logistical difficulties involved and the perceived loss of autonomy to judge their own quality and self-address issues. Questions were also raised over whether this approach to monitoring would involve a form of inspection additional to the Ofsted framework. It was suggested that, if so, Ofsted inspections should instead be increased in frequency.

Government response to feedback on monitoring

We have responded to the recommendation on monitoring (recommendation 12), and to the feedback we received on the proposed approach, on pages 17-18.

Question 22: Please provide any comments you have on a) the proposed target of September 2023 for first delivery of the Quality Requirements and b) DfE's proposed timeline.

Month	Activity
Early November 2021	DfE publishes revised ITT criteria and accreditation process opens for applications
November 2021 – March 2022	Potential providers establish partnerships and gather evidence against criteria as needed
End March 2022	Deadline for receipt of applications for accreditation by DfE
Early April 2022 – Early July 2022	DfE assesses applications for accreditation
Mid July 2022 (by end of summer term)	DfE notifies providers of the outcome of their applications
Early August 2022 – September 2023	Accredited providers recruit trainees and prepare for teaching of new curriculum
September 2023	First delivery of Quality Requirements

Table 9 Indicative timeline for accreditation as published in the ITT market review: recommendations consultation document

The main theme from across consultation responses was that it would not be feasible for providers to deliver the Quality Requirements within the timescales indicated. There was frequent mention of the time pressures that providers would face, especially with capacity already constrained by COVID-19 recovery and implementation of the recent teacher development reforms. Some respondents thought that this may have the unintended effect of lowering quality of ITT provision, as providers would not be able to give sufficient attention to preparing for accreditation or delivery of the Quality Requirements. A few respondents did view the proposed timeline as tight but achievable, although often this was stated to be dependent on the timing of the government response to the review and the absence of any further disruption due to COVID-19.

Two groups were suggested to be at particular risk of being unable to meet the proposed timeline; HEIs, due to the lengthy validation processes required when implementing changes to their course, and smaller and rural providers with limited resource available to concentrate on accreditation and the Quality Requirements. It was also noted that, under

the proposed timeline, recruitment of new trainees would begin before a provider received confirmation of whether they had been awarded accreditation.

Some respondents proposed that, in order for the Quality Requirements to be delivered by September 2023, the accreditation process should be removed. Some argued for an extension to the implementation timeline, most commonly of one year, although others preferred between 2 and 5, or suggested that time should be made for a pilot to be carried out.

Government response to feedback on timeline

Having listened to the consultation responses, the majority of which referenced the significant challenges providers would face in meeting the proposed timeline, we have extended the timeline for implementation of the new Quality Requirements to September 2024, giving all providers additional time to make the appropriate changes to their course.

As discussed in our response to recommendation 11 (page 16), we are clear that an accreditation process is our preferred method to ensure all accredited providers have ITT courses meeting the Quality Requirements.

Question 23: Having read ‘Initial teacher training (ITT) review – draft Quality Requirements for ITT providers’ and the anticipated timeline, if you think that your organisation would wish to deliver ITT in the future, would your organisation be likely to apply to become an accredited provider, seek to become or remain as a lead partner, or seek to become or remain as a placement school?

Future role in ITT system	Total (n=396)	Percent
Accredited provider	170	43%
Accredited provider under certain conditions	68	17%
Lead partner	74	19%
Lead partner under certain conditions	45	11%
Placement school	109	28%
Placement school under certain conditions	47	12%
Would choose to withdraw from ITT	55	14%

Table 10 Likely future role in the ITT system of respondents already involved in ITT (percentage sum exceeds 100 as respondents were permitted to select multiple options)

This question was directed specifically at respondents answering on behalf of an organisation currently involved in delivery of ITT.

Of the 396 respondents that this question applied to, the majority (86%) said that they would be likely to continue their involvement in ITT in some form. 71% (110 of 156) of those respondents that identified themselves as a current accredited provider of ITT indicated that they would also seek accreditation under the new process; a further 60 that were not already accredited providers expressed an interest in applying to become one in future.

Across those that said they would withdraw, or those that mentioned that their planned future role was conditional, common points of contention included the proposed timescale for delivery of the Quality Requirements, the costs to providers and placement schools, concerns that well-established partnerships would not remain viable in the new market, the increased costs to providers and placement schools and the need for flexibility in delivery of ITT to suit local context.

Government response to feedback on future role in the ITT system

We are pleased to see that the significant majority of respondents expressed an intention to continue in the market. We believe that the amendments made to the Quality Requirements in response to the consultation feedback, alongside extending the timeline for implementation by one year and providing up to £35.7 million in funding to support implementation of the Quality Requirements, should alleviate the concerns raised. As we have clarified, there is no need for providers to change their partnerships or approach to delivery provided the new requirements are met.

Question 24: If adopting a future model such as the one set out by the review, would you be looking to add more organisations to your current partnership?

Would you be looking to add more organisations to your current partnership?	Total (n=272)	Percent
Yes	187	69%
No	85	31%

Table 11 ITT providers looking to expand partnerships.

Question 25: If you answered yes to Q24, would your organisation require support to identify potential partners?

Would your organisation require support to identify partners?	Total (n=208)	Percent
Yes	73	35%
No	135	65%

Table 12 ITT providers requiring support to identify partners.

Questions 24 and 25 were also directed only to respondents answering on behalf of an organisation currently involved in delivery of ITT.

Over two-thirds of respondents said that they would look to add more organisations to their current partnership if they were to adopt a model including the 3 key roles set out in the review report; just over one-third of these would require support to identify new partners.

The most frequent asks regarding support that could be provided was a list of other organisations nationally and in the local area seeking to form partnerships (particularly those with capacity to host intensive training and practice opportunities) or a matching or brokering service run by DfE. In a few cases, respondents specified that they would appreciate support to build their relationship with their local teaching school hub.

Government response to feedback on support required to identify partners

The majority of providers suggested that they would not need support from us to identify potential partner organisations. For those that do, following the first accreditation round we will publicise which applicants have successfully gained accreditation status. This will enable organisations that would like to remain involved in ITT but are unable to meet the Quality Requirements the opportunity to instigate partnership discussions.

Teaching school hubs

Question 26: Please provide any comments you have on the proposed role of teaching school hubs in the future ITT market.

The main theme across responses was support for the involvement of teaching school hubs in ITT. The general perception was that hubs make high-quality partners to providers, with some noting their particular value in supporting the design and delivery of mentor programmes. Though the proposal to expand the role of teaching school hubs in ITT was widely viewed as a positive step, there were respondents with concerns around their capacity to effectively deliver any additional responsibilities alongside their other priorities, suggesting that a phased approach should be taken to hubs' operation within ITT delivery to minimise any disruption. Another logistical concern raised related to the geographical spread of teaching school hubs. Those providers at a distance from the nearest hub, likely those in rural or coastal areas, were seen to be at a disadvantage in establishing the effective communication and strong working relationships needed for delivery of high-quality ITT. It was also argued that these providers' trainees would face difficulties in reaching the partner teaching school hub, with some suggesting that funding should be provided to compensate for the increased cost and time of travel.

Government response to feedback on the role of teaching school hubs

Our response to the recommendation on the role of teaching school hubs in ITT (recommendation 10) is on pages 20-21.

The clarifications set out in the response should address the concerns raised by respondents regarding both the logistical challenges and the capacity of teaching school hubs to take on greater involvement in ITT.

ITT as a system-wide responsibility

Question 27: Please provide any comments you have on the proposed approach to increasing involvement of trusts in ITT.

Feedback indicated a common belief among respondents that responsibility for ITT should be shared across all aspects of the education system. Many respondents viewed

the proposals to increase involvement of school trusts favourably, suggesting that it would improve the quality of teacher development at both a local and a market-wide level.

Some responses questioned whether all trusts have the both the capacity and expertise needed for involvement in ITT, arguing that removing autonomy from trusts and obligating their participation in ITT delivery without the resources needed to effectively support trainees would have a detrimental effect on quality. Advanced testing and consultation with trusts was seen by some to be a necessity ahead of the adoption of any changes.

Two main points arose from discussion of the proposal to link involvement in ITT to trusts' funding streams. Some respondents claimed that more funding is needed to enable trusts to successfully manage ITT delivery, citing support for mentors as a particular funding pressure. Others argued that linking ITT participation with financial compensation may have unintended consequences, incentivising schools that are not well-placed to engage with teacher training to take part purely to secure an additional revenue stream.

Question 28: Please provide any comments you have on other incentives that could encourage schools and trusts to participate in ITT.

The incentive most frequently suggested by respondents was providing financial support to create capacity within schools to host and support trainees, although a small proportion of responses did note the potential consequences for placement quality of giving schools that are unequipped to participate in ITT a financial incentive to do so.

Other respondents argued that there needs to be a culture developed within schools that values ITT involvement. It was suggested this might be achieved through increased promotion and marketing of the benefits of participation, including access to new research and subject-specific expertise, resources for teacher professional development, and opportunities for collaboration and networking with other organisations involved in delivering ITT.

It was also proposed by some that involvement in ITT should be included in the [Ofsted education inspection framework](#), both incentivising schools to participate and helping to establish quality benchmarks and criteria for schools to aim for. Others thought that ITT involvement should instead be included as part of the cycle of improvement priorities, though only for schools that have been identified as having the required capacity and expertise.

Government response to feedback on ITT as a system-wide responsibility

On page 22, we have responded to the recommendation on increasing the involvement of academy trusts in ITT (recommendation 14).

The response to recommendation 6 (page 13) addresses the issue of encouraging participation in ITT by providing funding for mentor support.

The expert advisory group also recommended inclusion of ITT involvement in the education inspection framework (recommendation 13), and our response to this can be found on page 21.

Recruitment and selection

Question 29: Please provide any comments you have on a) the impact of the proposed reforms on the recruitment and selection process, including potential for streamlining of the recruitment process and sharing of recruitment practices, b) any barriers to implementing the proposed reforms at the recruitment stage, and c) support that would be needed to overcome these barriers.

Responses indicated a consensus that the manner in which the current ITT system operates is confusing for prospective trainees. There was also agreement between many respondents that the proposed reforms would give providers the opportunity to streamline their recruitment and selection processes, simplifying the ITT landscape and reducing candidates' confusion surrounding the variety of routes into teaching available. However, there were concerns that, for smaller providers joining larger partnerships, the reforms represent a possible loss of control and autonomy over their recruitment process.

Some respondents did raise the issue of training placement supply, should the reforms cause some currently accredited providers to withdraw from the market. As rural providers were often seen to be at particular risk of withdrawing, this was linked to some discussion of potential cold spots in the market and the impact of this on ability to attract suitable candidates based in these areas.

It was believed that new partnerships would benefit from both extra time and funding in implementing recruitment processes. Some respondents noted that establishing processes across a larger partnership presents complexities such as increased administration workload and GDPR arrangements that would require structural investment to overcome, while others indicated that they would need funding to cover the travel and childcare costs of trainees allocated to non-local placement schools.

It was suggested in some responses that increased marketing and communication could improve applicants' understanding of the market. These included proposals for teaching school hubs to provide information to applicants, or for providers to create and share clear visualisations of the different routes into teaching that they offer.

Government response to feedback on recruitment and selection in ITT

We were pleased to see agreement across many consultation respondents that the reforms create an opportunity for providers to streamline recruitment and make the system easier for applicants to navigate.

We are clear that placement sufficiency in all areas of the country must be maintained. To support providers in implementing the reforms and alleviate concerns regarding market withdrawal and cold spots, we have allowed an additional year to prepare for accreditation and delivery of the Quality Requirements. This will also give new partnerships the requested extra time to design and launch their simplified recruitment processes.

To help give potential applicants a clear understanding of different routes into teaching, we provide guidance to candidates via the [Get Into Teaching](#) website, our contact centre and the Teacher Training Adviser service. We have also taken steps to simplify the application system itself. As of the start of the current recruitment cycle, the end-to-end application journey is now entirely owned and run by DfE. As well as the improvements this delivers for aspiring teachers, the data we can now access will allow us to work with the sector to enable data-driven decision-making and produce a more consistent experience for candidates.

Following the accreditation process, we will continue to work closely with ITT providers and applicants to understand how we can make further improvements to the recruitment process.

Impact assessments

Question 30: Please use this space to raise any a) equality impacts and b) any impacts specific to schools in rural areas that would result from the implementation of the proposed Quality Requirements.

Across responses, there was agreement that the reforms proposed represent a particular challenge for providers and placement schools located in rural or hard-to-reach areas. It was suggested that demands associated with preparing to implement the Quality Requirements and, for providers, the accreditation process would be too great for many of these organisations to meet within the proposed timescales, given the limited capacity available to them.

This led into discussion on equality impacts; geographical disparity caused by loss of rural providers from the market was viewed to have significant effects on equality of access both for trainees and experienced school staff, due to the increase in travel time and cost. This was seen to disproportionately impact single parents, those with caring responsibilities, and those from low socioeconomic backgrounds. It was also noted that the increased travel requirements and potential withdrawal of HEIs from the market could

reduce trainees' access to pastoral and academic support, a particular concern for those with disabilities, mental health issues or learning needs.

Government response to feedback on impacts of the review

We have considered the consultation feedback alongside our own assessment of the impacts of the reforms. We are aware that implementation of some of the proposed reforms may pose a particular challenge for small rural providers, especially within the indicative timescale set out in the consultation document. We expect that the amendments made to the Quality Requirements and the one-year extension to first delivery will reduce the demands on providers and schools associated with preparing for accreditation and implementation of the requirements, in turn reducing the number of organisations unable to continue in ITT due to lack of capacity. Those providers that successfully achieve accreditation in 2022 will also receive a grant of £25,000 to support them to implement the Quality Requirements ahead of course delivery in September 2024. In the case that we do see market exit by some ITT providers in rural areas, we would work with teaching school hubs and ITT providers to support expansion of ITT activity into areas where provision has been withdrawn. The funding of up to £15 million for general mentors and up to £10 million for lead mentors we are providing to schools to cover mentor initial training time and lead mentor duties will also be an important factor in supporting rural school placements.

We have published our [equalities impact assessment](#) alongside this document.

Final thoughts

Question 31: Please use this space to give any comments you have on any aspect of the report of the review or the 'Initial teacher training (ITT) review – draft Quality Requirements for ITT providers' document that you have not had the opportunity to provide in response to any of the other questions.

Many of the responses to this question re-iterated previous points made regarding the proposed timings for implementation, the costs and additional workload the proposals represent to providers, and the potential withdrawal of providers and perceived consequences for quality and sufficiency of training. A number of respondents again challenged the evidence supporting not only the expert advisory group's conclusions, but the idea that any changes to the market are needed at all. A few responses did acknowledge a need for change, though there were suggestions that reforms should be piloted before considering wider roll-out.

Some comments questioned the timing of the review, given both the strain caused by COVID-19 and the changes to the CCF, ECF and Ofsted initial teacher education inspection framework that are still being established. Others focused on the consultation process, noting that some of the consultation period overlapped with school holidays and

suggesting that this may have inhibited the ability of some teachers and school leaders to submit a response.

Government response to other comments

We acknowledge the concerns raised regarding the timing of the consultation process. We are confident that we received responses representative of the sector's wide variety of settings and viewpoints. The organisation types that responded to the consultation can be found at Table 1. We have continued to engage with various sector representatives on the subject of these reforms following the closure of the consultation and intend to continue this engagement throughout implementation of the changes set out in this government response.

We appreciate that workloads have increased as a result of COVID-19. We expect that the extended timeline for delivery of the Quality Requirements will reduce the immediate pressure on providers. However, we are clear that now is the right time to implement these changes. Well-trained teachers will be critical in supporting COVID-19 recovery, and we intend to build on the good progress already made with the CCF, ECF and NPQs to ensure that we give trainees the highest quality ITT possible, as soon as possible.

Annex A: Quality Requirements for ITT providers

1. Curriculum

Overarching requirements

Providers must have a fully developed, evidence-based curriculum which explicitly delivers all aspects of the ITT core content framework (CCF) and ensures that trainees are prepared for the next stage in their professional development as teachers – the early career framework (ECF) induction. The curriculum must be designed in the light of the best evidence for effective teacher training and development (as reflected in the national professional qualification for leading teacher development (NPQLTD)). Programmes must be designed to reflect how children learn most effectively and, wherever appropriate, reflect cognitive architecture in curriculum design.

The CCF and the ECF will be reviewed together in future, building on previous iterations and drawing on the best available evidence.

Providers should move beyond the CCF's foundation to design a curriculum appropriate for the particular subjects, phases and age ranges that their trainees will teach. Providers should continue to integrate well-evidenced content into their ITT curricula, including relevant subject-specific content and critique of theory, research (including, where appropriate, their own) and expert practice. This additional content must be integrated into a sequenced and coherent curriculum which supports trainees to develop their classroom practice.

Those responsible for teaching, tutoring and mentoring trainees should have a deep understanding of the provider's planned curriculum and its basis in evidence, to ensure that trainees experience consistent training and support at all stages.

Providers must identify how all components of the planned curriculum will be taught, applied to practice in a range of contexts and assimilated. The curriculum should encompass a variety of approaches, including direct explanation, deconstruction, structured and focused observation and targeted practice with systematic analysis, feedback and mentoring. At all times, the planned and sequenced curriculum must closely inform taught components, independent learning, practice and feedback. When trainees move on to delivering longer sequences of teaching which draw on a range of knowledge, skills and behaviours, they should do so in the confidence that fundamental components of knowledge, understanding and practice have first been properly consolidated.

Component elements of the planned curriculum must be closely integrated at each stage with appropriate opportunities to ensure that trainees have sufficient support to understand, apply, practise and embed new approaches. As trainees move from focusing

mainly on the practice of components of effective teaching towards more complex, composite sequences and scenarios, they must have sufficient opportunity to identify and isolate areas where consolidation or more practise is required.

Providers must identify curriculum components which will benefit from specific expertise or specialised training techniques (which may include, where appropriate, approximations of teaching) to ensure effective delivery, understanding and practice. To support this, providers must demonstrate how specialist intensive practice schools and specialist or lead mentors, alongside the wider range of teaching placement schools, will ensure that the requirement is met.

Specific requirements

Providers must design a sequenced curriculum which:

- 1.1 Explicitly delivers the requirements and principles of the CCF in full, includes further content to be taught that moves beyond the foundation of the CCF and prepares trainees for the ECF and the broader demands of their early career.
- 1.2 Demonstrates explicitly how all components of content are taught in a sequenced way which incrementally builds the expertise and confidence of trainees across the year, beginning with a focus on the fundamental component elements and moving towards complex or composite practice.
- 1.3 Demonstrates in what setting the content of each part of the curriculum will be delivered and how delivery and practice are integrated at each stage to build systematically towards trainees' fluency in classroom practice.
- 1.4 Specifies a range of methods, carefully and intentionally orchestrated across the curriculum, including training undertaken with a range of experts, training undertaken with peers and supported independent study.
- 1.5 Identifies the range of settings in which trainees will undertake each part of their training, including the minimum 2 placement schools and intensive training and practice (as described in Box 1).

Box 1 – intensive training and practice

The intensive training and practice element is designed to give trainees feedback on foundational aspects of the curriculum where close attention to and control of content, critical analysis, application and feedback are required. It provides an opportunity to intensify the focus on specific, pivotal areas. Intensive training and practice should also build powerfully the link between evidence-based theory and practice. This means that intensive training and practice will need to be led and supported by an appropriate range of experts. Because the main aim is to strengthen the link between evidence and classroom practice, some elements of intensive training and practice will need to take place in a school environment, but it may also include the use of approximations of practice and/or elements delivered directly by the ITT institution or virtually if helpful or necessary.

Intensive training and practice would typically involve groups of trainees, but providers may choose to run them in smaller groups or even individually if a group experience is not possible. These placements may take place in one of the 2 general placement schools where a trainee is located (though it must be additional to the general placement itself), as long as that is appropriate to the curricular intent of intensive training and practice.

Schools supporting intensive training and practice should offer a sufficient range of strengths to support the delivery of strongly curriculum-aligned practice. In many cases they will be among the provider's lead partners.

We would expect to see these same opportunities in general teaching practice placements during which trainees spend significant time working with specified classes or teachers. However, intensive training and practice is different from general teaching practice placements, as the critical element is the intense focus on specific pivotal areas, for example setting up behaviour routines, subject-specific focus, or effective interventions for pupils with special educational needs and disabilities. As such, the intensive training and practice element is additional to the 24 weeks spent on general school placements.

As a minimum, intensive training and practice will consist of:

- delivery of carefully selected pivotal or foundational aspects of the planned training curriculum. These will be identified in the overall design of the curriculum. Many are likely to relate to the CCF and, where possible, will be specific to the subject and phase being taught
- structured observation of selected teaching sequences with those aspects under focus

- critical analysis of observed teaching, including teaching materials used, guided by an expert, with a focus on identifying the links between theory and practice
- preparation and practice delivery of the identified aspects of the training curriculum, with expert feedback and opportunities to repeat and vary the preparation and delivery for different circumstances

Examples of opportunities allowed by intensive training and practice include:

- expert theoretical and practical input by tutor(s) and/or mentor(s) and other relevant experts (in school or in ITT institution)
- critical analysis of relevant teaching materials (e.g., textbooks) in the light of theory and evidence (in school, virtually or in ITT institution)
- focused demonstration/observation/deconstruction of teaching (in school or virtually)
- expert modelling and deconstruction of individual components of teaching practice (in school or virtually)
- deliberate practice by trainees (in school or in a rehearsal environment)
- live classroom teaching practice (in school)
- focused feedback and opportunities to practise further and improve

The design of intensive training and practice will reflect how trainees learn effectively, for example, ensuring high-quality interleaving of different elements, immediate and targeted feedback focused on improvement and appropriate questioning to ensure trainees remember and understand the content.

The outcomes of intensive training and practice for trainees should include a strong grasp of the evidence base for the area concerned, which they can articulate, justify and exemplify, and the ability to identify effective classroom delivery and to prepare and apply those aspects of teaching confidently in a range of contexts.

While the minimum period for intensive training and practice is 4 weeks (20 days) across the training year, this does not need to be delivered as one 4-week block and providers may locate such practice at suitable pivotal points to ensure maximum advantage is gained for trainees' growth in knowledge and expertise.

Providers should select 3 to 5 focus areas which are considered foundational, and which should normally be drawn from different areas of the CCF. Providers whose trainees' geographical distribution makes group intensive training and practice elements logistically difficult must propose ways of delivering the intensive training

and practice entitlement, for example, by using a combination of virtual and face-to-face experiences.

Providers of salaried routes will need to consider the most appropriate way for their salaried trainees to complete their intensive training and practice element, whether it forms part of their main school placement, replaces or forms part of their second school placement or another innovative solution.

- 1.6 Identifies those parts of the curriculum that will be delivered as intensive training and practice, with the necessary detail on how this will be achieved and how high-quality delivery, practice and feedback will be assured.
- 1.7 Includes detailed curriculum planning for teaching trainees evidence-based subject and phase-specific approaches to teaching, including the use of systematic synthetic phonics for all primary trainees. Subject- and phase-specific approaches must be delivered by suitably qualified experts and take full account of the evidence available for subject- and phase-specific teaching, for example, Ofsted subject research reviews. This part of the training curriculum must adequately cover all national curriculum subjects for primary trainees and the relevant teaching subject(s) for secondary trainees and must enable trainees to understand the application of general research-based principles, including all content set out in the CCF, to the specifics of teaching the subjects in question.
- 1.8 Includes a comprehensive suite of high-quality materials for trainees and those responsible for curriculum delivery to support all aspects of the training, including evidence-based subject- and phase-specific training.
- 1.9 Meets the minimum time expectations for specified elements of any course, as set out below.

Box 2 – minimum time expectations

Accredited providers must design training programmes within the parameters set out in this document. In doing so, they must also reflect the minimum time allocations for pivotal aspects of ITT programmes set out in Table 1 below. Providers should note that these times refer to course design and provision. It is accepted that at times and for exceptional reasons such as sickness absence, some trainees, mentors or lead mentors may not meet full attendance. Providers should continue to exercise appropriate judgement in individual cases where that happens.

By the end of the course, all trainees must have experienced at least 6 weeks of 80% contact ratio teaching.

Table 1 – minimum time allocations

ITT minimum time allocations	Postgraduate	Undergraduate
Total weeks of course	36	N/A
Minimum weeks in school placements (general placements only, excludes intensive training & practice)	24	24 (3-year course) 32 (4-year course)
Minimum weeks of intensive training & practice (in addition to general school placements, does not need to be delivered in a single block)	4	6
Minimum hours in classrooms (including observing, teaching, co-teaching, etc.) each week during general school placements	15 on average	15 on average
Minimum hours mentoring each week during general school placements	1.5	1.5
Minimum planned and supported hours per week during intensive training & practice*	25	25
Minimum hours of expert support per trainee per week during intensive training & practice**	5	4
Minimum hours initial training time for general mentors	20	20
Minimum hours initial training time for lead mentors	30	30
Minimum hours annual refresher training for general mentors	6	6
Minimum hours annual refresher training for lead mentors	12	12

* This means 25 hours of the trainees' time during this intensive training & practice period must be planned activity, but that does not necessarily mean that the expert must directly lead delivery of all 25 of these hours. The 25 hours should be a full and demanding timetable, which may include expert input, group work, lesson preparation, lesson delivery, observation, and feedback.

** This expert support time does not need to be 1:1 and may take place in groups.

2. Mentoring and guidance

Overarching requirements

Providers must establish a professional network of well-trained and expert mentors* who have a deep understanding of the curriculum, the relevant research base which informs it and their role in supporting its delivery and practice. Mentors must ensure in-school experiences are seamlessly coherent with the training curriculum, with opportunities for purposeful practice of the key concepts and high-quality feedback. Trainees must also have access to mentors who have expertise in the subject- and phase-specific approaches set out in the planned curriculum, so that trainees are able to learn the best evidenced ways of teaching their subject or phase and can apply the general principles set out in the CCF.

Providers must ensure observation, deconstruction and feedback take place throughout the year and are fully aligned with all components of the curriculum. Providers need to ensure that mentors have the time, resources and the support of their school to discharge the requirements of their role.

Specific requirements

Providers must:

- 2.1 Demonstrate how they will recruit and train sufficient mentors to ensure that every trainee receives their entitlement of 1.5 hours per week of mentor support.
- 2.2 Demonstrate how they will ensure that mentors have expertise in evidence-based subject- or phase-specific approaches to teaching and that they are allocated to trainees as appropriate to their subject or phase needs.
- 2.3 Create a fully resourced mentor curriculum that aligns with the trainee curriculum. This will equip mentors with an understanding of the curriculum content trainees will cover and an approach to mentoring based on the best available evidence.
- 2.4 It is envisaged that lead mentors cover much of the same training content as general mentors and go into further depth to be fully prepared to deliver the lead mentor

* Mentoring is defined here as in the CCF: "Receiving structured feedback from expert colleagues on a particular approach – using the best available evidence – to provide a structured process for improving the trainee's practice."

functions. They will also have an ongoing role in course development and improvement.

- 2.5 Put in place a training programme (face-to-face or virtual) for all mentors (both lead and general mentors) covering the minima set out in this document, which has a clear focus on the curriculum of the trainees they are going to mentor. Providers should consider the prior learning of their individual mentors in determining the exact emphasis of the mentor training. Providers should not require mentors to repeat any training but should adapt the delivery of the mentor training curriculum to meet individual needs. Where specific material has already been covered, this may include a reduction in the total hours of training required. In all cases, providers must be able to demonstrate that all mentors have been trained in all areas of the mentor training curriculum.
- 2.6 Ensure that mentoring practice fully reflects the intent and content of the training curriculum.
- 2.7 Demonstrate how the requirements for intensive training and practice will be delivered.
- 2.8 Ensure that mentors receive enough time to attend the required training and discharge the mentoring entitlements according to the minima set out in these Quality Requirements.

Box 3 – lead mentors or mentor leadership teams

All mentors must undergo training meeting the minimum requirements, which must focus on building their knowledge of the training curriculum, the relevant research which underpins it and their role in guiding and supporting trainees through that curriculum. Minimum training times for mentors are set out in Table 1, as are minimum allocations for trainee time with mentors. Beyond this basic requirement, providers must also give trainees access to lead mentors or a mentor leadership team. The lead mentor/mentor leadership team must have particular expertise in the evidence base for effective initial teacher training, including programme design and content selection.

A suitable qualification for lead mentors is the NPQLTD and training for lead mentors/mentor leadership teams should build on or complement the content of the NPQLTD or equivalent.

Minimum training times for lead mentors/mentor leadership teams are set out in Table 1, along with allocations for the time trainees should spend with them.

Roles of lead mentors/mentor leadership teams include:

- oversight, supervision and quality assurance of other mentors
- design and delivery of training for other mentors
- close working with trainees during intensive training and practice and the design of such elements
- oversight of trainee progress throughout the year and identification of interventions or modifications where required
- in addition, providers may delegate other appropriate functions to lead mentors/mentor leadership teams, e.g., the opportunity to work on the design of training curricula relevant to the lead mentor's expertise

Box 4 – training specific to subject and phase

Subject specificity goes beyond subject knowledge. It is critically important not only that teacher trainees learn about the evidence underpinning effective teaching at a general level, but that they are also given a secure grounding in how this evidence applies in the specifics of teaching subjects in the relevant phases. The CCF makes this clear when it emphasises the need for training to be specific to subject and phase. The curriculum designed by providers must set out in detail approaches for each subject and phase and be clear about how subject-specific approaches will be taught to trainees. This will mean:

- setting out the evidence base used for each subject and phase (Ofsted's subject research overviews are a useful resource for this)
- ensuring that trainees have sufficient knowledge of the content of the school curriculum in each subject and phase, including at the level required by relevant examination courses, and, in primary, ensuring that all national curriculum subjects are covered
- translating the evidence-informed principles of the CCF into a subject- and phase-specific context, ensuring fidelity, with sufficient subject- and phase-specific exemplifications to enable alignment of practice at all levels for tutors, mentors and trainees, and ensuring that trainees understand how subject-specific approaches to curriculum and pedagogy are based on both general and subject- and phase-specific research and evidence
- ensuring that tutors, lead mentors and mentors, including those supporting intensive training and practice, have the relevant subject knowledge and subject-specific curricular expertise, and close knowledge of the provider's planned curriculum for teaching subject-specific approaches, to guide and support trainees effectively
- setting out clearly how the subject-specific elements of the planned curriculum will be taught to trainees, by whom, and when, and how fidelity to the intention and content of the planned curriculum in this respect will be assured
- introducing trainees to relevant subject- and phase-specific communities of practice and equipping them to contribute in an informed way to relevant debates affecting the teaching of their subject(s)/phase(s)

3. Assessment

Overarching requirements

Providers must set out an assessment and progression framework that is aligned to the planned and sequenced curriculum. It should draw on overarching evidence-based principles for good quality assessment, including those set out in the CCF, ECF and NPQs relating to the assessment of pupils. The assessment framework should, as such, assess trainees with appropriate frequency both on whether they know, remember and understand the curriculum, and their ability to apply it in classroom practice. Because ongoing assessment is an important part of the training process, it should include focused feedback designed to enable trainees to improve. Feedback should draw on the content of the training curriculum and should, at each stage, support trainees in understanding how practice is informed and helpfully shaped by research and evidence.

Ongoing in-course assessment should be against content delivered by that point in the course, rather than against the level of expertise or standard required by the end of the course. During the course, assessment should feed into the identification of aspects of the curriculum which trainees are finding challenging and be used to adapt approaches to delivery or reshape practice accordingly. Providers must demonstrate the ways in which this will happen.

Providers must ensure that all mentors and others involved in assessment of trainees have received sufficient training to enable them to understand and use the provider's assessment framework accurately and appropriately.

Assessment specifically against the teachers' standards should be reserved for end-of-course assessment to meet the requirements for the award of qualified teacher status. Providers should also ensure at the end of the course that trainees have good knowledge of those aspects of cognitive science which are contained in the CCF. Providers must demonstrate that end-of-course assessments are objective, valid and reliable.

This approach aligns with the assessment principles of the Ofsted initial teacher education inspection framework.

Specific requirements

Providers must design an assessment framework which reflects evidence-based principles for good assessment, is straightforward to use and which:

- 3.1 Ensures that ongoing formative assessment and feedback take place throughout the course, focusing on whether trainees are gaining, applying and refining the knowledge and skills set out in the curriculum.

- 3.2 Is centred on the assessment of the component elements of the planned curriculum as they are delivered and practised.
- 3.3 Recognises the need for trainees to be assessed and receive feedback on the evidence-based, subject- and phase-specific approaches set out in the curriculum.
- 3.4 Clearly defines roles and responsibilities for those conducting assessment and providing feedback at all levels within the provider's network, including arrangements for the robust quality assurance of assessment.
- 3.5 Assesses whether trainees know, remember and understand the training curriculum, and whether they apply that knowledge to their classroom practice.
- 3.6 Requires those conducting assessment and providing feedback to gain a rich and developed knowledge of trainees' performance over time and to draw on a range of sources to ensure conclusions are secure and balanced.
- 3.7 Requires those conducting assessment to provide feedback to trainees which they can use, and are supported to use, for improvement, and which supports trainees' understanding of how practice can be improved in the light of research evidence.
- 3.8 Enables insights from assessment to feed into programme delivery so that those responsible for training and mentoring can adapt in response to trainee needs.
- 3.9 Includes arrangements for objective, valid, and reliable end-of-course assessment against the teachers' standards prior to the award of qualified teacher status.

All those responsible for assessment and feedback must receive thorough training on the assessment framework and the ways in which it is intended to be used, to ensure that approaches are of consistently high quality for all trainees.

4. Quality Assurance

Overarching requirements

Providers must develop quality assurance processes to ensure that all aspects of the delivery of the course meet the high expectations to which all trainees are entitled.

Specifically, providers must demonstrate robust arrangements for monitoring:

- the quality and fidelity of all aspects of curriculum delivery to trainees
- the training and expertise of those involved in curriculum delivery
- the training and expertise of mentors and lead mentors/mentor leadership teams
- the quality of mentoring work of all types and levels, including ensuring that time allocations for mentors and trainees are met
- the quality of regular in-course assessment and feedback and their impact on trainee knowledge and expertise
- the quality, reliability and validity of end-of-course summative assessment

There must be clear systems in place for reporting and taking action to address any shortfalls in quality in a prompt way, to protect the entitlement of trainees to world-class training.

Providers must also have clear identification of responsibilities and accountability for quality assurance at all levels, including for accurate record-keeping of quality assurance work.

Clear mechanisms must be in place for trainees to raise concerns or make complaints about the quality of training/mentoring and for investigating and, where necessary, addressing such concerns or complaints in a timely fashion.

Specific requirements

Providers must set out a framework for quality assurance which:

- 4.1 Monitors and assures quality in all required areas of the programme and at all levels.
- 4.2 Sets out suitable monitoring methods.
- 4.3 Sets out clearly the range of specific roles and responsibilities for quality assurance.
- 4.4 Demonstrates how concerns identified by quality assurance will be addressed, including the range of intervention options which will be used.
- 4.5 Specifies how records relating to quality assurance will be kept.

- 4.6 Sets out robust arrangements which enable trainees to raise concerns or make complaints.
- 4.7 Sets out how quality assurance information will be used to improve the quality of training across the provider's partnership and make the programme and all aspects of the partnership more resilient.
- 4.8 Puts in place an effective system for supervising and quality assuring the initial and ongoing training of mentors, the quality of their work, including their approach to subject- and phase-specific mentoring, and systems for securing specific improvements where necessary.

5. Structures and partnerships

Requirements

Providers must be able to set out the essential features of their structures and partnerships which will enable them to deliver teacher training in the way described in the preceding sections. Providers must:

- 5.1 Be able to set out at what scale they operate and, recognising the quality level set out in this document, demonstrate that they have sufficient capacity to be able to meet the Quality Requirements for training in all subjects and phases offered.
- 5.2 Secure and retain schools and other partners to enable them to deliver their programme in line with the Quality Requirements, meeting the needs of all trainees, and set out how they will develop the training and delivery capacity of ITT lead partners and schools in their partnership.
- 5.3 Be able to set out which courses are to be run and what target recruitment numbers and minimum and maximum numbers will be in place.
- 5.4 Identify and retain lead partners and be able to articulate what responsibilities may be delegated to lead partners (which may include teaching school hubs). Providers should also consider how they plan to involve other relevant specialist hubs.
- 5.5 Establish the structure of their partnership and governance arrangements, including formal arrangements between lead partners and accredited providers and between teaching practice schools and providers, and exercise governance effectively, recognising that accountability for all aspects of the operation of the partnership rests with the accredited provider.
- 5.6 Market the course offer, recruit trainees and help potential trainees to navigate the market.
- 5.7 Establish budgetary arrangements that set out how funds are distributed across accredited providers, lead partners and schools, and how funding is distributed within the partnership in a way which adequately reflects the distribution of delegated responsibilities. Providers must ensure funding is used for intended purposes at all levels in the provider's partnership, and that these arrangements contribute both to quality provision for trainees and to the retention of partners.
- 5.8 Ensure that trainees are prepared to teach pupils in schools across a full range of contexts found in the geographical area in which they are training, including areas of high disadvantage. For example, trainees' placements could include time in schools serving disadvantaged communities, or a focused period teaching pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds or schools judged to require improvement.

- 5.9 Ensure that, at a local level, schools and other lead partners are well placed to recruit trainees (for example, in the way that School Direct currently achieves this), given the fact that local recognition and relationships are critical for securing and maintaining the confidence of potential trainees.
- 5.10 Establish arrangements for secure and compliant data handling across composite organisations and partnerships.

Annex B: Methodology of consultation analysis by York Consulting

The aim of this project was to undertake independent analysis and reporting of responses to the consultation on the ITT market review.

1. Prior to the end of the consultation, the first 342 anonymised responses were used to develop an initial coding framework for the qualitative data from the open text questions (25 questions) and to identify respondent groupings for analysis of the closed questions (10 questions).
2. On closure of the consultation, all 796 responses went through data cleaning and management of any missing data. All responses were assigned a unique ID.
3. The initial coding framework informed by the first 342 responses was used as part of an iterative process to develop up to 10 codes per open question.
4. Excel was used to code the first 342 responses. This process informed the further development of the coding framework and assisted the process of analysing qualitative data across the consultation. Responses were analysed to identify recurring themes and emerging patterns in relation to the consultation questions.
5. The remaining 454 responses were incorporated into the data set. Thematic coding was then undertaken on the complete set of responses. New themes were developed as they emerged through an iterative process.
6. Analysis of additional responses emailed to DfE was undertaken.
 - Of the 34 emailed responses, 3 followed the consultation questions and format so were added into the main consultation data file and 4 were duplicates of responses submitted through the online consultation platform.
 - 27 emailed responses did not conform to the format of the consultation; these were coded under the 9 headings of the consultation and separately analysed to identify areas of consensus and views that differed from those submitted via the online platform.
7. Finally, Excel was used for the analysis of quantitative data. Analysis of numerical data on respondent characteristics for each of the closed questions was carried out using descriptive statistics, e.g., frequencies and cross tabulations.



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2021

This document/publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/consultations

Reference: [000-000-000]



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk