
INITIAL TEACHER TRAINING (ITT) PARTNERSHIP IN WALES: CONSULTATION

17 December 2004 Ref: W04/77HE

To: Heads of ITT providing higher education institutions in Wales

Summary: This circular seeks views on possible future arrangements for the maintenance and development of ITT partnerships in Wales.

Response by: Friday 28 January 2005 (*seminar delegate registration form*)
Friday 25 February 2005 (*consultation responses*)

Further information: Karen Jones
Telephone: 029 2068 2283
E-mail: Karen.jones@hefcw.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

- 1 This circular seeks views on possible future arrangements for the organisation and delivery of ITT Partnerships in Wales.

BACKGROUND

- 2 Education Data Surveys (EDS) were commissioned by HEFCW to undertake a study of ITT partnership, commencing in February 2004. The brief was to examine, in particular, the cost and operational aspects of ITT partnership as well as building on the good practice already developed across the HE sector in England and Wales. The final report was received in July 2004, and was circulated to the sector in October 2004 following Council consideration (Circular W0463HE refers). The executive summary, conclusions and recommendations sections of the report are attached at **Annex A**. The full report is available at the following address:

http://www.elwa.org.uk/elwaweb/doc_bin/he%20circulards/w0463he%20main%20report%20pages%2001%20to%2062.pdf).

- 3 In brief, the report concludes that a decade after its introduction there is widespread commitment to the partnership model of teacher training. All involved are working to provide high quality teachers for schools in Wales. Such concerns as there are relate particularly to financial pressures and the effects that these may have on the ability to continue to deliver a quality programme in the future. Concerns over the variability of school placements were also expressed. The report makes recommendations to the Council on improvements to the present system, such as developing common practices and reassessing the unit of resource. There are also more strategic recommendations that are aimed at assisting the future development of partnerships, particularly regarding the involvement of schools and ITT providers.

COUNCIL ACTIONS

- 4 The Council considered the recommendations and conclusions of the report at its late September 2004 meeting, and took the view that future action should fall into two areas: issues which could be pursued immediately, and issues for further consultation with the sector.
- 5 Issues to be taken forward immediately include HEFCW:
 - i. establishing an internal officers group to examine in association with the sector, as the group sees fit, the financial recommendations arising from the study;
 - ii. initiating a discussion of the outcomes of the study with Estyn and Welsh Assembly Government officers;
 - iii. publishing the report.
- 6 In addition, the Council agreed to undertake a consultation exercise between December and February 2005, on a range of issues emerging from the study including:
 - i. the possibility of reforming the system of payment, including possibly establishing a uniform rate of payment to schools, built upon agreed criteria;
 - ii. whether there should be a mechanism to oversee developments in ITT partnerships in Wales;

iii. whether a system of training and recognition that applied across Wales should be developed, and by whom;

iv. mechanisms for enhancing the commitment of all schools involved, and not yet involved, in ITT to provide quality training;

v. the development of a unified approach in the following areas: (a) timing of placements; (b) mentor training; (c) documentation provided for schools; (d) format for recording and reporting achievement of standards; (e) the balance of support provided by HEI staff and school staff; and (f), allocation of schools to institutions on a geographical basis.

- 7 Since its publication, HEFCW officers have considered the report internally. Officers have also discussed the report with officers of the Welsh Assembly Government, Estyn and the GTCW. Officers will continue to meet regularly with associated officers throughout 2004/05 to elicit views in relation to the each of the specific recommendations contained within the report, as well as views on the development of future Council policy and practice in this area.
- 8 Council officers are in the process of considering existing research on the costs of both higher education and schools of ITT partnerships. The Council is considering ways of supporting ITT Partnerships as an interim measure, pending completion of this process.

ISSUES FOR CONSULTATION

- 9 Drawing on the conclusions and recommendations set out in the EDS report, the main issues on which the Council wishes to consult are set out in the following sections:

The Cost of ITT Partnerships

- 10 The Council was asked to consider recommending that HEIs adopt a common and transparent financial framework in order to facilitate long-term strategic planning for the funding of ITT in Wales and to ensure mutual accountability in the use of funds between schools and HEIs involved in ITT. HEFCW proposes to work alongside the sector to establish good practice guidelines rather than imposing a strict financial framework of ITT partnership funding. This approach would enable each HEI to continue to maintain institutional autonomy in this area, whilst providing the opportunity for institutional decisions to take account of best practice guidelines.

Issue 1: Respondents are asked to provide views on this proposed approach. We will welcome examples of existing good practice in this area that could be incorporated into a publication for dissemination across Wales.

- 11 The report invited the Council to discuss with ITT providers whether funds transferred to schools by HEIs for ITT partnerships should be subject to institutional overheads. The Council is not in a position to consider recommending such action without wider consultation. The Council wishes to be advised of any financial and/or logistical impediments, such as institutional financial management systems, that may preclude such exemptions being made.

Issue 2: The Council would welcome views from the sector on whether the Council should advise HEIs to consider whether funds transferred to schools by HEIs for partnership activities be exempt from institutional overheads.

- 12 The Council was invited to consider the principle of a uniform rate of payment to schools, built upon agreed criteria, with payment to primary and secondary schools calculated using the same formula. Following internal consideration, officers felt there was

considerable merit in the development of a uniform rate for school involvement in ITT partnerships. Further consideration would need to be given, based on available evidence, to the possibility of establishing fixed ITT partnership rates linked to agreed criteria, based on explicit statements of the relative responsibilities of schools and HEI in ITT partnerships. Institutions would continue to be able to inflate the rate of payment where a partner school was being asked to undertake duties above and beyond the core criteria. This criterion would not include the range of additional benefits experienced by schools engaged in HE partnership by means of staff development/CPD opportunities etc. These would need to be identified elsewhere, possibly through a partnership promotion scheme.

Issue 3: Respondents are asked to outline the advantages and disadvantages of the Council establishing a uniform payment to schools for work on Partnership in ITT. Views on possible criteria for funding, alongside information on the range of fees associated with existing partnership arrangements should be provided, where possible.

Operational Aspects of ITT Partnerships

- 13 The report recommended that ITT providers be asked to give serious consideration to the benefits and weaknesses of the development of a unified approach in the following areas:
- a. Timing of placements
 - b. Mentor training
 - c. Documentation provided for schools
 - d. Format for recording and reporting achievement of standards
 - e. Balance of support provided by HEI provided by HEI Staff and school staff
 - f. Allocation of schools to institutions on a geographical basis
- 14 HEFCW does not consider it appropriate for the Council to lead on any developments in this area. Rather, a unified approach to one or more areas identified could only be achieved if established by staff involved in ITT partnership arrangements, based on best available practice. It is recognised that the unification of the areas listed above would need considerable work that would require a long-term commitment from all ITT providers and strong leadership/management. It might even be appropriate for a designated manager or project team to lead this work. In order to address this, the sector might wish to consider submitting a proposal to undertake this pan-Wales development to the HEFCW Reconfiguration and Collaboration Fund.

Issue 4: The Council would welcome views from providers and sector groups on the feasibility of the sector being able to develop a unified approach to ITT partnerships. Proposals for how a unified approach might be achieved would be helpful.

- 15 The report recommended that the Council discussed with the Assembly and providers whether there should be a mechanism to oversee developments in ITT partnerships in Wales. This might take the form of a strategic body with two main functions: (a) the strategic development of partnership within ITT in Wales; (b) an overview of operational aspects of partnership. Such a body could be tasked to develop the work of partnership committees in quality enhancement, enhance the commitment of schools, and promote discussions of a national system of training and recognition for partnership schools.

Issue 5: Views are invited on the merits of a strategic body being established to oversee ITT partnerships, or whether this function could be undertaken via existing groups/committees.

General Comments

- 16 The Council would welcome any other comments which respondents wish to make on other aspects of the EDS report.

NEXT STEPS

- 17 We greatly appreciate your active support for this important work, and welcome your input into the consultation process, which will include a consultation seminar at HEFCW offices in Cardiff on Friday 11 February 2005. Institutions should use the form attached at **Annex B** to book places at the seminar. Places are limited to three per ITT provider. We hope that institutions will be represented by at least one senior officer as well as by those directly involved in ITT provision.
- 18 HEFCW officers are currently in consultation with Estyn to establish a good practice/dissemination event in Summer 2005 linked to activities identified by ITT providing institutions through the ITT strategic planning process. It is proposed that good practice in ITT Partnerships could form the main focus of this event. Further details of the proposed event will be issued in March 2005.
- 19 Responses to the consultation will feed into the Council's development of future policy in ITT. We also note the intention of the Welsh Assembly Government to review Initial Teacher Training in 2004/05. We have alerted the Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning to the outcomes of the EDS study and anticipate that the Assembly will take account of the outcomes of the Council's work in this area as part of its Review of ITT.

RESPONSES

- 20 Responses should be sent to Karen Jones, Senior Learning and Teaching Manager, Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, Linden Court, The Orchards, Ilex Close, Llanishen, Cardiff, CF14 5DZ, or Email: Karen.jones@hefcw.ac.uk by **Friday 25 February 2005**.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The partnership model presently used in the training of teachers originated in the early 1990s and for the first time formally recognised the significant role played by schools in the training of teachers. In February 2004, the final outcome report of the HEFCW funded Initial Teacher Training Partnership Initiative concluded that developing effective partnerships is the key to achieving further improvements in the initial preparation of the next generation of teachers to enter schools in Wales. This study considers the views of the providers of ITT, schools, students and policy makers about current state of the partnership model in Wales. Data was generated from interviews, focus groups, questionnaires and the analysis of a range of documents.

FINANCE

The funding of ITT was a major concern of almost all HEIs and many schools. Both groups considered that a shortage of money constrained their ability to deliver the partnership model and was inhibiting the development of better notions of partnership. Many HEIs informed us that they are still paying partnership schools the same amount of money as in the mid-1990s - the time of the original agreement - despite significant changes in school staffing costs. These extra costs have largely been absorbed by the schools and represent a potential funding charge that would be difficult for HEIs to meet from their present resources.

Schools received different fees from different HEIs for the same service. The sums ranged from £275 to £729 for a primary student and from £699 to £1000 for a secondary student. HEI staff thought that the difference in payment between primary and secondary schools was not defensible unless the only criterion was 'what the market would bear'. Students often receive little or no support with either travel costs or the provision of resources for teaching. On our calculations of the direct cost schools of student placements, we estimate the total to be around £1,060 per course. The evidence from this study suggests that ITT is under-funded at present. Funding for both HEIs and schools at current levels has an impact of quality.

THE SUPPLY OF PLACEMENTS

We found three primary schools that were in partnership with three providers and 73 primary schools that were in partnership with two providers. One secondary school appeared on the lists submitted by five ITT providers. A further four schools were on lists provided by four HEIs, and 38 schools were identified as being in partnership with three providers. Thus almost 20% of the total were associated with more than one training provider. According to the School Usage Survey we conducted there seems to be spare capacity in many partnership schools in most subjects except modern languages and the sciences. However, providers were less certain, when interviewed, about spare capacity for additional placements.

If projections show a future need for significant numbers of additional placements, a national scheme for recruiting more schools to partnership would be the most cost effective way to achieve this end. The policy option would be to require schools to participate in the preparation of teachers as a part of their core activities.

UNIFICATION AND NATIONAL APPROACH

One recurrent theme from all those contacted in the research was the recognition that there was the capability for some rationalisation of ITT procedures to provide a greater degree of commonality.

One HEI HOD put it succinctly: *"It does seem quite bizarre that we have so many HEIs operating partnership in a very small country like Wales – all on the basis of different arrangements, different payments and schools, different structures, different staff and so on. Schools cannot understand why we should not have one set of programmes, one pattern, and one partnership. I would like to see a National Director for ITT partnerships."*

HEI staff thought that a uniform payment rate was good in principle, but if it involved paying more out of existing funds they would find this hard and – in the case of at least one institution - staff thought it would mean the closure of ITT. Schools favoured the same timing of placements from all HEIs, especially those in more than one partnership. HEIs were not opposed to a unified start date for the timing of placements, but pointed out that this timing was a consequence of the course rationale and design. National placement dates could not be achieved without course revisions. HEI tutors also volunteered that the difference between payments to primary schools and to secondary schools for placements was ‘frankly indefensible’.

HEIs welcomed the recent ‘reconfiguration exercises’ and the links formed through these projects might constitute the basis for a compromise with respect to common course and placement dates. Moderation of standards was a concern. Using different formats for reporting documentation when students are being judged on the same competencies is likely to compound the difficulty of the task. HEIs generally favoured the idea of national mentor training, especially for secondary school mentors. There was some recognition that the geographical spread of schools used by providers may not be the most efficient and that an overview of the allocation of areas to institutions might be helpful. The absence of LEAs at a strategic level in partnership was noted, and HEI tutors regretted this. They expressed the opinion that it would be helpful to have: HEIs, GTCW and LEAs in addition to HEFCW and the National Assembly, involved in strategic planning of teacher education or at least in discussions of initial and in-service teacher education. HEI tutors from more than one institution mentioned what they perceived as being sidelined in discussions of NQT support. Overall, there was some support for a unified approach in:

- The timing of placements;
- Mentor training;
- The documentation provided for schools;
- The format of reports on student achievement of standards for teaching;
- The balance of support provided by HEI staff and schools staff (how many HEI visits);
- Uniform payments to schools and;
- The allocations of schools to institutions on a geographical basis.

QUALITY ASSURANCE

All the participants in the partnerships expressed concerns about quality assurance. Students did not feel confident that standards were applied uniformly across mentors and schools. Schools in several partnerships were concerned about different HEI regimes. HEIs made the following points:

- QA is a problem across the partnership schools, especially in assessment practices;
- There is inconsistency of practice– across HEIs and across schools and between the two;
- Senior mentors are reluctant to take responsibility for the training of teachers, especially for their assessment;
- Mentors input into HEI courses is invaluable;
- The HEI’s perceived need to monitor assessment and training standards will limit the role of schools in partnership;
- The PGCE course is too compressed. It should be at least 18 months long;
- HEIs find it difficult to impose QA on schools. Consistency is needed across ongoing trainee reports and the final report.

Some HEI tutors suggested the following ideas:

- Recognition of schools in ITT partnership;
- schools should be audited;
- A kite marking system for schools with an automatic expiry date;
- Quality assurance visits to partnership schools;
- The use of a logo on letterheads.

WELSH MEDIUM SCHOOLS

HEIs were keen to promote Welsh medium teaching and school placements were available. Recognised providers of Welsh medium training received enhanced funding of an additional 0.26 per student. HEIs said the extra funding for Welsh speaking students has 'no scientific basis'. In secondary subjects Welsh medium provision was often uneconomic. HEI tutors pointed out that trainees working in secondary schools needed extra help in developing professional and curriculum language for teaching their subject through the medium of Welsh, especially at Key Stages 4 and 5. Tutors regretted the demise of the Welsh Medium Mentoring project. It may be that the number of places offered for Welsh medium courses will often be insufficient for an HEI to be able to create cost-effective group sizes and, therefore, some additional financial support will often be justified. Use of some Welsh medium secondary schools as training schools might consolidate Welsh medium training.

ICT

ICT support for ITT was seen as a promising area for future development. As yet, the potential had not been fully realised. Students used mobile telephones text or phone tutors. These were under their control and did not rely upon the need for access to many schools limited internet facilities. Opportunities abound for using ICT to develop the partnership model. Already in hand were developments using Blackboard software, a CD for mentor training and on-line recording of student achievement. HEFCW has funded a distance learning initiative entitled Hyfforddi Athrawon/Teacher Training (HATT) – The project was established to enable the sector to develop a bilingual open and distance learning PGCE in Wales.

HEIS' VIEWS

HEIs in general had a positive view of the partnership between themselves and schools. Both partners had come to see it as indispensable in the delivery of effective ITT. HEI staff referred to the partnership in practice as a triangle of active parties – the HEI tutor, the school mentor and the trainee teacher forming each angle of the figure. The mentoring process across all institutions was deemed broadly adequate. However, in general, not only was there an absence of remuneration for the commitment and hard work of mentors, but there was no acknowledgement at any level of their value as part of the system for training teachers.

SCHOOLS' VIEWS

There was a consensus among school staff of the need for clear and accurate communication between all those involved in delivering ITT. Senior and class mentors wanted more face-to-face contact with the HEI tutor. This would help them feel less at the receiving end of a one-sided relationship. When communication was good, with good advance knowledge of placement dates and student details, and when they regularly saw the HEI tutor then they judged the partnership model a success. But all the schools serving a number of HEIs complained at the variability in procedures, documentation and placement dates between the HEIs. Schools valued the ITT partnership as a source of additional funding, for the influx of new ideas from trainees, because trainees provide an "extra pair of hands", because it offers professional development available for mentors, because HEIs can deliver teaching projects; it produces good NQTs and helps with recruitment; because good practice can be recognized and given a higher profile; and because it gives access to HEIs for teacher professional development.

Other things schools would like from partnership included: more tutor support (especially with weaker students); continuity at HEIs; more time to prepare for placements; more guidance on assessment and standards generally; the standardisation of partnership procedures, documentation and placement dates; the fuller integration of mentors into ITT and seminars at schools from HEI staff.

STUDENTS' VIEWS

Almost 1,000 (n=998) questionnaires were returned from students at all eight HEIs in Wales. 73 were completed in Welsh. Students appeared to have had plenty of notice of their placements. Over 80% had longer than a week's notice. The vast majority (86%) were satisfied with their placement experiences. The level of satisfaction was very similar across all eight HEIs. The figures for students show that as few as fifteen per cent of students reported never having lessons observed by senior staff in their school, and a further 43% were observed just once. Over 83% were observed by senior staff no more than twice. At the end of the practice, virtually all students expected both HEI and school staff to be jointly involved in the assessment of their competence to teach. Around 40% per cent of students thought the administration of placements could be improved and over thirty per cent wanted improvements in help and advice.

Of the Welsh Medium students, 90% had received additional language support in the HEI since they had started the course. ICT offers the opportunity for students to maintain communication with their HEI whilst on their placements. Sixty-five per cent of students (n=631) said that they had used electronic means to keep in touch. Students were broadly impressed by the way ITT was being delivered. Such criticisms as students identified were mostly focussed on: inconsistency of assessment; travel and accommodation difficulties; support from mentors and school staff generally; the mentor-tutor link; insufficient tutor-mentor meetings; the perceived reluctance on the part of mentors to be properly trained.

On placements, students noted that they could be made to feel unwelcome at the school; the placements could be very badly organized, they felt exploited by the school, a few rarely saw their mentor; there was too much variation in the support schools gave to them during placements; HEI tutor observations were too late in the TP; they did not like being the only trainee on placement in a school. They had difficulty when: the format for lesson plans did not work; it was difficult to track the standards for QTS; teachers were not focused on standards; there was no computer access at school. Only around 40% had received any help with travelling costs with only a quarter of these having had travelling costs fully met. Very few students had received help with accommodation costs.

INNOVATION AND BEST PRACTICE

All the partnerships have been innovative at some level. Some examples include:

- On-line recording of student achievement;
- Mentor training available on CD (*One HEI has developed a CD – available on-line - to support mentors*);
- Dissemination of innovation and development in schools (*One secondary history teacher has developed the use of an extensive range of on-line materials in the classroom. The partner HEI has been active in disseminating this work*);
- Joint mentoring conference and standardisation of procedures. (*Two HEIs have organised joint mentoring conferences and collaborated with paperwork*);
- Teaching Fellowships (*One HEI has introduced six annual teacher fellowships in which teachers will be seconded to the HEI for one term*);
- Introductions of schools and students to each other. (*Videos of schools for students and introductory letters from students to schools*);
- Settling placements early (*One HEI managed to settle all the placements for the PGCE before the start of the course*);
- Involving schools in selection processes;
- Clarity in use of funds.

Other suggestions that should not be lost are:

- Administrators should work together to develop best practice;
- Involve advisers more;
- More research into partnerships;
- Classroom based research could be developed mutually;
- Curriculum/ subject leader roles could be developed mutually.

CONCLUSION

A decade after its introduction there is widespread commitment to the partnership model of teacher training. All involved are working to provide high quality teachers for schools in Wales. Such concerns as there are relate particularly to financial pressures and the effects that these may have on the ability to continue to deliver a quality programme in the future.

CONCLUSIONS

This study commissioned by HEFCW has considered various aspects of the operation of the partnership model of ITT in Wales. The fieldwork was conducted between March and June 2004 and consisted of interviews with staff at all ITT providers and representatives of the schools in partnership with them. Additionally, the views of trainee teachers were obtained through a questionnaire together with additional interviews and focus groups. Students and school staff members were provided with the opportunity to contribute in Welsh. As part of the study, a school usage survey was conducted to provide evidence on the participation of schools throughout Wales in the training of teachers. Discussions with the various partners involved in ITT about the funding of the partnership model formed an important part of the study. In this final section we have tried to draw out some of the major points that have arisen from the study.

FUNDING, QUALITY AND STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT

The partnership approach to ITT has been in place for about a decade and has been welcomed by schools, students and HEIs. At present, what seems to be under threat by a lack of funds is the strategic development of partnership and creative ideas for its future. There was also evidence that the basic funding for ITT was inadequate for some programmes. Thus the time and resources currently available were barely sufficient to cover both the immediate needs of the partnerships and to maintain quality. More time was needed to work directly with students, to maintain and enhance quality and, perhaps most importantly, to contribute to the strategic development of partnership. Many of these issues had been identified by Estyn in their 2002 report.

Both school staff and HEI staff felt the number of tutor visits to schools were insufficient to develop and enhance quality. Staff made do, but the assurance of quality was vulnerable. Mentors were short of time free from lessons. They managed to make observations of students and to work with them, but had little time to attend training, to develop cross-school monitoring, to develop other teachers in ITT or to work jointly with HEI tutors to attend meetings in HEIs to manage and plan strategic development of partnership. The current notion of partnership includes a great deal more than merely observing students and crosschecking standards and involves mentors working with other schools, mentors being involved in training mentors, mentors contributing to HEI-based part of the source and being involved in interviewing students. All these aspects of partnership were constrained by lack of funds.

The development of partnership in a truly strategic manner means involving schools and teachers more fully in its development, and in having schools make a substantial contribution to development, management and quality assurance of the partnership model. Schools may be unwilling to become more involved if the payment they receive barely covers the core activities of partnership

THE NATIONAL PICTURE

The training of teachers is recognised as a complex activity. Within Wales, several different bodies are responsible for parts of the process. The National Assembly takes the lead in defining the required standards and setting the numbers of trainees that need to be recruited each year. The HEFCW is responsible for the allocation and funding of these places, and Estyn undertakes the inspection function and, as a result, is responsible for quality assurance. Finally, although not directly involved in ITT, the General Teaching Council for Wales is responsible for the registration of Qualified Teachers in Wales; without registration, it is not possible to teach in maintained schools.

However, it is the higher education institutions in Wales, and the schools that they are in partnership with, who undertake the day-to-day tasks associated with the preparation of virtually all trainee teachers in Wales. What appears to be missing in all this pattern is any relationship between the preparation of new teachers and the labour market they enter on completion of their training. This complex network of relationships raises questions about the overall strategic direction of teacher preparation in Wales. How, for instance, is feedback about quality of new entrants once they start have started teaching relayed either to the higher education institution who trained them, or to the National Assembly to allow them to monitor the effectiveness of the standards set down for training? Given the differing nature of the higher education institutions involved in the training process, how is the research agenda for developing high quality training identified and funded?

Perhaps the functioning of the process of decision-making about teacher preparation in Wales is best highlighted by the decisions that have or indeed have not been taken in relation to the funding of teacher preparation since the introduction of the partnership model in the early 1990s. The twin effects of 'efficiency gains' and changing salary structures within schools and higher education during the past decade have inevitably had an effect on the teacher preparation process. However, there seems to be a lack of any forum that allows all those involved to understand and accept the consequences of funding decisions. For instance, although expected to be key players in partnership for teacher preparation, schools effectively are only able to negotiate locally with individual providers about financial decisions and have 'no clear voice at the national table'. Although this study was into the area of 'partnership', and not the strategic decision-making process, that process needs consideration: at present, day-to-day operational matters are often decided without the support of an overall strategic framework.

This has implications for how the notion of partnership has developed over the past decade. Whether teacher preparation courses are best funded through the higher education funding process or by another model such as through a purchaser-provider agreement directly between the National Assembly and training organisations, be they higher education departments, schools or private training organisations, is beyond the scope of this study on partnership. Nevertheless, after discussions with all concerned, we do think that there is room for a worthwhile debate on this point as a part of a wider consideration of how the medium-term strategic development for teacher preparation in Wales should be developed to reflect the notion of partnership at all levels.

UNIFIED STRUCTURES

Throughout the study the view kept emerging that there was room for a greater consistency of approach to ITT across Wales without the loss of the unique characteristics of individual partnerships. As we have recommended, this means that there are areas such as mentor training, the timing of placements, the development of common documentation and quality assurance mechanisms where collaboration between providers supported by HEFCW could bring improvements in the quality of the partnerships at relatively small cost. However, those involved in partnership, both schools and HEIs, would need to agree any changes. Whilst the larger secondary schools are often operating as effective training schools, there may be a need to embed the whole concept of partnership more firmly in the culture of some schools, particularly in the primary sector.

Throughout this report we have made a number of recommendations to HEFCW. At one level they are about improvements to the present system, such as developing common practices and reassessing the unit of resource. However, there may also be some more strategic recommendations that are necessary to assist in the future development of the partnership model of ITT. In particular, we are concerned about how strategic planning for teacher preparation courses in Wales involves all the present partners, including both schools and higher education. This issue will become more important as alternative routes into teaching, such as the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) are developed by the National assembly.

The present arrangements for teacher preparation in Wales have now been in operation for almost a decade. They have generally served the schools well. After conducting this study, we would concur with the view expressed by Estyn in 2002 that, 'Initial training providers and their partner schools show a strong commitment to partnership and enjoy a good working relationship.' However, to allow that commitment to continue we believe that it is necessary to address the strains on the partnership model we have identified in the study.

LIST OF RECOMENDATIONS

1. *The Council should take account of existing research on the costs to both higher education and schools of ITT partnerships when reviewing the unit of resource for initial teacher training. (p 25)*
2. *The Council should recommend that HEIs adopt a common and transparent financial framework in order to facilitate long-term strategic planning for the funding of ITT in Wales and to ensure the mutual accountability in the use of funds between schools and HEIs involved in ITT. (p 26)*
3. *The Council should discuss with providers whether funds transferred to schools by HEIs for ITT partnerships should be subject to institutional overheads. (p 26)*
4. *The Council should discuss with the Assembly the idea of a Partnership Promotion Scheme for Wales to manage any increase in the number of schools required to be involved in training teachers. (p 30)*
5. *The Council should consider the effectiveness of the HATT initiative as a means of increasing provision via distance learning and whether additional research into distance learning is necessary. (p 31)*
6. *The Council may wish to discuss with the National Assembly whether any co-ordination of ITT placement needs between the different routes into teaching is necessary. (p 32)*
7. *The Council should give consideration to the principle of a uniform rate of payment to schools, built upon agreed criteria. The rate of payment to primary and secondary schools should be calculated using the same formula. (p 41)*
8. *The Council should consider the advantages of a uniform payment to schools across Wales for work on Partnership in ITT. (p 69)*
9. *The Council should consider the findings of the National Assembly review of the Welsh Medium Incentive Supplement Scheme with a view to exploring with the Assembly whether one or more of the alternative routes to QTS might be of use in supporting Welsh medium teacher training (p 72)*
10. *The Council could consider one or more pilot project to explore how small schools might both gain the benefits of Partnership and contribute their special expertise to the training of students. (p 78)*
11. *The Council should give serious consideration to discussing with providers the development of a unified approach in the following areas:*
 - Timing of placements*
 - Mentor training*
 - Documentation provided for schools*
 - Format for recording and reporting achievement of standards*
 - The balance of support provided by HEI staff and school staff*
 - Uniform payments to schools*
 - Allocation of schools to institutions on a geographical basis (p 79)*
12. *The Council should consider discussing with the Assembly and providers whether there should be a mechanism to oversee developments in ITT partnerships in Wales. This might take the form of a strategic body with two main functions: (a) The strategic development of partnership within ITT in Wales, (b) An overview of operational aspects of partnership (p 79)*
13. *The Council should discuss with the National Assembly how provision might be made for additional schoolbased support for improving the Welsh of trainee teachers in Welsh medium schools. (p 80)*

14. *The Council should work with the sector to develop the work of partnership committees in quality enhancement. (p 82)*
15. *The Council should work with the sector to enhance the commitment of all schools involved in ITT to provide quality training. (p 83)*
16. *The Council should promote discussions of a national system of recognition for partnership schools. (p 84)*
17. *The Council should ensure sufficient funds are available for training mentors. Consideration could be given to developing a system of training and recognition that applies across Wales. (p 89)*

ITT PARTNERSHIP STUDY: CONSULTATION SEMINAR

A seminar is to be held on **Friday 11 February 2005, 11am – 3pm** at HEFCW offices in Llanishen, Cardiff, to enable HEFCW to consult with institutions, partner schools and sector bodies on proposals for enhancing ITT partnership arrangements. The seminar will request active participation by delegates on the Council's approach for addressing the outcomes of the EDS ITT Partnership Study. Delegates views will be fed back to the HEFCW Council to help inform its future policy decisions in this area.

Registration form for institutions (limited to three delegates per institution)

Delegate 1

Name:

Institution:

Position:

Email Address:

Dietary Requirements:

Delegate 2

Name:

Institution:

Position:

Email Address:

Dietary Requirements:

Delegate 3

Name:

Institution:

Position:

Email Address:

Dietary Requirements:

Please return this form to Karen Jones at HEFCW by Friday 28 January 2005
By Email to: karen.jones@hefcw.ac.uk By Fax to: 029 2068 2283
By Post to: HEFCW, Linden Court, Ilex Close, The Orchards, Llanishen, Cardiff, CF14 5DZ