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1 a) What practical strategies, models and practices do ITT providers and schools deploy to equip trainees with the skills and knowledge to become outstanding teachers?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  Training should embrace obvious priorities such as subject content, learning and progression within the subject, classroom management and monitoring and assessment. Successful training models both at primary and secondary level include a high proportion of practical experience in at least two distinctly different contexts, allowing trainees to gain experience of teaching different types of pupil, of different ages and with different backgrounds and needs. Feedback from trainees, particularly within newly established School Direct routes suggests that provision in school often lacks a sufficiently strong subject dimension, and that they therefore tend to rely very heavily for guidance in subject pedagogy on the university-based input. However in the most secure and well-established partnerships, stable groups of history mentors working in conjunction with a university tutor have really had the opportunity to develop their expertise and skills in this respect. Trainee feedback from more than one course suggests that trainees highly value the university element of their courses as adding breadth and depth to their knowledge and understanding of history education.  The most important practical strategies in equipping trainees to become outstanding teachers are:  **1. Focused attention on candidates’ subject knowledge from the very beginning of the application and selection process**  Within the Oxford PGCE Partnership, for example, the interview includes two tasks that allow applicants to draw on their existing subject knowledge strengths (a short presentation on a historical figure prepared in advance, and a written curriculum planning task with some freedom to select the specific focus within the remit of the National Curriculum). This provides scope for the interviewers to probe applicants' conceptual understanding of the nature of the discipline and ideas about how substantive knowledge can be structured and presented to make it accessible. Two further tasks (responding to samples of pupils' written work, and suggesting how teachers might select and use a particular historical source) are deliberately designed to focus on topics that are unfamiliar to the applicants to test their capacity to apply their more general understandings of historical method to make informed judgments about pupils' learning and to suggest fruitful lines of enquiry in relation to topic. They also allow the interviewers to assess the applicants’ awareness of the importance of well-developed subject knowledge. Successful applicants then receive a subject-knowledge audit with some suggestions for further reading both in relation to substantive topics and in relation to the nature of history, some months before the course begins. The trainees are also alerted to other resources such as those available through the Historical Association, particularly its excellent podcast series, with contributions from many leading historians.  **2. The further development of subject knowledge through careful audit and development planning and in course design**  If trainees have been given guidance in working on subject development before the start of their course, the process of auditing their knowledge should obviously be repeated at the start of the training, when an emphasis can be placed on the specific topics taught within the history curriculum at each key stage in their first placement school. This is most effective when followed up in an individual tutorial to ensure that each trainee has mapped out a plan for their own knowledge development, and the implementation of this plan also needs to be monitored (as it is, for example, in the Oxford partnership during the university tutor’s first school visit). Trainees’ subject knowledge audits are also often used effectively to create a directory of expertise within a particular programme so that trainees can seek advice from their more knowledgeable peers in relation to specific topics.  Regular sessions within the university-based programmes when trainees provide introductions to unfamiliar topics for their peers are an excellent tool for developing trainees’ subject knowledge. This can be said for both primary and secondary courses. Again, within the secondary PGCE course at Oxford, sample sessions are first modelled by the tutors, following exploratory discussion of the kinds of knowledge that teachers most need and how they can be helped to develop it quickly and effectively. While that obviously includes some of basic substantive knowledge, it also involves alerting them to the key issues that are debated by historians - the real questions that are worth asking about those topics - and providing one or two examples of the interesting 'nuggets' - the curiosities or exciting characters that would serve to capture pupils' interest and secure their engagement.  Within primary training, the 3 year course at Roehampton for example, offers three history specialist modules (1st year subject knowledge, 2nd year subject application with focus on fieldwork using museums and sites, 3rd year subject leadership) These specialist courses are in addition to the generalist course that all students do. In the first year trainees focus on British history which seeks to develop subject knowledge, especially for KS2. In the second year, the focus is heritage and community which looks at evaluating and working with museums and sites and fieldwork in general - a key element to primary history. A large proportion of educational visits to museums come from the primary sector so knowing how to work with museum educationalist and how to plan effective learning outside the classroom is key. The third year focus is diversity and significance which stresses the importance of diversity and alternative narratives within history which is central to working within inner city multicultural schools.  Subject knowledge development can also be promoted through careful course design when addressing issues of pedagogy. Within university-based sessions, for example, attention can be given to the most commonly taught topics within the National Curriculum and at secondary, GCSE and A-level specifications in determining the substantive content on which to base exemplar lessons and teaching materials and the exercises on which trainees' work (for example on planning lessons, designing resources, marking and moderating examples of pupil work, and constructing or analysing models of progression).  For a topic such as the Holocaust, which is a compulsory part of the curriculum in all secondary schools, it is possible for courses with sufficiently large numbers of history trainees to call on experts from such organisations as the Holocaust Education Centre (based at the IOE) to provide highly focused training in appropriate pedagogy that takes account of the sensitive nature of the topic and that is informed by on-going research (including research into those aspects of substantive knowledge with which teachers tend to be more and less familiar).  **3. Constant consideration of the subject dimension in developing trainees’ repertoires of teaching and management strategies**  A lot of harm can be done by generic training that treats all subjects as though they are the same, so it is crucial to ensure that pedagogy is seen through the lens of each particular subject, and not to assume that the same techniques will always be appropriate regardless of what is being taught. Assessment for Learning, for example, can be very easily reduced to mechanical techniques that fail to encourage trainees to focus effectively on exactly *what* it is they are expecting the pupils to learn and so to consider what kind of strategy is needed to check pupils' grasp of a particular concept or their capacity to engage in a particular process. Damage has also been done by simplistic application of 'Bloom's taxonomy' of cognitive objectives, with generic training suggesting, for example that 'explanation' always involves 'higher-level' thinking than 'description' and should therefore be prized more highly. In history helping students to write richer, more detailed or more nuanced descriptions of a particular period, or situation or character is just as valuable as developing their capacity to write more clearly articulated or better substantiated explanations of why a particular event happened.  Behaviour management issues that need to be addressed within subject-specific elements of the programme relate to ensuring that students understand not only what they are being asked to do, but also why. This applies at a broad level – *why* are we studying this particular topic and how does it relate to what has gone before; but also at a more detailed subject driven level: for example, what information am I looking for in reading this particular account and how will it help me to judge whether this battle was the most decisive turning point. There is considerable research (see for example, Haydn, T. and Harris, R. (2010) ‘Pupil perspectives on the purposes and benefits of studying history in high school: a view from the UK’, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 42 (2) pp. 241-261) and inspection evidence (Ofsted 2011, *History for All*) that suggests pupils are often very unsure about why learning history matters or what exactly the value of study any particular content might be to them. Within history-specific programmes, trainees therefore need both to develop their own understanding of the purposes and value of what they are teaching, and also learn how to communicate this effectively to young people in ways that make sense to them. They also need to learn how to provide clear explanations – and check for student understanding of them – and to present clear instructions, modelling tasks effectively (actively involving the students in that process) so that there is little scope for pupil confusion or anxiety about what they are expected to be doing since such confusion or anxiety can be a cue for poor behaviour.  **4. Sufficient attention to the subject dimension within primary education, including the opportunity to specialise**  Although the range of subjects that primary teachers need to deal with makes it much more difficult for them to develop such knowledge and expertise across the full range of subjects within a single year of training, it is noteworthy that the best primary training courses are those that allow their students the opportunity to specialise to a degree in certain subjects, with those specialisations being led by subject specific trainers, as in the courses at Roehampton and Leeds Trinity universities. At Roehampton, as previously mentioned within the section relating to subject knowledge, a three-year undergraduate programme is in operation which allows students to spend three years, with a minimum of three assessed placements, developing their understanding of primary practice. This route also allows Roehampton to develop subject specialists. Students are able to choose a subject specialism which covers the full three years of the programme and takes the student from the development of subject knowledge and pedagogy to planning and subject leadership. As part of this element, students are also asked to plan INSET training in the subject for their placement school. Feedback from students is positive and many go on to become subject co-ordinators in their own right. This opportunity is ever more important given recent evidence. Testimony gathered through an Historical Association survey (of over 230 individual teachers) and recent evidence from subject coordinators collected by Roehampton University indicated that many subject coordinators had received little or no training for their role.  In addition to specialisms, Roehampton also offers a more flexible opportunity for students to take option modules. These are offered to all students regardless of specialism, and history, for example, features as an option. One of the strengths of the undergraduate route with particular reference to primary teaching is the fact that it allows sufficient time for students to gain a range of experiences and to develop particular specialisms or strengths, each in turn led by a specialist trainer with the necessary expertise. This is something that can only be offered through a university-based route and is particularly important in primary education where those entering training do not already have a specialist background in all of the subjects they will teach. Evidence from primary trainees indicates that they do not always encounter history teaching in school on a regular basis, so the opportunity and time to develop subject-specific knowledge and pedagogy within a coherent and well planned primary training course is not just desirable, but essential.  **5. Sustained attention to the nature of progression within the subject**  At a time of profound curriculum change with schools being encouraged to develop their own, more appropriate forms of assessing and reporting students’ levels of attainment and rates of progress in different subjects, it is extremely important that trainee history teachers, both at primary and secondary level are given the opportunity to look very carefully indeed at what it means to get better at history. It is not enough for them to be trained in the application of any one particular model (vitally important though this is, as they develop their practice in particular settings); they also need to be given the opportunity to examine the principles and assumptions (and research models, if any) on which any such scheme is based and to think critically about different models, since it is extremely likely that they will be encounter different systems as they move schools, and that they will quickly be involved as new professionals in developing and refining the system in use in those schools. One of the main reasons for abolishing the previous 10-level model was to allow for more appropriate recognition of the nature of progress in different subjects, so it is particularly important that trainees can focus in detail on developing and articulating their understanding of the nature of progression *in history* and are aware of the different research traditions and bodies of evidence that underpin our conceptions of pupil learning and of the particular well-documented problems in the recent past that have been associated with particular approaches to assessment. They also need to be given the opportunity to examine a range of *different* approaches, exploring their distinctive strengths and weaknesses and the particular rationales that have been advanced for them. The Historical Association has played an important role in making important research into progression accessible to teachers through the journal *Teaching History* (see for example the series of articles based on Project CHATA – Concepts of History and Teaching Approaches, written by Peter Lee, Denis Schemilt and Frances Blow), providing a forum to express concerns and explore alternatives to current models and now in encouraging teachers to share the alternatives which they are developing and trialling. Issues 115 and 131 of *Teaching History* were both focused on assessment; a supplement to support the new curriculum published in 2013 incudes a key article on assessment without levels, and the next issue (157) to be published in December 2014 will also be devoted to these questions.  **6. Providing models of experienced teachers who are critically reflective and research-literate**  Trainees are only likely to recognise the importance of critical reflection and research literacy if they can see those qualities in the teachers with whom they work and who are presented to them as exemplars. One of the key resources on which initial teacher education in history has come to depend (at secondary level) is the professional journal *Teaching History* precisely because the vast majority of the articles within it are written by practising teachers who adopt exactly that approach to their own practice - developing and rigorously testing ideas for teaching rooted in the reading of historical scholarship, in research in history education specifically, and in wider research in teaching and learning. One or two articles published each year have their origins in work undertaken by history *trainees*, usually in the context of formal assignments which are structured in ways to ensure that they bring research-informed understandings of history teaching and pupil learning to bear on their practice experiences of classroom teaching.  **7. Protocols for debriefing that promote trainees’ own reflection and sufficient time to review their practice in the light of other sources of evidence**  The promotion of critical reflection depends to a considerable extent on training mentors to use methods of observation and debriefing that encourage the trainees to evaluate their own teaching from the very beginning in ways that are strongly focused on pupils’ learning – clearly identifying the evidence on which they are basing their judgments. Of course mentors play a crucial role in providing specific, detailed advice (informed by their own developed expertise and their knowledge of subject-specific pedagogical research) but it is important that they begin any debriefing by finding out the trainees’ own opinion of the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson and encourage them to identify the evidence on which they are basing their judgment. Such an approach builds the trainee’s own capacity for reflection and encourages them to focus on the evidence available to them. The mentor handbook within the Oxford PGCE programme, for example, sets out clear expectations for the structure of debriefing conversations that follow this model, and the same principles are endorsed by other outstanding providers.  Structured time and opportunities away from the classroom to review their observations of others and their own practice in the light of research-informed understandings, growing experience, and through discussion with peers and experienced teachers, are also crucial to the development of the critically reflective professionals in primary and secondary education that we all want to see.  **8. Assignments that are designed to promote rigorous, evidence-based critical reflection and encourage trainees to examine the application of research findings and other theoretical insights within their own teaching**  Subject-specific assignments provide one of the most powerful tools for encouraging and equipping trainees to bring together the range of different sources from which they need to learn. The formal demands of an assignment can provide scope for trainees to look critically and systematically at an issue they are seeking to address in their own teaching, carefully determining what their teaching objectives are in that situation, reading research and scholarship related to those objectives and rigorously testing it out in practice, collecting detailed evidence to inform their judgment about how it can be appropriately applied in a very particular context. To be useful in modelling the processes of critical reflection and the appropriate use of research to inform practice, assignments therefore need to be focused on practical and specific problems of teaching and involve systematic collection of evidence related to students’ existing understandings and the learning that takes place. Examples of the power of such assignments and the ways in which they promote both careful evaluation of pupils’ developing knowledge, understanding and skills and critical application and review of history specific educational research and scholarship can be seen in the following *Teaching History* articles that have been developed from PGCE assignments:  Buxton, E. (2010) ‘Fog over channel; continent accessible? Year 8 use counterfactual reasoning to explore place and upheaval in eighteenth-century France and Britain’ *Teaching History, 140,* pp.4-15.  Conway, R. (2006) What they think they know: the impact of pupils' preconceptions on their understanding of historical significance. Teaching History, 125, 10-15.  Richards, K. (2012) ‘Avoiding a din at dinner, or teaching Year 13 students to argue for themselves: Year 13 students plan a historians’ dinner party’ *Teaching History, 148,* pp. 18-26.  Smith, D. (2014) ‘Period, place and mental space: using historical scholarship to develop Year 7 pupils’ sense of period’ *Teaching History, 154,* pp.8-15.  **9. The connection of trainees to the wider history education community and academic historians**  It is essential that aspiring teachers are encouraged to look beyond the confines of their particular school placements for models of outstanding practice in history education. The most effective courses therefore seek to connect their trainees to the wider community of history educators and to ensure that they have ready access and encouragement to continue engaging with current historical scholarship. As ‘the voice for history’ for both primary and secondary history education, the Historical Association provides a powerful resource for doing so, through its professional journals, largely written by practising teachers but also bridging the worlds of school history, history education research and academic history; through its extensive website resources, including its expanding podcast series delivered by leading historians; face-to-face at its annual conference and regular regional forums; through the expertise of both its primary and secondary education committees and via its extensive branch networks.  At primary level the journal *Primary History* calls upon the expertise of a wide range of professionals within primary history education who are able to set the subject knowledge required to deliver the new history curriculum effectively within the context of child development and who are able to successfully communicate to an audience of aspiring teachers who may well not be history subject specialists. This, coupled with practical teaching ideas, largely written by primary teachers and trainers, and insights into the latest academic research relating to children’s learning in history, (such as Penelope Harnett and Hilary Cooper’s work on chronology and young children), means that *Primary History* is becoming an indispensable aid for both practising primary teachers, and for teacher trainers and their trainees, especially where their courses allow for some degree of specialisation  The secondary PGCE programmes at Oxford, Cambridge and the Institute of Education, for example (all graded as outstanding providers at their last Ofsted ITE inspections) expect all their trainees to join the Historical Association. For two years, Teach First provided free membership of the Historical Association for all its first and second year participants and this year they have negotiated a Teach First ‘landing page’ to introduce participants to the range of resources provided by the HA and to encourage them to become full members. This was one of the initiatives undertaken by Teach First in response to the recommendations from its 2011 Ofsted inspection, which graded the programme as ‘outstanding’ but nonetheless noted the need to improve the quality of participants’ subject-specific preparation. The Historical Association also works in partnership with training providers such as Leeds Trinity University to hold special history-focused professional development forums which provide an opportunity for teachers to engage with subject knowledge expertise, network and share ideas at a low cost. These events attract a sizeable number of trainees as well as experienced teachers.    **10. Opportunities for further Master’s level study and accreditation**  The high levels of subject knowledge and pedagogy that are required, based on a secure understanding of how children learn mean that teaching should become properly recognised as a Master’s level profession, with initial teacher education training providing credits towards qualification at this level and encouragement for the teacher to undertake further accredited study as part of their ongoing professional development. While this has been intended and discussed before, progress has been piecemeal. It is crucial that following qualification, teachers are given the opportunity to undertake M-Level professional development courses, which not only benefit the teachers concerned but also the school. Subject associations and universities are perfectly positioned to provide training and support in these areas. | |

1 b) How do the best ITT providers and schools ensure that trainees gain the right experience in school placements and school based training, to equip them to become outstanding teachers?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  **1. A well-defined programme with scope to respond to individual needs.**  A clear and systematic programme is essential to ensure that all the main components of effective history teaching are addressed. While this needs to provide a good overall framework, it also needs to allow for sufficient flexibility to respond to each trainee's prior experience and individual needs over the course of the year and to the specific features of each school context. The underlying structure of the programme needs to be very secure with an explicit commitment from the school/mentor to provide scope for the agreed tasks, training sessions and teaching opportunities - and to contribute though mentor meetings to the on-going review and development of that programme.  **2. Stable partnerships with expert leadership at the subject level that promotes the development of mentors’ expertise**  It is the team of mentors that is the key to the quality of trainees’ experience in school, but as with every team, its ongoing success needs to be nurtured. This requires the leadership of a history education expert with sufficient time to fulfil the role and strong knowledge of all aspects of education scholarship and pedagogy relating to their subject and a wide-ranging appreciation of diverse classroom practice. It is these experts who make the difference between an organisational structure and a community. The subject expert will liaise with mentors and support them, and will invest in the quality assurance processes so that the hard-pressed teachers who are acting as mentors will feel valued and supported. It is worrying that in some of the new training models, there is little investment in subject leaders, either university or school based.  **3. Appropriate attention to subject pedagogy in association with the more generic principles that underpin all effective teaching**  Recent evidence from School Direct trainees suggests that the predominantly school-based elements of their training tended to focus considerable attention on training in behaviour management, pastoral care and the operation of particular school systems. Unfortunately, their mentors tended to be much less alert to issues of subject pedagogy and the trainees found themselves highly dependent on the university-based input in this respect. This division of responsibilities is unhelpful, however, in that it makes the integration of research-informed understandings of children’s learning with the practical development of trainees’ skills much less likely. The most effective provision is within stable partnerships in which groups of subject-mentors are able to work with a university-based history educator so that the different elements are effectively combined.  Developing effective behaviour management strategies, for example is one aspect of initial teacher education that can be largely (but not exclusively) addressed by a generic and practical approach. Indeed, within any school setting, the more consistently that approaches to assertive management are developed and operated by teachers across all subjects, the more effectively they tend to work. However, it is important that history trainees are also alerted to the ways in which effective planning and careful management of key transitions within the lesson contribute to the *prevention* of challenging behaviour. The particular issues that need to be addressed within subject-specific elements of the programme relate to ensuring that students understand not only what they are being asked to do, but also why.  Supporting students with special educational needs is also an aspect in which some generic input in trainees’ programmes is extremely important, equipping students with knowledge of the nature of different needs, the specific kinds of barriers that they can present to learning and research-based knowledge of particular strategies that have been shown to be effective in overcoming those barriers. But again history trainees also require the opportunity to look in detail at how those particular needs impact on learning in history and to work in systematic ways, examining their implications within the subject as well as focusing on individual students, using case-study approaches with individual pupils to help them engage in the necessary processes of liaison with special needs staff and in tracking the effectiveness of particular strategies.    There is also a developed appreciation within the history education community that certain approaches to differentiation for pupils with low levels of literacy – reducing the demands of written texts and sources, for example, tend, in fact to compound the difficulties that such learners face by removing both the ‘colour’ and interest of the source or story and depriving the pupils of essential contextual detail with which to make sense of the past situation. Trainees therefore need both access generic detail and to history specific examples of other ways in which teachers have made challenging texts accessible to all students – not simply by editing the text. (See for example, Harris, R. (2005) ‘Does differentiation have to mean different?’ *Teaching History*, 118, pp. 5-12; and Foster, R. (2011) Using academic history in the classroom. In I. Davies (Ed.) *Debates in History Teaching.* Abingdon: Routledge, pp.199-211.)  The Cambridge PGCE partnership seeks to ensure that its course is 'schools-led at the subject level'. Too often, however, courses are simply 'school-led', and subject mentors are not part of a community of subject experts that can become bigger than the sum of their parts. When that happens, it is all too easy to end up with a course that is largely generic, in which, at best, subject matters are rather tacked on; at worse, the subject is tackled superficially. In the worst cases in other quarters, trainees are just expected to implement the latest policy or initiative without any understanding of its rationale, antecedents or basis in research. They therefore do not know how to judge it for curricular rigour or rigour as historical learning or how to theorise their own goals for high quality history education. This results in new teachers who are simply unable to draw on rich knowledge of history education trends and practices to put together their own mark-scheme or their own goals for short or long-term planning. They know nothing but Level Descriptions and GCSE mark-schemes and lack the knowledge either to critique or to replace them.  **4. Regular evaluation and review of the programme by all partners**  Joint planning and regular review of the joint curriculum (in light of feedback from trainees and from mentors, conducted at the end of each placement) depends on a measure of continuity from year to year. This allows new mentors to be inducted into a well theorised and tested programme and for both new and experienced mentors to draw on their experiences to keep shaping and refining the programme so that it responds to trainees' needs and to changing circumstances in their school, or to curricular reforms.  Effective training programmes will continue to be reflective and will necessarily include regular and systematic collection of evaluation data from trainees. This should be conducted at the subject-level as well as the whole-school level for each placement (as well, obviously, as for any university-based components of the training programme). The standard use of external examining in relation to courses accredited by universities also provides important data collected from the trainees about the quality and consistency of the training that they have received.  **5. A requirement for sustained experience in more than one school context and a commitment to preparing teachers for the profession rather than for a single school**  The idea that 'schools grow their own' teachers which is part of the discourse behind the most recent moves towards more school-led teacher education seems to want to 'flatten' out any variation within particular schools and prepare teachers to teach in only one way which happens to suit that particular school, and is essentially unhelpful in preparing adaptive professionals, able to work in a range of contexts. | |

1 c) What are the characteristics of effective ITT partnerships?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  **1. Integrated school/university partnerships**  The key principles in constructing effective partnerships are that the distinctive contributions of school and university based partners are effectively *integrated,* achieving the ‘seamless’ programme to which the Cambridge partnership, for example, aspires. Since this depends on joint planning, it can best be secured by stable partnerships to which subject mentors are prepared to make a significant commitment because they know their departments will be engaged with it on a long-term.  The history curriculum programme within the Oxford PGCE is another jointly planned programme originally developed by the mentors and university-based tutors agreeing together the overall sequence, including both the specific focus of sessions in the university and the associated training activities that would take place in school during the same week. As this design suggests, ‘serial’ rather than block placements for at least part of the programme (i.e. with time split each week between school and university) allow for highly effective *integration* of the different sources of knowledge on which beginning teachers need to draw, with a chance to explore research-based and theoretical principles in their observation and through their own practice, with continued scope to being their insights and experiences back together for careful discussion within a subject group.) Such programmes obviously need to include an element of flexibility in relation to those aspects of history teaching that cannot be guaranteed to be taking place at a particular point (e.g. while *every* lesson can be expected to provide scope to focus on teacher explanation and exposition or effective questioning, a specific focus on teaching about a particular second-order concept in history such as causation - with scope to explore pupils' common misconceptions will depend on exactly what is being taught in that particular lesson - and so more time is built into the curriculum plan to ensure that trainees have the chance to examine the issue through observation or in practice before revisiting it again in university sessions).  Secure partnerships thus facilitate effective liaison between schools and university (or other central provider) and allow for them to help shape the course offered to the best of each partners’ strengths in terms of time and expertise. They are also able to navigate the most effective route to supporting and developing each individual trainee, maintaining a coherent yet flexible approach.  *Evidence from the Historical Association annual survey* The most recent annual survey of history teachers conducted by the Historical Association included a series of questions about their views and experiences of initial teacher education and there is very little support for the further expansion of employment-based routes into teaching, essentially because of the strength that most teachers see in integrated forms of partnership that bring together schools and universities. Responses to these questions are reported below to illustrate the strength of support among HA members for university-school partnerships with both partners working closely together. Around 270 history teachers responded to these questions and the analysis makes it possible to compare the responses of teachers from schools that are *currently* with involved in initial teacher education with those of teachers in schools that do not currently have any trainees.  *a) Strong support for university-school partnerships*  Nearly 80% of respondents agreed with the proposition that partnerships between schools and universities are the most effective way of training teachers this view and less than 5% opposed it. As Figure 1 shows, those who were currently working with a history trainee in their school tended to be more strongly supportive of the claim (92%) than those who were not actively working with beginning teachers (85%).  *Figure 1: The extent to which respondents agreed with the claim that partnerships between schools and universities are the most effective way of training teachers*    *b) Lack of support for further expansion of employment-based routes into history teaching*  As Figure 2 shows, over half of the respondents (53%) to the survey *disagreed* with the suggestion that increasing the numbers of employment-based trainees would improve the quality of history teachers entering the profession. While almost a third (31%) had no clear views on the subject, only 17% of respondents expressed support for the idea. Opposition tended to be more marked among those respondents who had current experience of ITE, with a current history trainee in their school.  *Figure 2: The extent to which respondents agreed with the specific suggestion that increasing the number of places for employment-based salaried trainees would improve the quality of history teachers.*  *c) Support for the inclusion of a minimum amount of university-based training*  Among respondents to the survey, 90% agreed with the suggestion that all training programmes for history teachers should include a guaranteed minimum amount of university-based training. As Figure 3 reveals, over half of those respondents agreed *strongly* with the claim. Only 2% disagreed and thought that university-based element should not be an entitlement of all history trainee  *Figure 3: The extent to which respondents agreed with the claim that all history trainees should*  *be entitled to a minimum amount of university-based training.*    Eighty percent of respondents also expressed agreement with the suggestion that one of the most important benefits arising from school-university partnerships in ITE arises from the scope that it provides for trainees to engage with subject-specific educational research. As Figure 4 shows, only 5% of respondents disagreed in any way with this claim. As with previous responses the tendency to agree with the claim was more pronounced among those actively engaged with history trainees (85%) than among those who were not (75%).  *Figure 4: The extent to which respondents agreed with the claim that one of the key benefits of university/school training partnerships is that trainees are encouraged to read and engage with subject-specific education research*  *d) Teachers’ reasons for preferring partnership models of training*  Forty-four of the respondents chose to explain their views by adding a comment at the end of the series of statements about the quality and strengths of different forms of provision and the impact of further increasing the role of school in ITE. Only three of these statements were used to explain positive views of an increased role for schools. While one suggested university-based input was only appropriate for those training to work in private schools, another referred to the poor communication that they had experienced within a particular partnership, which meant that they had received very late notice of trainee placements. The third respondent suggested that school-based training was the most effective at ensuring good practice in terms of behaviour management, but balanced this by arguing that the university-based contribution helped to ensure effective pedagogy.  The vast majority of comments were therefore made in support of partnership forms of ITE provision. The need for a balanced contribution from both schools and universities was a common theme and was explicitly endorsed in eight comments.  *The partnership between schools and universities is invaluable in allowing trainee teachers to gain an in-depth understanding of both practical and theoretical aspects of teaching, and to reflect properly on pedagogy, curriculum and assessment in general as well as being concerned with their day-to-day practice in school. Part of the reason people choose a salaried route like Teach First or Schools Direct with much less university input is because of the costs of a PGCE course balanced against being paid a salary for their training year. It would be much more useful for trainee teachers to provide [them with] an allowance and scrap fees than to limit university participation in initial teacher education. (Teacher 258, Academy)*  Where comments were critical of increasing the role of schools or reducing the role of universities three kinds of arguments were used. One focused on the distinctive contribution of universities in terms of the input that they provided. This input was seen as deriving from research and focused particularly on pedagogy, particularly subject specific pedagogy.  *At university, trainees have the time to work with others from their subject and therefore to discuss or engage in more specific issues relevant to them, e.g. research about how to teach the Holocaust. In schools, they have the practical experience but there is nowhere near enough time to engage in such interesting debates or to explore possibilities in the same sort of way.*  *(Teacher 10, Grammar school)*  *The learning of pedagogy in universities underpins what students put into practice in schools. If students miss this, they do not have an understanding of what they are doing and why.*  *(Teacher 146, Academy)*  Occasional reference was also made to the way in which university partners could support the development of specific subject knowledge (substantive content).  *I agree that a relationship with a university is important to provide a range of practical pedagogical theories and ideas. I did the GTP scheme and felt I missed the breadth of teaching practice that others experienced on a PGCE. I also agree that subject knowledge development is important - especially after the restrictive diet experienced by recent students. Here a link with a university is also important especially if the school doesn't contain teachers with a range and depth of historical knowledge.   (Teacher 153, Independent School)*  Another common argument focused on the value of stable partnerships that could bring groups of students together outside the demands of the immediate teaching context to reflect critically on their own practice (which it was argued speeded beginners’ learning considerably) and to learn from each other’s experiences and through reviewing the range of practices that they each had insight into from different schools.  *Most departments are small and may have even fewer specialists themselves. Trainees need exposure to a wide range of ideas/approaches and this could be limited if too much training in school. The opportunity for trainees to learn from their peers (i.e. other trainees) is also invaluable so there need to be forums for trainees to work together not just all alone in school depts.*  *(Teacher 18, Independent school)*  It was also noted, that even where time was officially set aside for particular training activities in school, these were frequently abandoned under the pressure of other, unforeseen events (which was seen as an inevitable feature of school life) or because senior leaders tended to prioritise generic training over a focus on subject specific professional development.  *The school-based aspect of ITT is critical, and it is right that this is weighted more heavily as students must be in this environment and in the classroom for as long as they can. However, it works well in conjunction with university-based training. Students NEED university time as this allows them dedicated, proper time to reflect on their practices properly, and engage with the pedagogy. Schools will have the best of intentions but anyone who has worked in a school will know that things fall by the wayside due to the immense day to day pressures. Students will only get proper, dedicated, quality time to reflect and properly learn, if they have Universities drive this aspect of it. BOTH are needed.*  *(Teacher 209, Independent School)*  *Some history teachers may have the capacity to provide the professional education but schools discourage any training other than their own devised CPD, for example I have had 3 training sessions cancelled by SLT and made to do them after school in our own time even though there are school-based CPD sessions every night after school. I would say that although schools want to train teachers themselves they want to do it on the cheap without the necessary means or knowledge to do it properly.*  *(Teacher 136, Academy)*  The third main argument focused on the unreasonable demands that mentoring made on teachers if there was no other substantial source of input into the trainees’ learning. While some argued that mentors currently lacked the skill and knowledge to fill this gap, others implied that it might be possible but that it would be inappropriate to seek to do so, given the primary commitment of mentors to their pupils’ learning.  *With the increased (and increasing) pressures on teacher workload, this would add an enormous amount of extra pressure and work on any teacher with the responsibility for that trainee. Furthermore, understanding of pedagogy and ideas/ philosophies/ theories of teaching would be drastically reduced under this system.*  *(Teacher 148, Academy)*  *My experience suggests that the demands of teaching a full timetable whilst trying to teach someone how to teach History does not have a positive impact on my teaching.*  *(Teacher 261, Academy)*  With the exception of the three critics of university providers within ITE partnerships, who represent less than 7% of those who chose to add an explanatory comment, the range of views expressed thus provides strong support for the view that secure partnerships represent the most effective way of training beginning history teachers, and ensuring that they have access to subject-specific educational research. While there is obviously strong commitment to the work of school-based mentor as full partners in initial teacher education and a recognition of their vital and distinctive expertise, and in many cases, a sense of confidence about what skilled subject-specific mentors could achieve with more dedicated time for their role, there was a also a keen awareness that such time cannot easily be given without seriously disrupting their main teaching commitments and that school-led employment based routes tend to have a strong bias towards generic training that neglects the subject specific dimensions of research and pedagogy.  In addition to this Historical Association survey evidence, evidence from a York University careers department survey of graduates suggested that graduates displayed a preference for Russell Group University led PGCE partnerships rather than School Direct provision. This trend has been repeated elsewhere, reflected by lower levels of take-up for School Direct training places.  **2. A formal partnership agreement**  In a strong partnership, each partner’s commitment to the programme should be spelt out in formal partnership agreements so that each partner (and the trainee) knows what can be expected of those supporting and guiding them in different contexts. The partnership also needs to be sufficiently large and secure that if a problem arises in a particular context (due, for example, to ill-health; or a new mentor failing to honour their commitment to provide a regular time-tabled session for discussion of the trainee’s progress and developmental support) a trainee can be moved to a more suitable context in which they will receive that specified training.    **3. Regular visits by a subject specialist from the university or other central provider**  Regular visits by a history specialist make it possible both for the tutor and mentor to engage in joint observation and feedback of the trainees' teaching. In the case of the Oxford Internship Programme trainees receive a minimum of four school visits from a history education tutor over the course of the year. Such visits serve several purposes:  a) A developmental role in supporting the mentor's practice - for example in ensuring that they have identified a specific focus for observation related to the trainee's current targets for development (linked to the Standards for QTS); or in providing scope for the trainees' reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson (which enables them to pitch and prioritise their own feedback and further advice, as well as supporting the development of effective self-evaluation); or in ensuring that subject-specific dimensions are brought to the fore (including substantive content knowledge as well as appropriate forms of pedagogy)  b) A moderating role in serving to ensure that judgments about effective practice are based on shared standards across the partnership  c) A developmental role in equipping mentors with a repertoire of strategies to support trainees' learning. Joint discussion of a trainee's current development priorities and of the steps by which they could be address those priorities helps to broaden mentors' new mentors' awareness of the range of resources from which the trainees might learn most effectively (depending on the nature of the issue). While observation of other teachers and observation of their own practice are fundamental to school-based learning, there are many other ways in which trainees can learn in school and this individualised discussion of specific issues can help to alert new mentors to the range of strategies and resources available to them in school, such as: collaborative planning and teaching; joint observation (mentor and trainee of a colleague's teaching with follow-up discussion) shared marking and moderation of pupils' work; more systematic analysis of students' work to identify common misconceptions that need to be addressed; joint discussion of articles about teaching specific content or concepts written by practising history teachers; joint discussion of works of historical scholarship to identify worthwhile enquiry questions for a short sequence of lessons; seeking student feedback on particular activities etc.  **4. Engagement with subject associations**  As previously discussed, strong ITT partnerships will also engage fully with subject associations not only through their journals (see *Teaching History* and *Primary History*) and online resources, but also through professional development events and conferences. The Historical Association journals play a pivotal role in several history training courses both at primary and secondary level across the country and as well as providing knowledge and pedagogy, also provide the opportunity to learn from successful practitioners. Articles from our journals have been reproduced in other leading education journals. Subject associations have a strong role to play in developing subject knowledge and pedagogy and effective ITT partnerships realise this. Strong ITT providers also often have highly effective practice to share and these providers can regularly be found doing just that. The Historical Association conference, for example, routinely attracts ITT providers and partners to its conferences, both to present workshops, and to share their developing ideas, research and practice.  With over 6000 members, including academics as well as history teachers, the Historical Association allows history mentors to benefit from the latest scholarship in relation to a wide variety of historical periods and themes, as well as from research in history education. Sir David Cannadine is one among a number of distinguished historians to be affiliated with the Historical Association and the association regularly works alongside the Royal Historical Society. Subject associations are extremely well placed to offer great support to both teacher trainers and trainees and effective ITT partnerships will make the most of their links with subject associations.  In summary, the most effective partnerships draw upon the subject community as a whole. ITT doesn’t come from ITT; ITT comes from the subject community. | |  |  | |

1 d) what elements create really effective mentoring?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  **1. Knowledgeable mentors, aware of previous developments in the teaching of their subject and of current research, particularly practitioner research**  In history education, mentors need to know about major debates and trends, changing policy and practice, and patterns of history teacher-authored literature that have been influential in ongoing problem-solving in historical learning over the last 20 years at least. Without that, the trainee is forced to 'translate' across two discourses - one informed and rooted in diverse practice of numerous history teachers over time; the other not informed, and narrowly rooted in one or two contexts. At best, history mentors are researchers and possibly writers themselves. Not all mentors can achieve that, of course, but at the very least, mentors should know about other practising history teachers' writings and research, especially where these have been influential, for good or ill. Without that, they cannot hope to help the trainee to understand how history teachers in the past have tackled history-specific curricular and pedagogic problems, and so are unable to do the really important job of building trainees' intellectual confidence to plan with rigour and to engage in an informed, constructive critique of, for example, daft assessment practices that are not only antithetical to rigorous history, but completely unnecessary mistakes because teachers made them 20 years ago.  Mentors ideally need to be role models who not only read history education literature but also historical scholarship too. This is difficult for many to achieve. Even where they really want to, few history departments find the time that they would dearly love to have to read and discuss historical scholarship regularly and thus keep in touch with academic discourse. The range of demands that teachers face frequently drag history departments away from deep reflection on subject-specific matters, let alone reading recent scholarship. This provides all the more reason for the community of subject mentors, in any ITT partnership or alliance, to work together to find ways of modelling that culture and passing it on to trainees. Section D of the history handbook from the Cambridge partnership (see Appendix 1) illustrates how the team of mentors strives to achieve this.  **2. Adequate time for subject-specific mentoring**  The amount of time and effort required to support and develop even the very best trainees is often underestimated. Mentors are everything to all types of training courses as the bulk of training happens in school. Effective mentoring therefore depends on protected time for the mentor’s work and support for their development within that role. From the secondary trainee’s perspective, the most crucial element is that they are mentored by a subject specialist and such opportunities also need to be made available, at least in their ‘specialist’ subjects for primary trainees. Current evidence from training providers shows that the strengths of the best history mentors derive in large part from their membership of a partnership that links them to research and scholarship and new developments in history pedagogy. There is no guarantee that outstanding teachers will become outstanding mentors, but partnerships with universities have been shown to provide a culture and space to support the development of outstanding practice in mentoring through membership of a strong collaborative community. The team of subject mentors should thus form an integral part of any training partnership and help to shape it as well as supporting the induction and development of new mentors and of those who require additional support.  **3. Stable partnerships of a reasonable size in terms of scope for subject specific mentoring**  As previously discussed, effective mentoring arises from a stable and effective ITT partnership. In order to ensure that partnerships can provide high quality subject-specific mentoring they need to be off sufficient size to create a stable group of history mentors, able to meet regularly to play a full part in the design and review of the programme, to induct and support new colleagues by drawing on the expertise of more experienced mentors, and capable of engaging in their own research and development work in refining the programme and the mentoring strategies that they use.  A stable partnership also allows for experienced mentors to play an important role in the training, induction and professional development of new and less experienced mentors. The formal forum for this support are new mentor induction events, with some sessions led by experienced mentors, and regular mentor meetings (at Oxford, these take place four times a year) which always include items run by experienced mentors. The partnership at Cambridge, as previously discussed, also has a team of lead mentors who are always fully involved in planning and leading sessions within their regular mentor development days, and attendance at those days is obligatory for all mentors. (see Appendix 2 and 3 for examples)  Stable partnerships also allow for regular meetings of subject mentors, which provide a key forum for discussion and development of their practice, not only as mentors, but also as subject teachers. Provision of core reading for trainees in relation to each dimension of history education, also serves to provide mentors with guidance about recent developments in subject pedagogy and some highly effective programmes (jointly planned by the mentors) such as the Cambridge History PGCE expect their mentors to read all the same core readings as they set for their trainees so that they can discuss them with them. Stable partnerships that can guarantee their numbers from year to year are much more able to develop (in partnership) agreed selection criteria for the choice of mentors and to be able to formalise and adhere to agreements about the expected duties of each partner. Where places are allocated on an ad-hoc basis or particular departments are pressured to take a trainee to make up numbers it is very difficult to insist, for example, on attendance at mentor training or to enforce minimum expectations in terms of the quality of mentoring. Regular mentor meetings also make it possible for a group of mentors to address issues of common concern in relation to their *own* professional development, thereby improving their own practice and so becoming more effective in supporting trainees' learning in relation to those issues. Current mentor meetings at Oxford, for example, have focused on exploring different models of progression and assessment as schools seek to respond to the new requirements of the revised curriculum.  Findings from the HA survey demonstrate the value that mentors and other experienced teachers gain from the way in which their role connects them with history-specific educational research and scholarship. As Figure 4 below shows, almost 80% of respondents agreed with the claim that experienced teachers gained from being involved in a partnership that links their history department to a university ITE provider.  *Figure 4: The extent to which respondents agreed with the claim that history mentors (and other history teachers working with trainees) also benefit from training partnerships that link the department to a university provider*    **4. Effective leadership of the subject team**  The most important job of the leader of a history PGCE course is the building, nurture, inspiration and renewal of the history mentor team, the history mentor community and the knowledge of that community as it shares its experience, its scholarship of practice, its habits of reading, its efforts to sustain a culture of reading against the odds. A team can do far more than an individual and the fact that all are accountable to the subject team combats complacency.  **5. Appropriate training for mentors and their involvement in induction and training meetings**  The most effective training for mentors involves other experienced mentors, able to share their developed expertise and to draw on specific examples of work with trainees in their own contexts. They can provide specific exemplification of how to break down the processes involved in learning to teach, and of how to meet competing objectives, such as giving trainees sufficient experience of working with GCSE and A level classes, without jeopardising the chances of the pupils in those classes. They can model the high standards of engagement with research and scholarship that are expected of mentors training teachers to be critically reflective and research-informed – and influence new mentors in ways that simple exhortations from a university-based tutor will not achieve.  The regular 'Move Me On' feature in the professional journal *Teaching History* provides a written resource for mentors' struggling to address particular problems in their trainee's learning. Regular subject tutor visits facilitate a similar kind of focused discussion and identification of strategies to tackle particular developmental needs.  **6.** **Regular visits by the university based history tutor (or subject coordinator)**  As noted above, regular visits by a subject-specific tutor provide an invaluable opportunity to focus as much on the development of the subject mentor’s expertise as on that of the trainee – through modelling good practice and focused discussion of specific developmental challenges, as well as explicit moderation of shared standards.  **7. Accreditation**  Effective mentoring is time consuming, thought provoking and reflective process for the mentor and can act as professional development in itself. The role and expertise that it requires should therefore be appropriately recognised through an accredited programme that will encourage experienced teachers to take on the role and validate their work and professional learning within it. It is important, however, that there is scope and explicit encouragement within such accredited programmes to focus on the subject-specific dimensions of effective mentoring | |

If you are a trainee or interested in applying for an ITT programme, please consider the questions below:

2 a) What information do trainees look for when choosing ITT courses?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  While we are not responding to this question as a trainee, we are aware from the questions that trainees ask us and the advice that they seek that, despite the information currently provided by the Teaching Agency and the DfE provide a level of initial information, the application process for all training courses over the past year has been somewhat chaotic and applicants are confused (particularly in relation to School Direct provision). The range of different routes, of different designs and length, make it difficult for the potential trainee to know which route is best for them or what is available in their subject in the particular area where they live or want to train. It is also not easy for them to find out how courses have been rated. There is often a lack of transparency about the nature of any particular partnership arrangement.  Trainees would value a central point of information and a common application process for all courses. Subject Associations may also have a role to play in offering tailored guidance for specific subjects. Trainees want to know what is available to them by subject and by area as well as the entry requirements. They also want to be able to make informed decisions about which course is best for them through access to up-to-date information about the course and its locality, about outcomes for former trainees and insights into their experience on the programme.  The fact that funding for schools in handling applications runs out next year, will place an additional burden on an already complex system of applications. | |

2 b) What information should trainees look for when choosing ITT courses?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  We suggest that a common single place should be identified where students can access the following information :  1. The full range of courses available to them (in the particular subject) and their location.  2. Details about the key features of each course, including   1. Length of course 2. Length, number and structure of school placements. 3. Length, number and focus of university-based sessions and their relationship to the school placements. 4. The minimum number of visits they can expect from a university-based tutor or central provider (if applicable) 5. The extent of the opportunities that trainees have to meet and draw upon the experience of other trainees (within the same subject) placed in other contexts 6. At secondary level, the balance between subject specific and professional generic training 7. At primary level, the time spent on individual subjects and the scope for any specialism 8. Access to research and scholarship through online subscriptions, journals and libraries 9. The amount of time allocated for school-based mentors to work with their trainees and some insight into the role that mentors play within the development and delivery of the training programme. 10. How many places are on offer for each type of course within any particular partnership 11. The nature of the accreditation (QTS, or PGCE, for example), including details of the number of Masters-level credits that may be awarded (if applicable) 12. The employment rates of past trainees, and specifically for School Direct, how secure any future employment opportunities are within the school or partnership. 13. Ofsted judgments about the quality of the provision 14. Feedback from former trainees about the nature of their experience. | |

2 c) Is that information available or easy to access?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Yes | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | No | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Not Sure |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: The Department for Education website goes some way to describing the different routes into teaching, but a greater level of information about the full range of courses (including Teach First) should be accessible from the same place. In addition to this, as there is not one single standardised approach or course, full details of each training provider and course, as well as recent trainee feedback should be available. | |

2 d) Where is the ideal place for information to be accessible?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: Information is most easily accessible through a common website that carries information on all or the major training routes. Subject specific guidance could be offered through subject associations either through the same site or via links | |

2 e) What are the most useful ways in which information should be presented?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: Information is probably most accessible if displayed digitally on an independent central website in a clear and easy to read format. Evidence from past trainees could be in video format. | |

If you are representing a School Direct school that is either looking to, or has identified an accredited ITT provider, please consider the questions below:

3 a) What information do schools look for when seeking an accredited ITT provider?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: NA | |

3 b) What information should schools look for when seeking an accredited ITT provider?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: NA | |

3 c) Is that information available or easy to access?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Yes | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | No | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Not Sure |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: NA | |

3 d) Where is the ideal place for information to be accessible?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: NA – but some kind of central placeholder to carry this kind of information may be useful, not just for School Direct schools, but also for other interested parties. | |

3 e) What are the most useful ways in which information should be presented?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: We recommend a single central point for all training information and guidance. This would most usefully be an independent website, but with possible telephone and administration support. | |

If you are representing a school that is not offering School Direct, please consider the questions below:

4 a) Would more transparent information about ITT courses be helpful to you? Why?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: As a subject association, we field a number of queries from potential trainee history teachers each year concerning training options. More transparent and clearly signposted information can only help trainees to make the right decision for themselves. At the moment, because there is no single standard route or course, it is difficult for trainees to weigh up which course or route they find to be the most suitable, or which has the best reputation, aside of word of mouth recommendation or what the providers say about themselves. This kind of information available would serve to drive up standards and provide greater impetus to share ideas and practice. | |

4 b) What information would you look for?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: As previously suggested – Full course details as well as reputational feedback from each course and partnership. | |

4 c) Where is the ideal place for the information to be accessible?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: See above | |

4 d) What are the most useful ways in which information should be presented?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: See above | |

If you have already completed an ITT programme, please answer the following questions:

5 a) How did you decide on the course you took?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: NA | |

5 b) Was there any other information you would have found useful before deciding on the course?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: NA | |

5 c) Where did you look for information and did you seek any careers advice?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: NA | |

5 d) Where is the ideal place for this information to be accessible?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: NA | |

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Textbox | **Please acknowledge this reply.** | | X |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | TextBox | E-mail address for acknowledgement: melanie.jones@history.org.uk | | |

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox | X | | | Yes | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | No |

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [Principles on Consultation](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/255180/Consultation-Principles-Oct-2013.pdf)

The key Consultation Principles are:

* departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
* departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and use real discussion with affected parties and experts as well as the expertise of civil service learning to make well informed decisions
* departments should explain what responses they have received and how these have been used in formulating policy
* consultation should be ‘digital by default’, but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy
* the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Aileen Shaw, DfE Consultation Coordinator, tel: 0370 000 2288 / email: [aileen.shaw@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:aileen.shaw@education.gsi.gov.uk)

**Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.**

Completed responses should be sent to the address shown below by 22 September 2014

Send by post to:

Servet Bicer  
Department for Education  
2nd floor  
Great Smith Street   
SW1P 3BT

Send by e-mail to: [carterreview.evidence@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:carterreview.evidence@education.gsi.gov.uk)