



An employment-based route into teaching

An overview of the first year of the inspection of designated recommended bodies for the Graduate Teacher Programme 2003/04

January 2005

© Crown copyright 2005

Document reference number: HMI 2406

Website: www.ofsted.gov.uk

This document may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-commercial educational purposes, provided that the information quoted is reproduced without adaptation and the source and date of publication are stated.

Contents

Introduction	1
Main findings	3
Recommendations	5
Recruitment and selection	6
Training and assessment	7
Trainees' progress in achieving the standards	14
Management of the ITT partnership	17
Quality assurance	22
Conclusion	25

Introduction

1. Designated Recommending Bodies (DRB) were first established in 2002. The Teacher Training Agency (TTA) allocates places to them annually for the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP). This is an employment-based route into teaching whereby schools train teachers on the job. The GTP is designed primarily for trainees who are additional to school staffing and the TTA pays a grant towards salary as well as training costs. However, some GTP trainees who have teaching experience are funded by a training grant and the school meets the employment costs. Each DRB is responsible for recruiting candidates, identifying their training needs, organising training programmes to meet those needs and assessing trainees against the Standards in *Qualifying to Teach*. There were 92 DRBs in 2003/4.
2. DRBs range in size from 15 to more than 200 trainees. They include higher education institutions (HEIs) and school-centred initial teacher training (SCITT) partnerships with considerable experience of initial teacher training (ITT), as well as local education authorities (LEAs), schools and providers of other education services. Many DRBs are partnerships between several of these organisations.
3. The designation of recommending bodies is an interim stage on the way to full accreditation as a provider of initial teacher training. One of the purposes of the three-year inspection programme that started in September 2003 was to provide information on individual DRBs to assist the TTA with the accreditation process. The inspections checked that individual DRBs met the Requirements for ITT as set out in *Qualifying to Teach* and also provided evidence for Ofsted to report on the overall quality of DRB provision.
4. Ofsted previously inspected the GTP in 2000/1 and published a report¹ in 2002. This report updates the earlier findings using the outcomes of the DRB inspections in 2003/4. The small proportion of GTP places that were administered outside the DRB system in 2003/4 were not inspected.
5. Each DRB received two inspection visits during 2003/4. The reporting inspector visited for up to a week during the autumn or spring terms. They scrutinised documentation, met key staff to discuss the systems in place to manage and quality assure the training and visited two or three schools to meet trainees and school-based trainers. In the early part of the summer term, phase and subject specialist inspectors visited a sample of 207 trainees in schools to observe them teaching and judge how well the trainees were

¹ *The Graduate Teacher Programme*, Ofsted, 2002

meeting the Standards; the inspectors also evaluated the training, assessment, management and quality assurance arrangements in the schools.

6. Following the 46 DRBs inspections in 2003/4, Ofsted reported to the TTA that 17 providers met the Requirements for ITT in *Qualifying to Teach* and recommended them for accreditation. Ofsted identified grounds for refusing accreditation to ten providers because they did not meet one or more of the Requirements and recommended that the remaining 19 providers should receive accreditation subject to specific conditions being met.

Main findings

- The GTP scheme attracts good candidates with the potential to be effective teachers and makes a strong contribution to recruitment in secondary shortage subjects and from under-represented groups
- Most DRBs have productive working relationships with schools and have brought improvements in GTP training, especially given the short time they have been established.
- In around half of the DRBs inspected managers had a clear understanding of the distinctive demands of an employment-based route and planned the provision systematically to provide effective training.
- Success is unrelated to the size or type of DRB. Some LEA and school-led DRBs with limited previous experience as ITT providers are particularly successful
- DRBs have found the management of GTP training in a range of diverse schools, and ensuring that all trainees achieve the full range of the Standards, more challenging than they had anticipated. In their second year, around half the DRBs did not meet the Requirements in *Qualifying to Teach* in some respects, and for around one in five the provision was poor.
- By the end of their training, around 90% of trainees achieve the Standards, around half at a good level. Similar proportions of GTP trainees teach satisfactory or good lessons as those trained on other ITT routes, but fewer GTP trainees teach very good lessons and more teach lessons with some unsatisfactory features
- GTP trainees are highly committed and determined to be successful teachers. Their main strengths are professionalism, their ability to organise and manage classes, their use of information and communication technology (ICT) and their commitment to inclusion and raising pupil achievement
- The training and outcomes for primary trainees are better than those for secondary trainees
- The most common weaknesses of GTP trainees' teaching are a lack of challenge for higher attaining pupils, poor evaluation of the impact of teaching strategies on learning and insufficient linkage between assessment and planning
- While most DRBs successfully match trainees to the schools responsible for most of their training, half do not implement effective systems to

identify and meet trainees' individual training needs. The auditing and development of subject knowledge is particularly weak in the secondary phase

- The design, review and updating of individual training plans need improvement in many DRBs. Much GTP training lacks a clear structure and the second school experience could be used more profitably to give trainees further opportunities, for instance, to teach pupils from a wider age or ability range
- Most mentors have previous ITT experience, although four in ten are inadequately prepared to undertake the training and assessment responsibilities required of them by an employment-based route
- With few exceptions, DRBs make reliable final assessments for the recommendation of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). However, a quarter does not monitor trainees' progress effectively and does not identify early enough those who are making unsatisfactory progress
- Strong DRB managers are having a positive impact on quality in around half the DRBs. Others do not have secure arrangements to monitor and evaluate provision systematically
- DRBs recognise shortcomings in their provision and have made effective use of inspection feedback and support from the TTA to improve its quality

Recommendations

- To improve the quality of this employment-based route, DRBs should ensure that:
 - All trainees receive appropriate training across the full range of the Standards so that they fulfil their potential and become good teachers
 - Trainees' individual needs are assessed thoroughly at the outset to provide a basis for subsequent training
 - Training and assessment are carefully planned, in both the base and second school, and matched to the trainee's need to demonstrate the Standards
 - Secondary trainees have an appropriate programme to develop their subject knowledge and their understanding of subject pedagogy
 - School-based trainers are thoroughly prepared for their roles and responsibilities in the GTP
 - The capacity of each school to train GTP trainees is checked carefully at the start of the training and the quality of provision is monitored and evaluated effectively
 - Trainees in receipt of salary grants are given adequate time for training and are not filling a teaching vacancy
 - Their self-evaluation and development planning are more rigorous and action is taken to secure improvements in quality

Recruitment and selection

7. DRBs successfully recruit candidates with the potential to be effective teachers from a range of backgrounds, including some who have completed access routes and some academic high achievers. The GTP scheme attracts good candidates into teaching and makes a strong contribution to recruitment in secondary shortage subjects and from under-represented groups, particularly minority ethnic trainees and men in primary schools.

8. A few providers did not recruit to their TTA allocations in 2003/4, mainly in the secondary shortage category. Teacher supply needs in a region often drive recruitment efforts and lead to successful provision in LEA and school-led schemes, especially where the DRB works closely with LEA recruitment officers and community groups.

9. Selection decisions are well founded; almost all trainees met by inspectors were very suitable for training through an employment-based route. The majority of DRBs have effective procedures to ensure that all the selection Requirements of *Qualifying to Teach* are met, involving school and DRB managers in the selection process. A significant weakness for a minority is the informality of interviews in which insufficient attention is paid to applicants' subject knowledge and written communication. Many DRBs refined and developed selection procedures during 2003/4 in the light of their experience, for example, by improving the impartiality and rigour of the interviewing process and establishing systems for detailed record keeping. Not all DRBs provide unsuccessful candidates with constructive feedback to help them to prepare for a subsequent application.

10. It is a DRB role to match trainees to appropriate schools. A minority are not actively doing this and expect trainees to find schools themselves. However, most carry out this challenging role well.

Good practice in selection and match to schools

In a LEA-led DRB, there was a close link between the LEA's development plan and DRB recruitment. Selection panels included managers from schools and the DRB and recommended candidates for schools to appoint as graduate trainees. The DRB had secure knowledge of the quality of the schools and subject departments through its own monitoring processes. Trainees could be offered more than one place and were able to select the school that they felt would best match their needs.

11. Schools employ GTP trainees as unqualified graduate teachers and most DRBs ensure that all parties understand fully the employment arrangements. DRB staff often visit schools before the partnership agreement is signed to check that they understand the required commitment to training.

Training and assessment

Identification of training needs

12. Good GTP training depends on a thorough analysis of training needs, yet practice is unacceptably varied and requires significant improvement in many DRBs. Only half have effective systems to identify prior experience and learning to provide a baseline for planning subsequent training.

13. Where needs analysis operates well, the DRB fully involves schools in the assessment process and there are workshops and meetings to ensure that schools and trainees understand their roles. Effective needs assessment and subject auditing involve a range of challenging experiences in the early part of a trainee's programme, that go well beyond a 'tick-box' self-evaluation.

Good practice in needs analysis

A university-based DRB provided schools with detailed guidance on conducting needs analysis and the accreditation of prior learning. Initial analysis began at interview, but trainees spent at least two weeks on this in school at the start of their training. A DRB tutor made an advisory visit to the school to discuss with teachers how to assess training needs. This included subject and ICT audits, classroom observations to assess teaching skills, interviews and discussions with key staff. Tutors checked the needs assessment to verify its accuracy. The trainees then began to compile a portfolio of evidence that ensured that strengths are identified early in the training to boost their confidence.

14. However, many DRBs do not provide sufficient guidance so that schools are unsure about their role in evaluating needs thoroughly against the Standards and assessing prior experience and learning. In the worst cases, there is no needs assessment at all.

15. Subject knowledge auditing is weak. In many cases, no formal audit is undertaken at the start of the training. Most audits are self-evaluations of strengths and areas to develop which have limited value if they are completed before trainees are aware of what they need to know to teach their chosen subject or key stage. Some audits are not well focussed; for example, audits for secondary ICT trainees that concentrate on software applications and neglect ICT concepts and processes. Few DRBs provide good opportunities for trainees to discuss their audit with a subject specialist trainer to ensure they are detailed and accurate.

Training plans

16. The length and content of GTP training is agreed for each individual trainee. Good provision takes account of a trainee's previous achievements and initial needs, and establishes an individual training plan that will enable him or her to meet all the Standards by the time of the final assessment. Nearly all providers compile a training plan in some form. Good plans indicate essential training experiences and how the training will be phased.

Good practice in using training plans

In one DRB, trainees documented their prior experience carefully and identify where they need to develop their expertise. Their plans gave full details of training activities, the specific Standards each activity would contribute to, and the evidence needed to establish that Standards are met. Plans were set out clearly in the teaching programme; for example, what classes were to be taught and the tasks and experiences to be covered term-by-term. Specific targets were given for visits to other schools and for the second school experience. The plans were used as a continuous reference by trainers when reviewing and setting targets.

17. In over half the DRBs the links between initial needs assessment and the development of training plans are tenuous, and a quarter of the GTP trainees visited did not have an adequate training plan to guide their learning and development. Weak plans often do not set out the trainee's training entitlement or give details about key aspects of training, such as the second school experience. Information about training activities is vague; for example, stating 'training for Key Stage 1' without setting out for how long, the focus of the training and what outcomes are sought. Even when initial training plans are satisfactory, their systematic review and updating often needs improvement.

18. DRBs that establish a model training plan for schools to follow often do not encourage sufficient tailoring for individual needs. Another weakness of common plans is that they refer to so many Standards for each activity that the training focus is obscured.

19. Training plans are often weakest for GTP trainees with significant experience who receive a training grant but the school meets their employment costs. These trainees usually have substantial teaching commitments. Their plans rarely address how they might improve beyond competence in areas where they already have some expertise and have the potential to become good or very good.

20. A weak plan does not always signal poor quality training. Nevertheless, without training plans in place DRBs cannot monitor effectively whether the training will enable trainees to demonstrate the Standards.

Training

21. Almost all schools strive to provide GTP trainees with a good range of teaching experience in their subject or phase. Mentors are invariably supportive and keen to nurture the next generation of teachers. An important strength of GTP training is the range of opportunities for trainees to become fully immersed in school life and gain a breadth of whole-school professional experiences; for example, meeting parents, managing the work of teaching assistants and informal networking with other teachers.

22. A few trainees need more varied teaching experiences, such as teaching across a wider ability range. Secondary trainees frequently have little opportunity for a focused primary visit to explore subject progression from Key Stages 2 to 3. In some subjects, particularly ICT and modern foreign languages, trainees often have insufficient access to teaching Key Stage 4 classes. Occasionally, trainees have too full a teaching timetable to learn from observation of, or working with, other teachers.

23. Trainees must have experience in at least two schools before they can be awarded QTS. The best DRBs use this second school experience well to ensure trainees gain relevant experience; for example, a design and technology trainee spent time in a second school developing a second field of specialism.

Good practice in second school experience

For one secondary trainee, a four-week placement in a second school was chosen well to address specific areas of the Standards, such as working with pupils from minority ethnic groups and those for whom English is an additional language. It also provided the trainee with experience of a different teaching approach, one which gave pupils greater scope to take responsibility for their own learning. This helped the trainee to develop his creative skills and to gain valuable experience in working with ICT in the classroom.

24. However, the second school experience often does not provide trainees with a complementary experience or target specific needs. Where the base school is of a particular type or phase, for example, grammar, junior or single-sex, trainees often have a narrow training experience without a well-targeted and significant placement in a contrasting school.

25. Good training is structured carefully and plans are reviewed and revised regularly as the training progresses so that trainees meet the Standards well. Trainees have opportunities to see a wide range of teachers in action and discuss teaching strategies with them. Where a mentor fully understands good practice in teaching and is able to articulate clearly how pupils' subject learning can be best supported, the quality of training is high. Such training is challenging and sets high expectations for the graduate trainee.

Good practice in training for a modern foreign languages trainee

In an LEA-run DRB, a trainee taught a good range of classes including her second foreign language at Key Stage 3. She was trained to teach effectively in the target language. Although training for the 11-16 age range, she observed post-16 teaching and taught at a feeder primary school, as part of her school's outreach work. She spent a short placement in a neighbouring school where she worked with pupils for whom English is an additional language. She attended central LEA courses and spoke highly of the literacy and ICT training she received and the way it addressed her subject. She attended externally run courses for behaviour management and followed a school-based programme for newly qualified and graduate teachers, with a strong emphasis to teaching and learning.

26. By contrast, many GTPs do not have such rich training experiences. The classes and the curriculum that trainees teach frequently drive the training, so topics are addressed as they emerge. This makes it difficult to provide comprehensive coverage. For example, a music trainee with weakness in music technology did not have the opportunity to observe teaching in this area. Much GTP training occurs informally; mentor meetings rarely have agendas set in advance and records are not kept to ensure that trainees are set clear tasks and targets to be achieved by a specified time. An informal approach can be successful in the hands of skilled trainer with a secure understanding of the Standards, but for many school-based trainers a more formal approach would help them to intervene more effectively to address trainees' weaknesses.

27. In only a minority of schools do GTP trainees receive good training programmes for the development of subject knowledge and pedagogy.

Good practice in subject training in ICT

An ICT trainee had a thorough subject training plan that was reviewed weekly and constantly updated and amended. It ensured that the trainee was well versed in using the materials from the National Key Stage 3 Strategy for ICT and knew how to prepare pupils well for public examinations at 16. The trainee received encouragement to read, reflect and evaluate teaching regularly. He had easy access to reading material because the school library held texts on the DRB's reading list and there were additional resources in the ICT department.

28. Such systematic and coherent training programmes for the development of subject knowledge are not widespread. Shortcomings in subject departments in secondary schools also have a direct bearing on the quality of training provided. In ICT, two out of three departments visited had weaknesses, such as a lack of specialist teachers, poor schemes of work or absence of specialist provision at Key Stage 4.

29. Many DRBs provide some core training centrally. In the primary phase, this is often appropriately targeted at improving subject teaching. Secondary trainees particularly welcome the opportunity to share training with their peers. In eight of the 46 DRBs the core training had significant weaknesses, such as:

- the content was inappropriate
- central training was not linked with school-based provision
- the timing was not flexible enough to accommodate employment-based trainees.

30. While most DRBs train both primary and secondary trainees, the inspections found that the training and trainees' outcomes for the primary phase were generally better than for the secondary phase. In 2001/2, the reverse was the case. The small, primary-only, DRBs inspected were all recommended for accreditation and a particularly strong feature was the quality of mentoring.

Good practice in primary mentoring

In one primary school, the lead mentor and trainee met every week to discuss teaching and targets and agreed evidence for the Standards. The meetings were logged and targets were recorded. The mentor provided good written comments on the trainee's lesson planning, teaching and evaluations, in which she offered constructive advice and practical solutions. She included subject-related comments, for example, on the teaching of calculation. The mentor met the mentor in the second school to discuss the trainee's needs and targets in advance of the placement.

31. Elsewhere, lesson feedback from mentors was uneven in quality. Poor feedback often reflects the limited amount of preparation mentors received for their training role. Feedback from DRB staff, such as a LEA advisor, HEI tutor or visiting consultant is often good. It is usually linked well to the Standards and results in clear targets for the trainee. The impact is reduced, however, when visits from DRB staff are infrequent or observations are not made by subject or phase specialists.

32. Some trainees are set assignments as part of the training. A minority of DRBs expect GTP trainees to complete assignments designed for PGCE courses without due consideration of their relevance. However, the best assignments encourage trainees to consider critically their own and other's teaching and provide evidence to demonstrate some Standards.

Good practice in generic training tasks and assignments.

In one school-led DRB, a GTP co-ordinator built a range of assignments into the training. They included writing reports from the second school and post-16 experiences and from interviews with the teacher responsible for inclusion. A particularly helpful task was the observation of seven lessons given by experienced teachers to identify where and how different behaviour management strategies were being used.

Assessment

33. Most DRBs have developed appropriate assessment systems, designed to judge whether trainees meet the Standards. They usually provide schools and trainees with clear assessment documentation and guidance on how to track the Standards. Most also have procedures in place to monitor trainees' progress. These include regular lesson observations, weekly meetings to review progress and the development of portfolios.

Good practice in monitoring trainees' progress

In an HEI-led DRB, wide ranging and clear systems were in place. Good guidance was provided to mentors about how to judge trainees' progress. Portfolios provided reliable and substantial evidence of progress towards meeting the Standards and the DRB was careful to verify this evidence. There was cross-moderation of lesson observations. There were very clear and effective procedures to identify and support trainees not making appropriate progress and for withdrawing them from the course if necessary.

34. A quarter of DRBs do not monitor trainees' progress effectively. In these DRBs, lesson observations are irregular or unfocussed and trainees' ongoing evidence for demonstrating the Standards is not checked thoroughly. Other common weaknesses are that trainees are not observed regularly for assessment by subject or phase specialists and are not assessed in the second school setting.

35. Where monitoring is weak it generally reflects a lack of understanding by school-based trainers of what is demanded by the Standards. Teachers who are unsure about assessment criteria rely heavily on visits by DRB staff. Where these are infrequent, monitoring is inadequate. Consequently, trainees making unsatisfactory progress are not identified early enough.

36. DRB staff are generally knowledgeable about the interpretation of the Standards and most apply assessment criteria confidently and diligently to make secure final assessments for the recommendation of QTS. GTP portfolios are usually detailed and provide a good basis for assessment against the Standards.

37. Good internal moderation verifies assessments through checking of portfolios, paired lesson observations and cross-moderation between partner schools. In the best practice, senior managers in schools see their role as moderators of mentors' assessments and systematically sample evidence.

Good practice in moderating assessments

One provider has adopted internal cross-moderation by personnel from the two participating LEAs, including headteachers. Another DRB has developed detailed and high quality internal moderation systems carried out by university tutors, and external moderation carried out by a programme manager from another DRB.

38. One DRB in five has not yet developed thorough moderation procedures. In one DRB in ten the final assessments were insecure, through confusion over the procedures or the absence of reliable evidence to provide a basis for a QTS recommendation; for example, trainees had not demonstrated the Standards in two consecutive key stages.

39. Most providers who have the responsibility for arranging independent, external moderation have appropriate procedures in place.

Trainees' progress in achieving the standards

40. GTP trainees are highly committed and determined to become successful teachers. Many, especially those training in the primary phase, have previous school experience from informal observation to employment as unqualified teachers or teaching assistants.

41. By the end of their training, almost all trainees satisfactorily achieve the Standards, around half at a good level. This compares with around three-quarters of trainees who achieve the Standards at a good level in PGCE courses.

42. Similar proportions of GTP trainees teach satisfactory or good lessons as those trained on other ITT routes. However, fewer GTP trainees teach very good lessons and one in five lessons observed by inspectors had some unsatisfactory features. The teaching of primary GTP trainees is better than that of secondary GTP trainees. One in four secondary lessons observed had some significant shortcomings and one in three lessons taught by ICT trainees was unsatisfactory.

Professional values and practice

43. Trainees' professionalism was a strong feature. They treated pupils with respect and consideration and recognised the importance of effective support if pupils were to make good progress. They ensured that questions were directed to all groups of pupils and included reticent pupils in class discussions. Trainees were aware of their statutory responsibilities. Most trainees used the time in their base school extremely well to get involved in the wider life of schools, for example staff meetings, in-service activities and extra-curricular activities. Almost all communicated effectively with parents and carers; primary trainees often had more opportunities to do this and often did it well.

44. The trainees demonstrated a proactive approach to their professional development. Most were keen to be successful teachers, took advice readily and worked hard to move their practice forward. Nearly all had shown themselves to be effective learners who had improved during the course of the year. Their progress was attributable to their motivation and ability to get the most out of the training and experiences offered.

45. The best trainees undertook independent study and were reflective, critical and perceptive in evaluating their own and others' teaching. They linked pedagogy with subject content; for example, a primary trainee analysed how she introduced pupils to symmetry. However, a common weakness in lesson evaluations was the lack of focus on teaching and learning strategies. Comments were often limited to aspects of pupils' concentration,

behaviour or enjoyment without considering the learning that took place and how the teaching influenced it. At times, trainers did not require trainees to provide detailed, written lesson evaluations and reliance on short oral reflections did not help them to improve.

Knowledge and Understanding

46. Primary trainees often have good academic backgrounds. Almost all showed a secure knowledge of the National Curriculum in the key stages for which they were being trained and understood the aims of literacy and numeracy in the Primary Strategy. Their confidence in English knowledge was stronger than in the other core subjects. One in fifteen trainees had weaknesses in mathematics, which were related to their personal subject knowledge rather than teaching requirements.

47. Nearly all secondary trainees had degrees that matched, or were closely related to, the subject they intended to teach. However, for a significant minority the application of their subject knowledge to Key Stage 3 and 4 teaching required further development, which reflected gaps in their training. Overall, specific shortcomings included:

- in ICT, half the trainees lacked the depth of subject knowledge to teach ICT well
- in science, health and safety in lessons was not given sufficient consideration
- in modern foreign languages, few trainees knew how to use the target language appropriately.

48. Secondary trainees often missed opportunities to extend pupils' subject knowledge and showed weak understanding of how to eradicate common misconceptions and how to raise pupils' achievement. Trainees' limited reading of books and articles about teaching often restricted their understanding of subject pedagogy. Many of the trainees ostensibly being trained to teach the full 11-18 age range were insecure about teaching post-16 courses.

49. Both primary and secondary trainees understand their responsibilities under the Code of Practice for pupils with special educational needs. They are well informed and alert to inclusion matters. Most showed good practical understanding of how learning may be affected by external influences. They understand the needs of pupils for whom English is an additional language, but only a minority had opportunities to assess and respond to such pupils. The best trainees are well-informed about personal, social and health education and citizenship.

50. Most GTP trainees have significant knowledge and confidence in their personal ICT skills. Some trainees, particularly in primary schools, were acting as effective role models for their teacher colleagues in the use of ICT for searching for and preparing teaching resources, but a significant minority had limited opportunities or facilities in their base school to demonstrate the use of ICT in the classroom.

51. An area of insecurity for many trainees was their knowledge of transition to or from adjacent key stages. Secondary trainees' understanding of Key Stage 2/3 transition was less well developed where training had not included a primary placement.

Teaching

52. The majority of trainees planned their lessons conscientiously and expressed high expectations of their pupils. They related their plans to the National Curriculum and the National Strategies, as appropriate, and were able to plan a coherent sequence of lessons. Weaker secondary trainees were over-reliant on schools' schemes of work or had plans which were simply a list of sequenced activities.

53. A common shortcoming, in a significant number of lessons, was the lack of precision in the lesson objectives so that trainees did not target specific learning. Differentiation and assessment for learning were relatively weak for both primary and secondary trainees and were often omitted from the lesson planning formats that trainees were expected to use. Trainees were often insecure in planning for the range of ability in the class and did not know how to provide challenge for higher attaining pupils. Around half the trainees had deficiencies in using their knowledge of pupils' prior learning in their short-term planning.

54. Primary trainees taught interactive lessons, made good use of questions and used a three-part lesson well, although the plenary was often given insufficient time for learning to be consolidated effectively. Most trainees managed to establish a purposeful learning environment and provided good feedback to pupils, keeping them on task during lessons. They made good use of teaching assistants.

55. The presentation of lessons by almost half of the secondary trainees was good. They used a range of effective teaching and learning strategies confidently, set well-focussed homework and were innovative. For example, an English specialist used drama techniques well for group tasks, and questioned the whole class effectively to promote thinking. Occasionally, secondary trainees had difficulty presenting material appropriately. For example, a music trainee had little recognition of how pupils' cultural and social backgrounds might influence their learning. In secondary mathematics, weaker trainees made limited use of practical and investigational activities to

stimulate pupils' enthusiasm and mathematical curiosity. In modern foreign languages, only one of the fifteen trainees visited used the target language well.

56. Most trainees are aware of a range of strategies for monitoring and assessing pupils and have had experience in assessing against national criteria in relation to Early Learning Goals, National Curriculum and the General Certificate of Secondary Education, as appropriate. Most marked pupils' work thoroughly and tried to include constructive and encouraging comments. However, the quality of informal, ongoing assessments to inform short-term plans varied significantly. In some cases, trainees did not monitor groups sufficiently well and had no clear idea of pupils' progress. There was also an unacceptable range of practice in how trainees recorded pupils' attainments over time, which often reflected the base school's policy and practice. At one end of the spectrum, trainees kept full records for pupils that provided clear evidence of their achievements over time; others had records that were meagre and insufficiently informative. There were very few instances of trainees using assessment information systematically to shape teaching strategies.

57. Most trainees used their time with classes to develop effective classroom organisation and management. They established teaching environments that were generally purposeful, stimulating and productively arranged. Resources and equipment were used well and laboratory and outdoor work was safely managed. Most have appropriately high expectations of behaviour and had developed a range of effective behaviour management strategies. However, for around a third of trainees, their focus on behaviour management narrowed the range of teaching styles they deployed. A few trainees, particularly where schools presented challenging circumstances, struggled to implement their schools' behaviour management strategies.

Management of the ITT partnership

58. Considering the short time DRB partnerships have been established, most have made good progress in establishing productive working relationships with schools. Most DRBs work closely with their partnership schools; teachers are actively involved on management committees and the DRB provides schools with speedy and effective support where needed. Nevertheless, 13 of those inspected did not fully meet the management Requirements in *Qualifying to Teach*. Common reasons were that the training was not coordinated and consistent across the contexts where it took place or schools were not actively involved in the partnership. The need to develop secure management systems quickly, together with the complexities of preparing trainers and managing training in disparate schools, have proved to be extremely challenging for many DRBs.

59. There are significant differences in the arrangements for management and staff deployment adopted by successful DRBs, showing that it is not necessary for all DRBs to adopt the same approach. Nevertheless, there are common features of well-managed DRBs which include:

- a steering group of personnel who have a broad range of expertise and are strongly committed to ITT
- efficient managers and administrators with well-defined roles and responsibilities
- trainers that meet regularly.

Good practice in DRB management

In an HEI-led DRB, the appointment of administrative staff has helped efficiency and released time for the co-ordinator to spend on monitoring the training and the trainees. An external mentor provides focused support for trainees with particular problems.

One LEA-led DRB has a strong board with wide representation, including trainees, and is chaired effectively by a local headteacher. The board is proactive and holds the DRB managers to account. The DRB is embedded within the LEA structures and is able to draw heavily on its resources in identifying effective schools, contributing subject specialist advice and quality assuring aspects of the provision. For example, the LEA's human resources team reviewed the selection procedures.

One medium-size DRB draws effectively on a range of staff to enhance the core training programme, including LEA officers, teachers from training schools, advanced skills teachers as subject and phase specialists and tutors from HEIs.

60. High quality leadership by the manager, or managers, is a key element in DRB success. Effective managers know the partnership schools well and use a steering committee to debate management matters and provide professional advice and support. They have a firm grip on the operation of the programme, and are well aware of the DRB's development needs.

61. Where DRBs are poorly led, there is no clear vision of how the GTP scheme would develop and schools feel marginalised because they are not consulted. Weak management is often found where:

- the DRB is formed from a loose confederation of providers without effective coordination
- headteachers and schools are not represented on management committees
- the staffing is insufficient for the nature and scale of scheme.

62. Good communication systems are essential for effective DRBs to enable managers to be responsive and to ensure that requests are dealt with promptly and efficiently. Partnership handbooks are crucial for clarifying roles and responsibilities and communicating expectations for procedures and accountability. Weaknesses in management often stem from uncertainties among schools and mentors. One area where this is often evident is in the poor management of the second school placement. In around a third of the schools visited, mentors identified shortcomings in the management of the DRB, citing poor communication, coordination and paperwork.

63. At the start of the inspection year, several DRBs did not have a signed partnership agreement in place for each trainee and there was therefore no secure contractual agreement between all parties to define the training and assessment responsibilities and the trainee's entitlement. The situation improved during the year and most DRBs established a partnership agreement, although many mentors remained unclear about their responsibilities within the GTP partnership.

Schools' capacity to train

64. Almost all schools that employ GTP trainees have previous experience of ITT and provide good training environments. The most effective DRBs have published criteria for the selection and de-selection of schools. They negotiate appropriate placements and screen schools to ensure they are able to provide good mentoring and training.

65. Good DRBs keep abreast of changing circumstances in schools and secondary departments to check they continue to have the capacity to train. For example, staff changes in a school can trigger training difficulties for trainees or an independent school may not be able to fulfil an appropriate training programme with respect to the National Curriculum and National Strategies. One in five DRBs does not identify or deal with such problems quickly or decisively enough. A few do not follow the guidance that the TTA provides with regard to placing trainees in schools in special measures.

66. Another area which DRBs have found to be problematic is monitoring the use of salary grants. It is expected that trainees in receipt of these grants should be additional to school staffing and should not be filling a teaching vacancy. However, a few schools, especially those facing teacher shortages, ask trainees to teach classes for whom there is no other teacher; this has a negative impact on the level of support and training they receive. The DRB is responsible for ensuring that a trainee receives appropriate training, but many DRB managers do not feel empowered to act when the trainee is employed by the school concerned.

Preparation of school-based trainers

67. Four out of ten mentors are inadequately trained especially in areas such as identification of training needs, developing a training programme, and understanding assessment of the Standards. This has a detrimental impact on the quality of GTP provision, especially in primary schools.

68. Many DRBs do not provide specific training for GTP mentors, but rely on the appointment of experienced ITT mentors or train them alongside those for other routes. This is not always sufficient for the distinctive requirements of an employment-based route. Mentors often do not have opportunities to meet other GTP mentors and feel isolated in the role.

69. The best DRB managers carefully check each school-based mentor's experience and take a firm line to ensure they receive relevant training. They supplement this with documentation, tutor visits and regular meetings to brief and support mentors. This works well where mentors are fully committed to the role and have significant recent experience of training. Joint observation between subject mentors and DRB staff, where it occurs, also plays a positive role in mentor training.

Good practice in mentors' meetings

In one LEA-led DRB, meetings for mentors and ITT co-ordinators were efficiently organised, regular, well attended and highly informative. The DRB style of management was open and consultative. They listened carefully to school views and took action when necessary to review arrangements, for example, by improving lesson observation forms and the speed of communication in response to school concerns.

70. A minority of DRBs do not bring the detail of the training Requirements to the attention of school-based trainers. Examples where mentors were insufficiently informed include:

- a mentor in a nursery school who did not realise that a Foundation/Key Stage 1 trainee needed significant experience in a Key Stage 1 setting to demonstrate all the Standards
- a mentor who was not aware that a KS2/3 trainee had to be trained to teach more than their specialist subject at Key Stage 2
- a secondary mentor who was not providing a business studies trainee with the required post-16 experience.

Equal opportunities and race equality policies

71. Most providers have appropriate equal opportunities and race equality policies in place, but few are integrated well into the course documentation and schools are not sufficiently aware of them. DRBs are not systematically checking the policies of the partnership schools or monitoring their impact on recruitment and provision.

Good practice in equality policies

One DRB collected equal opportunities and race equality policies from all partner schools. Trainees were expected, as part of their training, to investigate the schools' policies and explore their impact.

Quality assurance

72. One of the principal reasons for establishing DRBs in 2002 was to improve the quality assurance of the GTP scheme. Strong DRB managers, who have a clear understanding of what makes good training, are having a positive impact on quality in around half the DRBs. However, the rest do not have secure systems to monitor and evaluate provision systematically and do not yet meet in full the quality assurance Requirements as set out in *Qualifying to Teach*.

73. The monitoring of school-based training is particularly weak. Training plans are not monitored closely in many DRBs. Visits to schools by DRB staff are often informal, lack a quality assurance focus and do not provide schools with feedback on the quality of their training. Most senior managers in schools do not monitor their own GTP provision regularly, and many do not appreciate the need to do so. Even where schools are evaluating the quality of their own training, their mechanisms for quality assurance are often superficial.

74. The respective roles of DRBs and schools with regard to quality assurance are rarely set out clearly in the partnership agreement. Schools do not always appreciate that the DRB has a formal role in monitoring their work and is responsible for checking on a schools' capacity to provide a suitable training programme. Some DRBs have made a start to involve schools more directly in monitoring quality.

Good practice in monitoring the work of schools

The DRB manager has introduced a self-evaluation checklist for mentors. This has seven key questions for them to identify how well they are meeting expectations for the amount and quality of feedback, target setting and moderation.

75. Only a quarter of DRBs have a formal management group with responsibility to oversee quality assurance and receive monitoring reports. However, nearly all DRBs recognise the need to review and evaluate provision and have mechanisms to seek trainees' and mentors' views. Most commonly, trainees are asked to complete a questionnaire about their training. These evaluations often occur every term, but some DRBs only seek views at the end of the training or focus only on centrally provided training. The best managers also seek opinions about the effectiveness of training from past GTP trainees.

Good practice in the conduct of evaluations

When the DRB manager began in post, he conducted follow-up telephone interviews of some of the previous cohort. A similar evaluation of newly qualified teachers was planned. When evaluative information was gathered, it was used well to compile a comprehensive review and identify areas for development.

Improvement planning

76. The quality of development planning to improve provision is weak in many DRBs. They do not do enough to involve partnership schools in the evaluation of provision or use evidence from evaluations effectively to inform action plans. Almost all DRBs responded well to the first inspection visit and drew up action plans which led to improvements. Increasingly during 2003/4, DRBs made effective use of the consultant support offered by the TTA to help them to identify and resolve quality issues, and develop their practice in self-evaluation.

Good practice in self-evaluation

One DRB's self-evaluation at the end of its first year was accurate and all evaluations by trainees, mentors, GTP co-ordinators and schools fed into it. The DRB used this effectively to guide course improvements. For example, it revised the central training programme to mesh with school-based training and the timing of assignments. Trainees from the previous cohort were used to guide present trainees in how best to organise their personal portfolios.

77. In almost half the DRBs, external evaluation systems are underdeveloped. Most rely on the external examiners' report, and only a few go beyond this.

Good practice in the use of external quality assurance

An experienced consultant employed by the DRB carried out a very thorough evaluation of final assessment. She sampled all assessment forms, identified the strengths and weaknesses and prepared a detailed overall analysis for the DRB manager. This was circulated to all internal assessors together with a quality assurance report on their personal performance. The DRB used the outcomes of this evaluation successfully to inform a two-day training course.

78. Around half the providers inspected have begun to use some form of benchmarking.

Good practice in benchmarking

One large DRB was fully involved in a regional DRB network to facilitate benchmarking – through informal and formal meetings. It is also involved in other DRB-related research and development projects, for example a matched providers' project with a focus on the development of effective school-based training. This enabled them to make comparisons with other providers.

Conclusion

79. The 2003/4 inspections showed that the quality of provision is unrelated to the size or type of organisation. Some LEA and school-led DRBs who have had limited previous experience as an ITT provider are particularly successful.

80. The inspection outcomes showed that DRB partnerships could provide good GTP training where managers have a clear understanding of the distinctive demands that an employment-based route to QTS places on schools and trainees and plan the provision so that trainees systematically achieve the Standards. There are many DRBs where the providers, schools, mentors and trainees share responsibility for GTP training and the partners strive continuously to improve its quality. The rewards for success are high because of the strong candidates that are recruited to the GTP scheme and the potential contribution they can make to the teaching profession.

81. However, many DRBs have found the management and quality assurance of the training more challenging than they had anticipated, especially in ensuring that all trainees achieve the full range of the Standards when providing training in a range of diverse schools. Most recognise the shortcomings in their current training and have plans to address them so that they continue to improve the quality of the training they provide.