

Manchester Metropolitan University ITE Partnership

Initial teacher education inspection report
Inspection dates 3–6 May 2016

This inspection was carried out by Her Majesty's Inspectors in accordance with the 'Initial teacher education inspection handbook'. This handbook sets out the statutory basis and framework for initial teacher education (ITE) inspections in England from September 2015.

The inspection draws on evidence from the early years initial teacher training (ITT) partnership to make judgements against all parts of the evaluation schedule. Inspectors focused on the overall effectiveness of the ITE partnership in securing high-quality outcomes for trainees.

This is a re-inspection of the early years ITT provision, following the inspection in October 2015 that judged it to require improvement. The re-inspection was conducted as a one-stage process.

Inspection judgements

Key to judgements: Grade 1 is outstanding; grade 2 is good; grade 3 is requires improvement; grade 4 is inadequate

| | Early years ITT (EYTS) |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Overall effectiveness How well does the partnership secure consistently high-quality outcomes for trainees? | 3 |
| The outcomes for trainees | 3 |
| The quality of training across the partnership | 3 |
| The quality of leadership and management across the partnership | 3 |

Information about the early years ITT partnership

- The Manchester Metropolitan University early years ITT partnership comprises approximately 50 settings in 12 local authorities.
- Current trainees follow one of two routes which, on successful completion, lead to the award of early years teacher status (EYTS). The routes are a three-year undergraduate route and a one-year employment-based route. Both routes are in their final year of operation.
- During this inspection, there were nine trainees on the undergraduate route and 16 on the employment-based route.

Information about the early years ITT inspection

- When Manchester Metropolitan University EYTS partnership was last inspected in October 2015, it was judged to require improvement. The re-inspection was conducted as a one-stage process.
- At the time of the inspection, undergraduate trainees had completed their placements. An inspector met with three undergraduate trainees and had a telephone discussion with a former employment-based trainee.
- Inspectors observed seven employment-based trainees teaching in seven settings. During these visits, inspectors spoke with the trainees and their setting mentors. They also scrutinised the trainees' files.
- Inspectors met with representatives of the partnership and considered the partnership's self-evaluation and improvement plans; information about trainees' outcomes; completion rates and employment rates and case studies relating to individual trainees and settings.
- Inspectors took account of the six responses to the online trainee questionnaire. All six responses were from employment-based trainees.

Inspection team

| | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Mark Williams | Her Majesty's Inspector | Lead inspector |
| Stuart Bellworthy | Her Majesty's Inspector | Assistant lead inspector |

Overall effectiveness

Grade: 3

The key strengths of the early years ITT partnership are:

- university-based leaders' strong focus on improving the quality of the early years training through:
 - ensuring all in the partnership remain committed to the final cohorts of trainees before the courses close

- ensuring joint quality development processes with settings, to ensure the correct strengths and areas for improvement appropriate to those settings are identified – a feature valued by settings as enhancing their awareness of their role in training
 - securing broad accuracy in the assessment of trainees against the teachers' standards (early years) – an improvement on the previous inspection
 - the introduction of a wider range of sessions to ensure the partnership can present stronger evidence that trainees are at least meeting all of the teachers' standards (early years).
- trainees' strong commitment to their training, as demonstrated by nearly all completing, and their keen understanding of the importance of the early years in securing the best start for children
 - trainees' knowledge and understanding of how to keep children safe; in particular, employment-based trainees' strong understanding of the 'Prevent' duty
 - employment-based trainees' strong contribution to improving quality in their work settings
 - trainees' promotion of children's personal and social development which enables them to secure good relationships with children.

What does the early years ITT partnership need to do to improve further?

- To improve the quality of training further and to ensure trainees achieve as well as they are able against the teachers' standards (early years), leaders must:
 - ensure that setting mentors carry out their agreed roles in regularly checking the progress trainees are making, for example through observations of trainees' teaching and regular mentor–trainee meetings
 - ensure records of these are included in the evidence the partnership presents to support their assessment of trainees against the teachers' standards (early years)
 - make regular checks on the quality of settings used so that, if quality declines and is no longer good, arrangements can be made in a timely fashion to ensure trainees experience best practice
 - ensure all who make records of trainees' teaching report the difference such teaching has had on the learning and development of children.

- To ensure trainees achieve as well as they are able against the teachers' standards (early years). Where trainees are judged to be exceeding the teachers' standards (early years) at the highest level, leaders should ensure the evidence supporting these evaluations stands out.

Inspection judgements

1. As at the time of the previous inspection, the overall effectiveness of the partnership requires improvement. This is because the quality of ongoing support to trainees is not consistently good. Consequently, while all trainees at least meet the teachers' standards (early years), they are not all achieving their potential.
2. Nevertheless, this is an improved partnership than at the time of the previous inspection. Against a backdrop of uncertainty because of course closure, university-based leaders have remained committed to the trainees still on the course and have ensured that all elements are in place so that trainees at least meet, and often exceed, the teachers' standards (early years) by the time they complete.
3. A further improvement since the previous inspection has been the introduction of quality development processes in which university-based leaders meet with settings to evaluate the strengths and areas for improvement. Settings value the discussions, which have highlighted well the right priorities for each setting in relation to early years initial teacher training.
4. While the quality development processes are focusing on the right areas to improve training and outcomes, wider aspects of quality assurance are not always identifying the quality of settings, nor are they always ensuring that priorities are followed through into actions. A few mentors do not carry out their agreed roles in regularly checking the progress trainees are making, for example through observations of trainees' teaching and regular mentor–trainee meetings. Where this occurs, too much reliance is placed on university assessors to check the progress made by trainees, which means some trainees are not realising their potential. It also means that important evidence to support the assessment of trainees against the teachers' standards (early years) is lacking.
5. Where mentoring is best, mentor and university assessor liaison is two-way and issues that arise are addressed quickly. Where such strengths exist, trainees are set increasingly precise targets to improve their practice.
6. Trainees benefit from placements in a wide range of settings. These settings ensure trainees gain experience of children's development from birth to key stage 1 at least. The geographical spread of these settings also means that trainees experience working with children from a range of cultural and social

backgrounds. Such experiences mean trainees are prepared well for employment.

7. As reported in the previous inspection, the partnership benefits from a robust quality assurance system, adapted from primary ITT, to ensure that all placements are of good quality and meet trainees' learning needs. While the great majority of partnership settings have features identified as good or better by Ofsted, on occasions checks on the quality of settings used are not always made in a timely fashion. This has meant the partnership has not always been aware when quality has declined or whether a trainee has access to provision which is at least good in quality.
8. An important improvement since the previous inspection has been the securing of broad accuracy in the assessment of trainees against the teachers' standards (early years). Inspectors agree that the great majority of trainees are on course to exceed these standards in 2016. For those judged by the partnership to be exceeding the standards at the highest level, the evidence to support such judgements does not always stand out. University-based leaders agree with inspectors that more trainees should be at this level. Overall, there is little difference in the attainment of trainees on both routes.
9. As at the previous inspection, trainees demonstrate positive values, attitudes and appropriate behaviours for the birth-to-five age range and have high expectations for the outcomes of children in the early years. Trainees' strong commitment to their training is evident by nearly all completing their courses – highlighting again the sound procedures for recruiting and selecting trainees and their keen understanding of the importance of the early years in securing the best start for children. Of particular note is the way trainees promote children's personal and social development, which enables them to secure good relationships with the children and good relations between the children. One trainee, for example, in noting how well two boys were getting along with each other, praised them saying, 'You are such good friends.' The beaming smiles on both boys' faces was testament to the trainee's focus on what was positive about their behaviour.
10. The university-based training is valued by the trainees. The overall quality of training has been enhanced through the addition of optional sessions and workshops, including those relating to forest schools, den-building and teaching children who speak English as an additional language. Trainees use their training well, including that in phonics (letters and the sounds that they make), early reading and early mathematics on their placements. Trainees create stimulating environments, including tanks full of play frogspawn and outdoor water play activities, to encourage early skills in estimation. Trainee evaluations of these sessions are helpful in ascertaining how they feel their confidence has increased and how resources identified may be used in their settings. However,

the evaluation does not ask trainees to articulate how children's learning and development has improved as a result of putting the training into practice.

11. Trainees think hard about the range of activities they plan for children. They liaise well with their placement colleagues to put these plans into action. Such activities are enjoyed by children and learning takes place. However, while trainees describe well what children are doing, they are not always able to pinpoint exactly what difference their well-thought-out and often stimulating ideas have made to children's learning and development. This is because, as at the time of the previous inspection, records of trainees' teaching do not always report the difference such teaching has made.
12. The promotion of safeguarding is given high priority. Trainees understand well publications such as 'Keeping children safe in education' and know the importance of reporting any incident of homophobic or racist words. All trainees had received training in 'Prevent'. Employment-based trainees in particular articulate well the wider opportunities and responsibilities such training brings to early years settings.
13. The partnership now has a much sharper understanding of the destinations of employment-based trainees than at the time of the last inspection. Of the 16 who left last year, all but one have known destinations and 14 are in employment. It is little wonder that such a high proportion find employment. Trainees on this route make a strong contribution to improving quality in the settings in which they work. Examples include trainees providing updates and training in phonics, early mathematics and child protection to setting colleagues and managers.
14. University-based leaders are accurate in their evaluation of the quality of the partnership. Correctly, they have identified improvements in the accuracy of the assessment of trainees and in the increased range of training opportunities. As with leaders of settings, they too have seen the potential the quality development processes have brought in creating a partnership where all stakeholders know strengths and areas to improve well. University-based leaders are also open and honest about the challenges that have faced them, not least in ensuring mentoring is of a consistently good quality.
15. As at the time of the previous inspection, the partnership has ensured it fully complies with regulations regarding the recruitment of trainees and the requirements for early years initial teacher training.

Annex: Partnership schools and settings

The following schools were visited to observe trainees' teaching:

Blue Grass Purple Cow Nursery, Higher Disley

Bowland Montessori Nursery, Clitheroe

Copper Beeches Day Nursey, Sale

Ramillies Hall Nursey, Cheadle Hulme

St Kentigern's Roman Catholic Primary School, Fallowfield

St Paul's Pre-School, Stockport

The Kindergarten 2, Macclesfield

ITE partnership details

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Unique reference number | 70049 |
| Inspection number | 10010280 |
| Inspection dates | 3–6 May 2016 |
| Lead inspector | Mark Williams, Her Majesty's Inspector |
| Type of ITE partnership | HEI |
| Phases provided | Early years ITE |
| Date of previous inspection | October 2015 |
| Previous inspection report | https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/user |
| Provider address | Brooks Building, 53 Bonsall Street, Manchester M15 6GX |



The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, further education and skills, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may reuse this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted.

Interested in our work? You can subscribe to our monthly newsletter for more information and updates: <http://eepurl.com/iTrDn>.

Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 1231
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.ofsted.gov.uk

© Crown copyright 2016