

# Jewish Primary Schools Consortium SCITT

---

Agency for Jewish Education  
Bet Meir  
44b Albert Road  
Hendon  
London NW4 2SG

A primary initial teacher training  
short inspection report  
2006/07

Managing inspector  
Juliet Ward HMI

© Crown copyright 2007. This report 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 are stated.  
Inspection reports are available on the Ofsted web site ([www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk)).

## Introduction

The Jewish Primary School Consortium works in partnership with 15 schools to provide primary initial teacher training (ITT) courses. It offers 3 to 7 and 5 to 11 primary PGCE courses. At the time of the inspection there were 16 trainees.

## Context

The inspection was carried out by a team of inspectors in accordance with the *Ofsted Handbook for the Inspection of Initial Teacher Training (2005-2011)*.

This report draws on evidence from a short inspection of the provision and an inspection of the management and quality assurance arrangements.

Grades are awarded in accordance with the following scale

Grade 1	Outstanding
Grade 2	Good
Grade 3	Satisfactory
Grade 4	Inadequate

## Main inspection judgements

Management and quality assurance: Grade: 2

The overall quality of training is at least good.

The provider will receive a short inspection in three years.

## Key strengths

- the high level of commitment to improvement
- the very good recruitment and selection process which ensures well qualified trainees are selected who successfully meet the Standards at a good level
- the accurate identification of trainees' individual needs at interview and the use made of the information to provide successful candidates with relevant pre-course tasks and experience
- the quality of mentoring in schools
- the enthusiastic and highly committed trainees.

## Point for action

- ensuring all trainees have a good breadth of teaching experience across the key stages for which they are being trained.

## Points for consideration

- strengthening strategic planning and improving action planning at subject level
- improving the links between centre- and school-based training in science
- ensuring that trainees receive subject specific feedback on their teaching.

## The quality of training

1. The course is well planned and fully meets the Requirements. There is thorough and detailed coverage of the National Curriculum and Foundation Stage Curriculum, and the Primary National Strategy. Trainees have good opportunities throughout the course to put into practice the theories that they have been taught and the evaluation of the outcomes. The Standards are made explicit and are well embedded into all aspects of the course. This is evident in the planning for taught sessions, school-based learning, assignments and teaching placements. Both tutors and trainees share a good understanding of the Standards.
2. The training is planned to be progressive and to build on the developing experience and understanding of trainees. Subject training links very well with child development, particularly in mathematics and English, and very good links are made with general professional studies. The general professional studies course provides good training in special educational needs and inclusion, and in *Every Child Matters*. There is good coverage within the taught sessions of the key stages for which the trainees are being trained. However, the breadth of experience that trainees gain in observing and teaching across the age range for which they are being trained is sometimes too limited.
3. In English and mathematics, the elements of the training programme combine well to secure trainees' progress towards the Standards. However, in science, links between school and centre-based training are under-developed. In all subjects, assignments and school-based tasks are planned well and are particularly helpful in linking theory and practice. For example, in science, trainees are required to reflect on pupils' learning and progress in a science lesson which they have taught.
4. The quality of the training is good. Feedback from trainees is very positive. Individual taught sessions are planned well and are linked closely to the Standards. Tutors routinely model good primary practice and sessions are interactive. They bring a wealth of experience and expertise to the course.
5. Information and communications technology (ICT) is used well to support training sessions. There is a well stocked library at the training base. Partnership schools provide suitable resources to support school-based training. However, trainees are disadvantaged by not being able to access the university's library and resource centre.
6. Support for trainees' individual needs is a strength of the provision, particularly in English and mathematics. Comprehensive systems are in place to ensure the trainees' strengths and weaknesses are identified early in all the core subjects and that weaknesses are addressed fully. On-line audits of subject knowledge lead to clear and useful action plans. Tutors and mentors undertake careful monitoring, both formally and informally, to ensure that trainees are making steady progress towards the Standards. Tutors are approachable and communications are good. Trainees with specific needs, such as dyslexia, are very well supported.

7. There are comprehensive systems in place to monitor trainees' progress against the Standards through, for example, weekly meetings with mentors. Meetings between trainees, mentors and tutors also lead to clear targets being identified at the end of each placement, and these helpfully inform the focus of training in the next placement. Trainees have a good understanding of the Standards and maintain detailed evidence files.

8. Assignments are accurately marked against the grade criteria. Marking is referenced well to the Standards and gives clear indications of strengths and areas that can be improved. Assignments are also carefully marked against criteria for written English and action plans are put in place when weaknesses emerge. Course handbooks provide helpful descriptions of what constitutes a good assignment.

9. Trainees' teaching is assessed in detail. The lesson observation forms are well referenced to the Standards. Feedback from tutors is clear and evaluative. It provides a good commentary on the trainees' generic teaching skills but limited attention is paid to giving subject specific feedback, particularly in science.

## Management and quality assurance

10. The recruitment and selection process is very good. Criteria for selecting trainees are rigorous. Selection procedures are well designed to ensure a fair and transparent experience for all applicants. Applications are screened carefully and suitable candidates are invited for interview. Headteachers and experienced mentors from partnership schools are involved fully in the selection process. The candidates' qualifications are checked thoroughly. All trainees' suitability to work with children is checked with the Criminal Records Bureau and records are kept. Since the last inspection, improvements to the selection process have resulted in the recruitment of well qualified candidates; withdrawal rates are low.

11. The prospectus provides appropriately detailed information about the courses and the requirements for entry. The provider looks to recruit trainees with a strong commitment to the values of Judaism and Jewish education. The policies for equal opportunities and race equality are stated clearly and appropriate reference is made to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

12. Attention paid to meeting the individual needs of the trainees identified at interview is a key strength. Successful candidates are provided with reading lists and other preparation work which are tailored to their individual needs. Some candidates may be set additional support tasks and are required to submit completed work. This is very good practice and enables all individuals to start the course with appropriate support systems in place.

13. The partnership is well managed by the programme manager who is ably supported by consortium colleagues; all have a high commitment to improvement. The consortium managers work very closely with the partner schools. Roles and

responsibilities are clear and appropriate. Mentors are well trained and are provided with very clear written guidance. This has led to significant improvements in mentoring so that the quality of mentoring is now a key strength.

14. Underpinning the management of the partnership is a very clear partnership agreement. Schools have been involved in developing and reviewing the agreement. This is an effective strategy to ensure that it continues to meet all partners' needs. The management group, together with the steering committee and headteachers' forum ensure trainees' and mentors' voices are heard and acted upon. For example, the joint 'away day' held in the last academic year provided good opportunities for all partners to share views. Increasingly effective use is made of the expertise found in schools to strengthen the partnership through involving staff in course planning and delivery.

15. School-based training is monitored rigorously by the programme manager, professional tutor and director of education. They provide constructive guidance and feedback to mentors. This detailed and regular on-site monitoring has been a key factor in improving the quality of mentoring and school-based training. The communication across the partnership is good; all parties are briefed fully on the Requirements and changes to provision. Resources are deployed well to support effective training. University and centre-based training is also monitored through management observations. This has contributed to the improvements to training since the last inspection.

16. Trainees' assessments are moderated well, particularly those relating to practical teaching. The consortium has ensured that the systems for internal and external moderation are robust. The use of regular joint observation of trainees between visiting tutors and a range of school mentors, adds a further, helpful, dimension to the consistency and accuracy of judgements, particularly regarding subject knowledge.

17. Quality assurance procedures are good overall and meet the Requirements in full. There are appropriate systems to ensure that the consortium's race equality and equal opportunity policies are carefully monitored. The consortium is committed to inclusion.

18. The strategies for evaluating provision are good. Trainees' views are sought regularly and prompt action is taken to address any areas of concern. Meetings with university tutors and mentors provide further opportunities for internal evaluation. Procedures for external evaluation of the provision are good and lead to helpful reports from external examiners that are acted upon swiftly. While the provider has a very clear view of the strengths and weaknesses in provision, there have been occasional gaps in the quality of provision which have not been resolved fully. The quality of action planning for improvement at subject level is inconsistent, and it is unclear how some actions link to the overall improvement in the course. The provider is planning for short term development well. Longer term strategic planning is in the early stages of development.