

Roehampton University

School of Education
Roehampton Lane
London
SW15 5PJ

A secondary initial teacher training
short inspection report
2007/08

Managing inspector
Anne Looney HMI

© Crown copyright 2008. 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 website (www.ofsted.gov.uk).

Introduction

Roehampton University works in partnership with 99 schools to provide secondary initial teacher training (ITT) courses. It offers art and design, business education, design and technology, English, history, mathematics, modern foreign languages, music, religious education and science. At the time of the inspection there were 199 trainees. Roehampton University operates in partnership with three other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) as part of the South West London Teacher Education Consortium (SWELTEC).

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 next inspection of this provider will take place in accordance with the Initial Teacher Education Inspection Framework.

Key strengths

- the structure and content of the central training in subjects and professional studies
- the enthusiasm and professionalism of the subject tutors and the high level of support they give to each other and to the trainees
- the quality of the trainees recruited
- the quality of trainees' reflection on their teaching
- the formal and informal systems for eliciting the views of trainees
- the clarity of documentation provided that aids coherence between all elements of the training programme.

Points for action

- ensuring that subject knowledge auditing and development in mathematics is comprehensive and prepares trainees to teach to all levels at both key stages
- ensuring the highest levels of consistency in the work of the subject tutors by formalising the monitoring of their work.

Points for consideration

- making explicit and exemplifying the role of the school-based professional co-ordinating tutors in training the mentors and in monitoring their work
- making effective use of the range of evaluative data available to set specific and measurable targets for improvement.

The quality of training

1. The structure and content of the training programme are carefully planned to meet the Requirements and are well adapted to ensure that trainees meet the revised Standards. The implications of *Every Child Matters* feature prominently across the programme in professional studies and subject-specific exemplification. A good example of this is the way in which trainees in business education are encouraged to develop pupils' future economic well-being in their teaching.

2. A carefully planned university professional studies programme includes good coverage of key areas such as assessment and behaviour management. These are complemented by useful discussion and reflection in cross-subject discussion groups. In addition a virtual learning environment is used well to facilitate communication between sessions. Although documentation does not always show explicit links between subject work and professional studies, the topics covered are followed up by subject tutors in central training programmes.

3. The timing and phasing of placements is highly appropriate. In particular, the six days of school experience and associated documentation act as a useful introduction to the course and are valued by the trainees. The opportunity for trainees to come back to university between teaching placements allows them, as they say, to be 'refreshed and re-energised'.

4. Course documentation is designed clearly to support the links between the central and school-based training. In most subjects there is very secure coherence between the school-based and central training supported by good communication between schools and subject tutors. In a minority of subjects, mentors are less clear about what has been covered centrally and how they should build on this.

5. Central training is well planned. Subject tutors model good practice and blend theory and practice well. In addition, trainees benefit from a range of extra learning experiences, such as visits to a range of places of worship in religious education. In business education and music, particularly good use is made of outside expert speakers. Assignments are designed well to develop trainees' ability to analyse critically their own practice. Trainees are given good guidance on reflection and as a result develop incisive skills of self-evaluation at an early stage.

6. The quality of school-based training is generally high. The vast majority of trainees have access to regular and focused mentor meetings and mentors give their time freely and ensure that partnership requirements are met. However, for a minority of trainees, mentoring is less good, particularly when mentors are less confident about what is expected of them.

7. Trainees receive good individual guidance particularly from their subject tutors, whose support is widely appreciated by trainees and is a strength of the provision. Although it is not formalised in written training plans, training is personalised, builds on trainees' previous knowledge and experience and is reviewed regularly. Trainees receive regular, detailed and constructive feedback on their

teaching. The system of this regular written feedback and weekly mentor meetings provides well for ongoing and cyclical review and evaluation of targets. In practice there is some inconsistency in the quality of the target setting. Where it is less effective, it is task related or insufficiently specific about what the trainees need to do to improve.

8. Subject knowledge audits are completed at an early stage in the great majority of subjects and regularly reviewed by subject tutors and trainees. However, in mathematics trainees have not carried out any formal subject knowledge audit so are less aware of what they should know to meet the Standards.

9. Trainees' progress towards the Standards is monitored well and there are clear procedures for their assessment. The detailed end of placement profile is particularly effective in the way it highlights trainees' strengths and targets for the next phase of their training. Internal and external moderation is undertaken to ensure that the assessment of the trainees is rigorous, consistent and accurate.

Management and quality assurance

10. Procedures for recruitment and selection are effective and result in cohorts of trainees who are articulate, show enthusiasm and commitment and whose completion rates are high. Systems for ensuring trainees are suitable are secure. The university is committed to widening participation and the course has been successful in meeting targets set for the recruitment of trainees from black and minority ethnic groups. Under the aegis of its Single Equality Scheme the university has comprehensive policies in place and clear and detailed procedures of how these will be monitored. These are understood by schools.

11. Although the involvement of partnership schools in the recruitment and selection process varies, there is good practice in some subjects. In modern foreign languages, for example, partnership staff at a specialist language college probe trainees' linguistic skills in less widely spoken languages and an English mentor has been involved in reviewing and improving systems. The recently introduced system of peer reflection is supporting the development of shared best interview practice. However, in subjects that do not routinely involve partnership schools in selection, opportunities for moderating judgements on suitability are missed.

12. The management of the secondary provision as a whole and of the individual subjects works well. The programme convener, the two assistant programme conveners and the subject tutors are experienced and enthusiastic practitioners. There is a high level of professionalism and commitment in the subject tutors and they are trusted to carry out their management role. There is a very strong collegiate approach to their work and this leads to a high level of shared good practice. There are, however, few formal mechanisms for the programme convener to monitor the subject tutors' work and this has led to some inconsistency of practice.

13. The professional studies programme is well managed at central level and the core professional studies programme to be delivered in school has been well planned to ensure that repetition is avoided and key areas reinforced in the school context. Subject tutors manage their central training well to ensure trainees receive varied, up to date and challenging training. The design and technology programme is particularly well managed in the way in which the subject tutor has skilfully combined the demands of teaching the four strands of the subject.

14. Induction for central staff is good. There is an appropriately strong emphasis on the development of their teaching skills and they are well mentored. More experienced subject tutors exploit their subject networks well and many work as external examiners in other HEIs which extends their expertise. Very good use is made of training 'away days' to develop a team solution to projects.

15. This is a strong partnership. SWELTEC documentation supports school based trainers well by its clarity and coherence. At subject level, subject tutors generally have a good knowledge of the placement schools and communication between them and subject mentors is good.

16. The provider has addressed well the point for consideration arising from the last inspection on arrangements for moderating mentor judgements on trainees' progress. Systems are well understood and joint observations between subject tutors and mentors are the norm and secure moderation.

17. The partnership agreement lays out roles and responsibilities for all partners. It states clearly that it is the role of the professional coordinating tutor in schools to train the mentors and monitor their work. There is, however, still confusion in some partner schools about what constitutes training and the role of the professional co-ordinating tutor in delivering it. In the previous inspection report it was suggested that the provider might consider recommending activities for the professional co-ordinating tutors. Whilst this is discussed at conferences it is not made explicit in day-to-day documentation and the confusion remains in some schools. Not all schools, as a result, are training the mentors. Notwithstanding this, there is very good practice in some schools, many of which are training schools: these are making excellent use of the SWELTEC training materials and providing comprehensive and supportive generic training. In these schools mentors are clear about their role, have an excellent understanding of the new Standards and are setting high quality targets.

18. It is the role of the subject tutor to monitor the provision in schools. Issues following these visits are communicated to the programme convener but there is, as yet, no formal mechanism by which the outcomes of these visits is recorded, although one is being trialled by another provider in the SWELTEC consortium. The introduction of the Quality and Standards Advisers at SWELTEC level is a good additional monitoring tool and they have already identified clear areas for improvement.

19. Trainees are regularly consulted about all aspects of their training and their concerns carefully considered and changes made to programmes. Their views are highly valued. There is an increasing amount of well organised data available but this is not being used consistently in all subjects to identify areas for development and set measurable targets for improvement. At programme level the provider is starting to make good use of a range of benchmarking data as part of an end of year evaluation. This evaluation does not necessarily inform an action plan. On the whole, the existing review process does not identify the evaluation of actions taken and the subsequent impact on provision or trainees' outcomes.