

Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset East Secondary SCITT

Initial Teacher Education inspection report

Provider address

Bournemouth Learning Centre
Ensbury Avenue
Bournemouth
BH10 4HG

Inspection dates
Lead inspector

1–4 March 2010
Anne Looney HMI

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 Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, work-based learning and skills training, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It rates council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, safeguarding and child protection.

Further copies of this report are obtainable from the school. Under the Education Act 2005, the school must provide a copy of this report free of charge to certain categories of people. A charge not exceeding the full cost of reproduction may be made for any other copies supplied.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 08456 404045, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may copy all or parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes, as long as you give details of the source and date of publication and do not alter the information in any way.

www.ofsted.gov.uk

Reference no. 080190

© Crown Copyright 2009

Introduction

1. This inspection was carried out by Her Majesty's Inspectors and one specialist inspector in accordance with the Framework for the Inspection of Initial Teacher Education (2008-11).
2. The inspection draws upon evidence from all aspects of the provision to make judgements against all parts of the inspection evaluation schedule in the framework. Inspectors focused on the overall effectiveness of the training in supporting high quality outcomes for trainees and the capacity of the partnership to bring about further improvements. A summary of the grades awarded is included at the end of this report.

Key to inspection grades

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

Explanation of terms used in this report

Attainment is defined as the standard reached by a trainee at the end of their training.

Progress is judged in terms of how well a trainee has developed professionally from their starting point to the standard reached at the time of the inspection or at a suitable review point.

Achievement is judged in terms of the progress made and the standard reached by a trainee at the time of the inspection or at a recent assessment review point.

The provider

3. The Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset East Secondary School-Centred Initial Teacher Training Consortium (SCITT) works in partnership with 14 schools. It provides initial teacher education in the 11 to 16 age range leading to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and offers training in design and technology, mathematics, modern foreign languages and science. At the time of the inspection there were 26 trainees.

Key strengths

4. The key strengths are:

- the rigorous selection process which results in the recruitment of trainees who are strongly self-motivated and have the capacity to achieve well
- the professional attitudes of the trainees and the strength of the relationships they build with their students and colleagues
- the structure and content of the central training programme and the coherence between central and school-based professional studies
- the effective use of resources which benefit both schools and trainees
- the responsiveness and efficiency of the programme manager in his dealings with schools and trainees.

Required actions

5. In order to improve trainees' progress and attainment, the consortium must:

- ensure that there is a robust, coherent and consistently applied system for measuring and monitoring trainees' progress
- improve the trainees' understanding of teaching in a culturally diverse society.

In order to improve the quality of provision, the consortium must:

- improve the quality and consistency of mentoring and target setting by ensuring there is a greater emphasis on training about, and monitoring progress towards, the QTS standards
- improve the quality of the central science training by ensuring that the content is comprehensive and balanced
- develop a quality assurance system based on clearly defined roles and responsibilities which collates first-hand evidence of monitoring and which leads to targeted improvement planning.

Overall effectiveness

Grade: 3

6. The overall effectiveness of the provider in securing high quality outcomes for trainees is satisfactory. The consortium is successful in recruiting trainees with potential, and their attainment by the end of the course is good. Inconsistencies in the training and assessment, however, mean that, although all trainees make

at least satisfactory progress towards the QTS standards, not all trainees are making the progress of which they are capable.

7. The proportion of trainees graded at least good at the end of the course has been consistent since the SCITT was set up. In addition, in the last two years, approximately a third of the trainees were graded as outstanding. Trainees in design and technology have been particularly high attaining. Completion rates are above the national average and the consortium has been particularly successful in the proportion of trainees taking up employment locally. Outcomes for identifiable groups are comparable, but numbers are small and group sizes vary from year to year.
8. There are a number of strengths exhibited by all trainees. They are strongly self-motivated and show a good professional attitude. They quickly develop good working relationships with colleagues and students and their expectations of students' behaviour are high. They make effective use of a range of resources, including information and communication technology. Trainees have a good understanding of the needs of students with special educational needs and/or disabilities and of those who speak English as an additional language. They show less awareness of the educational needs of other minority groups, including students from minority ethnic groups. Trainees' lesson plans are detailed, but not all trainees are planning lessons in a way that ensures that learning objectives are specific and that these objectives and the lesson activities are matched to the needs of all groups of students. Their reflection on their practice, whilst regular, is not consistently focused on students' learning and related to how they, as trainees, need to improve in relation to the standards. This slows the rate of their progress.
9. Recruitment and selection procedures are good. They are regularly reviewed and amended in the light of the consortium's experience and evaluation. The rigorous interview process, with its varied and challenging activities, ensures the consortium selects candidates who are well suited to the school-based training and who have the potential to do well. Recruitment has been buoyant and, although the recruitment of minority ethnic trainees is not high, the consortium has worked hard to increase numbers and these compare favourably with those of similar providers in their area. In the priority subjects of mathematics and science the consortium selects trainees with less specialised degrees. These trainees are then well supported by subject knowledge enhancement courses. The auditing of trainees' subject knowledge, the subsequent target setting for improvement and the review throughout the course is variable. It is rigorous in design and technology and ensures that trainees extend their areas of expertise in a manner that is carefully planned and regularly reviewed. There are good links with the local authorities in the area and this helps trainees well as they finish the course and move into their first year of teaching.
10. Training and assessment ensure that all trainees who are capable of doing so meet the standards for QTS. The structure and the content of the training programme are good. The central subject training in design and technology, mathematics and modern foreign languages is comprehensive and relevant. The central subject training in science, however, is imbalanced, with a focus on

physics at the expense of the other sciences. The central training in professional studies is also comprehensive and there is good coherence between this and school-based professional studies programmes. Central training is also well enhanced by the contributions of outside speakers and inputs from lecturers from the higher education institutions with which the consortium is linked. There is a clear focus on continuing professional development in preparation for future employment and trainees are well supported into their first post.

11. All trainees have regular weekly meetings with their school-based subject tutors who provide them with good support and extensive, formative verbal feedback on their teaching. However, the guidance on, and criteria for, judging the quality of lessons in written feedback are not sufficiently clear and there is, as a result, an inconsistency in practice across the partnership. This inconsistency is compounded by the fact that weekly target setting is insufficiently focused on the standards and that targets are often tasks. As a result, there are no consistent and robust systems for monitoring the progress trainees are making towards the standards.
12. The use of resources is good. There is good access to library resources and innovative use of trainee resource boxes. All trainees have access to consortium laptops and can move documentation electronically from one placement to the next. The partner schools' needs have been well audited and a well-organised bidding system has led to a range of equipment, including scanners and videos, being provided to the schools to support their training work. The evaluation of the effectiveness of this is planned for later this year. The central training room is well resourced and models a good learning environment. The consortium has also, in response to the previous inspection, committed funding for human resources through the appointment of a quality assurance manager who has been working closely with school-based trainers.
13. The consortium has also invested money and considerable time into the development of a virtual learning environment. This is not yet effectively used by all partners. Trainees are confident users of the virtual learning environment and some are making excellent use of the online system to collate evidence against the standards. Lack of confidence of some subject tutors with the online system means that they are not all accessing this evidence and therefore they are not in a position to provide the feedback trainees need. Subsequently, not all trainees are making as much progress as they might.
14. Partners show a good level of commitment to the consortium and clearly support the rationale and the principles behind the school-centred programme. The management of the consortium offers good training on a regular basis, but attendance at this by school-based subject tutors is unreliable. This has led to inconsistencies in practice and is limiting the speed at which some trainees make progress. Considerable care is taken in the placement of trainees and the management acts quickly to remedy problems. The primary placement is not exploited as fully as it might be because not all trainees are focusing on, and evaluating, transition from primary to secondary school in their subject.

15. Trainees feel confident to report issues of discrimination or harassment and readily express their views. Most trainees are effective at teaching students with a range of educational needs, but some trainees have a limited understanding about the need to be prepared to teach in a culturally diverse society. The consortium is responding to trainees' lack of skill and confidence to teach students from minority ethnic groups, but this is not yet a strong area of provision. Individual trainees are well known to the management of the consortium and they are given strong pastoral support. As a result completion rates are high. Trainees appreciate the support that the small, tight-knit consortium can offer them.

The capacity for further improvement and/or sustaining high quality Grade: 3

16. The management of the consortium conducts regular and detailed evaluations of all aspects of the provision and involves all stakeholders. Response levels are high. These evaluations are analysed well in terms of trainees' attainment and completion rates but less rigorously in terms of their progress, where there is more limited data. Trainees' and ex-trainees' comments are carefully scrutinised and appropriate changes are made to improve the provision.
17. The quality assurance manager visits schools on a regular basis and ensures that all trainees receive their entitlement. Professional tutors talk positively about the visits and how they support their reflection on their school-based provision. Although the visits are starting to raise awareness in professional tutors of the need for their involvement in assuring the quality of the provision, many professional tutors lack confidence in monitoring their peers. The role of the lead subject tutors with regards to monitoring and evaluation lacks clarity. The lead subject and professional tutors know their colleagues well and trust that they are carrying out what is expected of them. As a result they are not consistently looking in detail at areas such as the weekly subject tutors meetings to ensure that trainees are being regularly challenged to make the progress of which they are capable.
18. Both internal and external moderation confirm the security of the final assessments, including that at the pass/fail borderline. This is further endorsed by the subject-specific external examiners' reports. These reports are both analytical and evaluative and inform the consortium's monitoring and evaluation process.
19. The consortium is responsive to, and the trainees understand, the significance of national initiatives. Their training ensures that they have a good knowledge and understanding of, for example, the Rose review and the developments in the secondary curriculum. Subject-specific initiatives are generally tackled well. Training in mathematics has responded well to recent changes in the school curriculum and trainees in modern foreign languages have a secure understanding of the implications of primary modern foreign languages on their

practice. In science, issues related to applied science have been less rigorously addressed.

20. The programme manager exploits the strong network links with other providers well and this informs the consortium's work on national initiatives. The programme manager also responds well to immediate needs, particularly those that relate to individual trainees. The consortium management group is also making every effort to manage succession and emergency planning at both lead subject tutor and subject tutor level. It recognises that this is critical in a consortium of this size.
21. Consortium staff and trainees are fully involved on all the management committees ensuring all have a voice. The improvement planning process is based on a wide consultation and trainees have the additional vehicle of a forum through which they can express their opinions. Improvement planning is thorough and comprehensive with clear actions identified and measurable success criteria. Many of these, but not all, are linked to trainee outcomes. This means that the plan does not sufficiently focus on how actions will impact on the quality of provision and hence on how well trainees perform. This has also had an impact on the quality of the consortium's self-evaluation as a whole which has been over generous as a result of a lack of focus on all outcomes for trainees. In an attempt to respond to all stakeholders, the improvement plan has been unwieldy. The management is aware of this and has recently highlighted the priority areas for improvement and is reviewing progress against those priorities.
22. The priorities for improvement identified at the time of the last inspection have been tackled, but progress in the areas of quality assurance and improvements in provision in science have been too slow.

Summary of inspection grades¹

Key to judgements: grade 1 is outstanding; grade 2 is good; grade 3 is satisfactory; grade 4 is inadequate.

Overall effectiveness

		Secondary
How effective is the provision in securing high quality outcomes for trainees?		3
Trainees' attainment	How well do trainees attain?	2
Factors contributing to trainees' attainment	To what extent do recruitment / selection arrangements support high quality outcomes?	2
	To what extent does the training and assessment ensure that all trainees progress to fulfil their potential given their ability and starting points?	3
	To what extent are available resources used effectively and efficiently?	2
The quality of the provision	To what extent is the provision across the partnership of consistently high quality?	3
Promoting equalities and diversity	To what extent does the provision promote equality of opportunity, value diversity and eliminate harassment and unlawful discrimination?	2

Capacity to improve further and/or sustain high quality

		Secondary
To what extent do the leadership and management at all levels have the capacity to secure further improvements and/or to sustain high quality outcomes?		3
How effectively does the management at all levels assess performance in order to improve or sustain high quality?		3
How well does the leadership at all levels anticipate change, and prepare for and respond to national and local initiatives?		2
How effectively does the provider plan and take action for improvement?		3

¹ The criteria for making these graded judgements are in the Grade criteria for the inspection of ITE 2008-11; Ofsted July 2008; Reference no: 080128.

Any complaints about the inspection or the reports should be made following the procedure set out in the guidance 'Complaints about school inspection', which is available from Ofsted's website: www.ofsted.gov.uk