



Teacher Supply: Recruitment, Retention, Shaping the Future

Thursday, 19th – Friday, 20th May 2016

REPORT

#SGHTeacherRRS



CONTENTS

Contents	2
Executive summary	3
Conclusion and Recommendations	3
Background and context	5
The consultation	5
The current teacher supply situation	5
Teacher training: "a fragile bud"	7
Allocating teacher training places	7
Recruitment	8
Providers: universities 'vs' schools	9
Retention	10
The role of evidence	12
Technology as a solution	12
Conclusion and Recommendations	14
Recommendations for government	14
Recommendations for the sector	14
Recommendations for those recruiting trainees	14
Recommendation for all parties	15
Examples from elsewhere to think about	16
Challenges to change	16
What good could look like ...	16
Participants	18



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This consultation brought together a wide range of stakeholders involved in, and concerned about, teacher supply. Recruiting, training and retaining high quality professionals are key to improving the quality of education in England.

There was a consensus among the participants in the intensive, twenty-four hours of debate and discussion that the current system was not working and that significant changes needed to be made.

The discussion was wide-ranging, covering issues including:

- The causes of the current problems in recruiting teachers (image of the profession, pay and conditions, work-load, high stakes testing of children, inspection)
- The quality of information for potential teachers on routes into teaching
- The move towards a more "market driven" system of recruiting trainees
- The impact of the radical changes made to teacher training, with a move towards a school-led system
- The lack of sophisticated management information systems to monitor teacher supply

The recommendations below, drawn from the consultation, require a new consensus between all of the key players in the sector, from central government to the individual teacher. It is hoped that this report will offer parts of an agenda that will help to build that consensus.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no mystery around the reasons for the teacher supply crisis. The flaws of the allocation and training system and concerns over falling retention are recognised across the sector. Action, though, requires all parties to admit openly the flaws of the current system and to work in partnership to solve them. A regional or sub-regional partnership model is likely to be more effective than centralised, top-down solutions.

Recommendations for government

The teacher supply model must account for the historic under-supply of teacher trainees. It must be under-pinned by robust management information, including an accurate and up-to-date picture of schools' requirements for high quality, specialist staff.

The allocation of training places should take account of regional and sub-regional variations in current teacher supply, broken down by phase and subject/specialism; it should not assume teachers are nationally mobile. It should also ensure that all schools – particularly isolated schools and those in challenging contexts – have equal access to and a sufficient supply of high quality trainees.

In order for the supply model to meet the sector's need there should be an open and transparent mechanism for consultation, including at regional level, as part of the planning cycle.

Teacher retention should become a priority to ensure England has an expert teaching workforce.



Financial incentives for trainees should be designed to retain them for at least five years, rather than providing a one-off financial boost. Options including repayment of student loans should be explored.

Newly qualified teachers should have an entitlement to early structured professional development that builds on and complements their initial training.

Recommendations for the sector

The sector should agree a framework for progression that gives teachers a clear vision of their professional development pathway, whether into leadership or expert classroom-based roles. The framework should be adaptable to the specific organisation structures of school groups and networks (MATs, TSAs), but should offer certainty of progression across the system.

The sector should embrace modern working practices that could address workforce challenges, including expanding opportunities for flexible working and employing technology to reduce teacher workload.

The sector should capture and disseminate case studies of effective practice for workload management, teacher development and retention.

Recommendations for those recruiting trainees

Information for prospective teacher trainees should be student-centred: signposting them to the best route given their financial, geographical and personal circumstances.

Recommendation for all parties

The government, Ofsted and the profession should seek to promote positive messages about being a teacher given the apparent focus on negative aspects of teaching. A coordinated effort is needed to improve perceptions of teaching as a career.



BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

This 24-hour consultation was convened and delivered by the staff at St George's House, which is situated within Windsor Castle.

St George's House organises regular consultations on matters of public interest, inviting key policy makers and representatives to spend 24 hours together. They discuss the subject in hand and look to make recommendations to improve or develop the *status quo*.

The consultation on Teacher Supply was a direct response to the public and private debate about the need to improve the supply of teachers, which is fast approaching a critical point.

The consultation

The consultation was prepared by Gary McKeone, Programme Director at St George's House and Chris Waterman, who is Secretary of the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) for the Teaching Profession and Chair of the Supply and Teacher Training Advisory Group (SATTAG). It was conducted under Chatham House rules with an independent rapporteur recording the key themes of the discussion.

This report, written two months after the event, is based on the rapporteur's report of the consultation but has been re-shaped to take account of the attendees' comments and to make it accessible to readers not at the event. It has also been updated to include a number of significant events that have taken place since the consultation in May 2016.

As is evident from the delegate list, the group was representative of the whole sector involved in planning and delivering the supply of teachers, with vital inputs from the National Audit Office and Ofsted. The report has been reviewed by all attendees prior to publication.

The current teacher supply situation

There is increasing pressure in the education system from a shortage of teachers across multiple specialisms. For the last three years the number of people starting teacher training has fallen short of government targets. More teachers are also leaving the profession each year¹.

These patterns in teacher supply are the result of policy decisions by government and a range of other quantitative and qualitative factors:

- The decision by government to introduce a more market-driven approach to the training of teachers
- The sharp increase in the number of places offered as School Direct trainee places, with a corresponding reduction in training places at university level
- The increased competition for new graduates in a period of expanding growth in the economy

1

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/535038/55621_Schoolteachers_Pay_PRINT.pdf



The growth in the school population is also increasing demand for the shrinking pool of teachers.

The introduction of a new system of allocating teacher training places, with a sharp re-adjustment of places between the traditional PGCE route and the much less formal School Direct approach, has not been universally successful. The allocation system for trainees beginning a one-year course in September 2016, with an initial open recruitment followed by an immediate cap as each subject reached its limit (a "first come, first served" approach) created major problems for training providers and applicants. In particular it incentivised providers to fill places as quickly as possible before the national quotas were reached, rather than holding out for high quality applications.

Potential teachers also struggle to obtain any clear, objective information about the variety of routes into teaching, which, in itself, may be a barrier to entering the profession.

Towards the end of the Coalition government:

- the Education Select Committee renewed its longstanding interest in teacher supply issues. Sir Michael Wilshaw, HMCI, drew attention, in his annual reports and speeches, to the importance of every school being staffed by appropriately qualified and trained teachers if the needs of every child in the education system are to be met
- the National Audit Office was coming to the end of a study of the costs and benefits of the modes of delivery of teacher training²

Since the event in May 2016, there have been a number of changes which may impact on the issue of teacher supply:

- The appointment of Mrs May as Prime Minister (Mrs May was appointed Shadow Secretary of State for Education and Employment in 1999 and served until the election in 2001)
- The appointment of Justine Greening MP as Secretary of State for Education, with additional responsibility for higher education
- The appointment of Angela Rayner MP as Shadow Secretary of State for Education
- The appointment of a new Chief Inspector of Schools (to take effect from 1st January 2017)



² This report was subsequently published and the Public Accounts Committee held an evidence session with the DfE

TEACHER TRAINING: “A FRAGILE BUD”

To open the discussion, participants' main concerns and recommendations about the teaching profession were solicited.

The urgent concern is that we need more people trained. The number of schools and students in England is increasing, while too few teachers have been recruited in the past few years. The demand for teachers is expected to peak around 2020, in parallel with an increasing general demand for graduates in the workforce (which means, potentially, fewer available for teaching).

Teacher allocations and recruitment were a mess last year. It's stated it will be different in future but presently the system is neither 'allocation by need' nor true 'free market' but (in effect) a rigged market unfairly disadvantageous to many. The allocations system needs recalibrating by going out and talking to people who know what is happening in their local area.

Bright spots exist of good practice, but the publications, reviews and findings – evidence – are not known by the wider system. The lack of institutional memory in the central government teams responsible for administering the allocation system results not only in reinventing the wheel but reinventing wheels that didn't work.

In the White Paper “Educational Excellence Everywhere” there is much to find that is sensible, but it raises serious concerns about the future of teacher training too: potential loss of the QTS brand, new accreditation difficulties if responsibilities shift to schools (potential abuse of the system; skewed incentives to accredit; workload implications; uncertainty about who will assure quality), the risk of de-skilling teaching, undermining mutual respect between parents and teachers, and other adverse consequences.

Cracks are appearing in schools' capacity. CEOs of multi academy trusts (MATs) and headteachers are at full stretch, and we need to reduce the burden of work on teachers. Adding another responsibility to a school-led system requires additional leadership capacity to fulfil that additional responsibility.

Collaboration and partnership between universities and schools is an essential part of the response to the challenges facing the system.

Allocating teacher training places

At present, the number of teachers to be trained in each subject is determined nationally. Places for each subject are allocated to providers across the country. But there is a significant mismatch between supply and demand in different regions. Some areas have a plentiful supply of NQTs, others do not. Some areas only face shortages in particular subjects. Those schools that are geographically isolated or in challenging areas are hardest hit, because it's difficult for them to draw in recruits from elsewhere. Most teaching schools are *not* in areas of deprivation. If we are going to rely on teaching schools for supply, their location and connection to schools working with less advantaged pupils is important.

What are the causes of localised shortages? These vary at a sub-regional level. In the major conurbations of the North-West there are many providers and high ratios of trainees to schools but still shortages, because high-performing districts rub shoulders with lower performing areas and draw away teachers. Meanwhile in the South East, although the region has the highest concentration of teacher training providers, geographically isolated areas still suffer from difficulties attracting recruits.



To improve the distribution of teacher training provision, and deployment of new teachers to where they are needed, requires better intelligence and data to make the right decisions. Modern technology and better data should enable allocations to be made at the sub-regional and possibly the school level.

The majority of allocations could be set at a sub-regional level, to account for local variations in need. Sector involvement should provide local intelligence on workforce needs, rather than civil servants working at a distance and relying on centralised models alone to allocate training places.

An accurate picture of school staffing pressures is also lacking. The school workforce census masks where schools are forced to recruit teachers who are not high quality or to allocate teachers to cover lessons that are not in their specialism. Without data that is sensitive to the realities of this 'make do and mend' situation in schools it is hard to estimate the full scale of recruitment needs.

We also need better data on where trainees go after they finish their training. There are layers of unknowns about where state-funded teaching trainees actually end up. For example, more than 9% of trainees are lost (to where?); and of another 5%, nothing is known. Of those trainees who end up teaching, it's not known whether they are in state schools, independent, or (again) unknown. Some information on this is held, but is not published; it seems quite possible that 20% of the public funding is, effectively, disappearing.

The numbers of trainees who are not awarded Qualified Teacher Status or who fall into the 'known-not-to-teach' bracket have, in future, to be factored into the teacher supply model, along with some acknowledgment of the relationship between the state and independent sectors. The taxpayer is currently subsidising the training of teachers who will never work in the state sector. International schools teaching the curriculum in English are another drain on our trainees and we should plan to mitigate against this.

National mobility must also be factored into models. Although allocation is done at a national level, not all teachers are able to move after they train. Any shift to a higher proportion of older applicants who can't re-locate (rather than the 21-24-year-olds who can) will present new problems for national allocation.

Some subjects are delivered in too few schools for sub-regional allocations to be efficient. Classics or philosophy are examples. These must still be allowed for through national specialist routes.

In order for providers to invest in delivering high quality training, they need certainty over the number of trainee teachers they will be allowed to recruit. For large subjects at high quality providers, multi-year allocations should be the norm.

Recruitment

An effective system needs to attract new entrants, provide clear routes into the profession that account for individuals' needs and preferences (e.g. to have a salary while training, to stay local or move location, to learn practically or partially in an academic setting) and must expose teachers to a range of schools so they know what outstanding practice looks like but are also prepared, through their training, to work in more challenging settings. It must ensure teachers develop transferable teaching skills. The emerging model does not meet these needs, in part because of the shift to a school-led model of teacher training.



Getting new people into teaching is a major concern. We need to find new, wider pools of potential trainees and new ways to reach them. There are fewer young people in teaching, in part because there are fewer young people in the job market overall, but also because of increasing competition for graduates from other sectors – particularly those needing science and maths

Unlike in many countries, few English children aspire to become teachers. Should we be worried that children and teenagers don't want to be teachers? We see young children playing at being doctors, chefs or vets. Must we encourage more play at being a teacher? Should we provide better representation of the profession at career fairs?

It is hard, in the current situation, to see why one would become a teacher. Pay has dropped relative to other public/private-sector occupations (added to student debt, housing expense and performance-related-pay issues); mission remains a motivator but capacity to 'make a difference' is eroded by the pressures of testing. Teaching is a powerful profession but individual teachers lack power, even against parents complaining on the basis of a child's report.

Teaching gets a bad write-up from the media and teachers get blamed for poor performance by government and Ofsted. Teachers themselves don't want just the bad news about being a teacher. They do need it to be recognised that their work is tough, but also to hear about successes and why it's worthwhile – a positive narrative that doesn't gloss over real issues, and which presents a higher proportion of 'solution per problem' for *real* problems. TV "documentaries", though popular, tend to narrate unrepresentative 'redemptive' stories, not the day-to-day orderliness of the majority of teaching experience.

Should we also campaign more vigorously for less negativity about teaching in the press and public opinion? A better public point of view about teaching in England would help. But it won't entirely solve recruitment/retention issues. The best advertisement would be a genuine improvement in experience: a manageable workload; for reasonable pay; doing what you love. Teachers need support, not finger-pointing, and making proper support not only available, but visible, will help encourage the right people to apply.

There is a question over the effectiveness of short-term bursaries to draw people into teaching when their salaries will be lower than those of other professions for years afterwards. Regarding incentives in recruiting teachers, perhaps bursaries could be replaced with an offer of repaying the student loan, not as short-term 'golden handcuffs' but over a period of years.

Providers: universities 'vs' schools

There is a bewildering variety of routes into teaching, but also a lot of overlap between them. Government policy makes the teacher training landscape discouragingly complicated to potential trainees.

Initial teacher training (ITT) is presented as being either university or school-based. The government's own website presents prospective applicants a choice between those two pathways. But ITT is a partnership between HE provision and school-led provision: all HE courses involve schools and nearly all school-led provision is made in partnership with an HEI. Teach First is a school-based route but includes university input. There are outstanding providers amongst the schools and HEIs, and each route has benefits, so polarisation is unhelpful.



Universities offer space and time to reflect; levers for system change; a broader perspective; diverse settings and experience in schools; an academic award (with implications for quality assurance, consistency, research, and transferability), and exposure of trainees to other students and their experiences in other schools.

Perhaps there is an interesting ideological debate to have about 'why we don't like universities'. Might this animosity originate in 60s/70s 'anti-intellectual' thought? And there may be a financial incentive involved in the down-playing of HEI's roles: to move trainee teachers away from the student loan system and manage down the size of student debt by shifting towards apprenticeship style learning and training on the job.

Learning in school also has strong benefits. Practical experience is vital to develop teaching skills, and experience across a range of settings. For greater schools' engagement and ownership, we should look for partnership with HEI's in a schools-led (rather than government-led) system: a sustainable, cohesive model with shared objectives and aims that meets collective needs regionally and nationally. It should be inclusive (not leaving vulnerable schools in the cold) and flexible (no rigid contractual arrangements that prevent responsiveness to system need), leaving behind any sense of 'them and us' between different schools or between schools and HEIs.

If schools are to become the leaders in teacher training and allocation, then they need the designated resource to do this: to manage and deliver allocation and training. If alliances or trusts are to become system leaders, they should offer not only subject area expertise but also breadth and depth of transferable teaching practice – (not one institution's teaching mode only).

The government also needs to decide who holds the reins. A basic problem – which goes wider than just the allocation of training places – is that a government vision is imposed using a system that holds teachers and schools accountable rather making them professionally responsible; and the teaching profession is not in a position to set out its own vision.

The partnership between UK universities and schools has been the envy of the world and, though the DfE tends toward support of one side, in fact both parties are united in wanting to improve the system.

Retention

Ofsted's study of teacher supply (commissioned by Her Majesty's Chief Inspector) showed that retention is not a separate issue from recruitment, even if it is seen so by government. The same factors affect recruitment and retention: location; access to training and CPD; school intake (whether it is seen as challenging, for example); and school performance (special measures, etc.).

We need experienced teachers. It takes time to become an expert and we lose too many teachers, so we end up with too few experts. England performs poorly for teacher retention. Our teachers stick around, on average, for twelve years, comparing unfavourably with an average of seventeen in other countries. Over a quarter leave within five years of qualifying; it takes five years to become really effective and therefore to begin to 'pay back' to the system after their training.

We already know a lot of what is needed to keep beginner teachers. They should work in a professional learning community focused on the students, providing affirmation as well as challenges. For some, the first year of teaching includes an overwhelming amount of planning. NQTs should start with a 'Delia' approach early



on, following prescribed but proven techniques rather than being made to re-invent the wheel. They can take a more 'Nigel Slater' stance later as they gain expertise; drawing on evidence for effective practice but adapting it to their context. The second and third years of teaching are key to retention and CPD must address that period carefully. Teachers need real mentoring with time to communicate and give space to deeper reflection about professional values.

Managing workload is the biggest lever to improve retention. We spend twice as much time marking as in other countries. Expectations have changed. We used to teach classes aiming at the middle with extra attention at top and bottom; we now expect teachers to tailor their teaching to the needs of individual children. The focus on every child's progress is welcome but has brought a huge increase in workload, the consequences of which have not been thought through. What practices or tasks can we get rid of, so a teacher has *time* to be a professional? Making space for professionalism would delay departure.

Certainly it would help for the DfE to take proper account of the real situation on the ground, and show that they hear teachers, and understand the implications of government actions on morale and workload.

Some schools are applying perverse incentives to try and retain teachers. But good retention happens for the right reasons: not promises of better pay indefinitely deferred, nor withholding of CPD lest it encourage itchy-footedness once teachers feel more developed. Performance-related-pay (PRP) is being used unfairly and has become toxic. Good pay is a simple hygiene factor in demanding work. Research shows PRP only works for simple tasks, which teaching is not.

CPD needs to be re-framed as a positive part of the job. In many schools being part of CPD is viewed as 'weakness' from teachers – feedback and development are threatening. We need more professional learning conversations.

CPD is focused on improving immediate practice and little is done to support long term career plans. Other professions also have clear lines of progression. Career management is not the norm in education. If teachers don't see a route for career progression over time and don't feel like anyone is interested in their future then they will see less reason to stay. Clear development pathways are needed – upwards into senior leadership and management but also pathways that allow individuals to stay in the classroom while being rewarded for the development of their expertise.

Education needs an over-arching strategy to manage its workforce. Succession planning is one aspect. Any commercial company would think about the consequences of, for example, having an ageing leadership tier or hiring mostly young females, but the same planning isn't happening in the school system. HR practices are also slow to change.

If schools want to keep hold of a young workforce with families then enabling educators to work part-time is one piece of the puzzle, but it involves practical considerations which vary from school to school. Primary and secondary schools have different needs and expectations but primary schools seem to be further ahead on this. Concerns include how to arrange continuing professional development (CPD) for part-timers; and the need for teachers to have real heart and commitment (the terms and conditions of part-time teaching still have to attract people with a mission or moral purpose, not dilettantes). Resistance in secondary schools comes from timetabling and exam pressures (which can mean part-time teachers are allocated to non-exam classes without considering how to ensure continuity in teaching, so non-exam pupils get the short end of the stick). But using part-time workers effectively could help deliver the high levels of specialist subject knowledge



needed for new GCSEs (could schools use specialists on and off, as universities do?).

Retention is vital if we want an expert teaching workforce. Practices need to modernise so that teachers find their workload manageable, can balance it with their personal life and can envisage a long term future in the profession.

The role of evidence

Given the long experience in England of delivering an education system, there should be robust evidence of what works for training, allocation and retention. We should be able to use evidence to inform solutions. But it seems to teaching professionals that government does not seek real evidence. Instead too often it labels anecdotal information 'evidence' and acts rashly on it, tending to hear only entrepreneurial-sounding phrases or wrong (but convenient) "evidence" rather than educational substance or historical precedent. It seems that evidence about what works and what doesn't is side-lined, or disappears, to suit the interests of the administration.

The speed of change and the political cycle also inhibits evaluation of policy changes. Too-sudden changes take place in parallel with clear vested interests in remaining blameless for the state of education. What works (or not) cannot be evaluated owing to 'newbroomosis' in the five-year political cycle and politicians changing education faster than the impact of previous changes can be measured.

The National Audit Office has evaluated the Department for Education scathingly on ITT and teacher supply. Recommendations will be made following finalisation of the conclusions of the Public Accounts Committee on the report, and then the DfE will have to respond formally, accepting the recommendations or rejecting them with a rationale.

Given that experts do actively offer deep understandings of the education and teacher supply systems and brilliant modelling along with good use of proxy measures, it is very frustrating to find that useful, honest knowledge is continually ignored.

Technology as a solution

Technology is a tool, and using technology well in education is a skill quite separate from the availability of devices. Technology can help teachers by unburdening them of repetitive drudgery in educational tasks, helping students tackle problems in new ways, or facilitating a personalised learning programme: Reading Assessment; Math42; School in the Cloud; Steve Jobs Schools.

Introducing technology can increase workloads if not done carefully. Understanding the exact purpose of the technology before adopting it and training teachers to use it is the solution.

Technology can also facilitate teacher learning, where it should be used to support deep conceptual understanding, rather than simply as a resource repository and medium for sharing of information).

Quality assurance for technological educational products may be an issue. Word of mouth helps bring the cream to the top. Can we use technology to facilitate word of mouth? (Who might pay for that)?



Technology might be a tool to improve teacher supply, whether through improved CPD or reducing workload. But time is needed to learn how to use it well. There is no silver bullet.



CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no mystery around the reasons for the teacher supply crisis. The flaws of the allocation and training system and concerns over falling retention are recognised across the sector. Action, though, requires all parties to admit openly the flaws of the current system and to work in partnership to solve them. A regional or sub-regional partnership model is likely to be more effective than centralised, top-down solutions.

Recommendations for government

The teacher supply model must account for the historic under-supply of teacher trainees. It must be under-pinned by robust management information, including an accurate and up-to-date picture of schools' requirements for high quality, specialist staff.

The allocation of training places should take account of regional and sub-regional variations in current teacher supply, broken down by phase and subject/specialism; it should not assume teachers are nationally mobile. It should also ensure that all schools – particularly isolated schools and those in challenging contexts – have equal access to and a sufficient supply of high quality trainees.

In order for the supply model to meet the sector's need there should be an open and transparent mechanism for consultation, including at regional level, as part of the planning cycle.

Teacher retention should become a priority to ensure England has an expert teaching workforce.

Financial incentives for trainees should be designed to retain them for at least five years, rather than providing a one-off financial boost. Options including repayment of student loans should be explored.

Recommendations for the sector

The sector should agree a framework for progression that gives teachers a clear vision of their professional development pathway, whether into leadership or expert classroom-based roles. The framework should be adaptable to the specific organisation structures of school groups and networks (MATs, TSAs), but should offer certainty of progression across the system.

The sector should embrace modern working practices that could address workforce challenges, including expanding opportunities for flexible working and employing technology to reduce teacher workload.

The sector should capture and disseminate case studies of effective practice for workload management, teacher development and retention.

Recommendations for those recruiting trainees

Information for prospective teacher trainees should be student-centred: sign-posting them to the best route given their financial, geographical and personal circumstances.



Recommendation for all parties

The government, Ofsted and the profession should seek to promote positive messages about being a teacher given the apparent focus on negative aspects of teaching. A coordinated effort is needed to improve perceptions of teaching as a career.



Appendices

The following three sections capture particular elements of the discussion and have been included as appendices.

EXAMPLES FROM ELSEWHERE TO THINK ABOUT

- Ontario: public perception of the teaching profession had collapsed; everyone, including the state, pulled together and turned it round.
- Finland: noticed primaries were not thriving in maths; didn't do more maths, did more pleasurable activities and children learned better overall, including in maths.
- Wales: has two-year postgrad programmes; four-year undergrad programmes; more subject specialisation; increased focus on research; an aspiration for all in profession to be qualified at master's level.
- Northern Ireland: has a teachers' professional learning framework, equipping teachers with research skills.
- Wales and Scotland: seem to have coherent policy despite budgetary constraints.
- Other countries have longer teacher preparation and induction periods.

CHALLENGES TO CHANGE

- Inertia: for example, academies and free schools *could* flex the school day away from three terms and 1265 hours, but mostly don't. (What elements of education are fixed in law and what are flexible? What forces stop the flexible elements from changing? How can we push against them)?
- Fear: comparisons of one school with another by limited means keep them fearful and conservative, terrified of slipping and losing budget. (Being brave as a school and as a head, to do what's right for the children in the school, is necessary but unusual).
- Doubt about how to manage processes into the unknown and know whether change is working. A strategic approach is needed, including risk management.
- Expectations: e.g., universities and school have different images of what learning looks like; society is becoming more choice-oriented in obtaining services. (Educators have to manage PR well to understand the contract with state and society, and assert their viewpoint).
- Lack of connect between evidence/knowledge and practice/policy/support and, related to this, a lack of evaluation of consequences and impacts of recent accelerating changes.
- Lack of expertise in schools to develop teachers beyond the 'struggle' stage and into experts.

WHAT GOOD COULD LOOK LIKE ...

We need a professional human resources body for the teaching profession, to think about evolving HR issues and solutions around organising schooling. (Any company would think about the consequences of, for example, hiring mostly young females). We need more data on where teachers go and what they do.

We should know whether we are managing a free market, similar to the legal profession; or running an organisation like a management training scheme for a supermarket which offers a salary after training. If it's a free-for-all, it means different management and attitude than running a system in which we want the best possible allocation of resources.

Dreaming ahead, could we totally uncap recruitment? – and ration bursaries (which are in low-demand subjects in any case)? There are gateways and standards to be



considered. Could teacher education institutions recruit to meet local need as allocated?

In parallel, teachers need to be able to continue their education and training with access to new developments in their subject areas, especially in subjects that change fast, such as biology. Existing resource platforms are expensive, but an open access version could be created; like the Teacher Training Bank, or PiXL, which pools resources among 1570 schools, and MESH, which provides online free education research findings.³ Who will organise and fund these resources? Private enterprise?

Good information should be widely available and trusted. We need case studies of effective practice – real experience presented using language that is accessible to teachers.

We need then a place to keep and access information. This could hold case studies of good practice but also a framework for development. A few organisations created a website for the British Computing Society, put on a basic draft of a professional development pathway and ended up, with an important framework for progress. Could such a body of information be saleable, by subscription for example, to entities other than signed-up UK teachers, to help fund admin/maintenance? (Who will do this)?

Let's collaborate more. Lack of coherence and money offers an opportunity to develop new and better partnerships, because there is no 'big player' dominating. Large, cohesive partnerships can identify needs for ITE and work to meet them. We'd need a governing body which could let government stand back; it should include school and university representatives and politically neutral bodies such as the NAO (to preclude accusations of 'vested interest'). The Chartered College of Teaching is promising, but looks too slow to wait for. Still, we should not try to replace the CCT before it exists but rather prepare the ground for it to succeed.

... within reasonable constraints

We must, realistically, work *with* government policy as well as the support of case studies towards what good would look like, and we'll need to be able to communicate and compare ideas as simply and efficiently as possible. Can we, then, agree a template for how to propose models, process, etc. to government? – with different individuals taking responsibility for the different sequential actions that could move us from ideas to implementation?



³ <http://www.meshguides.org/>

PARTICIPANTS

Mrs Sue Croft	Principal Oxford Spires Academy
Mr Mark Ellis	Head of Professional Development Twig World Ltd
Dr Jennie Golding	Lecturer in Education UCL Institute of Education
Ms Sonja Hall	Principal Official, Education NASUWT
Mrs Emma Hollis	Head of Teaching School Milton Keynes Teaching School Alliance (attending as a representative of NASBTT – The National Association of School-Based Teacher Trainers)
Professor & Councillor John Howson	Director TeachVac
Ms Kathryn James	Deputy General Secretary National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT)
Mr James Janson Young	Senior Analyst National Audit Office
Ms Emma Knights	Chief Executive National Governors' Association (NGA)
Mr Brian Lightman	Education Consultant Lightman Consulting Ltd
Dr Bethan Marshall	Senior Lecturer King's College London
Mr Gary McKeone	Programme Director St George's House
Dr Angela Milner	Specialist Adviser for ITE Ofsted
Mr Andy Mitchell	Deputy Chief Executive The Design and Technology Association
Mr Reuben Moore	Director of Leadership Teach First
Mrs Georgina Newton	Senior Teaching Fellow Centre for Professional Education, University of Warwick
Mr James Noble-Rogers	Executive Director Universities Council for the Education of Teachers
Ms Alison Ryan	Senior Policy Adviser Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)
Ms Katharine Scarfe Beckett	Rapporteur
Mrs Sue Tanner	Education Consultant Sue Tanner Education



Ms Katy Theobald

Strategy, Performance and Impact Manager
The Future Leaders Trust

Ms Helen Thorne

Director of External Relations
UCAS

Mr Chris Waterman

Executive Director
All-Party Parliamentary Group for the Teaching
Profession



ST GEORGE'S HOUSE



For more information about
Consultations at St George's House
visit www.stgeorghouse.org



St George's House, Windsor Castle, Windsor SL4 1NJ

T +44 (0)1753 848848 E house@stgeorges-windsor.org F +44 (0)1753 848849