

## Official Statistics Release

Policy area:	Initial teacher education inspections and outcomes
Theme:	Education, children's services and skills
Published on:	2 December 2014
Coverage:	England
Period covered:	1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014
Status:	<b>FINAL</b>
Issued by:	The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) 125 Kingsway London WC2B 6SE
Chief Statistician:	Robert Pike
Statistician:	Louise Butler
Public enquiries:	<a href="mailto:enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk">enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk</a>
Press enquiries:	<a href="mailto:pressenquiries@ofsted.gov.uk">pressenquiries@ofsted.gov.uk</a>
Publication frequency:	Annual

## **Table of contents**

Introduction	<b>3</b>
Key findings	<b>4</b>
Chart 1: Overall effectiveness judgements from ITE inspections between 1 September 2008 and 31 August 2014	<b>5</b>
Chart 2: Overall effectiveness judgements from ITE inspections between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014	<b>6</b>
Table 1: ITE inspections between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014	<b>7</b>
Table 2: Outcomes of ITE inspections between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014 ....	<b>8</b>
Table 3: ITE overall effectiveness judgements from most recent inspection as at 31 August 2014 (Final)	<b>10</b>
Table 3a: ITE judgements where most recent inspection was after 1 September 2012 (Final) ....	<b>11</b>
Table 3b: ITE judgements where most recent inspection was before 1 September 2012 (Final) ....	<b>13</b>
Methodology	<b>15</b>

## **Introduction**

The Education Act 1994 provides the remit for Her Majesty's Chief Inspector (HMCI) to inspect initial training of teachers for schools and, when requested by the Secretary of State, a duty to do so. The Education and Inspections Act 2006 and the Education and Inspections (Prescribed Education and Training etc) Regulations 2007 extended the remit of HMCI to cover the inspection of publicly funded training of further education teachers.

A single initial teacher education (ITE) provider can be inspected for more than one age phase partnership, resulting in several sets of inspection judgements. For inspections up to August 2013, ITE providers could be inspected for primary, secondary and further education phases, and also separately for employment-based routes (EBRs); therefore one inspection could result in up to four sets of judgements. However from 1 September 2013, the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) have ceased allocating places to EBRs: Ofsted, therefore, no longer inspects EBRs as separate partnerships. Some EBRs have become school-centred initial teacher training (SCITT) providers, others continue to offer the Schools Direct (salaried) programme as an employment route.

The purpose of these official statistics is to disseminate the data gathered about ITE providers through Ofsted's role as an inspectorate. This release reports on the ITE inspections that were conducted between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014. The release also includes the most recent inspection outcomes for all open ITE age phase partnerships that have been inspected, as at 31 August 2014. These statistics are based on final data and are not subject to change.


In May and June 2014, Ofsted conducted the first phases of the new two-stage ITE inspections, under the revised 2014 ITE inspection framework. These covered ten ITE providers, reporting on 14 ITE age phase partnerships. The second stages of these inspections concluded in September and October 2014 and the outcomes will be reported on in 2015. These inspections are not included in this official statistics release. For further details of the two-phase inspection process please see the updated inspection handbook: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/initial-teacher-education-inspection-handbook>.

## Key findings

- Between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014, 40 ITE providers were inspected, resulting in 62 sets of inspection judgements; of these, 94% were judged good or outstanding. This is more positive than inspection judgements for 2012/13, where 82% of partnerships were judged good or outstanding.
- At 31 August 2014, there were 225 open ITE partnerships which had been inspected by Ofsted. Some 98% were judged good or better, and none were judged inadequate. This represents a slight increase since August 2013, when 95% were judged good or better. Where an age phase partnership is judged to require improvement, NCTL is unlikely to allocate places until the partnership has been re-inspected and judged good. In these circumstances some providers close all or part of their provision upon being judged to require improvement. This in part explains the very positive profile of most recent inspection judgements.
- This year the first re-inspections of requires improvement providers took place, covering the University of Teesside (FE), Liverpool Hope University (Primary), University of St Mark & St John (Primary and Secondary), and London South Bank University (Primary). All these partnerships were judged to have improved to good for overall effectiveness.
- In 2013/14 two providers were judged to require improvement. Both of these providers were judged to require improvement for both their primary and secondary provision.

**Chart 1: Overall effectiveness judgements from ITE inspections between 1 September 2008 and 31 August 2014<sup>1 2 3 4</sup>**


*Number of partnerships*



1. An ITE provider with more than one age phase partnership will have a separate judgement for each.
2. The inspection framework changed on 1 September 2012. It is possible to compare overall effectiveness grades from before and after this time.
3. Prior to 1 September 2012 schools graded 3 were judged as satisfactory. Since 1 September 2012 they have been judged as 'requires improvement'.
4. As of 1 September 2013, employment-based routes are no longer allocated core places by NCTL and are no longer included in these statistics.

**Chart 2: Overall effectiveness judgements from ITE inspections between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014<sup>1 2</sup>**

*Number of partnerships*



1. An ITE provider with more than one age phase partnership will have a separate judgement for each (with one exception, see note 2).

2. The single judgement for primary/secondary partnership at West Berkshire Training Partnership has been excluded from the primary and secondary sections of this chart. It has been included under 'all partnerships'.

**Table 1: ITE inspections between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014<sup>1 2</sup>**

	Total number of providers inspected <sup>1</sup>	Partnerships inspected			Further Education
		Primary	Secondary	Primary/Secondary <sup>2</sup>	
Initial teacher education inspections	40	23	28	1	10

*Source: Ofsted inspections*

1. An ITE provider with more than one partnership will have separate age phase judgements for each (with one exception, see note 2). In general, the number of providers inspected is not the same as the total number of partnerships inspected.

2. Ofsted reported on primary and secondary ITE at the West Berkshire Training Partnership as a single set of inspection grades. There is one set of judgements which applies to both primary and secondary partnership. This has been counted as a single inspection of a primary/secondary partnership.

**Table 2: Outcomes of ITE inspections between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014**<sup>1 2 3</sup>

		Number of partnerships				
	Outcome	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Primary/ Secondary <sup>2</sup>	Further education
<b>Overall effectiveness</b>	Outstanding	16	8	5	0	3
	Good	42	13	21	1	7
	Requires Improvement	4	2	2	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Outcomes for Trainees</b>	Outstanding	16	8	5	0	3
	Good	42	13	21	1	7
	Requires Improvement	4	2	2	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Quality of Training</b>	Outstanding	16	8	5	0	3
	Good	42	13	21	1	7
	Requires Improvement	4	2	2	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Leadership and Management</b>	Outstanding	21	9	7	0	5
	Good	37	12	19	1	5
	Requires Improvement	4	2	2	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>

Percentage of partnerships <sup>3 4</sup>					
	Outcome	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Further education
<b>Overall effectiveness</b>	Outstanding	26	35	18	30
	Good	68	57	75	70
	Requires Improvement	6	9	7	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Outcomes for Trainees</b>	Outstanding	26	35	18	30
	Good	68	57	75	70
	Requires Improvement	6	9	7	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Quality of Training</b>	Outstanding	26	35	18	30
	Good	68	57	75	70
	Requires Improvement	6	9	7	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Leadership and Management</b>	Outstanding	34	39	25	50
	Good	60	52	68	50
	Requires Improvement	6	9	7	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100

*Source: Ofsted inspections*

1. An ITE provider with more than one partnership will have a separate judgement for each (with one exception, see note 2).
2. Ofsted reported on primary and secondary ITE at the West Berkshire Training Partnership as a single set of inspection grades. There is one set of judgements which applies to both primary and secondary partnership. This has been counted as a single inspection of a primary/secondary partnership.
3. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
4. Where the number of inspections is small, percentages should be treated with caution. Percentages have not been calculated for the partnership that received a single judgement for primary/secondary ITE.

**Table 3: ITE overall effectiveness judgements from most recent inspection as at 31 August 2014 (Final)** <sup>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</sup>

Outcome	Number of Partnerships <sup>2 3</sup>					Percentage of Partnerships <sup>5 6</sup>				
	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Primary/ Secondary	Further Education	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Further Education	
<b>Overall effectiveness<sup>1</sup></b> <small>2 7</small>	Outstanding	78	44	31	0	3	35	47	32	9
	Good	142	47	63	2	30	63	51	66	88
	Satisfactory/ Requires Improvement <sup>3</sup>	5	2	2	0	1	2	2	2	3
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	225	93	96	2	34	100	100	100	100

*Source: Ofsted inspections*

1. The Ofsted inspection framework for ITE changed on 1 September 2012. It is possible to compare Overall Effectiveness grades from before and after this time.
2. An ITE provider with more than one partnership will have a separate judgement for each (with two exceptions, see note 7). In general, the number of providers inspected is not the same as the total number of age phase partnerships inspected.
3. Prior to 1 September 2012 schools graded 3 were judged as satisfactory. Since 1 September 2012 they have been judged as 'requires improvement'.
4. As of 1 September 2013, employment-based routes are no longer allocated core places by NCTL and are no longer included in these statistics.
5. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.
6. Where the number of inspections is small, percentages should be treated with caution. Percentages have not been calculated for the two partnerships that received judgements for primary/secondary ITE.
7. Ofsted simultaneously inspected both phases of ITE offered at the West Berkshire Training Partnership and at Buckingham. For these inspections, there is only one set of judgements applying to both primary and secondary partnerships. These inspections are included under 'all phases', but have not been included under either 'primary' or 'secondary'.

**Table 3a: ITE judgements where most recent inspection was after 1 September 2012 (Final)** <sup>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</sup>

Outcome	Number of partnerships					Percentage of partnerships <sup>4 5</sup>			
	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Primary/ Secondary <sup>2</sup>	Further education	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Further education <sup>4</sup>
<b>Overall effectiveness<sup>6 7 8</sup></b>									
Outstanding	21	11	7	0	3	24	33	18	23
Good	62	20	30	2	10	71	61	77	77
Requires Improvement	4	2	2	0	0	5	6	5	0
Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Outcomes for Trainees<sup>8</sup></b>									
Outstanding	21	11	7	0	3	24	33	18	23
Good	62	20	30	2	10	71	61	77	77
Requires Improvement	4	2	2	0	0	5	6	5	0
Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Quality of Training<sup>8</sup></b>									
Outstanding	21	11	7	0	3	24	33	18	23
Good	62	20	30	2	10	71	61	77	77
Requires Improvement	4	2	2	0	0	5	6	5	0
Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Leadership and Management<sup>8</sup></b>									
Outstanding	27	12	9	0	6	31	36	23	46
Good	56	19	28	2	7	64	58	72	54
Requires Improvement	4	2	2	0	0	5	6	5	0
Inadequate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	100	100	100	100

Source: Ofsted inspections

1. The Ofsted inspection framework for ITE changed on 1 September 2012. It is possible to compare overall effectiveness grades from before and after this time.
2. An ITE provider with more than one partnership will have a separate judgement for each (with two exceptions, see note 6).
3. As of 1 September 2013, employment-based routes are no longer allocated core places by NCTL and are therefore not included in this chart.
4. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.
5. Where the number of inspections is small, percentages should be treated with caution. Percentages have not been calculated for the two partnerships that received judgements for primary/secondary ITE.

6. Ofsted simultaneously inspected both phases of ITE offered at the West Berkshire Training Partnership and at the University of Buckingham. For these inspections, there is only one set of judgements applying to both primary and secondary partnerships. These inspections are included under 'all phases', but have not been included under either 'primary' or 'secondary'.
7. Prior to 1 September 2012 schools graded 3 were judged as satisfactory. Since 1 September 2012 they have been judged as 'requires improvement'.
8. The new grades 'outcomes for trainees', 'quality of training', and 'leadership and management' are not directly comparable with any grades under the old framework for inspections before 1 September 2012.

**Table 3b: ITE judgements where most recent inspection was before 1 September 2012 (Final)** <sup>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</sup>

	Outcome <sup>2</sup>	Number of partnerships <sup>3</sup>			
		All phases	Primary	Secondary	Further Education
<b>Overall effectiveness<sup>2</sup></b>	Outstanding	57	33	24	0
	Good	80	27	33	20
	Satisfactory	1	0	0	1
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>How well do trainees attain?<sup>6,7</sup></b>	Outstanding	37	21	16	0
	Good	99	38	40	21
	Satisfactory	1	0	1	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>137</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>To what extent do recruitment and selection arrangement support high quality outcomes?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	64	34	30	0
	Good	70	25	25	20
	Satisfactory	4	1	2	1
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>To what extent does the training and assessment ensure that all trainees progress to fulfil their potential given their ability and starting points?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	59	33	25	1
	Good	79	27	32	20
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>To what extent are available resources used effectively and efficiently?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	85	44	36	5
	Good	51	16	21	14
	Satisfactory	2	0	0	2
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>The quality of the partnership: to what extent is the partnership across the partnership of consistently high quality?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	57	33	24	0
	Good	80	27	33	20
	Satisfactory	1	0	0	1
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Promoting equalities and diversity: to what extent does the partnership promote equality of opportunity, value diversity and eliminate harassment and unlawful discrimination?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	66	37	28	1
	Good	69	22	29	18
	Satisfactory	3	1	0	2
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Capacity to Improve<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	63	35	28	0
	Good	73	25	29	19
	Satisfactory	2	0	0	2
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>How effectively does the management at all levels assess performance in order to improve or sustain high quality?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	61	34	27	0
	Good	73	26	29	18
	Satisfactory	4	0	1	3
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>How well does the leadership at all levels anticipate change, and prepare for and respond to national and local initiatives?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	86	43	40	3
	Good	51	17	17	17
	Satisfactory	1	0	0	1
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>How effectively does the provider plan and take action for improvement?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	54	33	21	0
	Good	81	27	35	19
	Satisfactory	3	0	1	2
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>21</b>

	Outcome <sup>2</sup>	Percentage of partnerships <sup>4 5</sup>			
		All phases	Primary	Secondary	Further Education
<b>Overall effectiveness<sup>2</sup></b>	Outstanding	41	55	42	0
	Good	58	45	58	95
	Satisfactory	1	0	0	5
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>How well do trainees attain?<sup>6 7</sup></b>	Outstanding	27	36	28	0
	Good	72	64	70	100
	Satisfactory	1	0	2	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total<sup>7</sup></b>	100	100	100	100
<b>To what extent do recruitment and selection arrangement support high quality outcomes?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	46	57	53	0
	Good	51	42	44	95
	Satisfactory	3	2	4	5
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>To what extent does the training and assessment ensure that all trainees progress to fulfil their potential given their ability and starting points?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	43	55	44	5
	Good	57	45	56	95
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>To what extent are available resources used effectively and efficiently?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	62	73	63	24
	Good	37	27	37	67
	Satisfactory	1	0	0	10
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>The quality of the partnership: to what extent is the partnership across the partnership of consistently high quality?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	41	55	42	0
	Good	58	45	58	95
	Satisfactory	1	0	0	5
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Promoting equalities and diversity: to what extent does the partnership promote equality of opportunity, value diversity and eliminate harassment and unlawful discrimination?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	48	62	49	5
	Good	50	37	51	86
	Satisfactory	2	2	0	10
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>Capacity to Improve<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	46	58	49	0
	Good	53	42	51	90
	Satisfactory	1	0	0	10
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>How effectively does the management at all levels assess performance in order to improve or sustain high quality?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	44	57	47	0
	Good	53	43	51	86
	Satisfactory	3	0	2	14
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>How well does the leadership at all levels anticipate change, and prepare for and respond to national and local initiatives?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	62	72	70	14
	Good	37	28	30	81
	Satisfactory	1	0	0	5
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100
<b>How effectively does the provider plan and take action for improvement?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	39	55	37	0
	Good	59	45	61	90
	Satisfactory	2	0	2	10
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	100	100	100	100

Source: Ofsted inspections

### **Footnotes to table 3b**

1. The Ofsted inspection framework for ITE changed on 1 September 2012. It is possible to compare overall effectiveness grades from before and after this time.
2. Prior to 1 September 2012 schools graded 3 were judged as satisfactory. Since 1 September 2012 they have been judged as 'requires improvement'
3. An ITE provider with more than one age phase partnership will have a separate judgement for each.
4. Percentages are rounded and may not add to 100.
5. Where the number of inspections is small, percentages should be treated with caution.
6. These judgements apply only to partnerships inspected under the previous ITE inspection framework, for inspections before 1 September 2012, and are not directly comparable with any grades under the new framework for inspections from 1 September 2012.
7. For the Titan Partnership's primary age phase, no grade was awarded for trainees' attainment because the cohort numbers were too small. All other grades were awarded for this partnership.

### **Methodology**

1. Information in this release represents final data on ITE inspections undertaken between 1 September 2013 and 31 August 2014 and all open ITE partnerships at their most recent inspection on 31 August 2014.
2. From 1 September 2012 inspection events and their outcomes for initial teacher education were reported under a new framework in accordance with The Education Act 1994. Information regarding the new inspection framework can be found on the Ofsted website: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/initial-teacher-education-inspection-handbook> .
3. For inspections that took place prior to September 2012, a different framework was applicable. For information about the framework and how Ofsted inspected initial teacher education, please go to the Ofsted website: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/framework-for-inspection-of-initial-teacher-education-2008-11> .
4. From September 2012, the new judgement of requires improvement has replaced the previous judgement of satisfactory. ITE partnerships that are judged to require improvement will normally be re-inspected within a period of 12 months. If improvement is not seen at the second inspection of Primary or Secondary provision, the ITE provider is usually subject to the withdrawal of its accreditation by the National College for Teaching and Leadership. No such condition exists for inspection of FE provision since it is not accredited by NCTL.
5. The release contains key judgements and full details of published inspection outcomes which can be found in an underlying dataset in csv (comma separated value) and Microsoft Excel formats.
6. If a provider has been inspected more than once, not all age phase partnerships may be inspected each time. Statistics on most recent inspection judgements are based on the

most recent judgement of each partnership, not the most recent judgement of each provider.

7. Information on providers includes postcode, regional information and the status of which age phase partnerships are active at each provider. This is taken from the annual provider returns information collected and collated by Ofsted annually between January and April 2014. This information may be subject to change.
8. From 1 September 2013, Ofsted no longer judged the Employment-based route (EBR) as a separate provision of ITE. Some Employment-based initial teacher training providers (EBITTs) have converted to school-centred initial teacher training (SCITT) providers.
9. No judgements for EBR partnerships are included in the most recent inspection figures. This means EBITTs that converted to SCITTs are not included in this data unless they have been re-inspected after conversion. Further information on inspections of EBRs can be found in ITE official statistics from previous years.

## Glossary

### **Further Education (FE) Training**

Training for those entering the further education and skills sector.

### **Higher Education Institution (HEI)**

A university or university college that provides undergraduate or postgraduate teacher training. An HEI usually offers an academic qualification that includes qualified teacher status (QTS).

### **Initial Teacher Education (ITE)**

All programmes of teacher training that lead to qualified teacher status for state-funded schools or publicly funded teacher training for the FE sector.

### **Inspection judgements**

Inspectors make judgements using a four-point scale:

Grade 1	Outstanding
Grade 2	Good
Grade 3	Requires improvement ('satisfactory' under previous frameworks)
Grade 4	Inadequate
Grade 9	Not applicable, insufficient evidence or did not receive a judgement

### **Partnership**

Refers to the age phase of ITE offered by a particular provider. A single provider may be inspected and receive judgements for up to three different age phase partnerships: primary, secondary and FE.

### **Primary Training**

Training which prepares trainees to teach in at least two key stages of the primary age phase (pupils aged 11 years and under).

### **Primary/Secondary judgements**

When a provider offering primary and secondary ITE includes a small number of trainees, Ofsted may inspect both phases of ITE simultaneously and produce a judgement on the primary and secondary training. This is different from what happens in larger providers where judgements will be made separately for primary and for secondary training.

### **Qualified Teacher Status (QTS)**

The accreditation that enables newly qualified trainees to teach in state-maintained and special schools in England and Wales.

### **Secondary Training**

Training which prepares trainees to teach in at least two key stages of the secondary age phase (students aged 11-18 and/or 14 -19 years).

### **School-Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT)**

A consortium of schools, usually in a local area or region, providing graduate training for teachers.

© Crown copyright 2014

You may use and re-use 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:

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/>

Or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

Or email:

[psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)