



**CONSULTATION ON THE USE OF INFORMATION
ABOUT QUALITY IN ALLOCATIONS DECISIONS FOR
2002/2003**

FEBRUARY 2001

Teacher Training Agency, Portland House, Stag Place, London, SW1E 5TT

INTRODUCTION

The Teacher Training Agency has a statutory duty to link the funding of initial teacher training (ITT) to its quality as judged in OFSTED inspections. This consultation paper invites comments on proposals for using OFSTED inspection evidence to define the quality categories for ITT provision which will be used to allocate intake targets for 2002/2003. These comments should be sent by 8 June 2001 to:

Tim Hickson
Quality Assessment Team
Teacher Training Agency
Portland House
Stag Place
London SW1E 5TT

E mail : hicksont@teach-tta.gov.uk
Telephone: 020 7925 3817
Fax : 020 7925 3801

All public consultations by central government bodies are required to conform to the Cabinet Office's *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*. Further information about the code can be found at www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/2000/consult/Index.htm. How this consultation has been designed to meet these requirements is illustrated below using the Code's criteria.

Criterion 1: Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.

This consultation is being initiated about five months before the TTA normally makes a decision about the allocation of intake targets to ITT providers. That decision, which will be based on the outcome of this consultation, is made more than a year in advance of the relevant training intake.

Criterion 2: It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.

The consultation is specifically aimed at ITT providers and their representative organisations who will receive a direct mailing. Comments will also be welcome from others with a responsibility or interest in this area of the Agency's work: these stakeholders can access this document through the TTA's website.

Criterion 3: A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.

A summary of the consultation issues follows this introduction. The main document has been made as concise as possible given the complex nature of the subject matter. If

you have any questions or need assistance with making a response, please contact, in the first instance, Tim Hickson (020 7925 3817). A form on which comments may be returned to the Agency is included in this document. An electronic version is available from the TTA web site (www.canteach.gov.uk). You need not use the form if you would find it more useful to respond in some other way. We are happy to accept electronic or paper responses to the consultation.

Criterion 4: Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.

The consultation paper will be available on the Agency's website as well as hard copies being mailed to ITT providers, representative organisations and on request to other enquirers.

Criterion 5: Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.

The period of consultation, from 14 February to 5 June 2001 allows some 15 weeks for responses to be made.

Criterion 6: Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.

The responses received by the Agency will be summarised and reported to the TTA Board at its meeting on 4 July 2001. The Board will make its decisions informed by the responses. ITT providers will be informed of the Board's decisions with reasons in a report issued in mid July.

The TTA aims to ensure that all of its consultation processes are as open and transparent as possible. For this reason, responses may be made public unless confidentiality is specifically requested.

Criterion 7: Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

Plans are in hand to meet this requirement and to use the outcomes of an evaluation in planning future consultations.

**Nigel Vivian
Teacher Training Agency
February 2001**

SUMMARY OF THE CONSULTATION ISSUES

Secondary Allocation Categories

- 1. Secondary allocation categories in 2002/03 should continue to be based on new Secondary Subject Inspection (SSI) evidence, where it is available, and on existing evidence where it is not (paragraph 1).**
- 2. The definitions of secondary allocations categories used last year for 2001/02 should remain unchanged for 2002/03 (paragraph 2).**

Primary Allocation Categories

- 3. Allocation categories in 2002/03 and 2003/04 should be based on the inspection evidence from BOTH mathematics AND English, where available (paragraphs 3 – 7).**
- 4. New definitions of primary allocation categories should take into account the grades for both mathematics and English where they are available (paragraphs 8 – 9).**
- 5. The changes in the primary allocation category definition where grades for both English and mathematics are available should be used for both 2002/03 and for 2003/04 (paragraph 10).**

Former category D and E provision

- 6. A graduated approach should be adopted to restoring target allocations for former category D and E providers such that:
 - recovery to category A should result in greater level of restoration than recovery to category B; and
 - recovery to category B should result in a greater level of restoration than recovery to category C.**
- 7. Views are sought on the extent to which these changes:
 - should be retrospective; and
 - should apply to secondary as well as primary provision.

(paragraphs 11- 12)**

SECONDARY ALLOCATION CATEGORIES

Proposal i. Secondary allocations in 2002/03 should be determined by new Secondary Subject Inspection (SSI) evidence where it is available, otherwise existing SSI evidence should be used.

1. In previous consultations, the Agency set the principle of replacing the evidence from the first cycle of Secondary Subject Inspections (SSI) with that from the most recent cycle, as it becomes available. The Agency intends to continue with this approach until the end of the latest secondary inspection programme in 2001/02.

Proposal ii. There should be no change in the definition of secondary allocation categories for 2002/03.

2. It is proposed to continue with the existing definitions of secondary allocation categories (see annex B). Any change at the mid-point in this inspection cycle would be unnecessarily disruptive.

Consultation questions

1. **Do you agree that secondary allocation categories in 2002/03 should continue to be based on new SSI evidence, where it is available, and on existing evidence where it is not?**
2. **Do you agree that the definitions of secondary allocations categories used last year for 2001/02 should remain unchanged for 2002/03?**
3. **If you disagree, please set out your reasons and alternatives.**

PRIMARY ALLOCATION CATEGORIES

Proposal iii. Allocation categories in 2002/03 should use the grades for both mathematics and English, where available.

3. In setting allocation categories for 2002/03, the Agency will have available evidence from the second inspection under the Primary Initial Teacher Training Inspection (PITTI) programme for about half of the providers of primary ITT. For these there will therefore be recent inspection evidence for both mathematics and English. Others will have grades for either mathematics or English.
4. The Agency is proposing to use the evidence from the second part of the PITTI for allocations in 2002/03 and to use it along with the evidence from the first part of the inspection programme. This means that providers inspected in 2000/01 can benefit immediately from any improvement and their allocation category will be based on a broader assessment of quality which draws on the two core subjects, mathematics and English. It also enables the Agency to continue to use relatively recent, and still valuable, evidence.

5. Providers not inspected in 2000/01 will continue to have their allocation category based on one core subject, but this will be necessary only for one further year. For the other half of primary providers, it will be necessary to revise the allocation category definitions to accommodate ten rather than five inspection grades (see proposal iv).
6. Whilst this is the Agency's preferred option, it welcomes views on others which generally are covered by two possibilities:
 - a. to ignore the new PITTI evidence until it is available for all primary providers (i.e. the 2003/04 allocation round) and continue to use existing allocation categories; or
 - b. to use the new PITTI evidence in place of the old PITTI for those inspected in 2000/01 whilst leaving those not inspected in their previous allocation category.
7. These options were not preferred because, whilst (a) is consistent with the established principle of using only evidence that is comparable for all providers, it contradicts another of using new evidence as soon as possible. Option (b) misses the opportunity to base allocation categories on a broader assessment of primary provision, although it would allow existing allocation category definitions to be retained.

Consultation questions

4. **Do you agree that allocation categories in 2002/03 should use the grades for both mathematics and English, where available?**
5. **If you disagree, which alternative would you favour and why?**

Proposal iv. The definition of allocation categories given in option 3 should be used when grades for both primary mathematics and English are available.

8. If the Agency uses grades for both mathematics and English, a new definition of allocation categories is needed which uses the ten grades available. The Agency is proposing to continue to use definitions in which particular grade profiles qualify provision for each category. The definitions will need to be adjusted for the additional cells. The Agency does not prefer alternatives involving the aggregation or averaging of grades from two subjects because they are significantly different to how secondary allocation categories are defined and how we have to continue to define primary categories for those not inspected in 1999/2000.
9. Several options were modelled to assess the impact of changing the definitions of categories. The three most promising options modelled are given in Table 3. Using projected grades, option 3 appears to result in the fewest reductions in category.

Table 3	OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3
A	Six 1s in ST cells and the rest at least 2s; OR eight 1s and the rest 2s	Six 1s in ST cells and the rest at least 2s; OR seven 1s and the rest 2s	Six 1s in any cell and the rest grade 2
B	At least 2s in all cells OR up to two 3s (not in ST) matched by same number of 1s	At least 2s in all cell OR one 3s not in ST cell (no matching 1)	At least 2s in all cell OR one 3s cell in any cell (no matching 1)
C	At least two 2s and no lower than a 3	At least two 2s and no lower than a 3	At least two 2s and no lower than a 3
D	All 3s or one 2 and four 3s	All 3s or one 2 and four 3s	All 3s or one 2 and four 3s
E	Any 4	Any 4	Any 4

Consultation Questions

- 6. Do you agree that option 3 should be used to define allocation categories when grades for both mathematics and English are available?**
- 7. If you disagree, which option would you favour and why?**

Proposal v. The changes in the primary allocation category definition agreed in this consultation will continue to be used for 2003/04.

10. Similar inspection evidence will be reported on providers in the second year of PITTI. It would seem appropriate in the interests of predictability to use the inspection evidence in the same way following each year of the PITTI part 2.

Consultation Questions

- 8. Do you agree the changes in the primary allocation category definition should continue to be used for 2003/04?**
- 9. If you disagree, please set out your reasons and alternatives**

Proposal vi. Introduce new rules for restoring places to former category D and E provision.

11. The Agency is proposing to introduce new rules for restoring places to former category D and E provision where quality improves on further inspection. The rules will be more generous than under the current arrangements where provision in allocation quality category D or E may have cuts of up to 25 per cent and 50 per cent respectively to the intake target. If the further inspection indicates improvement to category C or better, one third of the cut made to the baseline of the primary provision is restored. There is no restoration currently to improved secondary provision.
12. A more graduated approach to restoration would allow improvement to category A or B to result in a greater level of restoration than improvement to category C. Views are sought on:

- whether the graduated approach should be adopted and what the levels of restoration should be;
- whether the new rules should be applied retrospectively and if so how far back in time should they be applied;
- whether the new rules should be extended to secondary as well as primary provision.

Consultation Questions

10. Should a graduated approach be adopted to restoring target allocations for former category D and E providers?

11. What should the level of restoration be for E providers recovering to C, B and A?

12. What should the level of restoration be for D providers recovering to C, B and A?

13. Should the new rules be applied retrospectively and if so, how far back should this be?

14. Should the new rules apply to secondary as well as primary provision?

**Teacher Training Agency
February 2001**

ANNEX A

Cells graded in primary and secondary inspections

Cell		SSI	Primary Core	Primary Specialist
ST1	The trainees' subject knowledge and understanding	✓	✓	✓
ST2	The trainees' planning, teaching and classroom management	✓	✓	✓
ST3	The trainees' monitoring, assessment, recording and accountability	✓	✓	
ST4	The trainees' knowledge and understanding of other professional requirements			
T1	The quality of the training	✓	✓	
T2	The accuracy and consistency of the assessment of trainees against the standards for QTS	✓	✓	
M	The effectiveness of the management and quality assurance of the training	Note 1		
S1	The appropriateness of the admission and selection process	Note 2		
S2	The trainees' qualifications and suitability for ITT	Note 3		

Note 1: Only used for new providers or in the re-inspection of a non-compliant provider

Note 2: This cell was inspected only in the old SSI and is not inspected in the new SSI

Note 3: This cell is not inspected since the information is available through the TTA's data collection exercise.

ANNEX B

1. OFSTED grading scale

Complies with Secretary of State's current criteria	1	Very good, with several outstanding features
	2	Good, with no significant weaknesses
	3	Adequate, but requires significant improvement
Does not comply with the Secretary of State's current criteria	4	Poor quality

2. Definition of Allocation Categories for 2001/2002

Category	Definition
A	EITHER <i>grade 1s in all the standards cells (ST) and no lower than grade 2s in the other (training "T") cells</i> OR four grade 1s and one grade 2 in any cell combination
B	EITHER <i>no grade lower than 2 in every cell</i> OR no more than one grade 3, which should not be in a standards cell, with at least one grade 1 and no lower than grade 2 in other cells.
C	<i>At least one grade 2 and no lower than grade 3s in other cells</i>
D	<i>No lower than grade 3 in any cell</i>
E	<i>One or more grade 4s</i>

CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

For the attention of:

Tim Hickson
Quality Assessment Team
Teacher Training Agency
Portland House
Stag Place
London SW1E 5TT

RESPONDENT NAME:

ORGANISATION RESPONDENT REPRESENTS:

Where the organisation is a representative body, please briefly summarise the people/organisations the body represents.

Proposal i. Secondary allocations in 2002/03 should be determined by new Secondary Subject Inspection (SSI) evidence, where it is available, otherwise existing SSI evidence should be used.

Proposal ii. There should be no change in the definition of secondary allocation categories for 2002/03.

- 1. Do you agree secondary allocations in 2002/03 should continue to be based on new Secondary Subject Inspection (SSI) evidence, where it is available, and on existing evidence where it is not?**
- 2. Do you agree that the definitions of secondary allocations categories used last year for 2001/02 should remain unchanged for 2002/03?**

3. If you disagree, please set out your reasons and alternative proposals.

Proposal iii. Primary allocation categories in 2002/03 should use the grades for both mathematics and English, where available.

4. Do you agree that primary allocation categories in 2002/03 should use the grades for both mathematics and English, where available?

5. If you disagree, which alternative would you favour and why?

Proposal iv. The definition of allocation categories given in option 3 should be

used when grades for both primary mathematics and English are available.

6. Do you agree that option 3 (see page 7) should be used to define allocation categories when grades for both primary mathematics and English are available?

7. If you disagree, which option would you favour and why?

Proposal v. The changes in the primary allocation category definition agreed in this consultation will continue to be used for 2003/04.

8. Do you agree the changes in the primary allocation category definition should continue to be used for 2003/04?

9. If you disagree, please set out your reasons and alternatives.

Proposal vi. Introduce new rules for restoring places to former category D and E provision.

10. Should a graduated approach be adopted to restoring target allocations for former category D and E providers?

11. What should the level of restoration be for E providers recovering to C, B and A?

12. What should the level of restoration be for D providers recovering to C, B and A?

13. Should the new rules be applied retrospectively and if so, how far back should this be?

14. Should the new rules apply to secondary as well as primary provision?

Signed: