



The National Association of  
School-Based Teacher Trainers

Release date: 5<sup>th</sup> July 2021

## ITT Market Review Final Report and Consultation: NASBTT statement

***“We simply cannot support the recommendation that a reaccreditation process is necessary”***

NASBTT has responded to the publication of the [ITT Market Review Final Report](#) and the [consultation](#) which seeks the sector’s opinions on the conclusions reached and the recommendations made by the review group.

Executive Director Emma Hollis said: “We acknowledge the ITT Market Review Final Report and welcome the group’s aspiration to create ‘a world-class teacher development system’ and its broad principles around a new set of quality requirements. Quality has always been at the forefront of school-based ITT. These providers have consistently demonstrated their quality in every measurable way, including through Ofsted inspections, regardless of their size or scale, and it is absolutely right to seek to continually develop provision. We therefore fully support the broad aim of the review to seek to further build on the existing quality of provision.

However, we simply cannot support the recommendation that a reaccreditation process is necessary to achieve the recommended adaptations to curriculum design and provision. The report presents no evidence to suggest that existing providers of ITT would be unable to deliver the new curriculum requirements in full. A wide-scale, expensive and disruptive reaccreditation process poses a huge risk to teacher supply. Introducing an unnecessary administrative burden to the sector, which, in turn, presents such clear risks to our teacher supply chain, with no clear rationale for the benefits it will bring, is simply indefensible.

The risks associated with the recommendation for reaccreditation are exacerbated by the timescale recommended in the report. The development of truly high-quality partnerships and well-sequenced curricula takes significant time and resource. Forcing providers to submit applications for reaccreditation within just a five-month window risks the loss of exceptional providers from the system because they do not have sufficient time, resource and capacity to undertake the process effectively.

We would also be interested to see the government’s plans for fairly and robustly assessing this unprecedented volume of applications in such a short timescale; and their evidence that a paper-based process will be a better determiner of provider quality than their current quality assurance processes, namely the Ofsted Inspection Framework. The costs to central government of an intensive accreditation process, and of increasing the frequency of Ofsted inspections, should also have been set out clearly in the report.

The quality requirements themselves are, quite rightly, ambitious and do represent some practical, logistical barriers which will need to be worked through carefully and tested rigorously to ensure that there are no unintended negative consequences resulting from their introduction. We believe that these barriers could be overcome with sufficient time, resource, support and

opportunities to test and learn key elements of the recommendations. In short, there would be much work for the sector to do if we are to deliver these recommendations ‘on the ground’ in the next two years; nevertheless we are confident that the sector can rise to the challenge, providing they are given the trust and space to do so without unnecessary interference.

Right now, however, there is a potentially catastrophic risk to destabilising the market. As the final report says, ‘it is important that existing strong SCITTs and School Direct lead schools become part of the reshaped market’, alongside the valuable contribution of Teaching School Hubs, which remain in their infancy. This really is not the time to be reducing (either through design or as an unintended consequence of an unnecessary accreditation process) the number of accredited ITT providers, which have been extremely effective in supplying this country’s schools with around 30,000 new well-trained teachers every year.

Separately, NASBTT has contributed to an All-Party Parliamentary Group for the Teaching Profession report by the Special Interest Group on ITT. The report, which can be downloaded [here](#), makes 11 recommendations around the ITT market review. It should be noted that none of the contributors (representatives of headteachers, teachers and schools) perceived there is a widespread or systemic issue around NQT quality.”

**-ENDS-**

NASBTT is a registered charity committed to promoting high-quality schools-led programmes of training, education and professional development of teachers. NASBTT represents the interests of schools-led teacher training provision in relation to the development and implementation of national policy developments. Our members include SCITT providers, School Direct Lead Schools, Teaching Schools, HEIs as well as a range of other organisations involved in the education and professional development of teachers. We have over 200 members representing more than 12,000 individual trainees.

**Website:** [www.nasbtt.org.uk](http://www.nasbtt.org.uk)

**Social:** <https://twitter.com/nasbtt> (@NASBTT)

**Media Resources:** [nasbtt.org.uk/media-hub](http://nasbtt.org.uk/media-hub)

**Media Contact:**

Phil Smith

NASBTT PR consultant

Telephone: 01778 218180 / 07866 436159

Email: [phil@philsmithcommunications.co.uk](mailto:phil@philsmithcommunications.co.uk)