


### Initial teacher education inspection outcomes

This initial teacher education (ITE) release contains provisional data for:

- outcomes from inspections completed in the 2014/15 academic year
- most recent inspection outcomes for all partnerships.

The proportion of partnerships inspected which were good or outstanding is lower this year than last year

Inspections of 17 partnerships were concluded in the 2014/15 academic year. Some 82% (14) of these partnerships were judged good or outstanding. This is lower than the 94% seen in 2013/14.



Three partnerships were judged less than good this year

The University of Essex was judged to require improvement in October 2014 and still required improvement at its next inspection in May 2015. Kent County Council was judged inadequate in October 2014.

Ninety eight percent of all partnerships were good or outstanding at their last inspection.

As of 30 June 2015, there were 231 open partnerships which had been inspected by Ofsted. Some 98% of these are good or better.

## Contents

Inspections between 1 September 2014 and 31 August 2015 .....	3
Most recent inspections for initial teacher education providers .....	5

## Acknowledgements

Thanks to the following for their contribution to this statistical release: James Twist and Andrew Rosser.

## Inspections between 1 September 2014 and 31 August 2015

Between 1 September 2014 and 31 August 2015<sup>1</sup>, 11 ITE providers were inspected<sup>2</sup>, resulting in 17 sets of inspection judgements for each age phase partnership. Eighty two percent of these 17 partnerships were judged good or outstanding. This is lower than the inspection outcomes for 2013/14 where 94% of partnerships were judged good or outstanding, but is equal to outcomes seen in 2012/13.

There were far fewer inspections concluded in 2014/15 compared to previous years (chart 1) because of the introduction of the two stage inspection process in June 2014. The two stage inspection process requires a second visit in the autumn term to observe the newly qualified teachers or former trainees. This introduced a lag in the conclusion of these inspections and, as a result, a dip in the number of inspections concluded in the 2014/15 academic year. Inspection volumes are expected to return to normal levels in 2015/16.

As chart 2 shows, all partnerships offering training in either primary or secondary education were judged good or outstanding this year. However two of the four further education partnerships were judged to require improvement and one of the two primary/secondary education<sup>3</sup> partnerships (Kent County council) was judged to be inadequate.

The National College for Teaching and Leadership has withdrawn Kent County Council's accreditation so that they are no longer able to offer training that leads to the award of qualified teacher status. Kent County Council's initial teacher education provision closed on 1 July 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> The last of the 2014/15 inspections took place in May 2015 and was published in June 2015. The first stage of 2015/16 inspections took place in summer 2015, and will conclude in autumn 2015. The outcomes from these inspections will be reported in subsequent releases.

<sup>2</sup> There were 12 inspections concluded in this period but the University of Essex was inspected twice. It was judged to require improvement in October 2014 and then inspected again in May 2015 when it was judged still to require improvement.

<sup>3</sup> See the background methodology and quality report for more information.

**Chart 2: Overall effectiveness judgements from ITE inspections concluded between 1 September 2014 and 31 August 2015**



Two providers judged to require improvement at their previous inspection were inspected again in 2014/15. The University of Leeds improved to good for both primary and secondary phases. Further education provision at the University of Essex was judged still to require improvement.

## Most recent inspections for initial teacher education providers

As of 30 June 2015<sup>4</sup>, there were 231 open partnerships that had been inspected by Ofsted. Some 98% of these partnerships were good or better, the same proportion as at 31 August 2014, and slightly higher than the 95% seen as at 31 August 2013.

Three partnerships were judged to require improvement and one as inadequate (table 3)<sup>5</sup>. All but one of these closed by 31 August 2015.

As of 30 June 2015, there were 66 open school centred initial teacher training partnerships (SCITTs) that had been inspected by Ofsted. All of these were judged to be good or outstanding at their most recent inspection. This is similar to the proportion of partnerships based in higher education institutions (HEIs) where 154 out of 156 (99%) partnerships were good or outstanding at their most recent inspection.

Ofsted has now completed inspections of 101 partnerships under the new framework that began in September 2012. This represents just under half (44%) of partnerships open on 30 June 2015 (table 3a).

Ninety six per cent of providers whose latest inspection was after 1 September 2012 are good or better compared to 100% of those last inspected prior to September 2012 (table 3b). The very positive profile of most recent inspection judgements is in part a reflection of the National College for Teaching and Leadership's policy for determining the number of trainees which each provider is eligible to accept. Where 'provision is repeatedly of requires improvement or lower quality'<sup>6</sup>, the National College for Teaching and Leadership will often withdraw trainee allocations until the partnership has been judged to be good. As a result, some providers close all or part of their provision upon being judged less than good.

Ofsted inspect weaker partnerships more frequently than stronger partnerships. The grade profile for partnerships last inspected prior to September 2012 is higher than

---

<sup>4</sup> Inspection activity for 2014/15 concluded in June 2015. In order to publish official statistics which are timely and useful to users the data are being published in September rather than in December as in previous years. Most recent inspection outcomes are based on partnerships which were open on 30 June 2015 and therefore include some providers which have since closed.

<sup>5</sup> Anglia Ruskin University (primary and secondary) required improvement and closed in August. Kent County Council was judged inadequate and closed in July. The University of Essex (FE) currently requires improvement and remains open.

<sup>6</sup> *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) accreditation withdrawal process, NCTL, 2014:*

[www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-itt-accreditation-withdrawal-process](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-itt-accreditation-withdrawal-process)

the profile for those inspected since September 2012 (tables 3a and 3b). This is partly because any partnerships that were less than good in September 2012 have now been inspected under the current framework.

**Table 1: ITE inspections concluded between 1 September 2014 and 31 August 2015<sup>1 2</sup>**

	Total number of inspections	Total number of providers inspected <sup>1</sup>	Partnerships inspected				Total number of inspection outcomes
			Primary	Secondary	Primary/Secondary <sup>2</sup>	Further Education	
Initial teacher education inspections	12	11	5	6	2	4	17

*Source: Ofsted inspections*

1. An ITE provider with more than one partnership will have separate age phase judgements for each (with two exceptions, 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 as a single set of inspection graders at Kent County Council and Hibernia College UK Limited. There is one set of judgements which applies to both primary and secondary partnership for each provider. These have been counted as a single inspection of a primary/secondary partnership.

**Table 2: Outcomes of ITE inspections between 1 September 2014 and 31 August 2015** <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	1	1	0	0	0
	Good	13	4	6	1	2
	Requires Improvement	2	0	0	0	2
	Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Outcomes for Trainees</b>	Outstanding	1	1	0	0	0
	Good	13	4	6	1	2
	Requires Improvement	2	0	0	0	2
	Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Quality of Training</b>	Outstanding	1	1	0	0	0
	Good	13	4	6	1	2
	Requires Improvement	2	0	0	0	2
	Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Leadership and Management</b>	Outstanding	1	1	0	0	0
	Good	13	4	6	1	2
	Requires Improvement	2	0	0	0	2
	Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>



		Percentage of partnerships <sup>3</sup>			
	Outcome	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Further education
<b>Overall effectiveness</b>	Outstanding	6	20	0	0
	Good	76	80	100	50
	Requires Improvement	12	0	0	50
	Inadequate	6	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Outcomes for Trainees</b>	Outstanding	6	20	0	0
	Good	76	80	100	50
	Requires Improvement	12	0	0	50
	Inadequate	6	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Quality of Training</b>	Outstanding	6	20	0	0
	Good	76	80	100	50
	Requires Improvement	12	0	0	50
	Inadequate	6	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Leadership and Management</b>	Outstanding	6	20	0	0
	Good	76	80	100	50
	Requires Improvement	12	0	0	50
	Inadequate	6	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Ofsted inspections

1. An ITE provider with more than one partnership will have separate age phase judgements for each (with two exceptions, see note 2).
2. Ofsted reported on primary and secondary ITE as a single set of inspection grades at Kent County Council and Hibernia College UK Limited. There is one set of judgements which applies to both primary and secondary partnership for each provider. These have been counted as a single inspection of a primary/secondary partnership.
3. Percentages have been rounded and may not sum to 100.

**Table 3: ITE overall effectiveness judgements from most recent inspection as at 30 June 2015** <sup>1 2 3 4</sup>

Outcome	Number of Partnerships					Percentage of Partnerships <sup>4</sup>				
	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Primary/ Secondary	Further Education	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Further Education	
<b>Overall effectiveness</b>	Outstanding	78	44	31	0	3	34	47	31	9
	Good	149	48	68	3	30	65	52	68	88
	Satisfactory/ Requires Improvement	3	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3
	Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Ofsted inspections

1. An ITE provider with more than one partnership will have a separate judgement for each (with two exceptions, 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 as a single set of inspection grades at University of Buckingham, West Berkshire Training Partnership, Kent County Council and Hibernia College UK Limited. There is one set of judgements which applies to both primary and secondary partnership for each provider. These have been counted as a single inspection of a primary/secondary partnership.
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. Percentages are rounded and may not sum to 100.

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

Outcome	Number of partnerships					Percentage of partnerships <sup>4</sup>			
	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Primary/ Secondary <sup>6</sup>	Further education	All phases	Primary	Secondary	Further education
<b>Overall effectiveness</b>									
Outstanding	22	12	7	0	3	22	32	16	19
Good	75	24	36	3	12	74	65	82	75
Requires Improvement	3	1	1	0	1	3	3	2	6
Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Outcomes for Trainees</b>									
Outstanding	22	12	7	0	3	22	32	16	19
Good	75	24	36	3	12	74	65	82	75
Requires Improvement	3	1	1	0	1	3	3	2	6
Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Quality of Training</b>									
Outstanding	22	12	7	0	3	22	32	16	19
Good	75	24	36	3	12	74	65	82	75
Requires Improvement	3	1	1	0	1	3	3	2	6
Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Leadership and Management</b>									
Outstanding	28	13	9	0	6	28	35	20	38
Good	69	23	34	3	9	68	62	77	56
Requires Improvement	3	1	1	0	1	3	3	2	6
Inadequate	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

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 separate age phase judgements 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 and may not sum to 100.
5. Where the number of inspections is small, percentages should be treated with caution.
6. Ofsted reported on primary and secondary ITE as a single set of inspection grades at University of Buckingham, West Berkshire Training Partnership, Kent County Council and Hibernia College UK Limited. There is one set of judgements which applies to both primary and secondary partnership for each provider. These have been counted as a single inspection of a primary/secondary partnership.
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** <sup>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</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	56	32	24	0
	Good	74	24	32	18
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>How well do trainees attain?<sup>6 7</sup></b>	Outstanding	36	20	16	0
	Good	91	35	39	17
	Satisfactory	2	0	1	1
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>129</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>To what extent do recruitment and selection arrangement support high quality outcomes?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	61	32	29	0
	Good	66	23	25	18
	Satisfactory	3	1	2	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</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	58	32	25	1
	Good	72	24	31	17
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>To what extent are available resources used effectively and efficiently?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	81	41	35	5
	Good	49	15	21	13
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>The quality of the partnership: to what extent is the provision across the partnership of consistently high quality?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	56	32	24	0
	Good	74	24	32	18
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</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	64	36	27	1
	Good	64	19	29	16
	Satisfactory	2	1	0	1
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Capacity to Improve<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	63	34	29	0
	Good	67	22	27	18
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</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	33	28	0
	Good	67	23	27	17
	Satisfactory	2	0	1	1
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</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	85	42	40	3
	Good	45	14	16	15
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>How effectively does the provider plan and take action for improvement?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	54	32	22	0
	Good	75	24	33	18
	Satisfactory	1	0	1	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18</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	43	57	43	0
	Good	57	43	57	100
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>How well do trainees attain?<sup>6 7</sup></b>	Outstanding	28	36	29	0
	Good	71	64	70	94
	Satisfactory	2	0	2	6
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>To what extent do recruitment and selection arrangement support high quality outcomes?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	47	57	52	0
	Good	51	41	45	100
	Satisfactory	2	2	4	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</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	45	57	45	6
	Good	55	43	55	94
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>To what extent are available resources used effectively and efficiently?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	62	73	63	28
	Good	38	27	38	72
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>The quality of the partnership: to what extent is the provision across the partnership of consistently high quality?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	43	57	43	0
	Good	57	43	57	100
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</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	49	64	48	6
	Good	49	34	52	89
	Satisfactory	2	2	0	6
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Capacity to Improve<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	48	61	52	0
	Good	52	39	48	100
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</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	47	59	50	0
	Good	52	41	48	94
	Satisfactory	2	0	2	6
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</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	65	75	71	17
	Good	35	25	29	83
	Satisfactory	0	0	0	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>How effectively does the provider plan and take action for improvement?<sup>6</sup></b>	Outstanding	42	57	39	0
	Good	58	43	59	100
	Satisfactory	1	0	2	0
	Inadequate	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

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 partnership will have separate age phase judgements for each (with two exceptions, see note 8).
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.
8. Ofsted reported on primary and secondary ITE as a single set of inspection grades at University of Buckingham, West Berkshire Training Partnership, Kent County Council and Hibernia College UK Limited. There is one set of judgements which applies to both primary and secondary partnership for each provider. These have been counted as a single inspection of a primary/secondary partnership.

© Crown copyright

You may 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 e-mail: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)