|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Outstanding partnerships**: | **Strength at MMU** | **Even better if >action** |
| 1. are outstanding at preparing new teachers **and** they have the evidence to prove it |  |  |
| 1. understand the rules of engagement of the Ofsted ITT ‘game’ and are strategic in ensuring **everything** they present works to shape Ofsted judgements of G1 |  |  |
| 1. have rigorous recruitment and selection procedures and have trainees with potential to be good or outstanding teachers, tell them from the outset that this is the expectation and what their role and the partnerships role is in this |  |  |
| 1. have a clear vision for continually enhancing the quality of the training offered – ensure this is understood by all |  |  |
| 1. ensure shortfalls or recommendations identified in the last Ofsted inspection have been fully addressed and strengths have been maintained or enhanced further and this is clearly documented re both actions and outcomes |  |  |
| 1. provide a coherent training experience, structured to ensure timeliness across school and centre-based training and of assignments and ensure all partners are aware of this intention |  |  |
| 1. demonstrate that all partner schools offer high quality training contexts strategically matched to trainee needs |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outstanding partnerships:** | **RAG / NA** | **Even better if > action > impact on trainee outcomes > evidence** | **By when?** |
| 1. provide complementary experiences and give opportunities for all trainees to develop competence in teaching pupils with a very wide range of learning needs, including pupils with EAL and SEND |  |  |  |
| 1. have **explicit** ways to involve schools in all aspects of provision including leadership and management of programmes, self- evaluation, improvement planning, selection and training |  |  |  |
| 1. have a high status group of ‘tutors’, providing explicit lines of communication to all schools, including: 360 evaluation, review of and planning for engagement in the partnership, discussion of priorities and QA |  |  |  |
| 1. demonstrate to all partners that they are part of a collaborative partnership which shapes and delivers consistently high quality training experiences and make effective use of partnership expertise |  |  |  |
| 1. have a transparent and robust grading system where implications of G3 / RI are clearly understood and acted upon and which secures absolute accuracy in grading judgements supported by sharply focused internal and external moderation. Know the boundaries!! |  |  |  |
| 1. provide high-quality support and individualised training to meet the precise learning needs of trainees |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outstanding partnerships:** | **RAG / NA** | **Even better if> action > impact on outcomes > evidence** | **By when?** |
| 1. rigorously measure the impact of training on the outcomes for trainees (how well they meet the Teachers’ Standards, how well they teach, completion and employment rates, variations between groups – ensure consistency of outcome across all groups and programmes) |  |  |  |
| 1. collect robust data, analyse it and identify implications and required actions to inform and track trainees’ progress and to measure the impact of improvements on trainees’ outcomes |  |  |  |
| 1. collect robust evidence of the impact of trainees’ teaching on pupils’ learning and progress |  |  |  |
| 1. undertake rigorous self-evaluation, driven by close analysis of all outcomes |  |  |  |
| 1. ensure that success criteria for improvement planning are focussed directly on improved outcomes for trainees |  |  |  |
| 1. secure consistently high completion and employment rates |  |  |  |
| 1. receive positive endorsement from their trainees and NQTs and have strong year on year evidence to show this – significant weight has been given to the evidence of NQTs |  |  |  |
| 1. Have robust evidence of NQTs competence, impact on pupil learning, impact on school improvement |  |  |  |