

## OFSTED consultation – notes for governors

March 2019

The OFSTED consultation is at <https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/EIFConsultation/>

(or web search “Ofsted consultation” and click through the links...)

It will take you through 11 specific questions, each with 5 options from Strongly Disagree up to Strongly Agree, plus a “Don’t Know”. There is a comment box after each question and a comment box available for the separate handbooks (e.g. Independent Schools, Early Years, Further Education).

Summary of changes affecting mainstream maintained schools and Academies, EYFS – Key Stage 4

Proposal 1	<b>“To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a ‘quality of education’ judgement?”</b>
What’s the aim of the proposed change?	“Quality of Education” will replace the current “Teaching and Learning” and “Outcomes” categories. It will encompass <b>intent (the curriculum), implementation</b> (how the curriculum is <b>taught</b> and <b>impact</b> (eventual <b>outcomes</b> ). The idea is to provide a broad education, to encourage methods of embedding longer term knowledge and develop understanding.
Why might this be good?	More focus on what is being taught and how as well as outcomes good for improving pupils’ life chances. Focus on good management of teacher workload. Specific points that might be of benefit e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Point 163 Equipping pupils with the knowledge and cultural capital they need to succeed in life</li> <li>- Point 169 Developing understanding, not memorising disconnected facts</li> <li>- Point 160 The inspectorate recognises the importance of schools’ autonomy to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- choose their own curriculum approaches</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Point 172 Inspectors will look at whether schools’ collections of attainment or progress data are proportionate and represent an efficient use of school resources, and are sustainable for staff.</li> </ul>
What could be improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Point 157 says that the school should not “offer disadvantaged pupils or pupils with SEND a reduced curriculum”. It is not clear how this affects pupils with a degree of special need for whom this might be appropriate.</li> <li>- There is no mention of inspections not being carried out while SATS are taking place. Is it possible to assess quality of education during SATS week?</li> </ul>

Proposal 2	<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed separation of inspection judgements about learners’ personal development and learners’ behaviour and attitudes?</b>
What’s the aim of the proposed change?	“Personal development, Behaviour and Welfare” splits into two parts. OFSTED will talk to pupils and <b>observe pupil behaviour</b> to come to a “Behaviour” judgement. They will look at how schools help develop pupils’ characters, focusing on <b>provisions</b> to inform

	the new “Personal Development” judgement.
Why might this be good?	OFSTED says “It recognises that the impact of the school’s provision for personal development will often not be assessable during pupils’ time at school.” and therefore schools will get credit if they have good “quality and intent” of provision even if other factors in pupils’ lives prevent schools from having more impact.
What could be improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the research informing this proposal finds that schools have had very little impact on the healthy lifestyles or otherwise of their pupils and that is why the focus is now on the actual provision. Does this research take into account the fact that schools have had little reward/incentive to prioritise outcomes for physical and mental health and will taking the focus away from outcomes exacerbate this?</li> <li>- Inspectors will interview staff and observe pupils as part of the behaviour inspection. Does this allow for random staff with a grudge, or pupils who have an express intent of disrupting the inspection?</li> </ul>
Proposal 3	<b>We want to ensure that the education inspection framework 2019 judgements are appropriate for the range of early years settings.</b>
What’s the aim of the proposed change?	This question asks about different settings, e.g. childminders, and after school care. We have not received any comments on this question. In terms of the EYFS framework, this mirrors the changes seen in the rest of the framework changes.
Why might this be good?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed EYFS framework seems to be generally positively regarded by EYFS practitioners.</li> <li>- An observation is that the new focus on intent should already be incorporated by good EYFS settings.</li> <li>- EYFS practitioners welcome the move towards a more EYFS-like approach to the curriculum across older year groups.</li> </ul>
What could be improved?	No-one has come up with any suggestions for improvements.

Proposal 4	<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed focus of section 8 inspections of good schools and non-exempt outstanding schools and the proposal to increase the length of these inspections from the current one day to two days?</b>
What’s the aim of the proposed change?	OFSTED say “We want to ensure that there is an opportunity to gather sufficient evidence while on inspection to confirm that a school remains good under the new criteria.”
Why might this be good?	OFSTED say that “feedback from pilot inspections showed schools welcomed the on site preparation”.
What could be improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A half form entry school arguably does not need a two day inspection.</li> <li>- The exemption of outstanding schools means that at May 2018, more than 1,600 schools had not been inspected for at least six years - including 296 which have not faced inspection for at least 10 years. Does</li> </ul>

	<p>doubling the time spent at good schools provide the best way of ensuring the highest standard of education for all children?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is currently no provision for inspection of whole MAT chains. How can systematic malpractice be identified without it?</li> </ul>
--	--

Proposal 5	<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed introduction of on-site preparation for all section 5 inspections, and for section 8 inspections of good schools, on the afternoon prior to the inspection?</b>
What's the aim of the proposed change?	This is the infamous "150 minute" proposal, with the potential for inspectors to notify at 10am and arrive at 12.30pm
Why might this be good?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An earlier arrival will help improve communication iron out logistics and build relationships between inspector and staff.</li> </ul>
What could be improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Governors and leaders in East Sussex and nationally are concerned about the implications for staff stress.</li> <li>- The new on-site preparation list looks a lot like what currently happens with the inspector off-site. It might be more productive for staff to be putting it all together rather than spending time with the inspector.</li> </ul>

Proposal 6	<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal not to look at non-statutory internal progress and attainment data and our reasons why? (If you disagree, please be specific about the types of data that you think inspectors should consider.)</b>
What's the aim of the proposed change?	OFSTED say internal data "has its limitations" so instead they will gather "direct evidence" about the quality of education and have "meaningful discussions" about how leaders know the curriculum is having an impact. The aim is to ensure that data is proportionate and useful.
Why might this be good?	The proposal takes into account research from the Teacher Workload Advisory Group. It is advised that Data collections should be limited to two or three times a year and actions should arise from data drops.
What could be improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where would this leave a school that is in the process of undergoing improvement but has yet to show an improvement in end of Key Stage outcomes? Should schools be given credit for developing accurate methods of forecasting and if this could be shown, why should internal data not be considered?</li> </ul>

Proposals 7 & 8 refer to Independent Schools and we have no comment.

Proposals 9 - 11 refer to Further Education and we have no comment.