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Foreword

Dear reader

I am pleased to introduce our consultation on the next iteration of education inspection: the education inspection framework 2019. It is the culmination of well over a year of preparatory work and discussions with many of the people who rely on or take part in inspection, and the bodies that represent them.

Our inspections directly involve leaders and staff in a wide range of education providers, as well as children and students themselves, their parents, governors, and representatives of responsible authorities such as local authorities and multi-academy trusts. Our reports are used in different ways by all these users and also by arms of government, including regional schools commissioners, the Further Education Commissioner and the Education and Skills Funding Agency. Ofsted has to balance the needs of all these users, but above all we have to make sure that inspection acts as a force for improvement, and that the interests of children and students come first.

There are two linked themes that run all the way through the draft framework: the substance of education, and integrity. We are proposing an evolutionary shift that rebalances inspection to look rather more closely at the substance of education: what is taught and how it is taught, with test and exam outcomes looked at in that context, not in isolation.

Outcomes clearly matter and will of course continue to be considered, in the context of what is being taught. But we all know that too much weight placed on performance measures alone can lead to a degree of distortion, both in what is taught and not taught, and in other aspects of how a provider is managed. We also know that those who come to education with a disadvantage of any kind are more likely to be directly affected when these distortions happen.

Our proposals reflect what we have heard from you about the things that work well in inspection at the moment, and what works less well; what we have heard about staff workload; what we know about the pressure points in each phase of education today; our own past findings and recent research findings, including on the quality and effectiveness of our own inspection processes; and the wider literature on educational effectiveness through all stages of education.

The proposed ‘quality of education’ judgement therefore brings together the essential ingredients of education: the curriculum; the teaching, and the assessment that provides the feedback loop; and the resulting outcomes. This judgement is intended to restore curriculum – largely ‘missing in action’ from inspection for more than a decade – to its proper place, as an important component of the quality of education.
In restoring the curriculum to its proper place, we have done much work to make sure we pitch our criteria at the right level. Too weak, and a poor curriculum that leads to little learning, and to the most disadvantaged making the least progress, would go unscrutinised. Too strong, and the diversity and innovation that are an important aspect of our education system would be hindered. The criteria draw on the academic evidence that exists around curriculum quality, and do not extend beyond what we have found that evidence justifies.

We have already tested the curriculum criteria to make sure that we get this ‘just right’ and that we can use them to inspect effectively with our current workforce. My third curriculum commentary and the accompanying report published on 11 December explain more about this. We have also run several instalments of inspector training aimed at the new elements of this framework, and have more lined up ahead of September 2019.

And here I want to reassure people. There is no need for anyone to think they must develop a new curriculum, or design everything themselves from scratch, or put themselves through intellectual gymnastics. The early years foundation stage framework, the national curriculum and the specifications for GCSEs, A levels and other qualifications can carry much of the load. So, for example, a primary school that fulfils the spirit as well as the letter of the national curriculum, across the full range of subjects, is already in the right place with its curriculum.

Similarly, there isn’t and won’t be an Ofsted curriculum, whether for nurseries, schools or post-16 providers. The curriculum research we have already published illustrates some of the very different models that we know are working effectively now in different places. We are as always being entirely open about our framework and handbooks, and have begun to share our inspector training materials too. There is no hidden agenda behind these.

I also have been asked a number of times how this approach will square with the Department for Education’s (DfE) use of reported outcomes in deciding when to intervene in schools and post-16 providers. The Secretary of State made a strong commitment last May to make changes in this area, starting with the commitment to intervene only in schools that Ofsted judges inadequate. That change has already taken effect. Data is a useful indicator of school performance but intervention action will only be taken when we at Ofsted have taken the rounded view of a school under the education inspection framework.

The Department for Education will be consulting shortly on a new approach to identifying schools that need support. The plan is to put that in place this September, alongside the new inspection framework.

We have already put the draft framework criteria through their paces in the field, and are continuing through the spring term with a pilot programme of more than 200 inspections. What we learn from this will inform the final version of the framework, alongside your responses to this consultation.
At the end of the day, we aim to do what I said at the start of this letter: to put the interests of children and young people first, by making sure that inspection values and rewards those who educate effectively and act with integrity. We hope that you will agree that this framework can be a real and positive step in that direction.

Yours sincerely

Amanda Spielman

Amanda Spielman
Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector
About Ofsted

The Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people and in education and skills for learners\(^1\) of all ages.

Purpose and background to the consultation

This consultation seeks your views on our proposals for changes to the education inspection framework from September 2019.\(^2\) Your feedback will help us refine and improve our proposed approach. We will consider all responses carefully before finalising and publishing the framework in summer 2019.

This consultation comes in two parts. First, it sets out our proposed changes to the education inspection framework, which will apply to all education inspections. Second, there are proposals specific to early years, maintained schools and academies, non-association independent schools, and further education and skills providers. There are remit-specific considerations that we would like your views on. Ofsted places equal importance on all education remits and is committed to ensuring that the new education inspection framework works well for all provision that comes within its scope. For these reasons we are seeking your views not only on the overall changes to the framework but, crucially, also on how these changes will work in practice for each individual education remit.\(^3\)

In September 2017, we published our corporate strategy for the following five years. At the heart of this strategy is our intention for Ofsted to be a force for improvement, by being intelligent, responsible and focused in everything we do.\(^4\) We have applied these principles in developing our proposals. In particular, we have worked hard to ensure that this framework is informed both by the experience that Ofsted has gained over the last 26 years and by the evidence that has emerged from research into educational effectiveness. A research commentary published alongside this consultation shows where the proposed inspection arrangements draw on research carried out by Ofsted and where they draw from the existing research literature.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) The term 'learners' is used for expediency throughout this consultation document to encompass in a single word those attending education, skills and registered early years settings. It should be read as including: ‘children’ in early years provision, ‘pupils’ in all schools, ‘students’ in sixth forms and colleges, and ‘apprentices’, ‘trainees’ and ‘adult learners’ in the range of further education and skills (FES) providers. Greater distinction is made in this document when referring to those who attend specific types of provision.

\(^2\) When we refer to education, we are including training, in particular apprenticeship training.

\(^3\) Please note: early years provision in schools is covered in the relevant inspection handbook for section 5 inspections of maintained schools and inspections of non-maintained independent schools.


Most importantly, we have sought to ensure that the framework focuses on the things that matter most. We want to remove any aspects that do not genuinely assess the quality of education, so that providers’ and inspectors’ time is focused on the things that have the greatest impact on learners’ education.

Considerable work has already been undertaken to inform and shape our new approach to the education inspection framework from September 2019. This has enabled us to test much of our thinking before arriving at our current proposals. Since June 2017, we have held over 200 engagement events, ranging from small group discussions, to our national programme of curriculum workshops, to speaking engagements by senior Ofsted leaders. These events have been attended by over 16,000 people from the sectors we inspect. We have used the feedback and responses from these events to shape the framework and handbooks, and more stakeholder events are planned during the course of this consultation. During the engagement we have undertaken to date, our intention to place the curriculum back at the heart of inspection and to view performance measures more in the context of the quality of education provided has generally been received very positively.

We have also undertaken a range of pilot inspections to test various aspects of our proposals, such as the inspection criteria, the methodology for gathering evidence against the key judgements and the extent to which those judgements capture the factors that matter most and which are most directly linked to educational effectiveness. During the summer and autumn terms 2018, we conducted nearly 200 such pilots across all education remits. Piloting will continue throughout the spring term 2019 as we continue to refine the new inspection arrangements.

To ensure transparency and provide sufficient detail to enable respondents to reach informed opinions, alongside this consultation we have published the following materials:

- the draft education inspection framework 2019
- the draft early years inspection handbook
- the draft school inspection handbook
- the draft non-association independent school inspection handbook
- the draft further education and skills inspection handbook
- a commentary setting out the research that has informed the development of the criteria in the framework
- the draft equalities, diversity and inclusion statement.

It is important to note that the education inspection framework and the remit-specific handbooks from September 2019 are all published in draft form; they are very much not the finished articles. At this stage, they are intended to give helpful context to practitioners, learners, parents and other interested parties responding to this consultation. We intend to use the results of this consultation and further piloting to shape up the final versions, which we will publish during the summer term 2019. However, we hope that seeing the handbooks in draft form provides a
helpful steer for providers as they look towards the commencement of the new framework in nine months’ time.

It is right that any accountability system moves with the times, but the changes we are proposing represent an evolution rather than a revolution. We will continue to make an overall effectiveness judgement about a provider on the current four-point grading scale and retain key judgements that are common across all the areas that form part of the education inspection framework. Users understand and value the clarity that the grading system provides. Similarly, we will continue to allow flexibility in how we apply these criteria in the different remits, and the differences are explained in the relevant handbooks.

Most of the individual inspection criteria that make up the inspection judgements build directly on the existing inspection framework. Nevertheless, there is room for a change in emphasis. The curriculum occupies a far more central place in all remits, and data a lesser place. There is a greater focus on the workload of teachers, lecturers, practitioners and leaders, and there is a sharper focus on ensuring that all learners have access to education and training, and addressing directly the practices that shut them out.

**Focusing on the curriculum**

The curriculum is the substance of what is taught. It is the specific plan of what learners need to know and should be able to do. The curriculum shapes and determines what learners of all ages will get out of their educational experience. For this reason, the curriculum is at the heart of the proposed quality of education judgement.

For our extensive curriculum research over the last couple of academic years to support discussions with providers, we have been using a working definition of the curriculum which recognises that it passes through different states: it is conceived, taught and experienced. The working definition was that the curriculum is:

- the framework for setting out the aims of a programme of education, including the knowledge and skills to be gained at each stage (intent)
- the translation of that framework over time into a structure and narrative, within an institutional context (implementation)
- the evaluation of what knowledge and skills learners have gained against expectations (impact/achievement).

That definition informed the development of the quality of education model now set out in the draft framework and inspection handbooks. The curriculum covers the intent and much of the implementation of the quality of education provided, but it is distinct from the impact, which is a measure of how well the curriculum has been learned. The curriculum is, therefore, integral to but not the whole of a judgement on the quality of education.
The curriculum is also distinct from pedagogy, which is **how** the curriculum is taught. Furthermore, it is distinct from assessment, which is a means of evaluating whether learners are learning/have learned the intended curriculum, although of course the curriculum and assessment need to work hand in hand. In so doing, the curriculum becomes the progression model.

Learning has been defined in cognitive psychology as an alteration in long-term memory: ‘If nothing has altered in long-term memory nothing has been learned.’\(^6\)

Progress, therefore, means knowing more (including knowing how to do more) and remembering more. When new knowledge and existing knowledge connect in learners’ minds, this gives rise to understanding. As learners develop unconscious competence and fluency, this will allow them to develop skills. Progress should not be defined by hitting the next data point. Rather, if learners attain within a well-sequenced, well-constructed curriculum, they are making progress.

A divisive debate has emerged in some quarters that creates an unnecessary opposition between knowledge and skills, suggesting they are separate alternatives. In reality, knowledge and skills are closely interconnected. Ofsted considers a skill to be the capacity to perform complex operations, whether cognitively or physically, drawing on what is known. The education inspection framework and inspection handbooks ask inspectors to consider what providers are doing to develop both learners’ knowledge and their skills.

Ofsted recognises that providers take different approaches to the curriculum. Different approaches to the curriculum will be judged fairly. We recognise and support the importance of providers’ freedom to choose their own curriculum approaches within the appropriate legal parameters.\(^7\)

**Helping to reduce workload**

Alongside refocusing on the curriculum, the proposed new framework focuses on reducing the pressures on teachers, lecturers, practitioners and leaders, particularly where those pressures are associated with inspection.

England’s early years settings, schools, and further education and skills providers have made real improvements over the past two decades. This is a testament to the hard work of teachers, lecturers, practitioners, leaders and many others. The accountability system has also played a part in this improvement. However, an accountability system that is over-dependent on performance data is a barrier to further improvement. There is ample evidence of the extent to which an accountability system that does not look at what learners are learning, and why they are learning it, diverts providers from the real substance of education. Far too much time, work and energy are spent defending and managing outcomes, and this

---


\(^7\) For example, for maintained schools this is the national curriculum; for non-association independent schools this is the independent school standards; for early years provision this is the early years foundation stage.
Culture has extended into defending against and managing Ofsted inspections and expectations.

Over the years, there has been much debate about the use of performance data in inspection. Inspection has never been solely or primarily about data: inspectors’ professional judgement has always been the determining factor. However, Ofsted accepts that developments in inspection have contributed to this imbalance in the accountability system. The main thrust of many typical inspection conversations has come to be about recent outcomes, assessment of current ‘learners’ progress’ and expectations of future progress. Our aim is to bring the inspection conversation back to the substance of education and training to treat providers as experts in their field and not as data managers, so that inspection complements rather than intensifies a focus on achievement and progress measures.

To this end, it is proposed that the new framework will no longer include the standalone ‘outcomes’ judgement. When reaching the quality of education judgement, inspectors will continue to consider the outcomes that learners achieve, using valid, nationally collected, data. However, inspectors will focus on what is taught and how, and will draw the outcomes that learners achieve into that education-focused, rather than data-focused, conversation.

Too often, internal assessment can be carried out in ways that create unnecessary burdens on staff and learners. When used effectively, assessment helps learners to embed and use knowledge fluently, and assists staff to identify clear next steps for learners; the information can also help shape development of the curriculum. However, it is important that leaders and staff understand the limitations of assessment, and avoid misuse and over-use, because the production, collection and analysis of data can create additional workload for staff and leaders.

Inspectors will also consider the extent to which leaders engage with staff realistically and constructively, and take account of the main pressures on them. They will consider the extent to which leaders protect staff from bullying and harassment.

Ensuring that all learners have access to education

We want inspection to contribute to an inclusive education system that can accommodate, and cater for, the needs of all learners of all ages. The specific issues vary by education remit, for example it means ensuring that:

- early years provision is inclusive of young children with specific needs
- schools do not remove, or lose, pupils from their roll for reasons other those in the best educational interests of those pupils
- further education providers are supporting learners to complete programmes of study that are appropriate and help them reach meaningful destinations.
More detail about how we propose to tackle these issues in the different education remits is set out in the individual draft inspection handbooks published alongside this consultation.

**Separating judgements about learners’ personal development from judgements about learners’ behaviour and attitudes**

The provision for learners’ wider development extends beyond the academic, vocational or technical curriculum. Our childcare settings, schools, colleges and independent learning providers play a crucial role in ensuring that learners of all ages are equipped with the knowledge and skills that improve their life chances. We consider that learners’ wider development is important to ensure that our young people and adult learners can prosper, lead successful lives and make meaningful contributions to society.

We propose to separate judgements about learners’ behaviour and attitudes from those about learners’ wider personal development. The combined judgement of ‘personal development, behaviour and welfare’ was introduced in September 2015, and the wide range of issues covered within it has sometimes made it challenging for inspectors to report and grade the provision, and especially the impact, meaningfully. In turn, this has made it difficult for users to understand the reporting under this judgement.

In making a judgement about personal development under the proposed new framework, inspectors will seek to evaluate the intent and quality of what a provider offers, but will not attempt to measure the impact of the provider’s work on the lives of individual learners. This will bring greater attention and focus to what education providers do to educate learners in the broadest sense, including the development of character and preparing them for life in modern Britain. Setting high expectations for learners and creating a positive climate characterised by respectful interactions are very important elements of educational effectiveness, as evidenced by research.\(^8\)

This approach will ensure that behaviour and learners’ attitudes, while at the provision being inspected, are given the importance that they are due. Creating a sufficiently disciplined environment is a prerequisite to any learning taking place. If behaviour is not managed effectively and learners are not instilled with positive attitudes to learning, nothing much will be learned. In early years, for example, the behaviour of children is underpinned by the curriculum for their personal, social and emotional development. For those in further education or skills training of any age, the right attitudes to working and learning are also essential. In contrast to learners’ wider personal development, behaviour and attitudes can be assessed in terms of the impact the provider’s work has on learners at the point of inspection. We believe, therefore, that in order for inspectors to make valid judgements that are helpful to providers and the communities they serve, behaviour and attitudes on the

---

\(^8\) ‘Education inspection framework: overview of research’, Ofsted, January 2019.  
one hand, and personal development on the other, deserve to be evaluated in their own right.

**Proposals**

**Framework proposals**

These proposals represent an important evolution of current inspection arrangements. The new framework aims to focus inspection judgements and the criteria that underpin them on the quality of education that providers offer. The sections that follow illustrate how we propose to do this.

**Proposal 1**

We propose the introduction of a new ‘quality of education’ judgement built around our working definition of the curriculum. It will focus on a provider’s educational intent, implementation and impact. Inspectors look at teaching, assessment, attainment and progress under the current inspection framework, and they will continue to do so, but these considerations will contribute, viewed in the context of the provider’s curriculum, to a single quality of education judgement. In short, we propose to take a holistic approach to considering the quality of education rather than artificially separating the leadership of the curriculum from teaching, and separating teaching and the use of assessment from the impact this has on the outcomes that learners achieve. This will de-intensify the inspection focus on performance data and place more emphasis on the substance of education and what matters most to learners and practitioners.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a ‘quality of education’ judgement?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

---
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Proposal 2

We propose to judge ‘personal development’ separately from ‘behaviour and attitudes’ to enhance the inspection focus on each and enable clearer reporting on both. This approach recognises the very different elements in focus. We believe that the behaviour and the attitudes learners of all ages bring to learning is best evaluated and judged separately from the provision made to promote learners’ wider personal development, character and resilience.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed separation of inspection judgements about learners’ personal development and learners’ behaviour and attitudes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

The British Psychological Society (BPS) agrees that learners’ personal development should be separated from learners’ behaviour and attitudes. However, we are concerned that, overall, the proposed new inspection framework fails to address the lack of focus on learners’ mental health and wellbeing under the existing framework.

If children are to develop the skills they need to succeed later in life, appropriate mental health support is essential. The new inspection framework presents an ideal opportunity to embed mental health and wellbeing at the heart of schools’, and Ofsted’s, work, while recognising the need to provide better support to schools and teachers to deliver appropriate guidance and to direct learners to the right support.

The BPS has developed a number of recommendations for the new inspection framework and handbook that we believe should be implemented as a priority. These will help Ofsted inspections to become a mechanism to inspire, support and recognise real change in children and young people’s mental health and wellbeing, and ensure learners receive the support they need to live mentally healthy lives and be engaged at school.

Our core recommendation is that Ofsted alongside the Department for Education should introduce new mental health and wellbeing measures into the school inspection regime that are accompanied by the provision of additional psychological support and guidance for schools. Additional recommendations and further supporting information is set out in more detail below.

**Recommendations**

1. Ofsted’s draft framework and inspection handbook must be expanded to include a greater focus on mental health.
   - Specific references to mental health must be included in the grade descriptors for all four judgement areas.
A psychologically informed definition of mental health needs should be set out that recognises the social determinants and complex nature of mental health.

Inspectors and schools must take into account the socio-economic and environmental factors impacting a school population and individual pupils’ mental health, and ensure young people are not seen as solely responsible for their own mental wellbeing.

The framework should define what “intelligent, swift and highly effective action” in relation to behaviour issues looks like and be clear that this requires flexibility from schools and does not equate to a quick move to temporary or permanent exclusion.

The framework should clearly set out the need for greater integration between mental health (including Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)), education, and special educational needs and disabilities (including with special schools). This should acknowledge all three areas are intrinsically linked, encouraging schools to consider these and provide support to pupils in a holistic way.

2. Ofsted’s framework should set out clear, accessible definitions for key terms that draw on the available psychological evidence base and consider replacing value-based terms with more valid, reliable and measurable alternatives.

- The Department for Education and Ofsted should set out a clear, dynamic definition of ‘resilience’ that recognises its fluidity and enables schools to take a whole school approach to supporting pupils’ mental health and wellbeing and move away from viewing resilience as a fixed characteristic of individuals. Resilience is not a characteristic or a skill but is a dynamic interaction between the person and their environment.
- The term “fundamental British values” needs to be replaced with a clear definition of what an inspection is trying to measure.

3. Inspectors must take a psychologically-informed approach to inspections.

- The inspection process should consider whether schools provide a positive environment that supports mental health and wellbeing and in which young people feel able to seek help. Pupils and their families should feel involved and consulted in this process.
- Inspectors must be given appropriate training and guidance that enables them to appropriately recognise schools’ provision of support for pupil and staff mental health and wellbeing. This should include a psychologically sound model of inspector training, which could include mental health first aid training (MHFA) as a minimum.
- In the longer term, Ofsted should ensure that every inspection team includes someone with appropriate psychological training.

4. Schools must be provided with sufficient guidance and support on how to best meet pupils’ mental health needs.

- Schools should be encouraged to make use of existing evidence-based toolkits and effective programmes that have helped deliver positive mental health and wellbeing outcomes.
- The Department for Education should undertake a thorough evaluation of whole school approaches to mental health and wellbeing, including pastoral support, and direct schools to appropriate support services and tools, evidence-based programmes, and methods for supporting children and young people’s mental health and wellbeing.
- To ensure good practice, mental health and wellbeing should be embedded throughout the whole school, with a particular emphasis in PSHE lessons.
- As well as the Mental Health Support Teams (MHSTs) that should be in place in up to 25 per cent of schools by the end of 2022/23 according to the Transforming Children and Young People’s Mental Health Provision green paper, additional mental health...
Additional information

Children and young people’s mental health

Improving mental health and psychological wellbeing in schools is one of the most important issues currently facing our society.

One in eight children and young people have a diagnosable mental health condition, with many more experiencing stress and pressures both in and outside of school (NHS Digital, Mental Health of Children and Young People in England, 2017).

The government has rightly acknowledged the scale of this challenge and has recognised the key role schools play in promoting wellbeing and responding to mental health difficulties. The Transforming Children and Young People’s Mental Health Provision green paper took steps to introduce more mental health support in schools and new Relationships Education, Relationships and Sex Education (RSE) and Health Education guidance has seen increased focus on mental health and wellbeing.

It is essential this is matched by a similar focus from Ofsted.

Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)

There is a growing body of evidence that Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs), such as: poverty (four million children now live in poverty), social inequality, deprived and degraded neighborhoods, and poor housing (including high numbers of families in temporary bed and breakfast accommodation) have a harmful effect on mental health throughout life (Hughes et al 2017). Long-term harm can result from the chronic stress of socially adverse experiences on children and young people, leading to lifelong mental and physical health difficulties and intergenerational cycles of distress (Public Health Wales, 2016).

Furthermore, the recent HeadStart study, conducted by UCL’s Evidence Based Practice Unit and the Anna Freud Centre for Children and Families (2018), found a strong and consistent association between deprivation and emotional and behavioural problems.

The Millennium Cohort Study (2016, 2017) collected data from 12,000 children at the ages of 11 and 14, and their parents, regarding their mental health and wellbeing. Using an eco-systemic model of analysis, the studies investigated the variety of factors at an individual, family, peer, community and wider societal level that influence mental health and wellbeing outcomes by either increasing risk or promoting resilience.

The study found a number of factors were associated with lower levels of mental health and wellbeing. These reflected family, peer, community and wider social factors, for example, being cared for by a single parent, low family income, physical ill-health, having problematic relationships with peers, arguing with parents and feeling unsafe in their home neighbourhood. The findings demonstrate the complexities of childhood experiences.

However, one factor was seen as enhancing resilience in both domains: being well engaged at school. This demonstrates the significant value appropriate engagement and support at school can have to improving mental health and wellbeing. School-based psychologically-informed services can provide a timely, stigma free service to children and families. It is essential that these ACEs are recognised by schools and learners are appropriately supported.
to overcome difficulties. This requires varying levels of intervention to meet individual needs, and a highly skilled and diverse workforce required to provide them.

Whole-school approaches

There is a pressing need for increased investment in whole-school approaches to support children and young people's mental health and wellbeing. This will ensure collaborative working across the school and also support mental health literacy. The BPS is calling on the government to roll out programmes that educate young people about mental health and how to cope with difficulties. These should be considered by Ofsted as part of the new inspection process. Important areas of focus would include peer relationships, friendships, intimate relationships, tackling bullying, understanding peer pressure and acceptance of risky behaviours.

The revised inspection approach

Given the above, it is crucial mental health and wellbeing are at the forefront of Ofsted’s inspection process.

The revised framework aims to provide greater focus on the substance of education, including on pupils’ behaviour and personal wellbeing. However, despite this focus, the BPS’ analysis of Ofsted's proposed inspection framework and handbook has found:

- Ofsted’s general approach tends to consider children and young people in isolation and does not understand them in the wider social context of their family, school community and neighbourhood.
- A missed opportunity to use the framework to outline appropriate guidance on what good looks like in schools’ support for mental health and wellbeing. School leaders are not being incentivised to prioritise this crucial area.
- A lack of recognition or prioritisation of mental health within the assessment criteria. Where mental health and wellbeing is mentioned, the reference is often vague and included as one of a number of related issues for consideration by inspectors. Physical health, safety and wellbeing are much more prominent, which goes against the government's stated commitment to parity of esteem.
- The continued use of a number of ill-defined terms such as: resilience, “fundamental British values”, character and “cultural capital”. There is no shared definition of these terms and therefore no reliable way to measure them.
- Extremely limited use of psychological evidence and research to support the new approach. Some of the psychological evidence that has been used is out of date.

These findings are very concerning at a time when children and young people are in increasing need of mental health support and when the government has committed to making improvements to provision.

Reforms required: Expanding the draft framework to prioritise mental health

Ofsted's draft framework and inspection handbook must be expanded to include a greater focus on mental health. This will ensure inspectors afford due attention to the mental health and wellbeing of pupils during inspections and encourage schools to prioritise wellbeing education and support.

- Specific references to mental health must be included in the grade descriptors for all four judgement areas. Although the behaviour and attitudes and personal development
judgements include a fleeting focus on mental health and wellbeing, along with areas like resilience that have a mental health element, there is little reference to mental health in their grade descriptors.

**Behaviour and attitudes**
- The Good grade descriptors for behaviour and attitudes should include: “Schools assess the root cause of any behavioural issues and the multiple factors including the way that institutional responses can maintain difficulties, with specific reference to mental health difficulties, and provide appropriate support to help pupils and their family or carers to understand and address these.”
- They should also include: “Schools create a learning environment that helps the whole school community understand the factors impacting on their own and others’ present and future mental health and wellbeing.”

**Personal Development**
- The Good grade descriptors for personal development should be updated to reflect the role of mental health, for example:
  - “The curriculum extends beyond the academic, vocational or technical and provides for pupils’ broader development, including their spiritual, moral, social and cultural development and mental health and wellbeing.”
  - “The curriculum and the school’s wider work support pupils to promote and protect mental health and wellbeing.”

**Leadership and Management**
- In order for leadership and management to be effective, school leaders must be able, and expected, to demonstrate a focus on creating a whole school approach to mental health and psychological wellbeing that is recognised and understood by all staff.
- Outstanding schools should be able to explain why mental health and wellbeing is important and accurately signpost what support is available to pupils.
- In addition, with 31 per cent of teachers experiencing a mental health difficulty themselves, a mark of good leadership and management should be a psychologically safe working environment. School leaders should recognise, manage and support teachers’ mental health and wellbeing needs, where needed, as well as providing staff the training and support they need to appropriately handle pupils’ mental health difficulties.
- The Outstanding grade descriptor for leadership and management should include:
  - “All staff understand the importance of mental health and wellbeing and are able to direct pupils to appropriate support. All staff are provided with appropriate training and support to identify the factors that contribute to good mental health.”
  - “School leaders have clear systems in place to recognise and support staff with mental health difficulties.”
  - “School leaders promote a culture of inclusion.”

**Quality of Education**
- Similarly, grade descriptors for quality of education should reference all elements of education, including relationships, sex education and health education – with a specific focus on mental health.
- The Good grade descriptor for quality of education should include, under intent, the following: “Pupils are encouraged to understand the value of good mental health and wellbeing and how to access support should they need it.”
- The grade descriptors should also include: “Schools create a learning environment that supports high quality teaching and learning that maximises the physical health and mental health and wellbeing of the whole school community.”

- **A psychologically informed definition of mental health needs should be set out in the framework and handbook that recognises the social determinants and complex nature of mental health.**
  - Ofsted states that inspectors will evaluate “the experience of particular individuals and groups, such as ... pupils with mental health needs” as part of their assessment of the behaviour and attitudes judgement. “Mental health needs” are not defined and the positioning within Ofsted’s documents is too binary: it suggests a young person can only be either mentally healthy or mentally unwell.
  - This approach does not allow for the fact everyone has mental health needs and that these sit within a broad spectrum with varying levels of support required to address them; and, most importantly, that mental health fluctuation it is a part of everyday experiences.
  - The lack of definition also serves to enhance misconceptions about what constitutes a mental health need. Some young people do not view ‘feeling stressed’ as a mental health need and see it as part of school life, other pupils may have more severe mental health needs, for example if they are self-harming; both groups have mental health needs and should be supported, but the latter will require more specialist support.
  - The guidance should be updated to state inspectors will evaluate: “the experience of particular individuals and groups, such as... pupils experiencing challenges with their mental health, including those identified as feeling stressed, experiencing anxiety, depression as well as other mental health conditions.”
  - This approach should be replicated elsewhere in relation to references to mental health.

- **Inspectors and schools must take into account the socio-economic and environmental factors impacting a school population and individual pupils’ mental health and ensure young people are not seen as solely responsible for their own mental wellbeing.**
  - Ofsted’s, and the government’s, approach to young people’s mental health and wellbeing places too much responsibility on the young person themselves for their own mental wellbeing, and on them to identify any issues and seek support for them.
  - There is significant research which demonstrates that good mental health is dependent not only on individual attributes but also the relationship between them, and social, economic and environmental factors. For example, if a child is living in a disrupted family environment, has experienced a loss, if their family is struggling due to adverse economic conditions, they will be more likely to experience mental health difficulties. (Mok et al. Family income inequalities and trajectories through childhood and self-harm and violence in young adults, October 2018; A.H Maslow, A theory of Human Motivation, 1943; The Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families, The Socioeconomic impact of childhood adversity).
  - While supporting young people to recognise and seek help to address their own mental health difficulties, schools should also be working to identify and support those pupils they believe are suffering from, or are at risk of suffering from, mental health difficulties. This is particularly important if a young person is dealing with external family or other social, economic or environmental pressures.
  - Ofsted guidance should be updated so that inspectors consider the socio-economic demographics of a school and use this knowledge to inform their evaluation the school’s approach to supporting the mental health and wellbeing of pupils.
In addition, the personal development grade descriptor for a Good school should include: “The school has clear systems in place for teachers to identify a pupil they believe to be suffering from, or at a heightened risk of suffering from, mental health difficulties and for that pupil to be referred to the appropriate internal psychological support.”

- **Ofsted’s framework should define what "intelligent, swift and highly effective action", in relation to behaviour issues, looks like and be clear that this requires flexibility from schools and does not equate to a quick move to temporary or permanent exclusion.**

- BPS members working with schools have found that staff often feel bound by behaviour plans and are unable to be flexible in their approach to supporting individual pupils because they believe they must rigidly adhere to their plan or be penalised by Ofsted. This is counter to an intelligence-led approach to behaviour management.

- Additionally, autistic children can be removed or excluded from lessons unjustifiably. BPS members have found that, for some schools, the process from first significant behaviour concern to exclusion can take only six weeks – insufficient time for a young person’s difficulties to be addressed and for improvements in behaviour to be demonstrated.

- In order to support schools to take a more adaptable and intelligent approach, the grade descriptor for an inadequate school should include: “Schools are inflexible in their behaviour policies and do not make reasonable adjustments to meet individual needs”.

- In addition, behaviour plans often do not take into account the impact of mental health needs despite the fact that these will likely impact the way in which pupils behave and their perceived attitude to learning.

- The handbook should be clear that inspectors will expect behaviour plans and policies to include specific references to mental health needs.

- **There should be an additional clarification in the framework that clearly sets out the need for greater integration between mental health (including with CAMHS), education, and special educational needs and disabilities (including with special schools). This should acknowledge that all three areas are intrinsically linked, encouraging schools to consider these and provide support to pupils in a holistic way.**

- The framework discusses mental health, where evident, as a siloed and separate area to education. In order to ensure a whole school approach to supporting mental health and wellbeing, and to align with the government’s new Health Education guidance, Ofsted must be clear that mental health and education are intrinsically linked and that schools should demonstrate an understanding of this.

- For example, Department for Education research on supporting mental health in schools and colleges showed that where schools integrated positive mental health and wellbeing support in everyday life, pupils were able to develop stronger emotional literacy and manage their emotions more effectively (Department for Education, Supporting Mental Health in Schools and Colleges, 3 August 2017; National Assembly for Wales, Mind Over Matter: A report on the step change needed in emotional and mental health support for children and young people in Wales, 2018).

- Pupils with special educational needs and disability (SEND) are also considered separately in the handbook. Ofsted should be clear that children with SEND might be more likely than their peers to experience mental health challenges, and appropriate support should be provided that cater for this. A whole school approach to mental health must take account of pupils with specific additional needs, such as SEND.
- Ofsted should assess how well schools are linked with mental health support, such as CAMHS, who can bring more specialist mental health knowledge into the school environment and, where necessary, provide support for those with more specialist mental health needs. Greater emphasis should be placed on collaboration between schools and other children and young people’s mental health services – while acknowledging that schools can sometimes struggle to successfully build these links. Schools should not be penalised if their attempts to build relationships do not succeed, but instead be encouraged to do so and appropriately judged for their efforts (National Children’s Bureau, What works in promoting social and emotional well-being and responding to mental health problems in schools, 2015).

Reforms Required: Better definitions and understanding of complex terms

Language matters. Assuming there is a common ‘everyday’ understanding of key terms can mask complexity and differences in understanding. Ofsted’s framework should set out clear, accessible definitions for key terms that draw on the available psychological evidence base and consider replacing value-based terms with more valid, reliable and measurable alternatives.

- The Department for Education and Ofsted should set out a clear, dynamic definition of ‘resilience’ that recognises different types of resilience and enables schools to take a whole school approach to supporting pupils’ mental health and wellbeing.
  - While Ofsted will assess pupils’ ‘resilience’, there is no consistent, formal, psychologically informed definition of the term set out in the inspection guidance or more broadly by government. Sometimes it is a term used in its own right in government publications and other times, it is given as an example of good ‘character’. Resilience is not a characteristic or a skill but a is a dynamic interaction between the person and their environment.
  - Government’s general approach is to focus on children being able to ‘bounce back’ from knock backs or to persevere if they do not succeed at something first time. However, this approach is not appropriate for many children and young people and does not account for their wider socio-economic context and its impact on their mental health and wellbeing.
  - It is unsuitable to apply a single term in this way to both children who may be more able to ‘bounce back’ from troublesome events and to those who may have suffered serious trauma, have attachment issues or experienced adverse childhood experiences (ACEs). A study by Hughes et al has highlighted the harmful effects of ACEs throughout life, showing that individuals with at least four ACEs face increased risk of poor health outcomes, including violence, mental illness, and substance abuse (Hughes et al, The effect of multiple adverse childhood experience on health; a systemic review and meta-analysis, 2 August 2017).
  - Similarly, the Ofsted handbook should define what is meant by ‘character’, which is also a difficult term to measure objectively.

- The term “fundamental British values” needs to be replaced with a clear definition of what an inspection is trying to measure. The Department for Education and Ofsted should consider an objective, measurable definition, or series of definitions, that allow flexibility to account for pupils’ different cultural backgrounds, as well as guidance to schools on how they should help pupils to develop these values.
  - There is a risk that, without a suitably psychologically informed definition, this could be misinterpreted by schools. BPS members have seen examples where well-intentioned efforts to demonstrate British values have inadvertently focused on a
narrow definition that can leave some pupils, particularly those that are Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic (BAME), feeling alienated or like they do not belong – which in itself can impact mental health and wellbeing.

- Ofsted should instead place greater emphasis on ‘universal values’ in schools, which include a belief in mutual respect and tolerance of others.

Reforms required: Towards a psychologically-informed inspection process

In addition to the framework and guidance being updated to give more focus to mental health and wellbeing, this needs to be reflected in the approach taken by inspectors during an inspection. It is essential that inspectors take a psychologically-informed approach to inspections.

The inspection process should consider whether schools provide a positive environment that supports mental health and wellbeing and in which young people feel able to seek help. Pupils and their families should feel involved and consulted in this process.

Inspectors should frame questions positively, understanding pupils’ self-esteem and attitudes towards school and learning. In particular, inspectors should ensure they focus on the following areas during inspections:

- Speaking with pupils first and seeking to gain understanding and to build rapport, while also being aware that a lack of trust may impact how a child responds to questions and what they feel comfortable discussing.
- Asking pupils and teachers what helps them to feel safe.
- Asking pupils if they know where to go or who to speak to if they need support or if they have concerns about their mental health or wellbeing.
- Assessing pupils’ mental wellbeing by asking questions to understand their self-esteem and attitudes to school and learning, such as:
  - How are you sleeping, are you ok about the amount of time you spend on social media/devices;
  - How’s your diet and exercise and does school support your healthy intentions;
  - Framing questions around positive feelings, such as whether pupils feel confident or optimistic about their abilities and the future;
  - Asking them how they feel about themselves and how the school supports them in this; and
  - Asking what they are good at, without focusing on specific academic or non-academic skills.
- Ensuring language used is accessible and appropriate, to enable pupils to feel comfortable and able to understand what is being asked of them, without feeling pressured to respond in a certain way.
- Speaking to leadership teams and other staff to understand if a whole-school approach to mental health and wellbeing is in place and if all staff have a full understanding of the value of this and how support should be provided.
- Observing pupils not just during lessons but also between classes and during breaktimes to understand how pupils behave and how their wellbeing is managed when not under direct supervision.
- Speaking to pupils that have recently been off-rolled, excluded or placed in a pupil referral unit, and their parents and carers, to understand the steps that led to that decision being made by the school and to understand if all appropriate support and management options were considered and attempted beforehand.
• Considering how the school sign-posts pupils to mental health support through displays and assemblies, and regular reminders through tutors/other pastoral staff.

To ensure the effective implementation of the above:

• **Inspectors must be given appropriate training and guidance that enables them to appropriately assess pupil and staff mental health and wellbeing, and a school’s provision to support this.** This should include a psychologically sound model of inspector training, which could include mental health first aid training (MHFA), which is currently on offer to every state secondary school in the country, as a minimum (MHFA England, National Secondary Schools Programme, 2018).

• **In the longer term, Ofsted should ensure that every inspection team includes someone with mental health training.**

**Reforms required: What good practice looks like**

If the inspection process is to place increased focus on mental health and wellbeing and hold schools to account on this, then **schools also need to be provided with sufficient guidance and support on how to best meet pupils’ mental health needs.** The BPS has produced a best practice guide: ‘What Good Looks Like in Psychological Services for Schools and Colleges: Primary prevention early intervention and mental health provision’, which reviews the evidence and discusses the practical ways in which psychological wellbeing can be addressed in school settings, as well as the implications for commissioning and delivery of provision (British Psychological Society, What Good Looks like in Psychological Services for Schools and Colleges Primary prevention, early intervention and mental health provision, 2017).

• **The Department for Education should undertake a thorough evaluation of whole school approaches to mental health and wellbeing, including pastoral support, and direct schools to appropriate support services and tools, evidence-based programmes, and methods for supporting children and young people’s mental health and wellbeing.**

• **Good practice in mental health and wellbeing support is underpinned by evaluation and experience. To ensure good practice, mental health and wellbeing should be embedded throughout the whole school, with a particular emphasis in PSHE lessons.**

  - The Lancet’s research on mental health interventions in schools in high-income countries highlighted that where mental health services are embedded within the whole school system, there is a higher likelihood of a continuum of integrative care that improves both mental health and educational attainment (Dr Mina Fazel, Mental Health interventions in schools in high-income countries, 1 October 2014).

  - The PSHE Association’s guidance on teaching about mental health and wellbeing outlines key aspects of teaching about mental health effectively and safely. This was relaunched in March 2019 to match the government’s new statutory PSHE requirements regarding Health Education, Relationships Education and RSE. This promotes pupils’ wellbeing through an understanding of their own and others’ emotions and the development of healthy coping strategies. It also contributes to safeguarding, providing pupils with knowledge, understanding and strategies to keep themselves healthy and safe, as well as equipping them to support others who are facing challenges (PSHE Association, Teacher guidance: teaching about mental health and emotional wellbeing, March 2019).

• **As well as the Mental Health Support Teams (MHSTs) being introduced by government, additional mental health staff should be available in schools, as well as schools being encouraged to work together to deliver better support within a local area.**
- The Scottish Government has pledged a £250 million health investment package, £30 million of which will fund counsellors in every secondary school, as well as an additional 250 school nurses to offer emotional and mental health support and provide more advice for young people and their families.
- The Welsh Government has identified an increasing body of international evidence which demonstrates the substantial negative impacts ACEs have on an individual’s physical and mental health. A report in 2016 by Public Health Wales found ACEs could be responsible for almost a third (27 per cent) of adults reporting a low well-being score. This means eradicating ACEs in Wales could potentially reduce the number of individuals who report low mental wellbeing by over 100,000. The Welsh Government has since set up an ACEs support hub to help organisations and communities across Wales understand more about ACEs and their impacts, as well what action can be taken to prevent them. The Society is pleased that the DfE has made a clear commitment to fund the training of more educational psychologists. However, the retention of existing educational psychologists in Local Authorities needs consideration.

- **Schools should be encouraged to make use of existing toolkits and evidence-based programmes that have helped deliver positive mental health and wellbeing outcomes.**
  - This could include making use of existing clubs, such as breakfast clubs or pupil forums, as a means of discussing mental health and wellbeing with pupils and using this more informal setting to assess whether young people might be struggling or at risk of developing mental health difficulties.
  - The Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families has created a toolkit to measure and monitor children’s mental wellbeing, helping to highlight its significance amongst school and college staff. This in turn helps schools and colleges to make better use of data and determine the wellbeing needs of students and how best to address needs. Overall, this reinforces attainment that improves student wellbeing, enabling children and young people to thrive and realise their full potential.
  - There is also evidence of good practice internationally, the Triple P – Positive Parenting Program – is one of the most effective evidence-based programs in the world, backed by more than 35 years of ongoing research. It gives parents simple and practical strategies to help them build strong, healthy relationships, confidently manage their children’s behaviour and prevent problems developing. It is currently being used in more than 25 countries and has been shown to work across cultures, socio-economic groups and in many different kinds of family structures (*Triple P, Small Changes Big Differences; Geelong Grammar School, Schools as Positive Institutions, 2018*).
  - In Ireland, the Clondalkin Partnership launched the Incredible Years Basic Parenting Programme to create community-based solutions to emotional and behavioural problems that develop within the child’s home, school and community. This found significant benefits for parents, both personally and in terms of their improved relationships with their child, as well an overwhelmingly positive view of the Incredible Years program itself (*The Incredible Years, Incredible Years Basic Parenting Programme: The Clondalkin Partnership Study in Ireland, 2006*).

**The BPS recommends the following resources**

- Anna Freud Centre, Wellbeing Measurement Framework for Primary Schools.
- Anna Freud Centre, Wellbeing Measurement Framework for Colleges.
Evidence Based Practice Unit & Anna Freud Centre for Children and Families Evidence Briefing #1 (2018), Mental health problems in young people, aged 11 to 14: Results from the first HeadStart annual survey of 30,000 children.

BACP (2015) School Counselling for All.


British Journal of Guidance and Counselling Guidance teacher and support staff experience of working with pupils with mental health difficulties in two secondary schools: an IPA study https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/mbpjg


Education Scotland, Applying Nurture as a Whole School Approach.


Geelong Grammar School (GGS) Schools as Positive Institutions

Geelong Grammar School (GGS) Does Positive Mental Health in Adolescence help to Promote Healthy Pathways into Adulthood.

Geelong Grammar School (GGS) A module for Positive Education.


Geelong Grammar School (GGS) Does Positive Education Training for Parents Contribute to Flourishing in the School Community.


National Children’s Bureau (2015) What works in promoting social and emotional wellbeing and responding to mental health problems in schools?


Early years (registered provision)

We know that, to make a real difference to a child’s life, high-quality education and care between birth and the age of five are crucial. These early years should provide the foundation of a happy, successful future. The ‘Statutory framework for the early years foundation stage’ (EYFS) sets out the education and care standards that all early years providers must meet to ensure that children, from birth to five, learn and develop well and are kept healthy and safe. Once a provider is registered on the Early Years Register, Ofsted carries out regular inspections to evaluate the overall quality and standards of the early years provision in line with the principles and requirements of the EYFS. This will not change, but we propose to put a greater emphasis on the curriculum. It should be noted that early years in schools and maintained nursery schools are inspected under the schools handbook.

The quality of education (educational programmes)

1. The educational programmes (EYFS) provide the curriculum framework that leaders build on to decide what they intend children to learn and develop.
2. Leaders and practitioners decide how to implement the curriculum so children make progress in the seven areas of learning.
3. Leaders and practitioners evaluate the impact of the curriculum by checking what children know and can do.

We have seen an industry develop around assessment and tracking of young children. What children learn is too often coming second to the delivery of assessment information. The education inspection framework will put more emphasis on the quality of education and care. It will ensure that we consider children’s experiences and how they are being developed, alongside assessments.

We want to make sure that the curriculum for children with particular needs, such as those with high levels of special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND), is ambitious and meets their needs from birth to the age of five. We want to find out how leaders make sure that these children have full access to their entitlement for early education.
Proposal 3

We want to ensure that the education inspection framework 2019 judgements (see section above and para 131 in the EY handbook) are appropriate for the range of early years settings.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the judgements will work well for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childminders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare on non-domestic premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare on domestic premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare settings that offer care exclusively before and after school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Maintained schools and academies

Proposal 4

Since their introduction in 2015, section 8 inspections of good and non-exempt outstanding schools have been valued by the sector. The changes made to the operation of these inspections from January 2018 have been welcomed by most schools inspected since then. The purpose of a section 8 inspection of a good school is to confirm that a school remains good. This will not change. However, as we have stated previously, the new education inspection framework represents an evolution in what it means to be a ‘good’ school.

We have set out within the schools handbook (paragraphs 270-282) the fact that a section 8 inspection of a good school will focus on particular aspects of the school’s provision, as a subset of the full education inspection framework criteria. These are drawn principally from the quality of education judgement, but also include specific elements of pupils’ behaviour, personal development and safeguarding.

Currently, section 8 inspections of good schools (or ‘short inspections’) last for one day. We want to ensure that there is opportunity to gather sufficient evidence while on inspection to confirm that a school remains good under the new criteria. Therefore, we are proposing to increase the time for which the lead inspector is on site to two days.

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Children and young people’s mental health and psychological wellbeing is influenced by a variety of factors at an individual, family, peer, community and wider societal level. We believe that a longer inspection would enable the inspection process to consider the school within its wider community and within the wider system of support for children and young people locally. Ofsted should use the inspection process to assess how well schools are connected to external mental health support, such as CAMHS. Greater emphasis should be placed on collaboration between schools and other services and community provision.

Proposal 5

In addition to the wider education inspection framework proposals we are introducing, we also propose a new approach to how our inspectors prepare for and begin inspections. This is in response to feedback that initial contact can be data-driven and not allow schools to communicate fully with inspectors.

We propose the introduction of on-site inspector preparation for all inspections carried out under section 5 and section 8 of the Education Act 2005. Currently, inspectors carry out pre-inspection preparation remotely on the day prior to on-site inspection. We propose that, from September 2019, this preparation takes place at the school on the afternoon before the inspection, enabling inspectors and leaders to carry out preparation collaboratively wherever possible.

On-site preparation will allow for better communication between the lead inspector and the school, allowing the school a clear role in preparation work. It will help to reduce the burden on schools of making logistical arrangements on the morning of the inspection and providing documentation. It will provide more time to establish good, professional relationships between school leaders and the lead inspector.

We propose that Ofsted will provide formal notification of the inspection no later than 10am on the day before the inspection. We then propose that the lead inspector will arrive on site no earlier than 12.30pm on that day. The lead inspector will use this time to talk with senior leaders in order to gain an overview of the school’s recent performance and any changes since the last inspection.
Conversations will focus particularly on how the school has built on its strengths, what weaknesses leaders have identified and what action they have planned or have in train to address those weaknesses. It will also be an opportunity to make practical arrangements, including about the documentation or other evidence that inspectors will need to see in the course of the inspection. Inspectors will complete their on-site inspection preparation and leave the school premises by no later than 5pm on the day before the inspection starts. Paragraphs 51 - 56 of the school inspection handbook set out in more detail what we expect on-site preparation to cover.

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

The introduction of on-site preparation could be a positive move if inspectors use this time to fully consider the socio-economic and environmental factors impacting a school’s population and individual pupils’ mental health.

The guidance should be updated to state inspectors will evaluate: “the experience of particular individuals and groups, such as … pupils with mental health needs, including those identified as feeling stressed, experiencing anxiety, depression as well as other diagnosed mental health conditions.”

Ofsted should assess how well schools are connected to external mental health support, such as CAMHS for more specialist mental health needs. Greater emphasis should be placed on collaboration between schools and other mental health services like CAMHS – while acknowledging that schools can sometimes struggle to successfully build these links. Schools should not be penalised if their attempts to build relationships do not succeed, but instead be encouraged to do so and appropriately judged for their efforts (National Children’s Bureau, What works in promoting social and emotional well-being and responding to mental health problems in schools, 2015).

Proposal 6

The recent Teacher Workload Advisory Group report noted that ‘time associated with data collection and analysis... is most frequently cited as the most wasteful due to a lack of clarity amongst teachers as to its purpose’.

Ofsted is committed to ensuring that our inspection work does not create unnecessary work for teachers, and as such we propose that inspectors will not use schools’ internal performance data for current pupils as evidence during an inspection. This is because:

- internal data for current pupils has its limitations, and inspectors will not be able to assess whether the data is an accurate and valid representation of pupils’ learning of the curriculum
- inspectors will gather direct evidence of the quality of education in schools
- inspectors will have meaningful discussions with leaders about how they know that the curriculum is having an impact.

Inspectors will, however, ask schools to explain why they have decided to collect whatever assessment information they collect, what they are drawing from this information and how that informs their curriculum and teaching. We believe that this will help to reduce unnecessary workload for teachers; we do not believe that it will have a negative effect on our ability to judge effectively the quality of education in a school.

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: If you disagree, please be specific about the types of data that you think inspectors should consider.

Concerning teachers’ workload, 31 per cent of teachers experience a mental health difficulty themselves. As such we support efforts to reduce workload burdens on teachers.

Additionally, a mark of good leadership and management should be an ability to recognise, manage and support teachers’ mental health and wellbeing needs, as well as providing staff the training and support they need to appropriately handle pupils’ mental health difficulties. This should be considered by inspectors when speaking to senior staff and recommendations made if it is determined senior staff are not giving due consideration to staff’s mental wellbeing.
Non-association independent schools

All independent schools are inspected at the direction of the DfE, which is the registration authority for independent schools. In standard inspections of non-association independent schools, Ofsted assesses compliance with the independent school standards (ISS) and makes graded judgements under the inspection framework. This model will continue when the new education inspection framework is introduced in September 2019.

Proposal 7

Some non-association independent schools offer a specialist curriculum and Ofsted recognises their autonomy to do so. For example, some schools offer a specialist faith-based curriculum, while others offer a specialist education in the performing arts. Inspectors will assess a school’s entire provision, including any specialist provision offered, when assessing compliance with the ISS and when reaching judgements under the education inspection framework in the following judgement...
areas: overall effectiveness; behaviour and attitudes; personal development; and leadership and management.

When reaching a judgement under the new quality of education judgement area, the non-specialist curriculum will normally be inspectors’ primary source of evidence. It is important that, where schools offer a specialist education, pupils also study a broad, rich curriculum alongside it. This is supported by Ofsted’s research, and is a requirement of the ISS.

However, where a school chooses to deliver a substantial number of the required subject areas\textsuperscript{10} through the specialist curriculum (for example through faith-based content or other forms of immersive study), or where there is insufficient evidence from the non-specialist curriculum that the quality of education criteria are met, inspectors will consider evidence from the specialist curriculum in arriving at their judgement.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal that inspectors should normally use the non-specialist curriculum as their primary source of evidence in assessing the extent to which the school meets the quality of education criteria?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

---

**Proposal 8**

Currently, where the DfE commissions Ofsted to conduct additional inspections of independent schools, such as progress monitoring or emergency inspections, Ofsted checks whether the ISS are being met but does not make new graded judgements.

\textsuperscript{10} The Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014, paragraph 2(2)(a)  
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2014/3283/schedule/made
about the school. As a result, a school retains the judgements from its most recent full standard inspection, even where it has improved and is now meeting the standards, or has declined and is no longer meeting them. A new graded judgement is not provided until the school’s next standard inspection.

We are aware that some schools may wish new inspection judgements to be made more quickly than they currently are, to reflect their improvement. We are also aware that when a good or outstanding school is no longer meeting the standards but retains its most recent standard inspection judgements, this can be misleading for parents and others.

To provide parents, school leaders and the DfE with better information, we are proposing to recognise and acknowledge sooner where schools have improved or declined, for example by bringing forward a standard inspection.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that where non-association independent schools have been found to improve or decline at an additional inspection, Ofsted should provide up-to-date judgements about the school’s current performance?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Further education and skills

The further education and skills sector is broad and diverse, with providers that deliver a wide range of education and training provision in different settings. We have drafted the proposed education inspection framework and handbook to be adaptable for all the types of provider that we inspect.

Under the common inspection framework, we currently inspect all publicly funded provision. We grade, and report specifically on, six different types of education and training provision:

- 16–19 study programmes
- adult learning programmes
- apprenticeships
- traineeships
- provision for learners with high needs
- full-time provision for 14–16 year olds.
Proposal 9

We believe that it would make our inspections and reports more coherent and inclusive if we were to reduce the types of provision that we grade and specifically report on as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed education inspection framework types of provision</th>
<th>Current types of provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education programmes for young people</td>
<td>16–19 study programmes, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- academic, technical and vocational study programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- study programmes for those with education, health and care plans, aged 16 to 24 (and those with high needs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 16–19 traineeships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- full-time provision for 14–16 year olds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeships</td>
<td>Apprenticeships at levels 2 to 5, whether frameworks and standards, levy or non-levy funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult learning programmes</td>
<td>Adult learning programmes 19–24 traineeships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will cover education and training for people with SEND and/or high needs thoroughly and appropriately within the relevant type of provision rather than separately. We consider that this will ensure that they are fully and properly represented and not marginalised or isolated within the inspection and report.

T-levels, a major reform of technical education at level 3, will be introduced from September 2020. That will take place after the beginning of this new framework. We intend to review how we should best integrate the coverage of T-levels into this framework closer to the time of their introduction and will consult further on this in due course.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal to reduce the types of provision we grade and specifically report on will make our inspection reports more coherent and inclusive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly agree
Agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Disagree
Strongly disagree
Don’t know
Proposal 10

Under the current common inspection framework, Ofsted carries out short inspections of most good further education and skills providers. This happens within five years of the previous inspection. Some good providers instead receive a full inspection for reasons of risk. We intend to continue with short inspections for most good providers on the same basis. However, given greater focus on the quality of education in the education inspection framework 2019, we believe we need to change the way we carry out the short inspection of good providers in some respects.

Under our current methodology, we undertake to confirm that a provider remains good by exploring a number of lines of enquiry that differ for each provider. As we are introducing a new inspection framework with a focus on the quality of education and the curriculum, we propose introducing an approach that focuses on the quality of education and training, safeguarding and effective management, and that this should be the same for all providers. We are continuing to pilot our proposed approach. The proposed areas we are piloting are:

- Is the quality of education/training good?
- Has the provider addressed the areas for improvement/next steps identified in the last inspection report well?
- Are the provider’s safeguarding arrangements effective?
- Are careers education and guidance of a good quality?
- Has the provider managed and implemented changes to provision effectively since the last inspection?

We will refine the above areas based on our pilot activity and from feedback following this consultation. In order to ensure that short inspections are planned effectively with providers, and to ensure coverage, we are proposing to increase the time the lead inspector, or in the case of larger providers, the lead inspector and another member of the inspection team, spend on site. We propose that the lead inspector, or in larger providers, two inspectors, arrive at the provider on the day...
following notification and complete the planning for the inspection on site with the provider (see paragraphs 126-133 of the draft further education and skills inspection handbook). They would then start inspection activity prior to the full inspection team arriving the following day.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed model for short inspections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Proposal 11

We are proposing to extend the timescale within which we should inspect providers judged to require improvement from ‘normally 12 to 24 months’ after the last inspection to ‘normally 12 to 30 months’ after the last inspection. This will provide greater flexibility to give providers more of an opportunity to improve to good while still allowing some providers to be re-inspected earlier if they are ready for it. A provider that has been judged as requires improvement would continue to receive a monitoring visit between inspections.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the timescale within which providers that are judged to require improvement receive their next full inspection should be extended from ‘12 to 24 months’ to ‘12 to 30’ months’?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspection of colleges at campus level

Ofsted has, for some time, intended to introduce grading and reporting on individual colleges within college groups as part of the overall inspection of the college group, subject to receiving the funding to be able to do this.

Since the disaggregated data that will make it possible to determine what provision is delivered by which college will not be fully available until 2021, it will not be possible to introduce that for the beginning of this framework. We will therefore consult further on this in due course. We will, in the meantime, look at ways in which we can better differentiate the relative performance of individual colleges within inspection reports of college groups.

Please use this box to record any additional comments in relation to the detail set out in the further education and skills draft inspection handbook.
The consultation process

1. We welcome your responses to this consultation paper. The consultation opens on 16 January 2019 and closes on 5 April 2019.

2. The information you provide us with will inform our consideration of changes to the education inspection framework from September 2019.

3. We will publish a response to the consultation in May 2019.

Sending back your response

4. There are three ways of completing and submitting your response:

   ■ **Online questionnaire**
     Complete and submit the response form online:
     [https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/EIFConsultation/](https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/EIFConsultation/)

   ■ **Complete and email**
     Complete the questions in this Word document and email it to [inspection.consultation@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:inspection.consultation@ofsted.gov.uk) with the consultation name in the subject line.

   ■ **Print and post**
     Print this Word document and fill it in by hand. Please post it to:
     EIF Programme Team
     Ofsted
     Clive House
     70 Petty France
     London
     SW1H 9EX
About you

Confidentiality

The information you provide will be held by us. It will only be used for the purposes of consultation and research to help us to become more effective, influence policies and inform inspection and regulatory practice.

We will treat your identity in confidence, if you disclose it to us.

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes  X  please complete Section 1 and the following questions
No  please complete Section 2 and the following questions

Section 1

If you would like us to consider publishing the views of your organisation, please indicate this below.

Organisation: The British Psychological Society

Section 2

Please tell us in which capacity you are completing this survey (please choose one option):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Local government representative</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Mayoral or combined authority representative</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher/Principal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>A registered early years group provider</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other school staff</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>A registered early years group provider (before and after school care <strong>only</strong>)</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil/student</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>A registered early years childminder</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Academy Trust representative</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>An early years provider run directly by a school</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/carer</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Leader/manager of a further education and skills provider or college</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Other Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/trainer of a further education and skills provider or college</td>
<td>Other employee of a further education and skills provider or college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An adult learner/student</td>
<td>An employer with an ESFA or apprenticeship levy training contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A member of the public</td>
<td>An employer without an ESFA or apprenticeship levy training contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative group or union representative</td>
<td>Proprietor of an independent school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>Other, please tell us: Professional body for psychologists in the United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are responding in a professional capacity, please specify where you work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Other Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A maintained primary school</td>
<td>A primary academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A maintained secondary school</td>
<td>A secondary academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A maintained nursery school</td>
<td>A non-association independent school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A maintained special school</td>
<td>An early years provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A general FE/tertiary college</td>
<td>A not-for-profit organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sixth form college</td>
<td>An independent specialist college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local authority</td>
<td>A higher education institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An independent learning provider</td>
<td>A free school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A non-maintained special school</td>
<td>Other, please tell us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What did you think of this consultation?

One of the commitments in our strategic plan is to monitor whether our consultations are accessible to those wishing to take part.

How did you hear about this consultation?

- ☐ Ofsted website
- ☐ Ofsted News, Ofsted’s monthly newsletter
- ☐ Ofsted conference
- ☐ Twitter (@ofstednews)
- ☐ Another organisation (please specify, if known)
- ☐ Other (please specify)

Please tell us what you thought of this consultation by answering the questions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I found the consultation information clear and easy to understand.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found the consultation easy to find on the Ofsted website.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had enough information about the consultation topic.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take part in a future Ofsted consultation.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there anything you would like us to improve or do differently for future consultations? If so, please tell us below.
Additional questions about you

Your answers to the following questions will help us to evaluate how successfully we are communicating messages from inspection to all sections of society. We would like to assure you that completion of this section is optional; you do not have to answer any of the questions. All responses are confidential.

Please tick the appropriate box.

1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female ☐</th>
<th>Male X</th>
<th>Prefer not to say ☐</th>
<th>Prefer to self-describe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 14 ☐</th>
<th>14–18 ☐</th>
<th>19–24 ☐</th>
<th>25–34 ☐</th>
<th>35–44 ☐</th>
<th>45–54 ☐</th>
<th>55–64 X</th>
<th>65+ ☐</th>
<th>Prefer not to say ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Ethnic origin

(a) How would you describe your national group?

X British or mixed British

☐ English

☐ Irish

☐ Northern Irish

☐ Scottish

☐ Welsh

☐ Other (specify if you wish)

☐ Prefer not to say
(b) How would you describe your ethnic group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Mixed ethnic origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Asian and White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Black African and White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Black Caribbean and White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
<td>Any other mixed ethnic background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specify if you wish)</td>
<td>(specify if you wish)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>Any White background (specify if you wish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>Any other ethnic background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black background</td>
<td>Any other background (specify if you wish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specify if you wish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Chinese background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specify if you wish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Sexual orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Religion/belief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buddhist</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>Any other, please state:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No X</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, further education and skills, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children’s services, and inspects services for children looked after, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may reuse 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 www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted.

Interested in our work? You can subscribe to our monthly newsletter for more information and updates: http://eepurl.com/iTrDn.

Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 1231
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.gov.uk/ofsted

No. 180044

© Crown copyright 2019

---