



# **NALDIC Response to Inspection 2012**

## **Proposals for inspection arrangements for maintained schools and academies from**

### **January 2012**

May 2011

As the UK professional body for all those interested in bilingual pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL), we see this as an opportunity to support the development of an inspection and regulation system which fully supports these pupils' access to the full curriculum and appropriate EAL provision thus ensuring that they attain well.

#### **To what extent do you agree with our proposed approach to judging achievement?**

Neither agree nor disagree.

#### **Do you have any comments or suggestions?**

Whilst we are pleased to note a continuing emphasis on the attainment and progress of different groups, NALDIC is concerned that bilingual pupils are not specifically mentioned in the consultation. The progress and attainment of EAL learners is not the same as the progress and attainment of pupils from 'different social and ethnic groups' and we believe it should be recognised as a distinct need which must be met by each school.

#### **To what extent do you agree with our proposed approach to using value-added measures and to making comparisons with similar schools?**

Neither agree nor disagree.

#### **Do you have any comments or suggestions?**

Whilst CVA measures had a number of shortcomings, NALDIC considers it to be important that inspectors are supported to look closely at the progress that bilingual pupils make in schools and the effectiveness of provision to support their language and curriculum learning. We are therefore particularly concerned that the consultation makes no reference to bilingual pupils.

The current contextual value added data does not give an accurate picture of the progress that bilingual pupils are making. This is because there is no differentiation between, for example, pupils who are fluent in English as an additional language and pupils who are at early stages. CVA and attainment data relating to bilingual pupils are therefore flawed instruments in their capacity to indicate whether pupils at various stages of learning EAL have 'done very well or underperformed'. We believe that a model of assessment needs to be put in place which would provide the flexibility to differentiate according to the range of learners of EAL, for example, the differing pathways for a Bangla speaker entering the school system at 4 or 5 years old compared with an 14 year old Polish speaker joining a school in Y9. A common national framework would take account of these different points of entry, provide criteria and supporting information about the varying developmental trajectories,

recognise positive starting points for EAL learners and provide positive descriptions of growth.

We note that it is proposed that 'inspectors are enabled to identify learners from particular groups who have done very well or underperformed, to promote more detailed discussion about their performance'. We would welcome this in relation to bilingual pupils but are concerned that they are not specifically identified as a group distinct from ethnic groups and interested in the identification process proposed. (see point above)

We believe that whilst value added and contextual value added measures can flag up areas of performance or progress, what ultimately counts is the detailed discussion about the provision for and the outcomes of specific teaching and learning strategies. Our analyses of inspection reports in a number of regions indicate that although a reference to bilingual pupils is a standard item, the quality of reporting of EAL teaching and learning issues is declining rather than improving. In order to therefore promote effective detailed discussions about the performance of groups of pupils, we would recommend that OFSTED re-introduce an EAL endorsement which is supported by appropriate training.

Without understanding the factors included in the comparison to similar schools, we cannot comment on whether this would or would not be appropriate. We believe that factors should include pupils' with EAL, ethnicity, gender, SEN and FSM as well as school related factors such as size.

**To what extent do you agree we should judge behaviour and safety in this way?**

Agree.

**Do you have any comments or suggestions?**

We are disappointed that there is no specific mention made of prejudice-related bullying in order to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people from different equality groups (in line with the Equality Act 2010). We believe that this issue should be confronted directly when seeking the views of pupils, parents and carers.

**To what extent do you agree that inspectors should judge the quality of teaching as proposed above?**

Agree.

**Do you have any comments or suggestions?**

As the consultation states, good teaching is characterised by 'careful attention to the learning needs of individual pupils'. As noted above, we would welcome a re-introduction of an endorsement for inspecting EAL which would represent a significant understanding by an inspector of how to identify teaching which promotes the language development of bilingual learners at all stages. This continues to be an area in which newly qualified teachers do not feel confident, and yet inspection reports very rarely criticise the effectiveness of teaching in relation to bilingual pupils.

We believe that it is essential that a programme of training is put into place for inspectors to ensure that they are able to make these judgements reliably. The reduction of the size of teams since September 2005 has meant that relatively few schools benefit from inspection by an inspector with significant experience and understanding of issues relating to English as an additional language. We believe that it is essential for OFSTED to improve the arrangement that are made for training inspectors in this issue. We note that the OFSTED good practice case studies now feature studies relating to EAL and would like to see that level of expertise routinely included in teams inspecting multilingual schools.

**To what extent do you agree that inspectors should judge the effectiveness of leadership and management as proposed above?**

Neither agree nor disagree.

**Do you have you any comments or suggestions?**

As noted above, schools now have a responsibility to advance equality of opportunity. We believe that this judgement should read 'The effectiveness with which the school **advances** equality of opportunity **and tackles discrimination**'. We welcome the inclusion of a judgement relating to how well the school promotes the confidence and engagement of parents and would welcome the extension of this to emphasise the school's responsibility to engage and support parents from all communities. We believe there should be explicit guidance for inspectors through a grade descriptor for each of these judgements.

**To what extent do you agree we should give most weight to the quality of teaching and pupils' achievement when making a judgement about the overall effectiveness of the school?**

Agree

**To what extent do you agree we should report on the school sixth form within the four key areas, covering teaching, behaviour, leadership and achievement?**

Agree

**To what extent do you agree we should report on the Early Years Foundation Stage as part of the four key areas, covering teaching, behaviour, leadership and achievement?**

Agree

**Do you have you any comments or suggestions about the proposal?**

No

**To what extent do you agree with this approach to risk assessment?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have you any comments or suggestions about how we might improve risk assessment?**

We believe the risk assessment process should include a focus on the attainment and progress of particular groups, including EAL learners. As noted earlier, it is proposed that 'inspectors are enabled to identify learners from particular groups who have done very well or underperformed, to promote more detailed discussion about their

performance'. Logically, the risk assessment process should therefore include a mechanism by which to assess if particular groups have done very well or underperformed and that significant underperformance by a particular group should be a factor within the risk assessment model.

**To what extent do you agree that our monitoring of satisfactory schools should be based on the factors set out above?**

Agree

**Do you agree that we should inspect a satisfactory school sooner when our monitoring indicates that it is making inadequate progress?**

Agree,

**To what extent do you agree that we should shorten the timescale for monitoring and re-inspecting schools with a notice to improve?**

Disagree

**To what extent do you agree that we should shorten the timescale and increase the frequency of monitoring inspections of schools requiring special measures?**

Disagree

**To what extent do you agree that we should respond positively to most requests for inspection?**

Neither agree nor disagree.