

OFSTED Consultation on Framework for Inspecting Schools NALDIC Response January 2005

Question 1

Do you agree with the proposals to continue to make explicit the judgement on overall effectiveness and its association with improving the quality of provision?

- ☐ No view
- ☐ Do not agree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Partly agree
- ☐ Completely agree

Comments:

Question 2

Do you agree with the amendments proposed to make the Framework more readily applicable to education and training, pre-school and post-16?

- ☐ No view
- ☐ Do not agree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Partly agree
- ☐ Completely agree

Comments:

Question 3

Do you agree with the changes proposal to report on the quality and standards in the Foundation Stage (where appropriate)?

- ☐ No view
- ☐ Do not agree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Partly agree
- ☐ Completely agree

Comments:

Question 4

Do you agree with the changes proposed to allow judgements more readily to be made to inform the inspection of children's services?

- ☐ No view
- ☐ Do not agree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Partly agree
- ☐ Completely agree

Comments:

Question 5

Do you agree with the proposals to provide separate guidance for different provision being inspected?

- a) ☐ No view
- ☐ Do not agree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Partly agree
- ☒ Completely agree

Comments We would wish to see guidance on using the schedule and guidance on conducting inspections make clearer and more detailed reference to EAL. For example, we would like to see explicit reference to EAL in guidance to inspectors and schools on the quality of provision 'Inspectors should evaluate: the diagnosis of, and provision for additional and individual learning needs, including additional English language learning needs

Question 6

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the designation to schools causing concern?

- ☐ No view
- ☐ Do not agree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Partly agree
- ☒ Completely agree

Comments:

Question 7

Do you agree with the proposed four-point grading scale for all inspection judgements?

- ☐ No view
- ☐ Do not agree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Partly agree
- ☒ Completely agree

Comments:

Question 8

Do you have any other comments?

As the professional association for English as an Additional Language, we believe adequate attention to provision for EAL and bilingual pupils is vital to the continuing effectiveness and validity of the inspection process. We welcome the increasing emphasis within the proposed arrangements on school self evaluation and the greater involvement of HMI in the process. We have for some time been concerned that the quality of inspection of EAL has suffered under the new Framework as smaller inspection teams attempt to cover a

range of subjects with fewer inspection days. We are hopeful that the greater involvement of HMI will ensure the reliability of EAL inspection evidence and that professional development and preparation for all HMIs will include significant training related to EAL issues. We would additionally welcome a greater involvement of LEA EAL personnel in the inspection process.

We remain concerned however that a 'sharper focus on a limited range of topics' will lead to a minimal focus on issues aside from core curriculum areas. Although we understand that the SSE will lead the inspection process, we are not convinced that this will ensure adequate attention to EAL and bilingual issues. Evidence from LEA inspections is that LEA provision for EAL and ethnic minority achievement is consistently not a focus of LEA inspections and no fieldwork is carried out. This appears consistent across both low and high diversity areas. We fear that a similar situation is occurring in school inspections which will be exacerbated by the new framework. In our view, possible 'thematic and survey' inspections which focus on EAL issues are not the appropriate way forward as these are based on samples and present only a partial view of a national issue. They would also mean that many EAL staff in schools and other settings would be subject to a dual inspection regime.

Knowledge and understanding of EAL issues is not yet fully embedded in the education system in England. For example, recent DfES initiated national specialist courses and training programmes and projects are still at the pilot stage; OFSTED training for inspectors in EAL has been discontinued. Schools still need considerable support and guidance in meeting the needs of not only early stage EAL learners but also the more advanced learners, whose needs are only recently being recognised. In such a context, it is doubtful whether school self-evaluation and the shortened inspection regime, will be able to identify whether schools are adequately meeting the needs of EAL pupils and may lead to the OFSTED inspection process failing in its duty to ensure that school provision meets the needs of all pupils. This is a particular danger in the inspection of schools with only a few EAL learners as unlike SEN, provision for EAL learners is not assured through the legal framework of a Code of Practice and therefore where EAL needs are less pressing or obvious, they are easily overlooked by both the school and the inspection team.

To prompt appropriate recognition of EAL issues we would strongly recommend the inclusion in the SSE of an evaluation of teaching and learning related to '*the diagnosis of, and provision for English as an additional language learning needs*'. In our view, a focus on achievement outcomes for different groups of learners should not be seen as adequate assurance that teaching is meeting the additional language learning needs of EAL and bilingual pupils and young people.

For further information please contact us at enquiries@naldic.org.uk or via our website www.naldic.org.uk

About you

To help our analysis we would like to know a bit about you.

I am a(n)

If other, please specify