

# A good education for all

---

Proposals for amended inspection arrangements for maintained schools and academies, further education and skills and initial teacher education from September 2012 – for consultation

**Published:** February 2012

**Reference no:** 120008

---



Corporate member of  
Plain English Campaign  
Committed to clearer communication

**361**

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 Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, work-based learning and skills training, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, 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](mailto: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/](http://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](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This publication is available at [www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/good-education-for-all](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/good-education-for-all).

To receive regular email alerts about new publications, including survey reports and school inspection reports, please visit our website and go to 'Subscribe'.

Piccadilly Gate  
Store Street  
Manchester  
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 1231  
Textphone: 0161 618 8524  
E: [enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk)  
W: [www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk)

No. 120008

© Crown copyright 2012



# Contents

---

<b>Foreword by Sir Michael Wilshaw HMCI</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Part 1: Summary of the main proposals for school inspections</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Part 2: Summary of the main proposals for further education and skills inspections</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Part 3: Summary of the main proposals for initial teacher education inspections</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex A. The consultation</b>	<b>20</b>

## Foreword by Sir Michael Wilshaw HMCI

Many of you will have read in the press that I am determined to use my position as Her Majesty's Chief Inspector to raise expectations and to do all I can to ensure that this country provides the best possible education for the nation's children, young people and adults. That requires significant changes in the way Ofsted inspects across its remits and not just schools. In this consultation I have focused on some key areas of inspection that I firmly believe will help those who provide education to improve children's chances of success. I have started primarily with a drive to improve the quality of teaching, because good teaching is at the heart of a good education. This consultation provides an opportunity for those interested in schools, initial teacher education and further education and skills to comment on proposals I would like to introduce from 1 September 2012.

Please take time to read about my proposals and to send in your views. If I am to succeed in my ambition I need the support of those of you who are equally passionate about improving our education system, especially those of you who are parents and those of you who work in education.

### Part 1: School inspections

Ofsted introduced a new school inspection framework in January 2012. This framework raises expectations and gives a very strong focus on the importance of teaching. I want us to do more for our children. They deserve the best education we can provide. All schools must be at least good so that our country's children have the best possible chances in life, and an outstanding school must be truly outstanding in every way. It should be a model of excellence.

For a number of years my predecessors as Her Majesty's Chief Inspector have highlighted in their Annual Reports that a satisfactory education is not good enough to give our young people the skills and qualification they need to do well in life. I am determined not to repeat that message. This is a time for change and reform. I have therefore set out a number of proposals that I believe will challenge all schools to provide a better education for our children.

Too often, the economic and social circumstances of pupils have been used as an excuse to explain the reasons why so many leave school without good enough qualifications. But there are schools that show that, no matter what the circumstances, all children can succeed. We owe them that chance. Many schools succeed against considerable odds; all schools must follow suit.

In September 2011 there were 6,082 schools serving just over two million pupils whose most recent inspection judgement was 'satisfactory'. Just under 3,000 of these schools have been judged 'satisfactory' for two consecutive inspections. I am determined to use inspection to drive up standards in schools like these.

The proposals I am consulting on are designed to challenge schools to achieve the highest standards. I am sure that, like me, you want the best education we can

provide for the nation's children so please take your time to give your views on the proposals I have set out. There is nothing more important to the success of our nation than securing a good future for our children.

If you wish to consult on the school inspection proposals please use the link:  
[www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-sch](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-sch).

## **Part 2: Further education and skills inspections**

In September 2011 there were 180 independent learning providers, 61 adult and community learning providers and 114 colleges serving over 1.1 million learners judged as 'satisfactory' in their most recent inspection. Sixty-nine of these colleges have been judged 'satisfactory' for two consecutive inspections, including 29 that have been judged satisfactory for a third time. This cycle of mediocrity needs to change. I am determined to achieve a step change in ambition and expectation across the board, but particularly in colleges and providers that are not yet 'good'.

The proposals I am consulting on are similar to those explained above for schools. They are designed to challenge the further education and skills sector to achieve the highest standards. There is nothing more important than securing a good future for our children, young people and adult learners and our country's future economic success depends on it.

If you wish to consult on the college inspection proposals please use the link:  
[www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-fes](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-fes).

## **Part 3: Initial teacher education inspections**

Ofsted has just completed a consultation on changes it intends making to the inspection of initial teacher education from September 2012. I am pleased that these proposals have been generally well received. I want, however, to be even more ambitious. I am proposing a number of changes similar to those for schools explained above that will establish higher expectations and standards for prospective teachers. Having highly skilled, talented and ambitious teachers is the cornerstone of a world class education system and I am determined to ensure that all new teachers are equipped to play their part in full in making this happen.

If you wish to consult on the initial teacher education inspection proposals please use the link: [www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-ite](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-ite).

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this consultation.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read "Michael Wilshaw".

## Part 1: Summary of the main proposals for school inspections

From September 2012, we propose that:

1. schools cannot be judged 'outstanding' unless their teaching is 'outstanding'
2. schools will only be deemed to be providing an acceptable standard of education where they are judged to be 'good' or 'outstanding'
3. a single judgement of 'requires improvement' will replace the current 'satisfactory' judgement and 'notice to improve' category
4. schools judged as 'requires improvement' will be subject to a full re-inspection earlier than is currently the case
5. a school can only be judged as 'requires improvement' on two consecutive inspections before it is deemed to require 'special measures'
6. inspections will be undertaken without notice being provided to the school
7. inspectors should undertake an analysis of anonymised information, provided by the school, of the outcomes of the most recent performance management of all teachers within the school, as part of the evidence for a judgement on Leadership and Management.

### Proposals to amend the inspection framework for maintained schools and academies

#### Proposal 1: To require 'outstanding' schools to have 'outstanding' teaching

The current school inspection framework makes clear that inspectors are likely to judge a school as outstanding if the quality of teaching is outstanding. Teaching is the area that has the greatest impact on the progress pupils make. We propose that to be judged an outstanding school (the core function of the school) 'teaching' must be outstanding.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree inspectors should only judge a school as outstanding if the quality of teaching is outstanding?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

## **Proposal 2: Defining an acceptable standard of education as being 'good'**

Just over two million pupils are educated in schools judged to be 'satisfactory'. For around half of these children, that may cover the whole of their primary or secondary schooling. Children need and deserve better. Our expectation is that the quality of education for all children should be at least good. This proposal will mean that any school not providing a 'good' or better education will be deemed to be a school causing concern. Our reports will be clear about what those schools that are not yet good have to do to improve. They will also make a distinction between schools that are showing strong signs of improvement and those that are not.

Currently, we define an acceptable standard of education as one that is satisfactory. Our proposal is to raise the acceptable standard for the quality of education to good, as defined in *The evaluation schedule for maintained schools and academies*.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to define an acceptable standard of education as being 'good'?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

## **Proposal 3: Introduce a single judgement of 'requires improvement' to replace the current 'satisfactory' judgement and 'notice to improve' category**

Currently, all school inspections carried out by Ofsted use the same grading scale:

- Grade 1: outstanding
- Grade 2: good
- Grade 3: satisfactory
- Grade 4: inadequate; if a school is judged 'inadequate' it is deemed to either require special measures or a notice to improve.

Ofsted is proposing to remove the 'satisfactory' judgement and 'notice to improve' category and replace them with a single Grade 3 of 'requires improvement'. This will give a new four point scale:

- Grade 1: outstanding
- Grade 2: good
- Grade 3: requires improvement
- Grade 4: special measures

Any school graded 3 or 4 will be deemed to require significant improvement as defined in section 5 of the Education Act 2005 (as amended). A school judged to be

'inadequate' will be deemed to be a school causing concern and will therefore 'require improvement' or 'special measures'. This change will raise expectations of the weaker schools and will support the proposal that the expected grade for all schools should be 'good'.

'Good' will continue to set high expectations. We believe, however, that the proposed change will encourage schools judged to be less than 'good' to bring about rapid improvement. Inspection reports will show clearly whether or not a school is improving.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that a single grade of 'requires improvement' should replace the 'satisfactory' grade and the 'notice to improve' category?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

#### **Proposal 4: Introduce earlier full re-inspection of schools judged as 'requires improvement'**

We know that inspection has an impact on the speed of improvement. Our evidence shows this. That is why we are proposing early full re-inspections of schools that require improvement. Currently, schools that are judged as 'satisfactory' are usually re-inspected after three years. Up to 40% of these schools receive a monitoring inspection after approximately 18 months. Schools given a 'notice to improve' usually receive a monitoring inspection after six to eight months and are re-inspected 12–16 months after the inspection that placed them in the 'notice to improve' category. All monitoring inspections consider whether the school is making sufficient progress and focus specifically on the key recommendations from the previous report.

Ofsted is proposing to re-inspect all schools judged as 'requires improvement' usually within 12–18 months of their last inspection. The inspection will be a full inspection under section 5 of the Education Act 2005 (as amended) and will consider the overall quality of teaching, the achievement of pupils, their behaviour and safety and the effectiveness of leadership and management at the school. These schools will not receive a monitoring inspection. Leaving a gap of about 12–18 months between inspections will ensure that further examination and test data are available for consideration by inspectors.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that Ofsted should introduce earlier, full re-inspection of schools judged as 'requires improvement'?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

**Proposal 5: Introduce a protocol that limits the number of times a school can be deemed as 'requires improvement' to two consecutive inspections before it is deemed to be 'inadequate' and requires 'special measures' to improve**

Many schools judged to be 'satisfactory' improve so that they are judged as 'good' at their next inspection. Unfortunately, some good schools decline and are judged as 'satisfactory', and some 'satisfactory' schools can remain at this grade for a number of inspections. The most recent Annual Report states that 'it remains a serious concern that over half the schools previously judged satisfactory and inspected this year remain stuck at satisfactory or have declined. This represents over 1,250 schools. In just over three quarters of these schools their capacity to improve is also judged no better than satisfactory.'

Being 'satisfactory' is not good enough. Ofsted intends to raise expectations by implementing a new approach. If, at a school's third consecutive inspection, it is not judged to have made sufficient progress to be graded 'good' it will be deemed to be 'inadequate' and will require 'special measures'. For those schools judged as 'satisfactory' before 31 August 2012, we intend counting this inspection as their first 'requires improvement' judgement for the purpose of implementing this proposal.

That means that satisfactory schools **not showing the expected improvement**, or good schools where the quality of education has declined, will follow the pattern set out in the table below.

Inspected before August 2012	Inspected after 1 September 2012	Next inspection within 12–18 months	Next Inspection within 12–18 months
Satisfactory	Requires improvement	Special measures	
Good	Requires improvement	Requires improvement	Special measures

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that, at a school's third consecutive inspection, if it has not made sufficient progress to be judged 'good', it will be deemed to require 'special measures'?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

### **Proposal 6: Undertake inspections without notice being provided to the school**

Ofsted intends to implement this approach for all schools from September 2012. This will allow inspectors to see what schools are really like and will provide reassurance to parents and pupils that inspections are as robust as they can be. Ofsted currently undertakes many unannounced inspections each year and is fully aware of the operational challenges this can present for those we are inspecting.

We have not introduced 'no notice' inspections in the past because we have not been able to find a way to gather parents' views without giving warning of the inspection. We now have a solution to this. Parent View enables parents to comment on their child's school at any time during the school year. During inspection there will be an additional facility to enable parents to 'post' comments about the school, as well as complete the questionnaire. Comments will not be visible to other parents, but will be sent to the lead inspector. We will adapt our inspection methodology to make sure that there is time to take account of the views of parents and to talk to governors, as in the current inspection.

We are consulting on whether inspections should be completely without notice.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that inspections should be unannounced?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

### **Proposal 7: Request the school provide anonymised information of the outcomes of the most recent performance management of all teachers**

High-quality teaching makes a significant difference to the future life chances of children. It is the most important factor in determining whether a school is 'good' or 'outstanding'. Good leadership and management mean that senior staff in schools should use performance management to increase the effectiveness of teaching so that it raises standards and increases the engagement of pupils.

Ofsted is proposing to ask schools to provide anonymised information of performance management outcomes, in whatever form it is available, to inspectors. These will not be reported in the inspection report but will be used, together with other evidence, as a line of enquiry when determining whether senior managers and governing bodies are showing strong leadership and management skills and using performance management effectively to assist in the drive for improvement.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that schools should provide inspectors with an anonymised summary of the outcomes of the most recent performance management of all teachers?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

## **Part 2: Summary of the main proposals for further education and skills inspections**

Towards the end of 2011 we completed a consultation on changes we would like to make to the inspection of further education and skills from September 2012. We are pleased that the response to the consultation has been broadly positive. We have decided to consult on a further set of changes we would like to introduce from September 2012.

From September 2012, we propose that:

1. 'outstanding' providers must have 'outstanding' teaching, learning and assessment
2. a judgement of 'requires improvement' replaces the current 'satisfactory' judgement
3. providers judged as 'requires improvement' are subject to re-inspection earlier than is currently the case
4. we will introduce a protocol that limits the number of times a provider can be deemed as 'requires improvement' to two consecutive inspections before it is deemed to be judged 'inadequate'
5. we will undertake inspections without notice to the provider
6. we will request that the provider presents an anonymised summary of the outcomes of the most recent performance management of all teachers, trainers and assessors.

### **Proposals to amend the inspection framework for further education and skills**

#### **Proposal 1: To require 'outstanding' providers to have 'outstanding' teaching, learning and assessment**

The current inspection framework makes clear that inspectors are likely to judge a provider as outstanding if the quality of provision, including teaching, learning and assessment, is at least good. Teaching, learning and assessment is the area that has the greatest impact on the progress learners make. We propose that to be judged an outstanding provider, 'teaching, learning and assessment' must be 'outstanding'.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree inspectors should only judge a provider as outstanding if the quality of teaching, learning and assessment is outstanding?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

### **Proposal 2: Introduce a judgement of 'requires improvement' to replace the current 'satisfactory' judgement**

Currently, all inspections carried out under the common inspection framework use the same grading scale:

- Grade 1: outstanding
- Grade 2: good
- Grade 3: satisfactory
- Grade 4: inadequate

Ofsted is proposing to remove the 'satisfactory' judgement and replace it with a single Grade 3 of 'requires improvement'. The Grade 4 category will remain as 'inadequate'. A provider judged to be 'inadequate' will be deemed to require re-inspection in line with current practice. This change will raise expectations of the weaker providers and will support the proposal that the expected grade for all providers should be 'good'.

We do not intend changing the grade boundary between 'good' and 'satisfactory' when we implement the change of the grade. 'Good' will continue to set high expectations. We believe, however, that the proposed change will encourage providers judged to be less than 'good' to bring about rapid improvement.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that a grade of 'requires improvement' should replace the 'satisfactory' grade?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

### **Proposal 3: Introduce earlier re-inspection of providers judged as 'requires improvement'**

Currently, providers judged as 'satisfactory' are usually re-inspected after four years. The majority of these colleges or providers receive a monitoring inspection after

approximately two years. Providers given a grade of 'inadequate' usually receive a monitoring inspection after six to eight months and are re-inspected 12–15 months after the inspection that judged them as 'inadequate'. All monitoring inspections consider whether the provider is making sufficient progress and focus specifically on the key recommendations from the previous report.

Ofsted is proposing to re-inspect all providers judged as 'requires improvement' within 12–18 months of their last inspection. The inspection will be a full inspection under part 8 of the Education Act 2006 and will consider the overall effectiveness of the provider. These providers will not receive a monitoring inspection. Leaving a gap of 12–18 months between inspections will ensure that further examination and test data are available for consideration by inspectors.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that Ofsted should introduce earlier re-inspection of providers judged as 'requires improvement'?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

**Proposal 4: Introduce a protocol that limits the number of times a provider can be deemed as 'requires improvement' to two consecutive inspections before it is deemed to be judged 'inadequate'**

Many providers judged to be 'satisfactory' improve so that they are judged as 'good' at their next inspection. Unfortunately, some good providers decline and are judged as 'satisfactory', and some 'satisfactory' providers stubbornly remain so for a number of inspections. It remains a serious concern that just under half of the providers previously judged satisfactory and inspected in 2010/11 remain stuck at satisfactory or have declined.

Being 'satisfactory' is clearly not good enough. Ofsted intends to raise expectations by implementing a new approach. If, at its third consecutive inspection, a provider has not made sufficient progress to be judged 'good' it will be judged 'inadequate'. For those providers judged as 'satisfactory' before 31 August 2012, we intend counting this inspection as their first 'requires improvement' judgement for the purpose of implementing this proposal.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that, at a provider's third consecutive inspection, if it has not made sufficient progress to be judged 'good', it will be judged 'inadequate'?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

**Proposal 5: Undertake inspections without notice to the provider**

Ofsted is considering the merits and challenges associated with implementing inspections without notice for all providers from September 2012. This will allow inspectors to see what providers are really like and will provide reassurance to learners, employers and parents that inspections are as robust as they can be. Ofsted currently undertakes many unannounced inspections each year and is fully aware of the operational challenges this can present for those we are inspecting.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that all inspections should be unannounced?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

**Proposal 6: Request that the provider presents an anonymised summary of the outcomes of the most recent performance management of all teachers/trainers/assessors**

High-quality teaching, learning and assessment make a significant difference to the future life chances of children, young people and adult learners. It is one of the most important factors in determining whether a provider is 'good' or 'outstanding'. Senior staff in providers should use performance management and professional development to increase the effectiveness of teaching, learning and assessment so that it raises standards and increases engagement of learners.

Ofsted is proposing to ask providers to supply anonymised information of performance management outcomes to inspectors. These will not be reported in the inspection report but will be used, together with other evidence, to determine whether senior managers and governing bodies are using performance management effectively to assist in the drive for improvement.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that providers should supply inspectors with an anonymised summary of the outcomes of the most recent performance management of all teachers, trainers and assessors?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

## Part 3: Summary of the main proposals for initial teacher education inspections

We have just completed a consultation on changes we would like to make to the inspection of initial teacher education (ITE) from September 2012. Early indications are that the response to the consultation has been broadly positive. We have decided to consult on a further set of changes we would like to introduce from September 2012. We hope that those of you who have already commented on our proposals for change will also submit your views on these additional proposals. It provides a unique opportunity for all those with an interest in and a passion for education to join together to use inspection to focus strongly on providing the best education possible for everyone. That includes the best training available for our future generation of teachers. We hope you agree that the following changes will help us to realise this aspiration.

From September 2012, we propose that:

1. a judgement of 'requires improvement' replaces the current 'satisfactory' judgement
2. ITE partnerships judged as 'requires improvement' are subject to a monitoring inspection within 12 months of their inspection
3. a protocol be introduced that limits the number of times an ITE partnership can be judged as 'requires improvement' to two consecutive inspections before it is deemed to be 'inadequate'
4. ITE inspections be undertaken without notice being provided to the ITE education partnership
5. a set of grade criteria are introduced to judge the overall effectiveness of a whole ITE partnership, as well as each age phase or separate programme inspected

### Proposals to amend the inspection framework for initial teacher education

#### Proposal 1: Introduce a judgement of 'requires improvement' to replace the current 'satisfactory' judgement

Currently, all ITE inspections use the same grading scale:

- Grade 1: outstanding
- Grade 2: good
- Grade 3: satisfactory
- Grade 4: inadequate

Ofsted is proposing to remove the 'satisfactory' judgement and replace it with a single Grade 3 of 'requires improvement'. The Grade 4 category will remain as 'inadequate'. This change will raise expectations of the weaker ITE partnerships and will support the proposal that the expected grade for such partnerships should be 'good'.

We do not intend changing the grade boundary between 'good' and 'satisfactory' when we implement the change of the grade. 'Good' will continue to set high expectations. We believe, however, that the proposed change will encourage ITE partnerships judged to be less than 'good' to bring about rapid improvement.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that a grade of 'requires improvement' should replace the 'satisfactory' grade?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

### **Proposal 2: Introduce a monitoring inspection for ITE partnerships judged as 'requires improvement'**

In the recent ITE framework consultation Ofsted proposed it would conduct a monitoring inspection to all ITE partnerships judged 'satisfactory' within 12–18 months of their last inspection. Feedback from stakeholders indicated that this should be shorter to have maximum impact. We agree and propose that this should take place within 12 months of an inspection where an ITE partnership is judged as 'requires improvement'.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that Ofsted should conduct a monitoring inspection for ITE partnerships judged as 'requires improvement' within 12 months of their previous inspection?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

### **Proposal 3: Introduce a protocol that limits the number of times an ITE provider can be deemed as 'requires improvement' to two consecutive inspections before it is deemed to be 'inadequate'**

'Satisfactory' is clearly not good enough, so Ofsted intends to raise expectations by implementing a new approach. If, at an ITE partnership's third consecutive inspection, it has not made sufficient progress to be judged 'good' it will be deemed

to be 'inadequate'. For those ITE partnerships judged as 'satisfactory' before 31 August 2012, we intend counting this inspection as their first 'requires improvement' judgement for the purpose of implementing this proposal.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that, at an ITE partnership's third consecutive inspection, if it has not made sufficient progress to be judged 'good', it will be deemed to be 'inadequate'?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

#### **Proposal 4: Undertake monitoring inspections, focused monitoring inspections and full inspections without notice being provided to the ITE partnership**

In the recent ITE framework consultation Ofsted proposed to reduce the notice period for an ITE inspection from eight to three weeks. There was general agreement that it would be appropriate to do this. We also proposed to introduce monitoring inspections to 'satisfactory' ITE partnerships and focused monitoring inspections on the quality of phonics training where responses to the newly qualified teacher survey indicate significant dissatisfaction with the quality of provision for two consecutive years.

Ofsted now intends to implement a no-notice approach for monitoring inspections where ITE partnerships are judged as 'requires improvement' and the focused monitoring inspections on the quality of phonics training from September 2012.

We also wish to consult on whether it would be possible to conduct no notice inspections of ITE partnerships and whether the notice provided for these partnerships should be absolute, for example arriving with no warning, or whether the lead inspector should telephone the partnership 15 minutes prior to arrival.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that there should be a no-notice approach for monitoring inspections where ITE partnerships are judged as 'requires improvement' and focused monitoring inspections on the quality of phonics training?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that no-notice inspections should be completely unannounced?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that the ITE partnership should be contacted by the lead inspector 15 minutes before arriving?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

**Do you have any comments or suggestions on this proposal?**

### **Proposal 5: Introduce an additional judgement for the overall effectiveness of a whole ITE partnership**

Ofsted inspections of initial teacher education have always graded each age phase or separate programme offered by an ITE partnership separately. This will continue to be the case because of the importance given to Ofsted's judgements about the quality of primary/early years and secondary provision and the link to Training and Development Agency (TDA) allocations. It is proposed that we also include an additional set of grade criteria in the evaluation schedule to enable inspectors to make a clear judgement about the overall effectiveness of a whole ITE partnership.

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that an additional judgement for the overall effectiveness of a whole ITE partnership should be made?**

**(Strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree, disagree; strongly disagree; don't know)**

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

## Annex A. The consultations

We welcome your responses to this consultation paper. The consultations remain open until Thursday 3 May 2012.

Please visit our website to complete and submit electronic versions of the questionnaires:

For schools inspections:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-sch>

For further education and skills inspections:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-fes>

For initial teacher training inspections:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ofsted-gefa-ite>

If you prefer to submit your comments by email please send these to:

For school inspections:

[SIF\\_Consultation@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:SIF_Consultation@ofsted.gov.uk)

For further education and skills inspections:

[LandS@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:LandS@ofsted.gov.uk)

For initial teacher training inspections:

[ITE@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:ITE@ofsted.gov.uk)