



Ofsted Updates July 2017

Since September 2016, inspection outcomes published in Essex for Primary Schools have been as follows:

6 category 2 schools became category 1 schools
1 category 3 school became a category 1 school
17 category 3 schools became category 2 schools
1 category 4 school became a category 1 school

49 category 2 school remained as category 2 schools
15 category 3 schools remained as category 3 schools

2 category 2 schools became category 4 schools
5 category 2 schools became category 3 schools
1 category 3 school became a category 4 school
1 category 1 school became a category 3 school
1 category 1 school became a category 4 school

This means that of the 92 schools identified, 25 schools improved their Ofsted grading, 64 remained the same and 10 declined.

Please click on the links in blue below to access documents, video clips or power point presentations.

Early Years Ofsted Myths

[#OfstedMyths](#) confirming the facts about our early years inspections and dispelling myths that can sometimes result in unnecessary workloads for registered child carers

27 July 2017

These myths are explained in a series of very short Youtube clips.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/ofsted-chie-inspector-writes-about-safety-culture-in-schools>

Ofsted's Chief Inspector writes about safety culture in schools

[Amanda Spielman](#) 5 August 2017

Below is an extract from Amanda Spielman's article in The Telegraph.

Over the years an over-cautious culture has developed in our schools, one that too often tries to wrap children in cotton wool.

It is, I am sad to say, a culture that deprives children of rewarding experiences, of the opportunity to develop resilience and grit, and which makes it hard for them to learn to cope with normal everyday risk. It's also undoubtedly a major factor in the growth of childhood inactivity, as children are deterred from more vigorous outdoor exercise in favour of "safer" indoor activity.

Being honest, I have to admit that Ofsted hasn't always got this right. We know inspection has sometimes seemed too much about tickboxes and worrying about things like the proper height of school fences. Making sure children are safe at school is, of course, an important part of our work, but I want to be sure we look at the right things in the right way, without going overboard. I want Ofsted to make sure that schools are properly focusing on pupil safety, but that it doesn't come at the expense of opportunities to broaden and enrich young minds.

That is why new training later this summer will remind inspectors what safeguarding is really about. It will ask them to focus on what schools are doing to identify children potentially at risk of real harm; how these children are being helped; and how they manage accusations and other serious problems with staff.

We want school leaders to make decisions based on their experienced judgement, rather than feeling the need to invent and then conform to overly prescriptive policies. This isn't just because we think a too-cautious approach to health and safety limits young people's experiences, but also because it can obscure real safety issues. Every minute spent enforcing a ban on conkers and yo-yos is a minute away from tackling the multitude of real issues we know schools face.

So my message to schools is this: keeping children safe from harm should always be your overriding concern, but in doing so, make sure you distinguish between real and imagined risk. Trying to insulate your pupils from every bump, germ or bruise won't just drive you to distraction, it will short-change those pupils as well – limiting their opportunity to fully take advantage of the freedom of childhood, and to explore the world around them.

[Sean Harford - developments in education inspection - GOV.UK blogs](https://educationinspection.blog.gov.uk/author/sean-harford/)

<https://educationinspection.blog.gov.uk/author/sean-harford/>

Posted by: Sean Harford, Posted on: 29 August 2017

Questions on curriculum

The curriculum survey has been warmly welcomed by senior leaders and educational professionals. Once we have the initial evidence we will look at whether we need to consider curriculum more during inspection; this will feed into the new inspection framework we are developing for September 2019.

Our initial survey of hundreds of schools, looked at many questions including:

How clear has the government been about the objectives of the curriculum?

Has the school made the objectives of the curriculum clear?

Is the school's approach aligned with national policy objectives?

What are teachers' objectives when they teach a subject?

Are teachers' objectives in line with the schools?

Will the teaching deliver the objectives for that subject?

Replacement for EduBase

The department for education is developing a replacement for EduBase to be known as Get information about schools (GIAS).

[A test version of GIAS can be accessed here.](#)

NB. This test version of GIAS does not contain live data. Users should continue to rely on the data contained in EduBase until advised otherwise.

[Constitution of governing bodies of maintained schools - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/.../constitution-of-governing-bodies-of-maintained-s...)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/.../constitution-of-governing-bodies-of-maintained-s...>

Statutory guidance setting out the arrangements for **the constitution of governing bodies** of all local-authority-maintained schools.

Updated August 2017

There are 2 key changes in the updated statutory guidance

. 1. Additional material on the Governance Database – paragraph 35, page 12

Governing bodies are required to provide the Secretary of State with whatever information she requires for the purpose of the exercise of her functions in relation to education. This means that governing bodies must provide to the Secretary of State for Education certain details they hold, as volunteered by their governors, through EduBase or the replacement GIAS system

The information to be provided is set out in a [message to all schools](#) published on 1 July 2016 on GOV.UK (see below).

. 2. New guidance on the power to remove elected and staff governors – Section C.5 – pages 23/24.

The governing body may also remove an appointed or an elected, parent or staff governor.

It is advised that every effort be made to avoid potential difficulties later by informing prospective election candidates, or appointees, of the nature of the role. It is advised that their agreement is secured to a clear set of expectations for behaviour and conduct – as set out in a code of conduct. A code of conduct is expected to detail (within the parameters of relevant regulations and this guidance) the circumstances in which the governing body may suspend or remove a governor. Good training, a thorough induction and effective chairing are also vital in helping to prevent situations occurring in the first place. It is advised that induction includes a clear setting out of the expectations of the governor role.

Governing bodies are expected only to exercise the power to remove an elected governor in exceptional circumstances where the actions or behaviour of the elected governor warrants removal rather than suspension. The power should not be used simply to remove dissenting or challenging voices. Good governance involves asking courageous questions and offering appropriate professional challenge. A diverse range of viewpoints contributes to healthy debate and good decision making; and avoids governing boards becoming inappropriately dominated by a single narrow perspective.

The five year disqualification term for removal reflects the expectation that the power to remove an elected governor will only be used in exceptional and

serious circumstances (and such seriousness will depend on the facts of the case). Examples which could give rise to removal are where:

- (a) there have been repeated grounds for suspension¹⁴;
- (b) there has been serious misconduct. Governing bodies should decide what constitutes serious misconduct based on the facts of the case. However, it is expected that any actions that compromise the Nolan principles, if sufficiently serious, would be considered in scope of this reason for removal.
- (c) a governor displays repeated and serious incompetence; for example where an elected governor is unwilling or unable, despite all appropriate support, to develop the skills to contribute to effective governance; or where attendance is so irregular that the governor is unable to make any meaningful contribution to the work of the board.
- (d) the governor has engaged in conduct aimed at undermining fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs; and/or;
- (e) the actions of the governor are significantly detrimental to the effective operation of the governing body, distracting it from its core strategic functions; and/or the actions of a governor interferes with the operational efficiency of the school thereby wasting a significant amount of headteacher and /or senior leadership time.

[National database of governors - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-database-of-governors)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-database-of-governors>

1 Jul 2016

Information to be collected

For all maintained school governors, and academy trustees, members and local governors, the data we will collect in Edubase and make publicly available is:

- full name (including title)
- appointing body (eg board, foundation, parents etc)
- date of appointment

- date term of office ends / ended if in last year
- for maintained schools whether they are the chair of governors or a member of the governing body, and for academies whether they are a trust member, a trustee, the chair of trustees, or a local governor on a local governing body

In addition, for all these individuals we will collect within Edubase, but not publish, a range of information to help us to identify specific individuals:

- postcode
- date of birth
- previous names
- nationality
- direct email address for chair

[Sean Harford - developments in education inspection - GOV.UK blogs](https://educationinspection.blog.gov.uk/author/sean-harford/)

<https://educationinspection.blog.gov.uk/author/sean-harford/>

Posted by: [Sean Harford](#), Posted on: 18 July 2017 - Categories: [OfstedMyths](#)

We are now 18 months into our myth busting campaign and we felt it was important to get a sense of whether it was making an impression. That's why earlier this year we commissioned research among the classroom teachers to establish whether or not the myth busting messages were getting through. The results were largely positive. Of nine myths we have been trying to bust, seven have been debunked. For example, of those surveyed:

81% knew that Ofsted don't require individual lesson plans

70% knew that we don't have guidance on preferred ways of marking

74% knew that we don't grade individual lessons.

Less satisfying though was the discovery that 70% of teachers still seem to think Ofsted has a preferred, child-centred, style of teaching. We don't. And only a small majority (56%) appreciate that most inspection teams include a serving school leader.

