

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?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

Before providing specific feedback, a brief overview of Pro Bono Economics' recent activities to date in this field is presented. Commentary is limited to questions we feel comfortable offering reasoned input to. In the interests of brevity, questions that we have no comment on have been removed entirely from this response.

Background

Pro Bono Economics' core brief is to help charities understand and improve their social impact. We achieve this by facilitating volunteering opportunities for professional economists keen to give their time on a pro-bono basis to charitable projects, active in any one of four fields. These are: i) education; ii) employment; iii) mental health; and iv) poverty.

Our approach to measurement is robust, transparent and focuses on the quality of data and supporting analysis. The resulting assessments highlight the economic and monetary value of initiatives whose effects might otherwise have appeared intangible. Indicators used include, for example, the potential impact a given intervention may have on an individual's workplace productivity, or his or her chances of using public services (welfare) for extended periods in future. A catalogue of our work to date can be found [here](#).

Wherever possible Pro Bono Economics seeks to share the insights from our work in these four areas to help inform relevant societal debates. It is our hope that by circulating these applicable insights, those in a position to shape policy in the UK in the broadest sense can benefit from rigorous and relevant information.

"Upside Down Sport"

"Upside Down Sport: building mental well-being and resilience in Britain's next generation" was an initiative kicked off by our hosting of a public lecture and panel discussion on this theme in February 2017 with Baroness Tanni Grey Thompson, Mark Gregory (Chief Economist at EY) and Will Watt (Director of Product at Jump) together with Simon Kuper of the Financial Times¹.

The lecture and discussion sparked were followed by a policy roundtable convened by Pro Bono Economics in November 2017. This welcomed representatives of charities, Non-Governmental Bodies, and the public sector to discuss whether the UK's policy priorities were correct, and how robust impact analysis might better inform these priorities.

Specifically, it examined how investing in grass roots physical activity programmes with demonstrable impact might help ensure the wellbeing and productivity of future generations. A summary of the discussion at the Roundtable is attached to this response.

Following these events, there has been a continuing appetite to explore further the issue of physical activity (PA) and physical education (PE)² and their prominence in schools specifically within our wider network, given their apparent potential to contribute in a meaningful sense towards children's learning ability and wellbeing.

Observations drawn from consequent desk research, proprietary analysis and a past Pro Bono Economics report are presented below.

¹ A recording of the lecture can be found [here](#).

² In the context of this submission PE is distinct from PA insofar as the former relates to lesson-based activity, while the latter is broader, capturing activities that might extend outside of normal school hours.

Quality of Education

A more holistic approach from Ofsted to assessing the quality of education lends itself to schools adopting more broad-based and creative – yet proven – means of boosting children’s attainment and wellbeing.

Amanda Spielman, HCMI, writes in the foreword to this consultation that: “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.”

One can quite plausibly infer from this that the inspection focus of Ofsted has previously been overly-weighted towards performance data in core subjects. The result being that even those schools that possess greater flexibility to actively shape their learning environment might have been reluctant to do so because of the prevailing inspection orthodoxy.

There may be potential for a two-fold win by pursuing a holistic ‘quality of education’ judgement, one that caters for schools to embark upon more innovative ways of prioritising “what matters most” to learners and has the biggest impact on attainment and well-being.

Evidence suggests that a child’s greater propensity to engage in PA has the potential to improve his or her academic performance. This is significant for several reasons, but we present just two here: i) Ofsted rightly recognises that traditional areas of focus at school level – performance data – will remain key metrics for assessment in future as they have been in the past³; and ii) British children remain some of the least active in the developed world⁴.

Second, more proficiency in and – most importantly – enjoyment of PA at a young age can play a key role in laying the foundations for children and later adults with higher levels of general wellbeing.

Both propositions are explored in more detail below, but it appears introducing a ‘quality of education judgement’ along the lines presented – one that would ‘de-intensify’ the inspection focus on performance data as historically understood – represents a sensible course of action.

This given the seemingly universal benefits to be had in facilitating schools to engage in activities that have the potential to support children’s development in the round, something that may not have been possible let alone encouraged previously.

³ It stands to reasons that the effect of school-based initiatives should be considered at least in part with reference to such historic measures.

⁴ Tremblay M.S et al (2016) Global Matrix 2.0: Report Card Grades on the Physical Activity of Children and Youth Comparing 38 Countries, Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 13 (Suppl 2), S343 -S366. <https://journals.humankinetics.com/doi/pdf/10.1123/jpah.2016-0594>

Attainment in the round

Relieving pressure on schools/teachers via the introduction of a more rounded 'quality of education' judgement could help contribute towards better children's performance against 'traditional' metrics (such as attainment) regardless.

There is academic research as well as anecdotal evidence from the charitable sector which supports the proposition that increased PE time and/or PA during school and out of school time may boost children's academic achievement.

Of relevance here is work from The Centres for Disease Control and Prevention in the United States which found using a 'review of reviews method' that increased PE time in schools had a positive, albeit modest, relationship with academic achievement in 11 of 14 studies. More specifically:

- Time spent in increased break (recess) play had a small positive relationship with classroom behaviour, including children's attention and concentration (all eight studies examined found one or more positive associations between recess and indicators of cognitive skills);
- Classroom-based physical activity (5-20 min break during lessons) improved children's academic behaviour and achievement (eight of the nine studies found positive associations); and
- Extracurricular physical activities (participation in school sports) also had a positive association with academic performance (all 19 studies examining after-school sport found one or more positive associations with cognitive performance).

The review concluded that school physical activity programmes have a positive impact on academic performance⁵, although the effects registered were inconsistent and often small.

We would also flag Pro Bono Economics' own work in this field, particularly a report published in December 2017⁶ on behalf of Greenhouse Sports, a London-based charity that uses sport to help young people living in the inner city realise their full potential.

The study examined data from over 700 participating pupils at four inner-city London schools. Those children involved often had histories of poor attendance and academic attainment with some on the cusp of being excluded. The data on attendance, behaviour and attainment was examined against control groups and

⁵ Biddle, S.J., Asare M (2011) "Physical activity and mental health in children and adolescents: a review of reviews", School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK. <https://bjsm.bmj.com/content/45/11/886>

⁶ Professor Downward, D et al (2017) Examining the Impact of Greenhouse Sports Programmes in Schools, Pro Bono Economics - https://www.probonoeconomics.com/sites/default/files/files/Greenhouse%20scoping%20study%20-%20December%202017_0.pdf

combined with the findings of 20 qualitative interviews. These were conducted with headteachers, Greenhouse Sports' full-time coaches, heads of PE and participating pupils.

The findings of the report show that on average, 36% of Greenhouse Sports pupils exercise for more than 60 minutes a day, a figure more than twice the then London average of 16%. Engagement with Greenhouse Sports also accounted for an average annual attendance increase of 4 percentage points and programme participants in Greenhouse Sports schools outperformed their peers by up to a third of a grade in English and 40% of a grade in Maths.

Of course, these results are specific rather than universal. However, there appears merit in allowing experimentation at school level – something a more holistic quality of education judgement could conceivably do – with different means of encouraging participation in PA. This, given its potential to help catalyse improvements in the realm of core performance data.

Contribution to wellbeing

A greater focus on the substance of education (including meaningful PE) should give schools a better chance of creating an environment that contributes towards high levels of children's wellbeing.

Current literature suggests that, when summarising PA and mental health in young people, PA is likely to have positive psychosocial outcomes⁷.

The effects appear strongest for self-esteem (at least in the short term), while those who are physically active appear less likely to suffer from mental health problems and may have enhanced cognitive functioning. Evidence on depression is also promising but remains an underdeveloped area of enquiry.

As with academic attainment, the findings in this regard are encouraging rather than definitive. There remains limited concrete evidence of these impacts being delivered due to the lack of Randomised Control Trials and the cross-sectional nature of many studies in this field.

Rather than being cause for inertia however, this lends further value to Ofsted introducing a rounded 'quality of education' judgement now, given that it should allow for a wider range of different approaches to enhancing life chances for children being used at school level, underpinned by a continuing focus on the importance of core performance data.

Not only should this be beneficial to educators and children alike for the reasons outlined here, it should also help contribute towards the availability of more data in future with which to ascertain causality in regards educational interventions.

⁷ *Ibid*

Diversity and inclusiveness

It is clear however that PE, being delivered in a lesson format, is far from universally popular among children so Ofsted might consider recognising efforts at promoting inclusivity and participation key determinants in assembling its overall 'quality of education' judgement.

To shed further light on the dynamics at play in this domain, Pro Bono Economics commissioned a survey of 840 teachers in March 2019 with the aim of understanding what a statistically significant group of educators felt was needed before they could support an increased emphasis on PA in schools.

The two most popular options in this regard were as follows:

- The availability of additional specialist PE teachers and/or coaches to run the curriculum classes, so that the responsibility didn't fall on me: **55%**; and
- A more inclusive approach to physical education, moving away from competitive sports, so that all pupils are more engaged: **42%**⁸

The first point here is presented primarily for contextual reasons as effecting this kind of change is outside of Ofsted's remit. Yet, the second point is of significance insofar as it illustrates the appetite from teachers and the value they perceive in taking a more participatory approach to PA in schools.

We would also flag research performed by the What Works Wellbeing⁹ centre in this regard for suggestions of activities that could be considered more 'inclusive' PA capable of generating real wellbeing improvements.

For example, there appears strong evidence of the effectiveness of yoga and tai-chi like movements at reducing feelings of anxiety, depression, and anger, while also improving attention spans wellbeing levels among 15-24-year olds.

We see value in Ofsted exploring further whether additional credit should be given to schools experimenting with 'alternative' means of enhancing participation in PA – through for example, dance classes which are also examined in the research cited – given their evident capacity to improve the wellbeing of young people in the round.

⁸ YouGov (2019) Teachers Track February 2019

⁹ Mansfield, L (2017) Sport, Dance and Young People - A systematic review of sport and dance participation in healthy young people (15-24 years) to promote subjective wellbeing.
<https://whatworkswellbeing.files.wordpress.com/2017/06/evidence-review-full-report-sport-dance-young-people-22june.pdf>

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?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

As highlighted in our comments above, much of the information in this debate – while encouraging and largely supportive of a shift towards a more holistic approach to educational inspection – would benefit from greater levels of data and analysis.

As such, it would appear sensible to separate 'personal development' from 'behaviour and attitudes' to the extent it caters for a more granular approach to inspection.

We hope this information may prove useful and should you require any additional clarification, please contact Simon Burns, Director, Public Affairs (simon.burns@pro.bonoeconomics.com) in the first instance.

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/>

- **Complete and email**

Complete the questions in this Word document and email it to 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 ☒ 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: Pro Bono Economics

Section 2

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

Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local government representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
Governor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mayoral or combined authority representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
Headteacher/Principal	<input type="checkbox"/>	A registered early years group provider	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other school staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	A registered early years group provider (before and after school care only)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil/student	<input type="checkbox"/>	A registered early years childminder	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multi-Academy Trust representative	<input type="checkbox"/>	An early years provider run directly by a school	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parent/carer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Leader/manager of a further education and skills provider or college	<input type="checkbox"/>

Teacher/trainer of a further education and skills provider or college	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other employee of a further education and skills provider or college	<input type="checkbox"/>
An adult learner/student	<input type="checkbox"/>	An employer with an ESFA or apprenticeship levy training contract	<input type="checkbox"/>
A member of the public	<input type="checkbox"/>	An employer without an ESFA or apprenticeship levy training contract	<input type="checkbox"/>
Representative group or union representative	<input type="checkbox"/>	Proprietor of an independent school	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other, please tell us:	

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

A maintained primary school	<input type="checkbox"/>	A primary academy	<input type="checkbox"/>
A maintained secondary school	<input type="checkbox"/>	A secondary academy	<input type="checkbox"/>
A maintained nursery school	<input type="checkbox"/>	A non-association independent school	<input type="checkbox"/>
A maintained special school	<input type="checkbox"/>	An early years provider	<input type="checkbox"/>
A general FE/tertiary college	<input type="checkbox"/>	A not-for-profit organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>
A sixth form college	<input type="checkbox"/>	An independent specialist college	<input type="checkbox"/>
A local authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	A higher education institution	<input type="checkbox"/>
An independent learning provider	<input type="checkbox"/>	A free school	<input type="checkbox"/>
A non-maintained special school	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other, please tell us	
Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>		

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?

- ☒ X 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.

	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Don't know
I found the consultation information clear and easy to understand.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I found the consultation easy to find on the Ofsted website.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had enough information about the consultation topic.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would take part in a future Ofsted consultation.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Is there anything you would like us to improve or do differently for future consultations? If so, please tell us below.

None.

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

Female <input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Prefer not to say <input type="checkbox"/>	Prefer to self-describe
---------------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

2. Age

Under 14 <input type="checkbox"/>	14–18 <input type="checkbox"/>	19–24 <input type="checkbox"/>	25–34 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	35–44 <input type="checkbox"/>	45–54 <input type="checkbox"/>	55–64 <input type="checkbox"/>	65+ <input type="checkbox"/>	Prefer not to say <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

3. Ethnic origin

(a) How would you describe your national group?

- ☐ 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?

Asian		Mixed ethnic origin	
Bangladeshi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Asian and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indian	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black African and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Caribbean and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other Asian background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other mixed ethnic background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Black		White	
African	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any White background (specify if you wish)	X
Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other ethnic background	
Any other Black background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chinese		Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any Chinese background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>		

4. Sexual orientation

Heterosexual X	Lesbian <input type="checkbox"/>	Gay <input type="checkbox"/>	Bisexual <input type="checkbox"/>	Prefer not to say <input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---

5. Religion/belief

Buddhist	<input type="checkbox"/>	Muslim	<input type="checkbox"/>
Christian	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sikh	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hindu	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other, please state:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jewish	<input type="checkbox"/>	None	X
Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>		

6. Disability

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No X	Prefer not to say <input type="checkbox"/>
--	------------------------------	------	---



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