

na
MP

RECORD OF A MEETING HELD IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S ROOM AT THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AT 1600 HOURS ON THURSDAY 30 OCTOBER 1980, TO DISCUSS THE ROLE OF H.M. INSPECTORATE IN SCOTLAND, ENGLAND AND WALES.

Present: Prime Minister
Secretary of State for Education and Science
Secretary of State for Scotland
Secretary of State for Wales
Sir James Hamilton, PUSS, DES
Mr. Trevor Hughes, PUSS, WO
Mr. Angus Mitchell (Scottish Education Department)
Sir Derek Rayner
Mr. Gordon Downey (CPRS)
Miss Sheila Browne (Senior Chief Inspector, DES)
Mr. J.F. McGarrity (Chief Inspector, SO)
Mr. E.O. Davies (Chief Inspector, WO)
Mr. N.J. Sanders
Mr. M.A. Pattison

* * * * *

The Prime Minister said that she had seen the proposal for a scrutiny of the Inspectorate in Scotland. She had some hesitations about this. She personally believed in full school inspections with a prime aim of maintaining standards. She understood that an agreement with the NUT had tended to limit these. Miss Browne said that the NUT's proposals had never been accepted. Mr. Carlisle confirmed that the number of full inspections had been built back up again.

The Prime Minister said that she wanted to see one full inspection at each level in each LEA annually. Miss Browne said that the Inspectorate operated a dip-stick system. They were limited by manpower considerations. Mr. Davies said that in Wales there was more than one inspection at secondary and one at primary level annually in each LEA. The programme had been stepped up by 25% recently. Mr. McGarrity said that in 1979/80 there had been 350 full inspections at primary level and 46 at secondary level. In response to a question from the Prime Minister, Miss Browne said that the inspection reports were issued to the Secretary

of State, and the Inspectorate were now moving towards publication.

Sir Derek Rayner said that he would like to proceed with the Secretary of State for Scotland's scrutiny proposal. In the past, where a scrutiny subject covered several Departments, a joint exercise had proved useful. He would therefore be even happier if it were agreed that there should be a parallel exercise in England and Wales, which would need to take account of the differences in the system. He was getting many approaches from outside Government on education. There was an issue of the balance between the Inspectorate's policy and administrative work and its direct assistance to those in the education system.

Mr. Younger argued that the scrutiny would be a valuable way of looking at the system, both in terms of the Manifesto commitment to strengthening the Inspectorate and to look for possible staff savings.

Mr. Carlisle said that he would need to be clear about the purpose of the study. DES looked after 31,000 institutions. 40% of the Inspectorate's time was spent inside them, and this ratio had been constant over a 20-year period. Inspection was still a prime function. Mr. Edwards said that he had less familiarity with the system, but he had been struck by three points. First, there were now few formal inspections, but many more informal ones. Secondly, he was unconvinced that the follow-up to inspections was as effective as he would like to see. Thirdly, in discussions within the Departments, he found a slight unease about the Inspectorate's relationship with the Departments. He sensed that this was a delicate area, and was undecided as to whether the Rayner method was the best approach. Government needed a neutral informal look at the role and functions of the Inspectorate, whereas the Rayner approach on the efficiency of existing performance might be premature.

After some detailed discussion of the approach adopted by the Inspectorates in the three countries, and the links between the Inspectorates' policy work and their knowledge gained from inspection, the Prime Minister emphasised her concern at the quality of the product of much of the education system. Far too many

employers were complaining that children were being turned out without the proper basic equipment. GEC and ICI had now found it necessary to set up their own courses for new recruits to remedy basic deficiencies. Mr. Carlisle asked whether a Rayner scrutiny might not take up time which would otherwise be spent on inspection. The current public expenditure cuts would inevitably push the Inspectorates' numbers down into the 300s. Sir James Hamilton said that he was not clear about the purpose of an enquiry in England and Wales. The Scots were looking at the possible reduction of numbers, whilst the England/Wales Inspectorate were already overloaded. It might be sensible to allow the Scottish scrutiny to be completed, then consider whether some of its conclusions were relevant to England and Wales. Miss Browne observed that Scotland had the great advantage of the notion of qualification of teachers. Mr. McGarrity suggested that, if the Prime Minister's real concern was with education in England, it might be a waste of resources to scrutinise the Scottish Inspectorate. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that the Scottish scrutiny was not directed primarily at the size of the Inspectorate. Nor was this review of the Inspectorate intended to deal with some of the wider policy issues raised at the meeting. Sir James Hamilton said that a large-scale enquiry could be mounted to tackle the issues raised by the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister said that she had no intention of instituting another large-scale enquiry. She wanted to focus on the curriculum and the quality of teaching and she wanted to see bad teachers dismissed. Mr. Carlisle commented that he lacked the powers. He did not see a Rayner efficiency study as the best way into these issues.

Mr. Downey said that the CPRS strongly supported Sir Derek Rayner's approach. The CPRS study on education and training had uncovered much employer concern. In addition, the study had found some confusion over the relative roles of LEA advisers and inspectors. The CPRS had also found unease about the balance between policy work and inspection, although he accepted Miss Browné's view of the inevitable inter-relationship.

/ The Prime Minister

The Prime Minister asked whether simultaneous scrutinies would be the most effective way of proceeding, or whether there was merit in the DES proposal of working in sequence. Sir Derek Rayner said that working in parallel allowed the benefit of cross-fertilisation. The terms of reference proposed for Scotland might well be inappropriate for England and Wales, but he would like to invite DES to suggest appropriate terms of reference. He would then like the scrutinies to go ahead with the same time-scale, so that the study teams could keep in close touch as they worked.

The Prime Minister confirmed that she would like to see the Scottish scrutiny to go ahead on the basis already submitted, and that she would like a parallel scrutiny undertaken in England and Wales with terms of reference adapted as necessary.

MAD

3 November 1980

PRIME MINISTER

Meeting on the Inspectorate

Attendance

Secretary of State for Education plus Sir J. Hamilton, plus Miss Sheila Browne

Secretary of State for Scotland plus Mr. Angus Mitchell (Head of SED) plus Mr. J.F. McGarrity, SCI

Secretary of State for Wales plus Mr. Trevor Hughes (Permanent Secretary) plus Mr. E.O. Davies, Chief Inspector

Papers

Flag A: CPRS/Rayner note, which attempts to draw together the issues and makes some suggestions on handling.

Flag B: A note by the DES Inspectorate, forwarded by Mr. Carlisle, setting out the way the Inspectorate perceive their role. (You may not get through all this paper, but you will be particularly interested in the current inspection figures in Annex 2 of this paper.)

Flag C: A note from Mr. Priestley, recording the comments of a couple who are both head teachers in large Midland schools. (This "empirical evidence" seems to have played a large part in informing the thinking of Derek Rayner's office on this subject recently.)

Flag D: The earlier note from Derek Rayner's office, commenting on and summarising the Scottish Office scrutiny proposal.

Background

You were reluctant to approve the Scottish Office scrutiny. It was brought to your attention because of the possible conflict with a Manifesto commitment. You doubted whether further study was necessary to establish the correct role for the Inspectorate.

/We are told

We are told privately that senior management in the Scottish Office has for some time seen scope for greater efficiency and commensurate savings in the Inspectorate. Something was about to come of this at the time of the election, but the Scottish Manifesto commitment on the Inspectorate caused Ministers to wish to hold back. The scrutiny programme provided a vehicle to renew the subject, and I understand that the Scottish Office is keen to do so, and is most anxious to find a way of presenting this in a form which will not lead you to veto it.

You have recently made clear your own views on the role of the Inspectorate. You spelled them out succinctly at Cabinet last week, and Mr. Carlisle is unlikely to be in much doubt about your approach. His paper would provide a base from which he can argue that the role of the Inspectorate has been evolving in a necessary way.

I have no indication of the likely Welsh Office input. The Rayner/CPRS line is likely to follow up the ideas they floated a year ago, namely that there is scope for much better value for money from the highly trained resources available in the Inspectorate.

Handling

The discussion could quite easily go in circles unless you establish early on that there is a firm proposition to be considered. All those present will know of the Scottish Office scrutiny proposal, and will have seen the DES Inspectorate paper.

The Rayner/CPRS paper recommends that you might decide to go for a joint scrutiny covering all the countries. This is one possible outcome. But it could meet fierce resistance. There is lingering antagonism between Rayner's office and DES since the time of the DES management review which was largely conducted by Mr. Priestley. As you know, Derek Rayner regards DES as very disappointing territory for his exercises.

/You may

You may therefore feel that it would be easier to conclude that the Scottish Office scrutiny should be allowed to go ahead, whilst making it clear that you will want to review its conclusions personally, and that you may well wish to press for some or all of them to be applied also in England and Wales.

YAD

29 October 1980

cc for information
Sir Derek Rayner
Mr Downey

Mr PATTISON

HM INSPECTORATES OF SCHOOLS: PRIME MINISTER'S MEETING, 16 00
HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY 30 OCTOBER

1. This offers the advice of CPRS and this office.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING AND ATTENDANCE

2. The purpose is to discuss with the Scottish, Welsh and Education Secretaries how best "to initiate a look at questions of the role of the Inspectorates of Schools in all three territories" (your letter to Mr Morgan, 18 September). I interpret this as meaning, to ascertain whether the Inspectorate is an effective instrument of Government policy on educational quality.

3. The Prime Minister will be supported by Sir Derek Rayner and Mr Downey (CPRS), the Ministers by their top Inspectors:

Scotland: Mr J F McGarrity, Senior Chief Inspector
Wales: Mr E O Davies, Chief Inspector
England: Miss S J Browne, Senior Chief Inspector

4. I believe that Mr J A M Mitchell, Secretary of the Scottish Education Department, may also be present.

SOME BACKGROUND POINTS

5. The Conservative Manifesto 1979 said that: "We shall promote higher standards of achievement in basic skills. The Government's Assessment of Performance Unit will set the national standard in reading, writing and arithmetic, monitored by tests worked out by teachers and others and applied locally by education authorities. The Inspectorate will be strengthened. In teacher training there must be more emphasis on practical skills and on maintaining discipline."



6. The Berrill/Rayner memorandum on efficiency in local government (January 1980) recommended reviews of the purposes and methods of inspection and of the Education Departments' contribution to the management competence of senior teachers and administrators.

7. The Prime Minister thought these points worth pursuing in their own right (your letter of 18 January to Mr Edmonds, DOE). The DES response was that Mr Carlisle did not "feel there is anything particular to pursue in respect of HM Inspectorate" (Mr Green's letter to you of 13 February). The points then made appear once again in Miss Browne's note for this meeting.

8. However, at a meeting with other Ministers, Sir Kenneth Berrill and Sir Derek Rayner on value for money in local services on 22 February, Mr Carlisle was specific in saying that the Inspectorate lack management experience and that their basic objective had not previously been concerned with cost effectiveness (Sir Derek Rayner's minute of 3 April).

9. The Prime Minister subsequently indicated that in her view, "the keys to high quality education and excellent administration are first class head teachers, effective chairmen of education committees, and good directors of education [and that] concentration on securing the right individuals for these key posts is likely to be the most effective means of guaranteeing high quality" (your minute of 5 August to Mr Ibbs).

THE PROPOSED SCOTTISH OFFICE SCRUTINY

10. The Scottish Secretary proposed in August a scrutiny of the role, organisation and staffing of his Inspectorate covering the main priorities of the work to be undertaken and arrangements for collaboration between it and the rest of his Department. It would take account of



- the present and prospective needs of the education service
- the role of LEA advisers/inspectors (whose growth is cited as part of the "prima facie case for a substantial reduction" in HMI resources for school and FE inspection)
- the Minister's functions
- Government policy on educational quality and the Inspectorate, but also public expenditure and Civil Service manpower.

11. This is a welcome proposal, strongly supported by Sir Derek Rayner and the CPRS.

MISS BROWNE'S PAPER ON HM INSPECTORATE IN ENGLAND

12. This is a descriptive, not a discussion paper.

13. The Prime Minister is already thoroughly familiar with the field, but it may nonetheless be helpful to make these points:

a. "Inspection" (passim) is now a term of art. It means any act of an Inspector while on his lawful occasions. Simply entering a school is "inspection". This helps to get Annex (2)'s reference to "All Forms of Inspection" into perspective.

b. The Inspectorate is a high quality national force of experienced teachers and others, dependent on local work. Its basic tasks are both administrative and educational:



- providing local intelligence to HQ as required
- liaison work with LEAs
- advising HQ on educational matters
- contributing to national work, eg on curriculum development or teacher training.

c. It divides: 300 on schools and teacher training, 118 on FE.

d. The classic inspection tool ("full inspection") is now rarely used. There has been a steady retreat from it under pressure from both LEAs and the teaching profession. Annex (2) indicates that in 1979 the proportions of establishments inspected were:

Primary	0.3%
Secondary	0.8%
Special	0.2%
HFE	1.6%

I understand that Inspectors are not often seen in primary schools and that they feel increasingly remote from secondary schools.

e. The Education Secretary is not required to inspect where he is satisfied with LEA arrangements for inspection. He does not formally satisfy himself about this, however, and there is an uneasy dividing line between his inspectors and those of LEAs. (LEA inspectors are stronger in PE, music and the "soft subjects" than they are in science and mathematics.)

f. The Inspectorate is a small cadre given the number of establishments that might be inspected. Inspectors are at present stuck between their own local role and a wholly national (research and development-type) role. It is still uncertain which way they should go for the future.



g. As Miss Browne says (para. 13), effectiveness of activity tends to be imponderable. It is interesting that the claims made are for results at the policy rather than the delivery end of education.

h. In case any argument is mounted on the constitutional independence of the Inspectorate (on account of them being "Her Majesty's") it might be noted that the Inspectorates have no separate constitutional status. They are civil servants paid for out of the staff Votes of their Ministers. But they are - like other professional and lay advisers - expected to speak their mind. Myths associated with "Her Majesty's" have caused and continue to cause confusion about role and status.

14. Nothing is said about the cost of the Inspectorates.

15. The Scottish Office scrutiny proposal indicates an annual cost (including the support staff) of £3.25m for 118 Inspectors. The DES Inspectorate is 3½ times as large, giving an approximate cost (also including support staff) of ~~£11m~~^{£13.6m}. The Welsh Office Inspectorate numbers about 60, producing some £1.0m more. So the total is in the region of £18m. This goes to support a small number of highly paid staff, the lowest grade of Inspector being on a scale from £12,325 - £17,506 pa. The top grade (Senior Chief Inspector) receives £24,500 pa.

A WORM'S EYE VIEW

16. The basic question is, "What is the value added by inspection?". What difference are inspectors making to pupils and to teachers?



17. On the pupils, Dr Rhodes Boyson said earlier this month that "he found continued concern among parents of all classes, but particularly among working-class parents about academic standards, discipline and values in schools" (Times, 4 October).

(at C)
18. On the teachers, I commend to the Prime Minister's attention the attached note by the Heads of two large secondary schools in the West Midlands. Their main points about present arrangements are:

Frequency of visiting: HMI: Very variable, either a feast or a famine. LEA Advisers: Frequent visits in some subject areas (not all), which are often valuable in spite of gaps in the service.

National courses: Somewhat disappointing.

National surveys: Value may well lie before rather than after the event, ie in provoking good work because teachers know the surveys are being undertaken.

Overall comment: "HMI seem to be too specialised and their visits too fleeting and advisers too "general" for either to have the in-depth approach needed. At times both services are unable to help with contemporary issues. HMI seem to spend too much time in assessing how we have arrived where we are now, rather than discussing with Heads and their assistants where we should be going in the future."

19. Their view of the future approximates at some points with that implied by Miss Browne, but they place a much heavier emphasis on the vigorous local expression of national criteria and policies, including sufficient inspectorial scrutiny to initiate change where necessary.



HANDLING AND ISSUES

20. The Scots may be reasonably forthcoming, but it should be noted that the Scottish Office officials present are not among those pressing most strongly for the scrutiny.

21. The position of the DES and Welsh Office, especially the former, will probably be to stand pat; try and get others to make the running; and pick them off as they toil over unfamiliar ground. In particular, Miss Browne (a former don who has not taught in a school) can be expected to mount a strong defence of the status quo, backed up by chapter and verse.

22. The Prime Minister might say that the question of standards and "value for taxpayer's money" is still crucial. While Inspectors are a devoted and hard-working body, there must be a very serious question whether they are helping the education service achieve better results. She welcomes the Scottish Office proposal, but would like to take the opportunity to go into the issues more extensively:

- How far can central government guarantee good quality education provided by LEAs?
- The Inspector is an expensive and important commodity. If he has something extra which teachers and LEA advisers/inspectors do not have, what is it and how is it best deployed?
- Has the focus moved too far away from inspection of individual establishments to work of a research and development type?
- How far can and should the Inspectorates concentrate on such new problems as those of managing the big secondary school and those of multi-ethnic education?



- What should be done about persistent areas of weakness such as reading and writing among the less able?

23. To keep general discussion within bounds, the Prime Minister might want to focus on four key topics.

- a. The inspection of individual institutions:
Inspections now appear to be more for obtaining national information than for improving the performance of the particular institution inspected. Do LEA advisers/inspectors do this adequately? What is the HMI role in giving advice to Heads, LEAs and the public?
- b. Development of Heads and Deputy Heads:
Are the Education Ministers satisfied that enough is being done?
- c. Management of large establishments:
Should HMI input to this be improved? What are the implications for HMI recruitment and deployment?
- d. The curriculum:
Frightening slow progress seems to be made on this. How do Education Ministers see the HMI role developing? Can anything be done to increase effectiveness and reduce overlap with other bodies?

DESIRABLE OUTCOME

24. We recommend that approval should be given for the Scottish Office scrutiny to proceed, subject to what is said below, and the Prime Minister should resist any tendency on the part of the Scottish Delegation to cut out the independent element represented by the "Rayner label".



25. If Ministers want a study of the role of the Inspectorates as a whole, the question arises of what form it should take. The possibilities include:

a. An official inter-departmental committee:

This could cover all interests and review the full policy issues without the expense of a public enquiry (see below). But it could be ineffective without the cutting edge provided by the independence of the scrutiny approach.

b. A national public enquiry:

This would have to cover a wide area, would be very expensive and time-consuming, would involve the "stage army" of professional educators extensively and would probably achieve little.

c. A scrutiny in Scotland (as already proposed):

The idea would be that any lessons learnt would be extended to England and Wales, but the lessons could not be available before the end of May 1981 at the earliest.

d. A joint scrutiny covering all the countries:

This would be preferable to either an inter-departmental committee or a national public enquiry, being cheaper, better focussed and ensuring that the different countries did not go in different directions. It might be carried out under the Scottish Office official already named for the scrutiny (a retired Under Secretary) with an officer added to his team, to cover England and Wales.

26. We recommend the joint scrutiny. There are risks in either leaving England and Wales to wait until the end of the Scottish scrutiny or letting them loose on their own. ("Rayner" experience with DES so far has been very disappointing.)

SP

~~C~~ PRIESTLEY

29 October 1980

CONFIDENTIAL



file R6
cf Master set

10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

30 October 1980

The Prime Minister had a meeting today with your Secretary of State, and the Secretaries of State for Scotland and Wales, about the Schools Inspectorates. Sir Derek Rayner and Mr. Downey of CPRS were also present.

The discussion ranged widely over issues of educational performance, and the role and capacity of the Inspectorates in helping to achieve improvements.

As a result of the discussion, the Prime Minister concluded that the Secretary of State for Scotland should go ahead with the scrutiny he had proposed to Sir Derek Rayner. She was strongly of the opinion that a parallel scrutiny covering England and Wales would be valuable, and that the aim should be to carry this out in a similar time scale. This would enable the officials working on the two scrutinies to share their experience in the course of the exercises. She recognised that the terms of reference proposed for Scotland would not necessarily be well suited for England and Wales, and she asked Sir Derek Rayner to consult your Secretary of State and the Secretary of State for Wales quickly to establish terms of reference for the scrutiny in England and Wales.

I am sending copies of this letter to Godfrey Robson (Scottish Office), John Craig (Welsh Office) and to Gordon Downey (CPRS) and Sir Derek Rayner.

M. A. PATTISON

Peter Shaw, Esq.,
Department of Education and Science.

CONFIDENTIAL GB



ELIZABETH HOUSE,
YORK ROAD,
LONDON SE1 7PH
01- 928 9222

FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mike Pattison Esq
Private Secretary
10 Downing Street
London SW1

28 October 1980

Dear Mike

Mr Carlisle has asked me to send to you a copy of the attached paper by the SCI about the work of the Inspectorate in England.

He hopes that the Prime Minister will find this useful for the meeting on Thursday.

I am copying this to John Craig (Wales), Godfrey Robson (Scotland), G S Downey (CPRS) and, as requested, am sending Clive Priestley's copy to you for onward transmission.

Yours sincerely

Peter Shaw

P A SHAW
Private Secretary

HM INSPECTORATE IN ENGLAND

GENERAL

1. HM Inspectorate (HMI) exists to inspect and to report to the Secretary of State on the state of education in England and by its professional advice to help Government in the discharge of its responsibilities. In the course of inspection, it also seeks by advice to help those with direct responsibility for the quality of education, namely LEAs and teachers, to get better results. It has no legal powers. How and what it inspects at any time depend on policies and initiatives of the government of the day and the strength in numbers and kind of the Inspectorate.

2. The Government's policies for reducing public expenditure and for maintaining and improving the quality of education therefore provide the framework for HMI's current work. Both require a steady flow of information and advice to Ministers and the Department based on first-hand inspection; related inspection-based work with local education authorities (LEAs), institutions, teachers and agencies such as the Council for National Academic Awards or the Schools Council; and the essential contributions (Annex 1) to the work of branches of the Department of Education and Science (DES).

3. The statutory basis of inspection is in Section 77 of the Education Act 1944, which places a duty on the Secretary of State to cause inspections to be made. This Section also provides for inspection by inspectors appointed by local education authorities.

LOCAL ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS

4. Local advisers - not all of whom inspect - operate within local policies and using local norms. HMI in their inspection reflect the national policy which local authorities are required to execute under the Secretary of State's control and direction, and use national standards derived from national inspection.

In any case local advisers do not inform and advise central government and a major purpose of HMI's inspection is to assist the Secretary of State in his statutory responsibility of controlling and directing the national education service. This is particularly true in those areas like teacher supply and training where the Secretary of State and not the LEAs has the main policy function.

HMI NUMBERS

5. In the ten years since 1970, the Inspectorate's complement has been reduced from 500 to 430 and the numbers in post are for good reasons currently 418. Of these nearly 300 are for schools and teacher training and the remainder for further and higher education. Among the schools inspectors 40 are primary school specialists and 16 for special education. All HMI are specialists with a certain general competence and inspection is organised as far as possible on a specialist basis.

6. The 418 HMI have to inspect 31,000 institutions. There are good reasons for not making straight comparisons with Scotland and Wales but it is perhaps worth mentioning that Scotland has 118 HMI for 4,000 institutions and Wales 60 for 2,400. Scotland does not inspect teacher training and Wales draws on English HMI for parts of the inspection of higher and further education.

DEPLOYMENT

7. In order to serve Ministers and the Department promptly and to keep closely in touch with policy and needs, some 40 HMI are based on the Department of Education and Science. From the Senior Chief Inspector down, all these also inspect from time to time and work with LEAs. The rest are distributed throughout the country and belong to interwoven teams of territorial and specialist inspectors.

ORGANISATION OF INSPECTION

8. The Inspectorate uses the inspection tool (formal, informal, full or partial) appropriate to the task in hand. It must organise itself to keep up a perpetual review of the system, give precise service to Ministers and the Department in connection with policy or day-to-day work, take corrective action in a minority of cases and encourage good practice on as wide a scale as possible.

9. Current figures for all types of inspection are given in the Annex (2). In 1979, 20% of all primary schools, 74% of secondary, 32% of special and 30% of independent schools received an inspection visit of one kind or another; more than 90% of higher and further education institutions, including those for teacher training, and 40% of Recognised independent Further Education colleges were similarly inspected. The figures reflect the proportionate distribution of HMI and the overall numbers of institutions.

10. With 31,000 institutions and half a million teachers and lecturers, there are limits to what even the most efficient organisation of 418 inspectors could achieve. Forward programming is used to control HMI's work so that essential inspection is not disrupted by sudden demands yet these can, where necessary, be met without undue delay. All inspection visits are concerned with standards and result in discussion within the school and where necessary with the LEA. All are recorded in the school file. Formal inspections lead to a report to the Secretary of State and the LEA or a publication or both. Publications are listed in the Annex (3).

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HM INSPECTORATE (ENGLAND AND WALES) 1967-8

11. In July 1968 the Select Committee on HMI (England and Wales) recommended that the Secretary of State's duty to cause inspections to be made should be reduced to a power and that the full scale formal inspection should be discontinued "save in exceptional circumstances". The Government of the day did not entirely accept these recommendations: the statutory duty of the Secretary of State was not changed. It is also fair to say that the ordinary

HMI did not recognise the picture of their work conveyed in the Select Committee's report or accept its conclusions. The present practice is for HMI to undertake a full inspection of an establishment whenever this is in the best interest of the purpose in hand and the manpower and financial cost can be afforded. It is a good tool in a reasonably static institution and within a structured programme, is useful as a means of comparing the effects of management or expenditure patterns or of types of school system. The number of full inspections is comparable with that of 20 years ago when the Inspectorate was 475 in number, FE was smaller and published surveys were rare.

12. Recording the results of inspection is only a beginning. For improvement or change to follow in matters like the curriculum or in-service training of teachers and heads all those with responsibility from central government through LEA to teacher have to accept the evidence, commit themselves to an identified end and understand how to achieve it. It is for this reason that inspection results have been brought together in survey reports. These provide a national framework and allow national conclusions and proposals to be made in a way that is not possible on the basis of individual inspections. There is evidence that good local authorities prefer the broad evidence and stimulus of survey reports to full inspection reports.

13. How far the education service finds it helpful to receive the advice of HMI cannot be precisely assessed and advice which is unpalatable may not always be welcome. But the sales of HMI publications, the attendance at courses (Annex (4)) and meetings arranged by HMI, and the majority of unsought views suggest that the advice is widely studied. It is a fair claim that in the last 5 years the work of HMI has made a major contribution in generating LEA action on the school curriculum as a whole and on all the major subjects; teacher deployment and management; in-service training policies; and standards (particularly by drawing attention to the hazards of mixed-ability classes and directing attention to gifted children in comprehensive schools).

CURRENT PRIORITIES

14. But whatever view is taken of the advantages which the education service derives from HMI, the scale and type of HMI activity is determined by the needs of the Secretary of State in discharging his responsibilities vis-a-vis the education service. For them as for HMI the overriding task must be to take whatever steps are possible to ensure that the quality of education is maintained and necessary changes are made within the resources available. This requires continuing assessment and professional advice throughout the country and in DES on every aspect of education. It is this range of demand which HM Inspectorate's complement has to match.

15. New tasks may well be added to those listed in Annex (1). In addition, HMI has chosen to inspect a group of middle schools since it appears they are particularly expensive to staff and equip and that teachers' targets are pitched too low for the older pupils. Other necessary inspection targets are: teachers' sense of standards, particularly but not only at the top of the primary school and in the first three years of secondary school; the education of the slow learner; the quality of sixth-form work; teacher training in both its subject and professional aspects; and the corporate management of institutions by their teaching staff.

S J BROWNE

28 October 1980

A. GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND INITIATIVES AND RELATED DES OPERATIONS
REQUIRING INSPECTION AND ADVICE FROM HMI ON DETERMINED TIMESCALES

i. Cutting Public Expenditure (subsuming waste and efficiency)

School Closure Programme
Block Grant: Educational Needs Assessment
DES/Treasury Working Group
Expenditure Sub-group Education

ii. Maintaining and Improving Standards

Inner London Committee
Framework for the Curriculum
Cockcroft Committee of Enquiry into the Teaching of
Mathematics in Schools
Post-Warnock White Paper: Special Needs in Education
EC Mother Tongue Legislation
Microelectronics Programme
APU and LEA Testing Programmes
Examinations - development of a single system at 16+
consultation paper on post-16 examinations
Assisted Places Scheme
Development of suitable record/assessment for non-examination
pupils
Schools, Industry and Working Life
The Young Unemployed
Macfarlane Group: Education 16-19
Urban Programme
Home Office White Paper: Young Offenders: Truancy Conference
Consultative Planning Document on Non-Advanced Further
Education
Consultative Document on Continuing Education
Capping the Pool and Management of Higher Education
Engineering Education and Conference
Review of Teacher Training Provision and Teacher Supply: ACSET
Measures to increase the Supply of Teachers in Shortage
Subjects
Select Committee Activities
Participation in Schools Council Activities

INSPECTION FIGURES 1979 AND 1980

1. Numbers of Full Inspections

<u>Maintained</u>	<u>Numbers of institutions</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u> /
Primary	22,689	87	119
Secondary	4,092	35	39
Special	1,568	3	25
HFE*	547	9	12

/ as programmed

* includes tertiary colleges

Independent

Schools	2,337	28*	15*
FE	156	4	10

* (Note: Arrangements for recognising independent schools as efficient were discontinued on 1 April 1978. "Registration" and routine inspection continue).

2. All Forms of Inspection: Percentage of Institutions Visited

<u>Maintained</u>	<u>Numbers of institutions</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u> (2 terms only)
Primary	22,689	20%	14%
Secondary	4,092	74%	45%
Special	1,568	32%	21%
HFE	547	90%	90%
Teacher Training			
<u>Independent</u>			
Schools	2,337	30%	14%
FE	156	40%	25%

3. Delegated Functions and Other Departmental Contracts

European Schools (9): 1 HMI seconded as Head + 90 days inspection

Advanced Course Approvals: 824 course proposals processed in 1980

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u> (as programmed)
Services Schools Overseas (MOD)	12	19
Channel Islands: Schools	15	11
FE Colleges	2	2
Isle of Man Schools:	2	1

HMI PUBLICATIONS SINCE 1973 (INCLUDING THOSE FOR PUBLICATION IN 1981)

The publications fall into three groups: descriptions and assessments of standard provision; accounts of good practice; and advice based on general inspection information.

I. DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF STANDARD PROVISION

(i) Nursery and primary schools

Pre-school provision in six areas:		1973, preparatory work for the research programme following the 1972 White Paper, A Framework for Expansion.
Combined nursery centres	:	1977, a critical study of the existing nine combined day nurseries/nursery schools.
Primary education in England	:	1978, an HMI assessment of the work of a representative sample of children, with test results in reading and mathematics.
The education of children in First Schools	:	in preparation, an account of work in a selected group of schools.
The education of children in 9-13 Middle Schools	:	in preparation, and to be followed by an account of the work of children in 8-12 middle schools.

(ii) Secondary schools

Curricular differences for Boys and Girls	:	1975
Mixed ability work in comprehensive schools	:	1978, a critical account.
Careers Education in Secondary Schools	:	1973
Mathematics, Science, Modern Languages in maintained schools in England	:	1977, a paper for DES regional conferences.
Aspects of Comprehensive Education	:	1977, a paper for a DES conference.
Classics in Comprehensive Schools	:	1977)
Modern Languages in Comprehensive Schools	:	1977)
) critical accounts
Aspects of Secondary Education	:	1979, a survey of the work of a representative sample of 14 and 15 year olds in English, Mathematics, Science and personal and social developments.

Aspects of Secondary Education : 1980
supplementary information on
mathematics

Mathematics in VI Forms : in preparation

(iii) Pupils with special needs

Behavioural units : 1977, produced as a result of a
Ministerial conference.

Education of children in : 1978
Hospitals for the Mentally
Handicapped

Community Homes with Education : 1980, produced in co-operation with DHSS.

(iv) Teacher Training and Further Education

Developments in the BEd Degree : 1979
Course

The Post Graduate Certificate : in preparation
in the Public Sector

Modern Languages in Further : 1980
Education

Educational Provision for the : in preparation
Young Unemployed

II. ACCOUNTS OF GOOD PRACTICE

Ten Good Schools : 1977, accounts of some successful
secondary and special schools.

The School Curriculum and : in preparation
Working Life

Girls and Science : publication November 1980

Gifted Children in Middle and : 1977
Comprehensive Schools

Art in Junior Education : 1978

Craft, Design and Technology : 1980
some successful examples

School Technology : in preparation

Truancy and Behavioural : 1979, description of how some schools
Problems in some urban schools cope with these problems.

Community Service in Education : 1974

Actors in Schools : 1976

III. ADVICE BASED ON GENERAL INSPECTION INFORMATION

A View of the Curriculum	:	1980, at the request of Ministers.
Mathematics 5-11: a handbook of suggestions	:	1979
Curriculum 11-16 Working Papers	:	1977/79, a series of papers being used and evaluated in 41 schools in selected authorities.
School Geography in the Changing Curriculum	:	1974
The Teaching of Ideas in Geography	:	1978
The Use of Micro-Organisms in Schools	:	1977
Health Education in Schools	:	1977
Integrating Handicapped Children	:	1974
Educating Mentally Handicapped Children	:	1975
Safety in:		
Science Laboratories	:	1973
Practical Departments	:	1973
Physical Education	:	1973
Further Education	:	1976
General Advice	:	1977

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

Short Courses for Teachers

HMI mount over 100 national courses each year for serving teachers in schools and colleges and for those concerned with the educational system, such as LEA Advisers and Officers. Among current priority targets are: the school curriculum and working life; the use and significance of computers and micro-processing; the training of Heads and Heads of Department; the successful teaching of all major subjects, especially those of the "core curriculum"; the education of children with special needs.