

**EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM TO THE  
EDUCATION (SCHOOL INSPECTION) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2005**

**2005 No. 2038**

1. This explanatory memorandum has been prepared by the Department for Education and Skills and is laid before Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

2. **Description**

2.1 The Regulations complete the new inspection regime for schools set out in the Education Act 2005 (“the 2005 Act”). They prescribe the interval between inspections; who must be notified of those inspections and the period within which parents must be provided with a copy of the inspection report; and make provision for fees to be charged for providing a copy of the report in certain circumstances. Where a report of an inspection identifies that the school is causing concern the regulations provide for a time period in which the governing body or proprietor may make comments on the draft report and, on receipt of the final report, the time period in which the local education authority or proprietor must prepare a statement of action.

2.2 The Regulations also cover procedures for conducting inspections of denominational RE and collective worship in maintained schools designated as having a religious character. They prescribe who the foundation governors or governing body must consult when choosing an inspector, the intervals between inspections, the time periods for conducting an inspection and preparing a report and make provision for fees to be charged for providing a copy of the report in certain circumstances.

3. **Matters of special interest to the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments**

3.1 None

4. **Legislative Background**

2.1 The regulations are the first use of the powers under the 2005 Act. The 2005 Act revokes the School Inspections Act 1996 under which the previous regulations were made. These regulations revoke and replace the Education (School Inspection) Regulations 1997 as amended. They are made under sections 5(1)(a), 6(1)(b), 13(2)(b), 14(4)(b) and (c), 15(3)(a), 16(3)(b) and (c), 17(2)(a), 48(2) and (3), 49(1), (2) and (4)(c) and 120(2) of the Education Act 2005. These sections provide for regulations to prescribe the details of the inspection regime.

2.2 Regulation 5 prescribes the period within which the governing body or proprietor may make comments on a draft report where the inspector has concluded that the school is causing concern. The Minister of State, Lord Filkin, made a commitment that 5 working days would be the prescribed period during the Report Stage (First Day) debate on a group of amendments. These amendments received cross-party support [see Hansard Vol.669 No.40 Col.1023-1025].

## **5. Extent**

5.1 This instrument applies to England.

## **6. European Convention on Human Rights**

No statement is required.

## **7. Policy background**

7.1 The school inspection changes are an integral part of plans to establish a new relationship between government and the education profession in the context of steady improvement in educational standards and attainment over the last decade. In addition, the changes reflect the need to assess the school's contribution to the well-being of pupils brought about by the Children Act 2004 (which provides in section 20 for joint area reviews to evaluate the extent to which, taken together, the children's services being reviewed improve the well-being of children and relevant young persons). Joint area reviews start this autumn.

7.2 The aim is to lighten the inspection burden on schools, whilst at the same time improving accountability and increasing the impact of inspection on improvement. Inspections will be shorter, sharper and more frequent. They will be conducted at short notice or in exceptional circumstances at no notice. Her Majesty's Inspectors will lead many inspections and will quality assure all reports. Inspections will focus on schools' core systems and key outcomes, and will start from schools' self-evaluation evidence. Reports will be shorter and will be turned around quickly. The scope of inspections will widen to include reporting on how the needs of the range of pupils are met, and the contribution the school makes to the well-being of its pupils.

7.3 In February 2004, Ofsted conducted a major public consultation on the future of inspection for schools. The consultation covered the principles underpinning the changes described above. A total of 1,377 responses from teachers, governors, parents, pupils, local education authorities and others were received. The results were published in June 2004 in the joint DfES/Ofsted publication<sup>1</sup>. These showed that average support for each consultation question was 77% and average opposition was 9%.

7.4 Working in 15 local education authority areas, Ofsted will have conducted over 200 trial inspections by the end of the summer term 2005. The trial inspections have been used to test out the new framework and the inspection arrangements. Evidence from the trials (March 2005) shows that: 98% of headteachers are satisfied that the inspection will help the school move forward (under the current system – 75%); 95% believe that the benefits of the inspection outweigh the negative effects (under the current system 60%); and 78% believe the new model reduced stress.

7.5 Ofsted has also been working with focus groups of parents with a view to ensuring that the reporting arrangements for school inspections meet their needs. Parents' views have influenced the structure and content of inspection reports. Parents are the primary audience for these new style reports.

---

<sup>1</sup> [A New Relationship with Schools](#)

7.6 Draft Regulations were submitted to the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee during the passage of the Education Bill and were also shared with opposition spokespersons and others at that time. No concerns were raised at that time.

7.7 Evidence from Ofsted's Future of Inspection Consultation shows that 74% of respondents fully or partially supported a move to more frequent but shorter inspections. Evidence from the trial inspections shows that schools have been able to distribute the report to parents within 5 working days and have not raised concerns about this timescale.

7.8 The Department consulted with a group of 20 local education authorities on a range of matters including the period within which a statement of action should be prepared following a judgement that special measures or significant improvement is required. There were mixed views on whether 10 working days was sufficient for this purpose. Some felt that this period was too short, others that the judgement should not come as a surprise and plans to support improvement should already be in development. The Department considers that 10 working days from receipt of the final inspection report is appropriate given that: it is in the interest of children at the school that prompt action is taken; the local authority will have received notice of the decision as soon as it has been confirmed; and the local authority should be aware of issues facing the school and should already be developing plans to support improvement.

7.9 The Department has consulted and communicated with representatives of all the faith groups affected by the legislation and many have fed into the development of the statutory provisions for inspection of denominational religious education and collective worship in schools designated as having a religious character. Those groups have, for example, suggested the persons listed in regulation 9. They have been keen to mirror where appropriate the new Ofsted school inspection arrangements including shorter and frequent inspections based on self-evaluation.

## **8. Impact**

A Regulatory Impact Assessment was prepared to support the Education Bill. The section covering school inspection is attached to this memorandum.

## **9. Contact**

John Malynn at the Department for Education and Skills Tel: 020 7925 6572 or e-mail: [john.malynn@dfes.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:john.malynn@dfes.gsi.gov.uk) can answer any queries regarding the instrument.

## EXTRACT FROM RIA ACCOMPANYING THE EDUCATION BILL PROVISIONS TO REFORM THE SCHOOL INSPECTION SYSTEM

### Purpose and Intended Effect

#### Objectives

The bill will enact the changes required in primary legislation to implement reforms to the role of Ofsted in school inspection. These reforms are intended to establish a lighter touch regime of inspection which places self-evaluation at the heart of the changes.

These proposals were first published by Ofsted in their consultation document *The Future of Inspection*<sup>2</sup>. The proposals reflect Ofsted's support for the Government's strategy of establishing a new relationship with schools, through a reformed system of inspection and accountability.

Much of the impact of these proposals is confined to the public sector (that is, maintained schools). Even within the public sector, requirements are to be removed that are no longer practical under the proposed new regime and which have been considered a burden in many cases.

In order that the proposed reforms are implemented there are consequential changes to the role of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI). These will have an impact on the market for inspection and on those contractors and independent inspectors who undertake school inspection work in this market.

In summary, the provisions will:

- Make Her Majesty's Chief Inspector (HMCI) accountable for all reports and responsible for all inspections
- Involve a greater number of HMI in routine school inspections
- Remove the requirement to tender from contractors for each school inspection
- Remove the requirement on HMCI to maintain a register of authorised inspectors
- Provide for shorter, sharper, more frequent inspection, with less notice
- Enable HMCI to constitute inspection teams as he/she sees fit. This will remove the requirement for lay inspectors to be included in the inspection team
- Repeal the requirement for a parents' meeting during an Ofsted inspection
- Repeal the requirement for Ofsted to meet with governors during an inspection
- Improve and simplify the current arrangements for schools causing concern

#### Background

---

<sup>2</sup> The consultation paper can be found on Ofsted's website at <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=pubs.summary&id=3566>

### The market for inspection

At present, all maintained schools in England are inspected at least once every six years by teams of independent inspectors who are recruited, assessed and registered by Ofsted. These inspectors are engaged to carry out the inspections by inspection providers (contractors) who are under contract to Ofsted. The inspection providers are involved in training and deploying teams and in supporting inspection arrangements by scheduling and quality assuring the inspections and reports.

There is in the current legislation a duty upon HMCI to promote efficiency in the conduct and reporting of inspection by encouraging competition in the provision of services by registered inspectors. This has led to the current procurement arrangements where the award of contracts is subject to annual competitive tendering. Contractors have to meet prescribed requirements before tendering and their performance is monitored.

Over the 12 years of Ofsted's work, the role and extent of the market has changed. In 1996 there were 250 contractors, most of whom were very small businesses or sole traders (as registered inspectors) who were asked to tender for each inspection. Since 1997, there have been reductions in the numbers of contractors but increases in the value and size of the contracts awarded, with more functions passed to contractors, more use of information technology and better business efficiencies (e.g. tendering electronically). There are now 23 active inspection providers, including major public sector partners, who have arranged over 4000 school inspections in the current academic year at a value of about £68million using about 72,000 inspector days.

### Responsibility of HMCI

Currently, an inspector's independence is enshrined in law and neither Ofsted nor inspection providers have any responsibility or exercise any control over the conduct of inspections or the final report. The inspectors are generally self employed and may work in a range of educational initiatives, often to a number of contractors. This has led to inconsistencies in quality control over final reports, leading to a risk of loss of confidence in the inspection system.

The provisions of existing legislation oblige HMCI to arrange inspections using independent inspectors, and only where he considers it expedient to do so can he make use of a member of the Inspectorate (Ofsted).

### Notice period of a forthcoming inspection

Current legislation places a duty on inspectors to consult with each school before an inspection and for the school to arrange a parents' meeting. It is common practice for inspectors to give advance notice of between six and ten school weeks of the inspection. This means that a school to be inspected in September will be notified in June. There is strong evidence that schools use this period to 'get their house in order', undertaking large amounts of work, adding to the burden on the school.

### **Risk assessment**

### The market for inspection

Although there have been major improvements in the efficacy of the inspection provider market, there is still a degree of duplication and lack of private sector investment because of the short term nature of the contractual relationships. Changes in procurement practices are not dependent upon changes in legislation but the coincident timing is beneficial.

### Responsibility of HMCI

There is at present an inconsistency of approach. Where HMI inspect schools, HMCI is responsible for the report of those inspections, but where schools are inspected under s10 by independent inspectors there is no ownership by HMCI and the reports are the legal responsibility of the lead inspector. At present where a report by an independent inspector is found to be flawed, there is no legal basis for Ofsted to amend the report. The proposal that HMCI becomes responsible for all inspection conducted by Ofsted removes that inconsistency.

Following the Education (Schools) Act 1992 the role of HMI in Ofsted was largely to train new inspectors and monitor their work. Since then, the inspection of FE Colleges, survey work and school improvement work has grown significantly and increasingly Ofsted has used a mixed economy of inspectors to carry out the work. Given the specialist skills sought in inspectors there is little rationale in continuing to use independent inspectors exclusively in school inspections, but not to make use of the resources directly available.

### Notice

Ofsted's recent consultation has indicated that most stakeholders would welcome reduced notice. Parents see that with the current notice periods, schools are too prepared for inspection and are not seen as they really are. Schools feel that the pressure of 10 school weeks of notice induces stress and adds to the burden of inspection. Although the inspection process does not require it, many schools spend the notice period preparing documents and policies, and this time should be spent in providing education for children.

### **Options**

#### Option i).

Do nothing. Given the legal advice received, Ofsted does not envisage the possibility of being able to use significant numbers of HMI on inspections without the legislative changes sought. Nor would this option lead to any improvements in the delivery of public services.

#### Option ii).

Existing HMI would be appointed as managing inspectors for all inspections within a given geographical area. The managing inspectors would exercise oversight of these inspections whether or not they were on the inspection team. Teams would comprise independent inspectors, recruited, trained, scheduled and supported by contractors and on some inspections, HMI. A smaller number of contractors are envisaged, working on a geographical basis to support the managing inspectors and with overall control resting with the managing inspector. Reports will be prepared by the lead inspector and cleared for publication by the managing inspector.

#### Option iii).

Bringing all inspections in-house, either by enlisting inspectors as permanent staff or as 'attached' inspectors. This would entail the removal of the market from HMCI's work, a very large expansion and restructuring of Ofsted and the risk of losing the contractors' expertise in preparing for and organising inspections. This route would also run counter to the Government's intention to invest in front line staff while reducing back office functions as part of the Efficiency Review. This option would not allow any opportunity for the improvements in quality and value for money generally associated with competition.

## **Costs and Benefits**

### **Sectors affected**

These provisions apply only to England. The main impact of the proposals in the public sector will be on Ofsted and on maintained schools. In the private sector, contractors for inspections and individual independent inspectors will be affected by the proposed arrangements.

### **Costs / Benefits**

Option i).

This option would not result in changes in the role of HMI or allow the proposed reforms for inspection. Inspection would therefore continue in line with current costs, diminishing the potential for efficiency savings to be made.

Option ii).

Ofsted anticipates that direct savings of a minimum of £10m each year will be generated by the total package of changes planned (for example, frequency and duration of inspection).

In practice and perception the inspection process is already HMCI's responsibility. Quality assurance and quality control costs will be slightly less than at present because they will be within the direct control of the managing inspector who will have responsibility for all the inspections in his or her area. The benefit will be that all inspections carried out will be the responsibility of HMCI. This will be clearer and prevent the risk of publication of reports which do not fully meet quality requirements (this risk exists at present).

The proposed changes will offer better value for money than either option i). or option iii). Running costs for the inspection system will be reduced directly under the new arrangements and it is anticipated that further efficiency savings will be possible through the revised delivery structure and proposed new procurement arrangements. Option ii) retains private sector involvement and competition, ensuring risks are not transferred back to the public sector and that best use is made of the strengths of the private sector. The contractor costs of the proposed system will be reduced, though it is not possible to quantify the extent of the reduction at present.

The removal of the register for inspectors is expected to save Ofsted the costs of the deregistration process. There are about two de-registrations per year at present and inspectors who are to be de-registered are able to take their case to a tribunal and to an adjudicator. The cost of the appeals process is offset to a large extent however by the current registration fee of £150 per inspector.

Option iii).

The inspector cost per inspection would not be significantly different if all inspections were to be brought in house through a large increase to Ofsted's workforce (perhaps up to 2,000 additional employees – an increase of 80% on current Ofsted staff numbers). However, there would be reduced flexibility in Ofsted's resourcing strategy as well as considerable operational risks which, under present proposals (option ii.), would be transferred to the market. Ofsted's overhead costs would necessarily increase to support a larger workforce, at a time when the public sector is under pressure to reduce back office function. There would be major IT development costs and potentially increased costs in travel for a workforce which is currently to a large extent home based. To meet the demand of additional 2000 members of Ofsted staff, the workforce would have to come from the existing field of private sector educational consultants, many of whom cover many roles in education and include serving head teachers. The additional management and infrastructure required for 2000 specialist staff is likely to be a major issue.

### Other Costs / Savings (Public Sector)

The new inspection arrangements will have most impact on schools, by reducing the actual time spent in preparation for, participating in and following up the inspection.

The demands that Ofsted currently places on schools in preparing for an inspection are much reduced from the requirements for the initial cycle of Ofsted inspections. Under the planned arrangements, the demands will decrease further. The only document which schools will be required to supply in advance of the inspection is the new self evaluation form. The self evaluation process which will replace the current forms S1-4 is a tool to support schools' own management and they will find it valuable to be able to use this tool throughout the year. The table below shows the extent of the reduced demand for documentation.

<b>Documents schools were required to submit before the start of the inspection</b>	
<b>1993-5</b>	<p><b>The very first Inspection Handbook asked for all documentation in the following categories:</b></p> <p><i>completed Head teacher's Form and statement</i></p> <p><i>policies and written procedures</i></p> <p><i>details of the curriculum and timetables</i></p> <p><i>copies of information the school sends to parents, including the prospectus</i></p> <p><i>management documents including the schools development plan, budgetary information, minutes of staff and governing body meetings, any staff handbook and details of staff job descriptions</i></p> <p><i>any achievement data not included with the Head teacher's Form, such as data on prior attainment, value added information and the results of standardised tests</i></p>
<b>2003-4</b>	<p><b>The current Inspection Handbooks ask for:</b></p> <p>completed forms s1-4</p> <p>the school's current development or management plan</p> <p>the prospectus or school brochure</p> <p>the most recent LEA monitoring report on the school's progress against its targets</p>



<b>Documents schools were required to submit before the start of the inspection</b>	
	the school's timetable plan of the school
<b>Proposals for 2005</b>	completed self-evaluation form

Regular surveys are undertaken by Ofsted to check schools' views about the demands placed upon them. In the first survey in 1996-97, just 43% of teachers felt that the demands for documentation and information were reasonable. In 2002-03 this figure was 80%. Surveys undertaken during the first 48 trials of the new inspection model (option ii) show 88% are satisfied with the demands for information and documentation.

When the system was introduced in 1993, schools were given up to a year's notice of the inspection and it was assumed that they were required to provide a wide range of documents prior to the inspection. Schools often went to great lengths to prepare for inspection. This could involve anything from a 'mock' inspection carried out by the LEA or a consultant, to a complete rewrite of all of the school's policies. In effect, the work of the school was put on hold until the inspection was over. It proved difficult to convince schools and LEAs that most of this work was unnecessary and often stressful for teachers.

Over time, as schools became more confident and realised that inspectors focused on practice rather than policy, staff spent less time engaged in activities of this sort. They knew what to expect and they focused on preparing materials for lessons and preparing files for interviews about subject and departmental work. This generally took less time, but again the range varied from school to school.

The new inspection methodology makes even fewer demands on schools. Changes that are being proposed take full account of the need to keep bureaucracy at a minimum. By reducing the notice schools are given of their inspection to between two and five days, there is no opportunity to make elaborate preparations for inspection. There are no exact figures for the amount of time schools used to prepare for inspection, but a head teachers' union, colleagues from LEAs and HMI agree that the estimates given below give a fair reflection of the situation.

<b>Estimated average amount of time in days spent preparing for inspection</b>			
<b>Schools</b>			
	Staff meetings* (at least 1 hour long)	Inset days	Personal time (evenings and weekends)
<b>1994</b>	60	5	30 hours per person
<b>2003</b>	20	1	10
<b>Proposal for 2005</b>	1	0	0

The move to shorter inspections will also result in a reduced burden in schools. The table below shows the progressive picture of how the number of inspector days has decreased and

will further decrease under the new system (NB inspector-day refers to one inspector in school for one day).

<b>Allocation of inspection days spent in schools</b>						
	<b>Primary</b>		<b>Secondary</b>		<b>Special</b>	
	Pupils	Days	Pupils	Days	Pupils	Days
<b>1994</b>	240	12	600	45	12	16
<b>2003</b>	240	11	600	36	12	14
<b>Proposal for 2005</b>	240	4	600	7	12	5

This means head teachers will have less interruption in their work and school governors will have less disruption to manage.

Linked to this, inspectors will spend less time observing lessons so the distraction of an inspector in the class will reduce. Those observations that do take place will be targeted and based on analysis of the school's own performance management systems. The extent of this change is demonstrated below.

<b>Average number of lesson visits per teacher during full inspections</b>			
	Primary	Secondary	Special
<b>2000</b>	5.26	3.06	6.14
<b>2003</b>	3.55	2.4	3.62
<b>Pilot 04*</b>	1.5	0.38	1.24

### **Equity and Fairness**

The proposed changes are consistent with reducing the burden of bureaucracy for all schools and do not disproportionately affect schools in different performance categories. The proposals promote equity and fairness in the quality of provision for pupils through the reduction in the period between inspections and the reduction of the notice period, both of which are intended to give parents and pupils a more immediate and realistic picture of the quality of provision in the school.

The school inspection system will maintain its transparency under the proposed arrangements with enhanced quality assurance and quality control through changes to the role of HMCI.

### **Small Firms Impact Test**

The proposals in the bill that relate to the reform of the school inspection regime and the role of HMI will have impact for contractors and self-employed independent inspectors involved in the inspection process. Details of the nature and extent of the impact are given under the options set out above. Consultation has taken place with those contractors and inspectors affected by the proposed changes and the response has been generally supportive of the new measures, welcoming the possibility of longer contracts and greater stability for private sector bodies involved in school inspection.

In the academic year 2004/05 the market of contractors comprises 23 providers, of whom six could be considered medium sized companies, providing about 200-300 inspections each in the year. A further seven companies are small firms, each delivering between 50 and 150 inspections in the year. These companies are active in other education areas, e.g. training and consultancy; they generally employ less than 20 employees, and secure inspectors on a freelance basis. The remaining companies (ten) provide small numbers of inspections in the year, are partnerships or associations of small groups of individuals, employing two or three people. The partners often carry out inspections themselves, as registered inspectors. Ofsted is keen not to lose the skills and experience that small and medium enterprises bring to their business and have specifically allowed for their inclusion as sub-contractors, joint bidders or under mergers in the procurement process.

All the contractors have rigorous quality assurance procedures (some to ISO 9000 standard), and have been encouraged to increase business efficiencies so as not to rely 100% on Ofsted as a revenue base. The application of the competitive tendering process over the last 7 years has seen a reduction in the number of contractors and this is an accepted part of Ofsted's business.

The market responded to a survey in 2003, which showed that the majority of tenderers had confidence in the integrity of the tender process. In the event that the services of the small providers are lost as a result of tender, this will not cause critical loss to Ofsted.

The Small Business Service has been consulted and agrees with the findings in this stage of the Small Firms Impact Test. The Small Business Service has therefore confirmed that there is no requirement to carry out Stage 2 of the test.

### **Competition Assessment**

In accordance with Office of Fair Trading guidelines, consideration has been given to the potential impact of the proposals on competition.

Under Option (ii) contractors who are able to offer the breadth and depth of inspection services sought under the proposed arrangements will be in a more advantageous position than others and contractors will need to have significant corporate and financial strength to support the longer, more valuable contracts. It is anticipated that some service organisations not currently represented may want to tender, and this may give opportunities for mergers and partnerships with small inspection contractors.

The market of inspection providers has proved to be effective and efficient in key areas of inspection services such as recruiting, managing and scheduling independent inspectors, scheduling inspections, and the provision of administrative support. These strengths should be enhanced within Ofsted's overall control, and within the move to longer contracts with fewer than the current number of contractors operating on a regional basis. This would increase business opportunity. As a result of the advertisement in "Government Opportunities", there are sufficient levels of competition in all the regions. After the initial contract award, contract and contractor management will ensure that the promises made in tenders are delivered, and an intelligent customer approach as envisaged by the Office of Government Commerce (OGC) will keep the opportunities for future competition open.

Option (i) retains the current competition. Option (iii) would remove the competition for service contracts with Ofsted but would open up recruitment opportunities for existing

contracted inspectors to seek employment in Ofsted as part of the increased pool of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI).

### **Consultation**

Ofsted published a consultation document *The Future of Inspection* on 10 February 2004. It outlined proposals for changes to the school inspection regime, leading to a reformed system of accountability in schools, a reduced bureaucratic burden and an increased emphasis on improvement where school inspections reveal deficiencies in one or more areas.

There has been extensive consultation with teachers, teacher unions, head teachers, governors, parents and other stakeholders in the inspection process. Respondents to the consultation are very supportive of its main themes and welcome the shift of emphasis in the inspection process towards self-evaluation and intelligent accountability. The move to make HMCI responsible for all inspection reports and for increased HMI involvement has been well received by teachers and head teachers, with the perception that this will significantly improve the consistency of inspections and the quality of reporting.

Meetings were held between Ofsted and all its current contractors during the period of consultation. Contractors generally supported the move to sharper more focused inspections with less notice to schools. They noted the need for effective planning, scheduling, management and administration and offer proven skills in these areas. They welcomed the opportunity for longer, more strategic partnership contracts, and pressed the need for good preparation for schools in implementing these arrangements.

In relation to the proposals for regional operation, those contractors who currently provide a small number of inspections, often to high quality were concerned about their potential to participate in the market. They sought and gained assurances that if the proposals are implemented, there will be opportunities for consortia bids and for sub-contracting. Ofsted's view is that the proposed contracting arrangements will best be met by a range of public sector service suppliers, and that those who offer the breadth (in terms of capacity to inspect and corporate infrastructures) and depth (in terms of experience in phases of education, including SEN), whether delivered by a consortium, sub-contractor relationships or a stand-alone company, would be best placed to bid. Contractors also stressed their concerns over the ability for inspectors to earn a reasonable livelihood if they are only inspecting for one or two days a week. Some contractors anticipated employing inspectors for a range of duties, including but not limited to inspection, so that the inspectors would continue to be available.

### **Monitoring and Review**

In preparation for the implementation of proposals (because of the long lead time to develop inspection materials and to train inspectors), pilot inspections testing the involvement of HMI are underway. These are being carefully monitored and more pilots will involve independent inspectors in future. The revised inspection arrangements will be kept under review as the duty of HMCI to keep the system of inspecting schools under review will remain in place.

### **Summary and Recommendation**

In order to ensure that the proposed changes to the school inspections system are implemented, DfES and Ofsted have concluded that the proposed legislative changes under Option ii). are necessary to achieve these reforms. The proposals form an important contribution to the implementation of a New Relationship with Schools while also supporting the objectives of the Efficiency Review with a significant reduction in the overall cost of school inspection.

Changes to the role of HMI in school inspections will have impact on private sector contractors and independent inspectors. However, the changes are intended to promote better working practices in partnership with the private sector and to maximise the effectiveness of the private sector contribution in school inspection while improving consistency and quality in the inspection process.