

Response ID ANON-WP87-KBFT-W

Submitted to **Monitoring inspection consultation**

Submitted on **2016-11-21 15:16:29**

Introduction

What is your name?

Name:

Nuala O'Donnell

What is the name of your organisation?

Organisation:

The Irish National Teachers' Organisation

What is your email address?

Email:

nodonnell@into.ie

What is your school/organisation address?

Street Address:

23/24 College Gardens

Town/City:

Belfast

Postcode:

BT9 6BS

Please indicate in which capacity you are responding:

Other (please specify below)

Other::

Recognised Teachers' Union

Page 1

The Monitoring Inspection will enable an even more proportionate approach to inspections by ETI?

Strongly Disagree

The foci of the Monitoring Inspection are appropriate.

Strongly Disagree

ETI stress that schools/organisations should not spend time preparing for inspection. The focus at all times should be on monitoring and improving standards for learners. Therefore 48 hours notice is adequate for a Monitoring Inspection.

Strongly Disagree

Additional Comments::

INTO are opposed to yet another unnecessary layer of inspections. 'Monitoring Inspections' is simply a demonstration of a lack of trust in schools by the ETI and the education system as a whole. The old adage, 'a watched pot never boils' springs to mind here. Currently the DI can, and do, undertake 'incidental district visits' to a school with less than '48 hours notice'. These visits enable the DI to inform ETI on prioritisation of inspections but crucially also potentially enable the DI to support the school in dissemination of good practice. Introducing another layer of inspections to the DI will reduce the time available to support schools and place further tensions and mistrust between schools and DIs.

In the current high stakes inspection climate 48 hours for any inspection is simply not acceptable. Whilst ETI may claim that 'schools should not spend time preparing for inspections', the emphasis on evidence required contradicts this claim.

Page 2

Monitoring Inspections should be carried out over a period of up to two days (normally by the District Inspector).

Strongly Disagree

The Monitoring Inspection should have a short published report indicating the outcome of the inspection to inform parents and stakeholders.

Strongly Disagree

Additional Comments::

There should be no 'Monitoring Inspection' at all, and there should certainly not be any published report. It is clear that the focus of the ETI and the DE in supporting this proposal is not on raising standards but rather continually inspecting them. Another old adage comes to mind 'weighing the pig doesn't make it fatter'. One of the recommendations of the Education Committee Inquiry Report states 'the DI ...should be allocated sufficient District Time to allow adequate provision of pastoral support for schools.' Instead of implementing the recommendations of the Assembly Education Committee, the ETI, in direct contradiction, are trying to impose yet another layer of bureaucracy, increased workload for schools with less pastoral support, none of which is conducive to raising standards.

Page 3

It is appropriate that the lines of enquiry on the Monitoring Inspection should be around:

enquiry - The quality of learning and teaching:

Strongly Disagree

enquiry - Action to promote improvement:

Strongly Disagree

enquiry - Standards, progress and achievement:

Strongly Disagree

Additional Comments::

This is clearly an inspection, done on the cheap, using one inspector instead of a team. Rather than seeking to increase the number of inspections schools face, the ETI would be better placed inputting their time and energies into contributing to the raising of standards in schools by implementing the recommendations of the Education Committee's Inquiry report. 'specifically two school inspection reports should be produced – the first should be a detailed, formative inspection report which would be made available to the school only...'. This additional report would be useful to schools but the ETI have to date ignored this recommendation.

Page 4

The outcome of the Monitoring Inspection should inform the next inspection activity.

Strongly Disagree

The conclusions associated with the Monitoring Inspection are appropriate.

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Disagree

Page 5

The organisation's completion of the safeguarding proforma is a suitable basis for the scrutiny of safeguarding during the inspection.

Strongly Disagree

Safeguarding issues that emerge during the course of the inspection may change the focus to that of safeguarding. In turn, this may trigger a six week follow-up visit for ETI to monitor and report on the school's progress towards addressing the safeguarding issues.

Strongly Disagree

Additional Comments::

While the INTO recognises the importance of addressing safeguarding issues, it is opposed to the introduction of another unnecessary form of inspection, 'Monitoring Inspection'.

If there are safeguarding issues in the school the DI should be able to raise these with the school and within ETI without the need for a formal inspection. Also issues of a safeguarding nature should be raised immediately with the school/ Board of Governors/ Employing Authorities without waiting for an inspection.

Page 6

If you have any further comments or suggestions please enter them in the box provided below:

further comments:

The stated aim of the proposed 'Monitoring Inspection' is to evaluate the extent to which the school is using the process of self evaluation. INTO understands that

the focus of TTI is on self evaluation which would be reflected in all school inspections. It therefore cannot see the need for an additional inspection for this purpose.

The ETI claim that Key stakeholders 'agree that inspections by the ETI should be more proportionate to risk with more frequent, shorter inspection activities.' ETI provides no evidence to support this statement and INTO, based on feedback from members, completely refutes this claim.