

Summary of Ofsted 2019

Please note – I had no timetabled lessons on day 1. I assumed that I would meet the inspector focusing on English to share my view of the department, our curriculum and strengths and weaknesses. Then I assumed we would observe some lessons and discuss what we'd seen. That wasn't quite how it went!

The day:

- Went straight into lessons at 08.30 and, in the first period, visited 3 classes. After each class, we discussed what we'd seen on the way to the next lesson. P1 was a KS3 focus as this was what was on. Questioning was very direct, but still couldn't get a sense of what she was looking for or expecting.
- I was instructed not to interact with the students besides asking to check their books etc.
- In each classroom I was given a list of students that I had to invite to a feedback panel later that morning. These were **all** PP students and a mixture of boys and girls. They were asked to bring their books from that lesson, and from their other teacher (if it was a split class).
- P2 was a repeat of P1, but with a focus on KS4. Students were selected on a similar basis (PP and gender mix).
- P3 student feedback panel. First half KS3 (Year 8 and 7) and second half KS4 (Y10). Heavy focus on whether lessons had clear aims and intent. Direct questioning as to whether English was more/less difficult than last year – especially drilling the Year 7s on this (how and why). But also phrased 'or about the same?'. Felt a little leading... Also lots of focus on grammar and whether this was taught explicitly (again linking to the progression from KS2). Asked what pupils liked about English and for 'better ifs' as well. Books that were brought were left behind.
- P4 more observations (trying to get some KS5). Didn't ask for student panels for KS5. The aim wasn't to see as many teachers as possible. In fact, some were observed 2 or 3 times in that first day and some not seen at all. Continuation of quick-fire questions between classrooms.
- P4 part 2 – work scrutiny. There wasn't much time but we went through the books that the (predominantly PP) pupils had left from the panel. Key areas of focus were: discrepancies and inconsistencies between amounts of work and presentation of work. Checking to see if schemes of work were being followed. Didn't really look at marking/feedback. Wanted to see extended writing, explicit SPAG work and explicit stretch and challenge. There were also questions raised on the quantity and quality of work in books for the same student but with different teachers (mainly KS4 splits between those delivering Lang and those delivering Lit).
- Lunch – meeting. I was asked lots of questions about: curriculum, setting, progression from KS2. Sat at my computer and had to pull up data for classes, examples of schemes of work, and tracking sheets to show how our assessments were being used. Heavy focus on intent – the one scheme of work she looked at was picked at random by her (using our curriculum overview). She wanted to see explicit reference to rationales, intent, progression from prior learning and to subsequent learning, stretch and challenge and differentiation opportunities. Although our curriculum overview sheets contain a lot of this info, she implied that it should be on the individual unit as well.

Questions about setting were based around gender balance. She had seen a bottom set Y8 group which was boy-heavy. I was asked to pull up the Y8 FFT data so that I could prove that a) we had a boy-heavy Y8 and b) that we had a boy-heavy 'bottom end' with regards to entry data. Everything was challenged!

Massive questions over the policy of teaching Y7 in mixed ability groups.

P5 she met with the rest of the inspection team. She advised me to prepare for the debrief (which was taking place after school). I was told to bring the books to the meeting. During the meeting she held up examples of books to highlight the inconsistencies that she had identified.

The meeting itself did not contain any questioning. It was a debrief, but very blunt and to the point. Not rude though. The emphasis was more on the negatives than what we were doing as a department to make the required

improvements. It was quite disheartening for some of the team. She did offer the opportunity for questions at the end, but nobody had anything to say.

Main targets from the feedback session were:

- Lack of pace and rigor
- Inconsistencies – high expectations
- Knowing what students can already do in Y6
- Curriculum planning – good on superficial level but needs replicating in SOWs
- Clearer evidence of knowing and remembering over time
- Setting – especially Y7 mixed ability – is ineffective in some cases
- Interleaving needs to be evident
- Students need to be reading aloud in class
- Key terms for units of work need to be evident.