



Education inspection framework 2019: inspecting the substance of education consultation

NSEAD response

Proposal 1: introduction of 'quality of education' judgement

We welcome the focus on quality of education. Bringing leadership and teaching judgements together recognises the importance of leadership in the curriculum. The expectation that leaders will support and develop teachers in the classroom is also welcome given the erosion of CPD opportunities for teachers in Art, Craft & Design. This is very important at key stage 1-2 where foundations subjects in ITE are afforded very little time to gain subject knowledge (22 Feb 2017: nsead.org/APPG/papers.aspx 'Today on average a student teacher is allocated an average of two sessions' Dr Peter Gregory). Also 'Developing Great Subject Teaching, Wellcome Trust', 16 May 2018 (nsead.org/APPG/papers.aspx) The Wellcome Trust reported: 'subject-specific CPD is effective in raising attainment and retaining subject teachers'.

We believe that the references in the framework to high-quality inclusive education based on shared values, is very positive. The key here is inclusive and for all – provision without strong Art, Craft and Design (ACD) CANNOT be said to meet the needs of all learners. Where it is not in place, we would expect to see that noted with recommendations to develop in inspection reports.

We agree that it is critical that 'leaders focus on improving staff's subject, pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge to enhance the teaching of the curriculum and the appropriate use of assessment. The practice and subject knowledge of staff should be built up and improve over time: 'The 2015-16 NSEAD Survey Report' revealed that teachers at both Primary and Secondary level are receiving minimal subject-specific CPD. We maintain that quality CPD is key, and this should not be limited to in-house or within multi academy trusts – external input is crucial if staff are to build confidence and subject knowledge over time.

We are pleased to see that there is a focus on broader vision and that the proposed School Handbook challenges the narrowing of curriculum and the disproportionate impact on disadvantaged pupils. The 2015-16 NSEAD Survey Report found that options for high and low achieving pupils had indeed narrowed at key stage 4 (KS4). Our respondents were clear that the Ebacc was a strong contributing factor. The focus on Intent should go some way to redressing this. Narrowing of the curriculum at key stage 3 (KS3) is limiting life chances – we would like to see Inspectors challenge provision that does not allow pupils to explore their interest and aptitude in Art & Design at every key stage.

The reference to ‘cultural capital’ is also welcome – particularly given the barriers that exist for so many children and young people. We believe that this is an entitlement for all young people and that Art, Craft and Design experiences are an essential element in building ‘cultural capital’. We would like to see definition of cultural capital that makes it explicit that all areas of the national curriculum should be part of that definition, including for those schools exempt from the National Curriculum. We ask how ‘cultural capital’ will be defined?

The requirement for coherent planning and sequencing, that prepares pupils for future learning and employment is particularly important given the changing nature of employment and the skills that will be needed. The booming creative economy and the increasing impact of AI mean that creative thinking, problem solving and making skills will be at a premium in the future employment markets. Well informed careers advice and guidance are an important element of this preparation. In the light of Amanda Spielman’s comments last year suggesting that there are limited employment routes for Creative Arts students leaving FE provision, this is a concern. We would ask, will Inspectors be up to date and briefed about current and potential employment routes into the creative sector? If these judgements are dependent of referencing local job markets, direct from Level 2 qualification, this would be of real concern. The recent London Economics report ‘Understanding the limitations of graduate outcomes metrics in higher education’ highlights what a complex area this is, and the impact it has on educational policy at all stages in the pipeline: <https://www.guildhe.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Understanding-the-limitations-of-graduate-outcome-metrics-in-higher-education-18-09-2018->

The expectation that providers will teach the full range of subjects is very welcome. We hope that this will mean an active focus on the impact of reduced KS3 on pupils’ entitlement? We wonder if the introduction of T levels and potential early identification of pathways has been considered?

We believe that it is vital that teachers have good knowledge of the subject(s) and courses they teach and that leaders provide effective support for those teaching outside their main areas of expertise. We would like to see teaching outside area of expertise discouraged at KS3 and KS4. This is an issue where Design & Technology teachers are being called upon to teach Art & Design and vice versa. These are distinct curriculum areas, with very distinct progression routes through GCSE, A Level and entry to Higher Education. Where they are treated as interchangeable, students are at serious disadvantage, with progression routes compromised. KS1 & 2 providers should be challenged to include effective CPD for Art and

Design teaching. For all phases, strong subject leadership should be encouraged, with adequate CPD, resources, and allowances.

We welcome the emphasis on teacher judgement to plan how they will design and deliver their curriculum, responding to learners not following inappropriate whole school or other approaches where they do not enhance learning. However, an emphasis on knowledge without a skills context is not helpful for practice-based learning that is the basis of Art & Design education.

A learner-focused environment, designed by specialist teachers is the ideal, and we are pleased to see that it is a feature of the framework. In our subject this means well-equipped and resourced classrooms and studios, with technician support at secondary and beyond. This means that pupils can learn about a wide range of processes and techniques and have the learning environment that will enable this. Technician support is essential to support this without creating unnecessary workload.

We agree with the need to ensure that 'learners develop detailed knowledge and skills across the curriculum and, as a result, achieve well.' Learners' progress in their Art and Design learning should be adequately recorded. We seek reassurance that impact is also measured not only in national tests but also in ensuring young people are accessing a broad and balanced curriculum even in subjects that are not measured by national tests. In making judgements about learner's achievement, it is important that inspectors know what quality in Art, Craft and Design looks like, and that the indicators they are working with are sufficiently nuanced to guide their judgements

Proposal 2: separation of judgements

We welcome the focus on pupil engagement and value of their education. The culture of the school and status accorded to learning in different subjects has a real impact on how those subjects are perceived. We would like inspectors to challenge where they see school leaders not giving status to Art, Craft & Design learning (and therefore limiting opportunities for pupils to gain 'cultural capital').

We welcome a broader perspective on how schools might consider the places and space where curriculum is provided. We would welcome this as a place where Art, Craft and Design can be explored and individual interests pursued – e.g. within arts award, enrichment, flexible curriculum, learning off-site, local partnerships, after school clubs, special projects, but not as a replacement for the formal curriculum. This is also a real opportunity to re-consider assumptions about 'academic', 'technical' or 'vocational'. We hope that schools and inspectors will be mindful that the arts and creative subjects are academic – too often arts and design fall into technical and vocational and that this false division must be challenged where it is found.

We welcome that the importance of personal development and the separation of judgement from behaviour and attitudes. High quality Art, Craft and Design education makes a unique, valuable contribution to personal development. NSEAD has an abundance of material that we can share to help Inspectors identify good practice. Children and young people's wellbeing can be greatly enhanced by engaging in art and design activities – in viewing and seeing, discussing and making.

We applaud the expectation that leaders engage with their staff and take account of the pressures upon them. This is particularly welcome as we see increasing evidence of the contrary. We believe that governors should have an overview of learners' work and progress in art and design. Each school should have a designated governor with a responsibility for art and design.

Proposal 6: non-statutory internal progress and attainment data

We welcome the recognition that internal data collection has its limitations. In Art and Design, our members report that some imposed systems of measurement and recording do not fit with classroom activity and natural assessment points. We believe that requiring leaders to justify the methods adopted will encourage more thoughtful approaches to gathering meaningful assessment data that supports learning and teachers' planning.

Draft school inspection handbook

We welcome the clarification for schools, which does indeed 'bust myths' about inspection. We would like to comment specifically on the following areas of the handbook:

43. & 58.

Where schools value the importance of visual and material literacy as both an entitlement and core skills that add value across the curriculum, approaches to curriculum can be distinct. A fair approach to judgement and recognition of effective practice is welcomed by NSEAD.

We hope that inspectors will report failure of maintained schools to adequately deliver any part of the national curriculum – including Art & Design.

44. & 46

Assessment in Art & Design is open to a range of approaches, at best, designed to meet the needs of specific learners, we are reassured that Ofsted will not bring or impose expectations of a standard approach to assessment. Also, by the discouragement of setting teacher performance targets on commercially available data sets.

78.

Talking to pupils and subject specialists and looking at work is a very good way of understanding learning and progress in Art and Design. We would question however whether all inspectors are equally equipped to recognise quality in our subject.

161.

We agree that the curriculum has indeed narrowed for pupils at KS3 and KS2. We also agree that this narrowing has a disproportionate effect on pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds – particularly in arts-based subjects. We are concerned however that the aspiration of this inspection framework has the unintended consequence of less focus on KS1. These early experiences are an essential part of children’s creative education.

We are encouraged that a shortened KS3 will be scrutinised but point out that the depth and amount of exposure to all subjects is equally important as a broad offer.

162.

We take issue with the premise ‘At the heart of an effective key stage 4 curriculum is a strong academic core: the EBacc’. Firstly, this places a false distinction between subjects and assumes that only those in the EBacc are ‘academic’. We strongly reject the characterisation of Art & Design as non-academic. Secondly, we refute the notion that technical and vocational study should not have equal value to so called ‘academic’ as part of a strong KS4 curriculum.

163.

That Ofsted’s understanding of Cultural capital definition matches that found in the national curriculum raises some concern. The statement: ‘It introduces pupils to the best that has been thought and said, ‘is problematic. In the context of cultural capital, we would like to see a definition that includes what is done, and what is made.

168.

We support the expectation of Ofsted that teachers have expert knowledge of the subjects that they teach.

169.

In defining learning as the ‘transfer (of) key knowledge to long-term memory’ it should be noted that this is achieved in our subject through practice – enough curriculum time needs to be dedicated to allowing this.

We welcome the statement: 'Pupils also need to develop fluency and unconsciously apply their knowledge as skills. This must not be reduced to, or confused with, simply memorising facts.'

174.

Inspectors will conduct 'discussions with subject specialists and leaders about the content and pedagogical content knowledge of teachers, and what is done to support them'. This is critical to the process – for inspectors to understand the subject specific characteristics of quality education in Art & Design, and to ensure that teachers get the support that they need to design and deliver that provision.

April 2019