



Department  
for Education

# **Proposed New Independent School Standards**

**Government consultation response**

**December 2014**

# Contents

Introduction	4
Overview	5
Government response	5
Summary of responses received	5
Summary of responses received and the Government's response	7
Question 1a	7
Government response	8
Question 1b	8
Government response	9
Question 1c	9
Government response	10
Question 1d	10
Government response	11
Question 1e	12
Government response	12
Question 3a	12
Government response	13
Question 3b	13
Government response	14
Question 4	14
Government response	15
Question 6a	15
Government response	16
Question 6b	16
Government response	16
Question 7	17
Government response	17
Question 8	18
Government response	18
Question 9a	20

Government response	20
Question 9b	20
Government response	21
Question 9c	21
Government response	22
Next steps	23
Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation	24
Annex B: Detailed analysis	31

## Introduction

1. The Education (Independent School Standards (ISS)) (England) Regulations 2010 (the 2010 Regulations), as amended, set out the standards that independent schools must meet in operating and providing education as an independent school. As part of a wider programme to reform the basis on which independent schools are regulated by the Secretary of State for Education (see [Letter from Lord Nash on independent schools regulatory reform programme](#) for full details), the Department for Education (“the department”) consulted on replacing the 2010 Regulations. The main aim is to raise standards, where required, across independent schools in England. Additionally, technical amendments have been made to bring the ISS in line with recent changes in related legislation, such as safeguarding.
2. The consultation was published online by the department on 23 June 2014. The department informed interested parties of the consultation launch, including emailing individual independent schools. The consultation was in two stages: closing on 4 August 2014 for comments on the proposed new Part 2- spiritual, moral, social and cultural (SMSC) development of pupils and Part 4- suitability of staff and proprietors standards. This was to allow the earlier introduction of the new SMSC and suitability of staff and proprietors standards. The consultation on the remaining standards (Part 1, Part 3, and Parts 6-8 inc) closed on 18 August 2014.
3. The government response document for Part 2 was published on 27 November 2014 and can be found at [GOV.UK](#). The Education (Independent School Standards) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 which inserted the new SMSC standard into the 2010 Regulations were made on 4 September 2014 and came into force on 29 September 2014.
4. The consultation raised a number of technical points with regards to Part 4, which the department wanted to take time to consider. Consequently, changes to Part 4 were not included in the September amending regulations, but were deferred for consideration alongside Parts 1, 3, and 6-8 of the standards. The response to Part 4 is included in this document and not alongside the Part 2 response document, as was initially intended.
5. The Education (Independent School Standards) (England) Regulations 2014 (the Regulations) (made under the Education and Skills Act 2008) will come into force on 5 January 2015.

## Overview

6. The department sought a broad range of views, including from individual schools, their associations, independent school inspectorates and other representative bodies. The consultation was widely publicised via a department press announcement and the regular local authority email publication. The consultation was available online via the GOV.UK website.

## Government response

7. The department has considered each response and a summary of the main points raised under each question, along with the Government's response, is set out in more detail from page 7.

## Summary of responses received

8. Page 4, of the Government response on Part 2, available on [GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk), explains the background and numbers of the "campaign" in relation to SMSC.

9. Across the whole consultation the total number of "campaign" responses was 909.

10. The respondent type for the remaining 620 responses is set out in the table below.

11. The total number of responses across both parts of the consultation (including "campaign") was 1529.

12. The Government welcomes the number and breadth of response received. We are grateful to respondents for taking the time to respond and whilst each individual response cannot be acknowledged and addressed here, we want to assure respondents that every response was read and has been considered.

13. A full list of the organisations that responded (excluding those that asked for their response to be treated as confidential) is available at Annex A.

14. Detailed analysis of responses is attached at Annex B. This includes data derived from analysis of each individual response, which identifies key themes under each question.

<b>RESPONDENT TYPE</b>	<b>No</b>
Independent school	137
Independent school association	16
School inspector	4
Parent carer	135
Faith group	62
Academy/free school	4
Headteacher/principal	45
Governor	36
Proprietor	3
Local authority	4
Other representative body	17
Other	157

15. Please note “campaign” responses which primarily focused on Part 2 have been excluded from the analysis of the responses to the other questions.

# Summary of responses received and the Government's response

## Question 1a

**Do you agree that Part 1 requires strengthening in order to raise the threshold for meeting the quality of education standard, securing continued improvement and ensuring students have experience in a range of subjects appropriate to their age and aptitude?**

There were 339 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

75 agreed; 220 disagreed; and 44 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- There was wide spread resistance to the proposal that the standards required that students should make progress “at the rate expected of pupils nationally” and that the school should have a framework for tracking pupil performance with reference to national norms:
  - Blunt
  - Ill defined
  - Risks standardisation
  - Threatens independents schools’ right to set own curriculum and goals
  - Fundamentally undermines the independence of schools
  - Leaves the system wide open to abuse and interference from future Governments/Secretaries of State
- The data which underpins section 5 (state school) inspections will simply not exist in the independent sector. Ofsted’s Inspection Manual, for example, requires inspectors to refer to “data from RAISEonline, the school data dashboard, the sixth form performance and assessment (PANDA) report, the Level 3 Value Added (L3VA) data...”. Independent schools might use a variety of assessment tools but they will not use these.
- It is not the role of government to track data/performance at this level for independent schools (‘genuine’ independent schools where no public money is at stake ie not academies and free schools).
- Benchmarking against national rates of progress would not take into account the differences between selective and non-selective schools.

## Government response

The Government has noted the helpful comments on this issue. In particular we have noted the fact that there are no relevant national yardsticks in relation to progress that apply to the independent sector.

The Government accepts that independent schools are accountable to their fee paying parents and it's important they have adequate freedoms to deliver the outcomes parents expect. This means that children may learn things earlier or later in some instances than may be the case for children following the national curriculum. This is a crucial part of the sector's independence and not something that the Government wants to have an adverse impact on.

The Government however does still believe that it has a role to play in ensuring a good education for all children and needs to balance the requirement for all pupils in independent schools (not just the high performing ones) to make progress, fulfil their potential and be adequately prepared for life in modern Britain, whilst acknowledging there isn't a standard way for independent schools to measure such progress.

Reflecting the concerns of respondents, the Government will make the following changes to the Regulations:

- At 2(2)(b) we have removed "standard expected of pupils nationally".
- At 2(2)(c) we have removed "achieve the fluency of students nationally".
- At 2(2)(h) we have removed "at the rate expected of pupils nationally".
- At 4 we have reverted to the original wording which allowed an alternative for the school's framework for pupil performance to refer either to the aims provided to parents, or to national norms, or to both.

These changes address respondents concerns regarding the ability of some independent schools to track performance against national norms which do not apply to the way they structure their provision, as well as removing any requirement for independent schools to track data that isn't available to them.

## Question 1b

**Do you agree that the proposed changes to Part 1 will achieve the aim of raising the threshold for meeting the quality of education standard, securing continued improvement and ensuring students have experience in a range of subjects appropriate to their age and aptitude?**

There were 312 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

46 agreed; 220 disagreed; and 46 indicated that they were not sure.



Key points were:

- The state has no role to play in raising educational standards in the independent sector.
- The market/parents will soon identify underperforming schools.
- Changes give the state an unacceptable level of oversight and influence over independent schools.
- Standards are already high.

## Government response

The Government accepts that standards across the independent sector are generally high. However it also notes that some schools do not provide a satisfactory level of education for their children and the Government cannot ignore this. Children only get one chance at school education and if they leave school without having achieved their potential this is a bad outcome for them, but is also a bad outcome for society generally. This is why the Government takes the view that it does have a role in relation to the education standards in the independent sector. The proposed changes to this part of the Regulations are aimed at raising the threshold for meeting the standard and in particular will require improvement from those schools that are only just meeting the current standard.

As with other proposed changes, the Government do not expect that raising the threshold for meeting the quality of education standard will have an impact on high performing independent schools. This is because they will already be doing more than enough to meet the new requirements.

## Question 1c

**Do you agree that inserting the word ‘good’ in Part 1 at paragraph 3 (a), (e), (f) and (g) should help to achieve the aim of raising the threshold for meeting the quality of education standard and securing continued improvement? If not, why not and how else might this be achieved?**

There were 283 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

56 agreed; 168 disagreed; and 59 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- After national norms “Good” was the second highest issue raised, top being- what does it mean, how will it be defined?

- The definition of good is difficult to standardise and comparisons between different schools with fundamental differences can be meaningless
- Inspection should ensure a minimum standard is met- not require value judgements.
  - Descriptive words have no place in regulatory standards and would contradict the approach of requiring grade descriptors from ISI and the other inspectorates
- IAPS schools already operate to demonstrably high standards and there is therefore no need to change “adequate/appropriate” to “good” in qualifying these standards.

## Government response

The Government approach is to raise the bar without tying independent schools into measurement systems that they don't use. We believe that “good” shows the intent to lift schools beyond the bare minimum. It allows schools to use their own systems for assessing how well pupils progress and allows schools to use their own expertise in understanding individual pupils, the subject being taught and the level of progress expected. We believe that using good in the standards in this context gives schools the flexibility to assess in their own way what is good whilst at the same time ensures that underperforming and coasting schools will be able to be held to account, if appropriate for poor performance.

The inspectorates already inspect schools and give quality judgements, and have no difficulty in identifying “good” and distinguishing it from less good provision.

## Question 1d

**Do you consider that the changes to Part 1 will help address any concerns about extremism including extremist teaching and curriculum content, and reinforce principles of equality and fundamental British values?**

There were 320 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

68 agreed; 163 disagreed; and 89 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- Many people mentioned the fact that the standards covering references to ‘fundamental British values’ were amended as recently as January 2013. Since then no HMC school has failed this standard and in fact every school inspected has achieved the highest grade of ‘excellent’ in this area. There is no evidence to suggest that this regulation requires strengthening.

- Concerned that the fear of extremism in some independent faith schools is being used to tar all faith schools with the same brush, and this feels like using a ‘sledge-hammer to crack a nut’.
- A small number of people made detailed comments about the scope of the powers- Secretary of State is improperly assuming/inserting powers that have not been subject to parliamentary scrutiny:
  - The Secretary of State’s powers to regulate the independent sector are dependent on and limited by statute, whether the Education Act 2002 or the education and Skills Act 2008 (when completely in force). Neither section 157 of the EA 2002 nor section 94 of the ESA 2008 expressly empowers the Secretary of State to prescribe curriculum contents for independent educational institutions or the values which they must uphold and promote
  - We expect that the various scrutiny committees for delegated legislation will wish to assure themselves that powers are not being improperly assumed and that they are subject to proper parliamentary oversight

## Government response

The Government has noted the concerns regarding extremism and fundamental British values. We want to be clear that we don’t think the changes will impact on the great majority of schools as they are already doing more than enough to meet the new requirement not to undermine the fundamental British values. The issue for the Government of course is the small minority of schools that are not doing enough. We are clear that this new requirement will be a vital tool in ensuring that the small minority of schools improve in this area or face appropriate sanctions.

A more detailed Government response with regards to fundamental British values and the Equality Act is included in the Government’s response to Part 2, referred to above.

It is important to note, as described in the Part 2 response document, that these changes do not require schools to promote other faiths – so in particular there is no requirement for a faith school to promote other faiths as well as its own. **Nor** do they extend schools’ obligations under the Equality Act. What the revisions do is strengthen existing requirements to promote respect and a culture of tolerance and diversity.

The changes do not extend equality requirements, nor do they discriminate against Christianity or undermine religious freedoms. A misconception in the consultation responses was that the proposal in standard 2(2)(d) in relation to PSHE would require schools to “promote the protected characteristics”. It is unclear in any case how there could be a requirement to promote the characteristics themselves. But to be clear, the proposed standard does not mean, for example, that schools must promote alternative lifestyles or same sex marriage. Rather, the proposed standard requires schools to

encourage pupils to respect other people, even if they choose to follow a lifestyle that one would not choose to follow oneself.

The proposal in standard 3(j) that the school's teaching does not discriminate against pupils contrary to Part 6 of the Equality Act quite explicitly does not place new equality requirements on schools. What it does is provide that if a school breaches the Act's requirements and discriminates between pupils contrary to the Act, then this will also be a regulatory failing under the independent school standards.

We have no concerns with the way we have exercised the powers in section 94 of the Education and Skills Act 2008 to prescribe standards in relation to the quality of education in independent schools.

## Question 1e

**The intention is for the strengthened quality of education standards not to affect the very many effective and high performing independent schools, but to impact on coasting and poorly performing independent schools where performance needs to be improved. Do you consider that the changes to Part 1 will achieve this aim?**

There were 307 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

41 agreed; 204 disagreed; and 62 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- The deletion of the phrase "... the school's own aims as provided to parents or... to both" is worrying. Independent schools have always and should always be judged in relation to their stated aims and objectives.

## Government response

The Government noted a number of responses that were concerned with the removal of "school's own aims" at 4 in Part 1. As noted above, we have amended the draft and it will now read:

*"The standard in this paragraph is met where the proprietor ensures that a framework is in place for evaluating and tracking pupil performance and progress, by reference to the school's own aims as provided to parents or national norms, or to both is in place."*

## Question 3a

**Do you agree that changes to Part 3 are required to ensure that these policies are not only drawn up, but are also effectively implemented?**

There were 273 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

93 agreed; 123 disagreed; and 57 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- Respondents were split relatively evenly on the merits of this proposed change.
- Some thought it was sensible and good schools would already be doing it and thus it was appropriate to target those schools that aren't.
- Those against the change were of the view that:
  - The solution to an extreme and publicly embarrassing problem is not further legislation, but simply stricter enforcement of our existing laws
  - The rewording of the section places greater emphasis on the effective implementation of policies for behaviour, health and safety and first aid. Under the current regime, IAPS schools inspected by ISI already have implementation monitored. Therefore there is no need for changes to this section for IAPS schools

## Government response

The Government acknowledge that the majority of independent schools already implement their policies effectively. In these instances existing standards and inspection processes are adequate. However our experience in a minority of cases is that some schools are not effectively implementing their policies and this in turn creates serious safeguarding concerns.

The Government is still of the view that the best way to address this issue is via the proposed update to Part 3. For the majority of good independent schools this change will have no impact as they are already effectively implementing their policies and will already demonstrate this via inspection.

On this basis the Government won't be making any major changes to Part 3 as a result of the consultation and the Regulations will come into force, in the main, as drafted.

## Question 3b

**Do you agree that schools should be required to have in place risk assessment policies and be able to demonstrate that they are implemented effectively and that action is taken to address identified risks?**

There were 291 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

138 agreed; 109 disagreed; and 44 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- A small majority supported this proposed change.
- Those in favour suggested:
  - Good schools would be doing it already
  - Common sense
- For those against it the biggest issues were:
  - Schools already assess risk in line with prevailing Health and Safety requirements/legislation
  - There is no indication of what “a written risk assessment policy” should comprise
  - Most schools already have in place a set of comprehensive risk assessments - what does the ‘policy’ add?
  - Existing measures must be enforced and adhered to in order to protect our children in schools, not by further legislation

## Government response

A small majority of respondents agreed with this proposal and the majority of those that disagreed did so because of lack of clarity in terms of what the ‘policy’ should look like.

As with 3a the Government believe the majority of good independent schools are already doing this and as such this won’t be an additional burden. However based on inspection evidence the Government is of the view that in a minority of independent schools risk assessment is unsystematic and lacking in key areas such as school trips and supervision. The Government is clear that it’s not acceptable for such gaps to exist and for children’s welfare to potentially be put at risk.

On this basis the Government won’t be making any major changes to Part 3 as a result of the consultation and the Regulations will come into force, in the main, as drafted.

## Question 4

**These standards are quite detailed, but we would welcome comments on them. In particular, do you consider them to be sufficient and appropriate to ensure the suitability of independent school proprietors and those employed in independent schools? If not, why not?**

There were 245 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

104 agreed; 84 disagreed; and 57 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- Fully supportive of the changes.
- Supportive of the changes subject to technical points, including:
  - Proprietor/Governors right to work in the UK
  - Register of checks and prohibition orders
  - DBS checks and regulated activity

## Government response

The Government notes the generally positive response to these changes. The Government note that most of the negative comments are related to technical drafting points. The Government is grateful for the technical points a number of respondents made.

Having considered the response the Government has decided to do the following:

- Amend the requirements so it is clear when a school is required to record a check in the register with regards to prohibition orders and interim prohibition orders.
- We have amended the drafting with regards to DBS barred list checks. It is clear that being a 'proprietor' in and of itself does not constitute regulated activity and as such no barred list check should be required on a proprietor simply by virtue of their position as proprietor. But it is clear if the proprietor is also engaged in regulated activity in the school, for example in the case of those proprietors who are also the Headteacher, then a barred list check is required.
- We have not changed the requirement that proprietors have to have the right to work in the UK.

## Question 6a

**Do you agree with the proposal to remove the requirement for schools to make details of staff available to parents of students and prospective students?**

There were 247 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

129 agreed; 75 disagreed; and 43 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- Majority supported this proposal, with the most common comment being that it removed an unnecessary burden.
- For those against, the main question was why take this out?

- It is good practice to make the list available
- Parents have a right to know who is teaching their children
- It works, why change it?

## Government response

The Government notes the majority support for this proposal and the fact it removes a burden. The Government acknowledges those respondents that are concerned on transparency grounds. However on balance the Government believes that the current requirements are so scant it's better to remove the burden altogether as at the moment it doesn't achieve a great deal. The alternative is to make the requirement much more detailed and robust and thus make it meaningful. The Government doesn't think that this would be appropriate. On this basis the Government won't be making any major changes to Part 6 as a result of the consultation and the Regulations will come into force, in the main, as drafted.

## Question 6b

**Do you agree with the introduction of a new requirement for schools to publish their inspection reports on their websites?**

There were 272 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

203 agreed; 31 disagreed; and 38 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- The vast majority of respondents agreed with this requirement with a good proportion of respondents pointing out that most good schools already do this as a matter of course.
- Of those who disagreed the main points were:
  - Pointless extra burden - reports already available via ISI websites
  - What about schools (such as ultra-orthodox Jews) that don't have websites? Or schools with legitimate technical problems with their website?
  - Section 32(1)(j) allows for "where no such website exists, are provided to parents". Sections 32(1)(d) and 32(1)(e) require a similar caveat

## Government response

The Government notes the majority support for this proposal and the general acknowledgment that it's putting existing best practice into the Regulations.



The Government believes that from a transparency perspective it is reasonable to require independent schools to publish inspection reports on their website. It ensures that the small minority of schools that try to 'hide' a poor inspection report can no longer do so as easily.

The Government wants to be clear that the new requirements don't create an obligation for schools that for a variety of reasons don't have a website to have one. Safeguards are built into the drafting of the Regulations to make clear that, where applicable, inspection reports should be provided to parents.

On this basis the Government won't be making any major changes to Part 6 as a result of the consultation and the Regulations will come into force, in the main, as drafted.

## Question 7

**The main changes are intended to ensure that schools record what action is taken as a result of a complaint and to no longer require schools to record all complaints, but to use their judgment to determine when to do so. Do you agree that changes to Part 7 are required and that the proposed changes will achieve this?**

There were 259 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

151 agreed; 48 disagreed; and 60 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- The majority welcomed the removal of a burden.
- Those that were against suggested:
  - It gives schools too much scope to ignore/bury complaints - all complaints should be recorded
  - Who decides if it was appropriate to record it or not? Value judgement
  - All formal complaints (in writing) should be recorded, allow scope to decide on informal eg conversations in playground etc

## Government response

The Government notes the majority support for this proposal. The Government also notes the concerns raised with regards to formal versus informal complaints by those both for and against the proposed change.

The Government wants to get the balance right between removing a burden for schools whilst at the same time ensuring complaints aren't easily 'buried' or ignored. The

Government wants a system that allows schools flexibility on how to deal with informal complaints, but also a robust system that ensures formal complaints are logged and dealt with appropriately.

On this basis the Government proposes to amend the Regulations at 33(j) to make it explicit that a record should be kept of complaints that proceed to the formal stage, but leave it to the school to decide how to record informal complaints.

## Question 8

**Do you agree that the new Part 8 standards are appropriate and will help drive up the quality of leadership and management in independent schools?**

There were 261 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

50 agreed; 139 disagreed; and 72 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- Concerns expressed by a large number of respondents on this new requirement. Whilst some were entirely against it, by far the biggest concern was the blurring of governance and management and leadership in the consultation draft standard.
- Within the current ISI inspection framework there is a very clear and helpful distinction made between governance and leadership and management. The new standard confuses this.
  - If the Standard has to stay it should be separated to reflect the difference in governance and leadership and management
- ISI already assess governance, leadership and management- this standard is not needed.
- What does 'good' mean?
  - How will this standard be fairly and consistently measured?
  - How would it be failed- failures in the other 7? Something else?

## Government response

The Government notes the opposition to this new Standard and in particular the argument that for good schools this is potentially an extra confusing burden in an area that they are already performing highly in.

However, as with other amendments to the Regulations this change is directed at the minority of underperforming independent schools. In this instance the Government has in mind those schools which remain continually on the borders of non-compliance,

improving in response to regulatory action only to sink back into failure again because the school's leadership is not placing sufficient priority on ensuring that the standards are met. This can be particularly acute in schools where the proprietor is also the Headteacher.

As many respondents point out the inspectorates already look closely at management and leadership and report back on it. However at present any failings are not regulatory and as such do not allow us to take appropriate action, such as requiring an action plan to address failing or weak leadership.

As with other changes the intention is not to create any extra burden for the great majority of high performing independent schools. However in order to deal robustly with schools that are failing it is necessary to make changes to the ISS which on the face of it directly impact on all independent schools. But we are clear that in the case of schools that have strong leadership and management, this new Part 8 will not create a new burden, as they will be significantly exceeding the new standard – as is currently identified by the inspectorates.

The Government has listened to respondents concerns regarding including governance in this standard as well as the broad nature of the requirement. Based on this feedback the new standard will be changed to:

## **PART 8**

### 1) Quality of leadership in and management of schools

34.—(1) The standard about the quality of leadership and management is met if the proprietor ensures that persons with leadership and management responsibilities at the school—

(a) demonstrate good skills and knowledge appropriate to their role so that the independent school standards are met consistently;

(b) fulfil their responsibilities effectively so that the independent school standards are met consistently; and

(c) actively promote the well-being of pupils.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1)(c) “well-being” means well-being within the meaning of section 10(2) of the Children Act 2004.

This removes the reference to governance which some respondents found to be potentially confusing and will allow, where appropriate, schools to keep the line they have between the role of governors and managers distinct. It should be noted that the standard applies in respect of all leadership and management activity within a school.

The new draft also makes it clear that the requirement to demonstrate good skills and knowledge is directly linked to the role of leadership and management in ensuring the standards are met.

## Question 9a

**Do you consider that any of the proposed changes to the regulations need to be amended from the draft text?**

There were 252 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

193 agreed; 28 disagreed; and 31 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- Don't change pupil/student.
- Role of Governor- should not require 'right to work'.
- Error in 21(3) - Can't backdate prohibition order checks to May 2007.

## Government response

The Government noted the numerous responses that duplicated here, the helpful comments that have been referred to earlier in this consultation response. Those duplicated responses are not addressed here as they have already been addressed via questions 1 and 3-8.

With regards to the changes that were proposed here more than at any other point in the consultation:

- The Government has noted the numerous comments with regards to 'Students' vs 'Pupils' and on balance have decided to go back to using the term 'Pupil'. An appropriate definition of 'Pupil' is included in the Regulations.

## Question 9b

**If the standards as currently drafted were to form part of the new regulations, could you indicate the extent to which you see the new requirements adding a burden, including the likely cost of reviewing them and the cost of making any required changes to school policies?**

There were 226 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

149 said they could indicate the extent to which they see the new requirements adding a burden; 23 said they couldn't; and 54 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- Only two responses put a cash figure on the cost to schools of the changes.
- Majority said it's very difficult to put a cost to but it would be significant:
  - Reviewing and Changing policies
  - Training
- Particular issues with the 'substantial' costs in relation to using 'national norms':
  - Fundamental changes to curriculum
  - Assessment methodologies
  - Taught qualifications
  - Data required as per Section 5 inspections
  - Tracking data as per Section 5 - a job in itself in the maintained sector to 'play the game'

## Government response

The biggest response in terms of additional burdens was 'national norms' which we have addressed on pages 7 and 8.

## Question 9c

**Do you have any suggestions for how the Department might assist schools in meeting the new standards, particularly those that are small (fewer than 50, but more than 10 employees) or micro (fewer than 10 employees) businesses?**

There were 195 (non-campaign) responses to this question.

105 said they did have suggestions; 55 didn't; and 35 indicated that they were not sure.

Key points were:

- By far the biggest response was – don't make these changes.
- Only make updates once a year (if needed) at the same time each year. Consult at the same time each year (long consultation) and bring in the changes at the same time so it's much easier to plan. A drip feed of ad hoc changes leads to inefficiencies.
- Give ALL schools significant time to plan for and implement the changes including a period where inspections consider 'progress towards' rather than actual outcomes.

- Department should provide model policies, templates, documents to reflect any of the additional burdens they are introducing. Would really help small schools in particular to meet the new burdens.

## **Government response**

The Government acknowledges that any change to the ISS will always result in additional work for schools and related bodies such as inspectorates. We always try to future proof any updates in order to keep future updates to a minimum.

In this instance not making the changes is simply not an option. We believe the changes are crucial from a performance and safeguarding perspective and it's essential they are made as soon as possible. We also believe some of the changes will reduce burdens on independent schools and it's clear from the consultation responses that some of these changes are broadly welcomed. As we think it's essential to make the changes in terms of safeguarding and fundamental British values we believe it makes sense to make other changes and smaller technical changes at the same time.

For the majority of independent schools a good deal of the changes won't have an impact as they are already more than meeting any new requirements. On this basis we don't think that good schools require a 'progress towards' period. As usual when we make changes of this nature, we will take into account schools' ability to respond in the short term when deciding on the regulatory action that should be taken.

In an ideal world the Government would be able to make changes once a year at the same time each year and run a long consultation in advance of this. However, this is sometimes simply not practical and when key changes need to be made urgently the Government has no choice but to act. We always do this as a last resort and with the extra work it creates for schools in mind.

Independent school guidance will be updated to reflect the new Regulations as appropriate.

## Next steps

16. The Education (Independent School Standards) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 for the new SMSC standard were laid before Parliament on 8 September and came into force on 29 September. A supplement to the department's SMSC guidance for independent schools to reflect the changes was published on 27 November 2014.

17. The Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014 will come into force on 5 January 2015.

## **Annex A: List of organisations that responded to the consultation**

- (HMC) Headmasters' and Headmistresses' Conference
- Abberley Hall School
- Abbots Hill School
- ADCS
- Affinity
- AGBIS
- Aldwickbury Prep School
- AMSUK
- Anglican Mainstream
- Ashford School
- Association of Managers in Education (AMiE)
- Association of School and College Leaders
- Association of School and College Leaders
- ATL
- Bablake School
- Badminton School
- Basingstoke Community Churches
- Berkhamstead School
- Bethany School
- Birkdale Preparatory School
- Birkdale school
- Birmingham City Council
- Bolton School
- Bootham School
- Bradford Christian School
- Bridge Schools Inspectorate (BSI)
- British Humanist Association
- Bruton School for Girls



- Buckinghamshire County Council
- Canford School
- CARE (Christian Action Research Education)
- Castle Court School Educational Trust Limited
- Catholic Education Service
- Catholic Independent Schools' Conference (CISC)
- Centre for Justice and Liberty
- Chair of Governors - Leicester High School for Girls
- Channing School
- Charnwood Road Baptist Church
- Christ Church Cathedral School
- Christian Democratic Party
- Christian Family Schools
- Christian Values in Education
- Church Communities UK
- Church of England Education Division
- Cobham Hall
- Cranleigh School
- Dame Allan's Schools
- Eastbourne College Incorporated
- Emanuel School
- Fairstead House School
- falkner House
- Family Education Trust
- family education trust
- Farlington School
- Giggleswick School
- Girls' Day School Trust
- Girls' Schools Association (GSA)
- Godolphin School
- Groundlevel Churches UK

- Guildford High School (United Learning)
- Haberdashers' Aske's Schools, Elstree
- Haileybury College
- Halliford School
- Hampton School
- Harrow School
- Headington School
- Headmaster and headmistress conference
- Headstart School
- Heathfield School, Ascot
- Hereford Cathedral School
- HIGHFIELDS CHRISTIAN CENTRE
- Highgate School
- Hill House School
- Hurstpierpoint College
- Independent Association of Preparatory Schools
- Independent Association of Preparatory Schools (Bramley School)
- Independent Schools' Bursars Association
- Independent Schools Council
- Independent Schools Inspectorate
- Ipswich School
- ISA
- Islamic Medical Association/UK
- James Allen's Girls' School
- James Allen's Prep School
- Kimbolton School
- King Edward's School, Bath
- King Edward's School Witley
- King's College, Taunton
- Kingham Hill School
- Kirby Laing Institute for Christian Ethics

- Latymer Upper School
- Leeds Christian School of Excellence
- Leicester Grammar School
- Llandoverly College
- Lochinver House School
- Loughborough Grammar School.
- Maltman's Green School
- Malvern College
- MANCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS
- Maranatha Community UK Office
- Marlborough College
- Millfield
- Montessori Schools Association
- Moon Hall Schools Educational Trust
- More House School, Frensham
- NAHT
- NASUWT
- National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT)
- National Association of Independent Schools and Non-Maintained Special Schools (NASS)
- National Board of Religious Inspectors and Advisers
- National Council of Faiths and Beliefs in FE
- National Governors' Association
- National Secular Society (NSS)
- Newcastle School for Boys
- Newcastle under Lyme School
- NFER
- North London Collegiate School
- Norwich School
- Norwich School
- NSCoPSE

- Olive Secondary
- Oundle School
- Our Lady's Abingdon
- Palmers Green High School
- Plantings School
- Prior Park Educational Trust
- priors field school
- Q3 Academy
- Reading Blue Coat School
- Redland High School
- Religious Education Council of England and Wales
- Rendcomb College
- Repton School
- Riverside Community Church
- Rokeby School (prep school)
- Royal Grammar School
- Royqal Surrey School
- Salt & Light Ministries UK
- Sands School
- School Inspection Service
- Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham
- Schools of Tomorrow
- Sherborne School
- South Hampstead High School
- SREIslamic
- St Albans High School for Girls.
- St Albans School
- St ANDrew's Church, Mirehouse
- St Dunstans Educational Foundation
- St Francis School
- St Helen's School

- St Joseph's College
- St Joseph's in the Park
- St Leonards-Mayfield School
- St Martha's School
- St Olave's School
- St Paul's Cathedral School (member of IAPS)
- St Swithun's School, Winchester
- St. Alban's Anglican Church
- Stamford Endowed Schools
- Steiner Waldorf Schools Fellowship
- Stonyhurst College
- Sutton Valence Preparatory School
- Swanbourne House School
- Taunton School
- The Association of Teachers and Lecturers
- The Board of Deputies of British Jews
- The Co-operative College
- The Dixie Grammar School
- The King of Kings School
- The King's School, Chester
- The Methodist Church of Great Britain
- The Mount School
- The Perse School
- The Peterborough School
- The Portsmouth Grammar Junior School
- The Portsmouth Grammar School
- The Purcell School
- The Queen's School
- The River of Life Church
- The Royal Ballet School
- The Royal Grammar School Worcester

- The Royal High School Bath GDST
- The Royal School
- The Royal School, Wolverhampton
- The Society of Heads
- The Tony Blair Faith Foundation
- Thetford Grammar School
- TISCA
- Trent College
- Truro High School
- Tyndale Community School
- Uppingham School
- Voice: the union for education professionals
- Walhampton School
- Warminster School
- Warwick School
- Wells Cathedral School
- Wilmslow preparatory School
- Wimbledon High School
- Wychwood School
- Wycliffe Prep School
- Yarm School
- Yehudi Menuhin School

## Annex B: Detailed analysis

### 1 a) Do you agree that Part 1 requires strengthening in order to raise the threshold for meeting the quality of education standard, securing continued improvement and ensuring students have experience in a range of subjects appropriate to their age and aptitude? If not, why not?

There were 339 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other rep. body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	16	0	0	15	7	2	0	5	7	0	0	3	3	17	75	22%
<b>Disagree</b>	103	11	0	23	11	0	0	34	9	2	0	0	3	24	220	65%
<b>Not sure</b>	4	2	3	12	2	0	0	4	2	1	0	1	4	9	44	13%
<b>Part 1 Doesn't need strengthening</b>	32	5	0	6	3	0	0	7	4	1	0	0	1	7	66	19%
<b>Leave to schools to decide</b>	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	3%
<b>Unnecessary change</b>	30	2	0	5	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	2	0	46	14%
<b>Leave to the market</b>	46	5	0	1	0	0	0	12	1	1	0	0	0	2	68	20%
<b>State should not intervene</b>	26	4	0	2	0	0	0	6	2	1	0	0	1	1	43	13%
<b>Adverse impact on performance</b>	30	5	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	42	12%
<b>No evidence for change</b>	34	4	0	2	0	0	0	11	4	0	0	0	2	1	58	17%
<b>Restricts freedoms</b>	33	4	1	1	0	0	0	9	2	1	0	0	3	1	55	16%
<b>Performance already very high</b>	53	4	0	1	0	0	0	19	3	0	0	0	2	2	84	25%
<b>Remove national norms</b>	51	6	1	0	0	0	0	12	4	1	0	0	2	1	78	23%

**1 b) Do you agree that the proposed changes to Part 1 will achieve the aim of raising the threshold for meeting the quality of education standard, securing continued improvement and ensuring students have experience in a range of subjects appropriate to their age and aptitude? If not, why not and how else could this be achieved?**

There were 312 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	9	0	1	9	3	2	0	4	5	0	0	1	1	11	46	15%
<b>Disagree</b>	95	10	0	23	11	0	0	37	10	3	0	1	5	25	220	71%
<b>Not sure</b>	9	2	2	12	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	4	9	46	15%
<b>Current regime is adequate</b>	54	4	0	5	2	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	2	6	82	26%
<b>Stifle creativity/freedoms</b>	34	5	0	1	0	0	0	9	2	1	0	0	1	0	53	17%
<b>Leave to school/parents</b>	39	3	0	1	0	0	0	11	2	1	0	0	0	1	58	19%
<b>Criticism of national norms/standards/benchmarks</b>	49	3	1	0	0	0	0	16	2	0	0	0	2	3	76	24%



**1 c) Do you agree that inserting the word 'good' in Part 1 at paragraph 3 (a), (e), (f) and (g) should help to achieve the aim of raising the threshold for meeting the quality of education standard and securing continued improvement? If not, why not and how else might this be achieved?**

There were 283 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	14	2	0	8	6	1	0	4	7	1	0	2	0	11	56	20%
<b>Disagree</b>	76	10	2	16	3	1	0	28	4	1	0	1	4	22	168	59%
<b>Not sure</b>	12	0	1	16	4	0	0	4	3	1	0	1	6	11	59	21%
<b>Definition of good</b>	32	4	1	5	0	0	0	12	2	2	0	2	5	8	73	26%
<b>Moves inspections to close to maintained sector</b>	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	4%
<b>Leave to market/parents</b>	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	28	10%
<b>Criticism of national norms/standards/benchmarks</b>	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	34	12%

**1 d) Do you consider that the changes to Part 1 will help address any concerns about extremism including extremist teaching and curriculum content, and reinforce principles of equality and fundamental British values? If not, why not and how else might this be achieved?**

There were 320 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Yes</b>	28	2	1	4	2	0	0	10	4	0	0	1	3	13	68	21%
<b>No</b>	39	8	0	31	14	2	0	22	7	3	0	2	4	31	163	51%
<b>Not Sure</b>	36	2	2	14	8	1	0	9	5	0	0	1	3	8	89	28%
<b>Standards amended in 2013</b>	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	10%
<b>Definition of British Values</b>	12	4	1	9	6	1	0	7	0	1	0	0	3	13	57	18%

**1 e) The intention is for the strengthened quality of education standards not to affect the very many effective and high performing independent schools, but to impact on coasting and poorly performing independent schools where performance needs to be improved. Do you consider that the changes to Part 1 will achieve this aim? If not, why not and how else might they be achieved?**

There were 307 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Yes</b>	7	0	1	8	3	1	0	5	4	0	0	0	1	11	41	13%
<b>No</b>	84	10	1	28	6	0	0	36	7	3	0	1	5	23	204	66%
<b>Not Sure</b>	20	2	1	10	6	1	0	2	6	0	0	2	4	8	62	20%
<b>State intervention/control</b>	16	4	0	3	0	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	3	34	11%
<b>Leave to independent inspectorates</b>	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	34	11%
<b>Leave to market/parents</b>	31	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	1	3	49	16%
<b>Criticism of national norms/standards/benchmarks</b>	26	3	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	0	0	1	0	42	14%

**2 a) Do you agree that changes to Part 2 are required to ensure proprietors actively promote the fundamental British values as set out in paragraph 5(a) and that schools are actively promoting the principles set out in paragraph 5(b), including: tolerance; respect for other people; and respect for democracy? If not, why not?**

There were 543 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy/free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	26	1	2	4	4	0	0	8	3	0	0	1	3	20	72	13%
<b>Disagree</b>	55	9	0	123	46	3	0	21	28	3	0	2	8	107	405	75%
<b>Not sure</b>	23	3	2	5	6	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	4	13	66	12%
<b>Promoting/ extending the Equality Agenda</b>	1	1	0	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	8	22	4%
<b>Knee jerk/ hasty</b>	4	1	0	4	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	10	25	5%
<b>Not needed</b>	37	7	1	22	8	0	0	16	10	0	0	0	2	24	127	23%
<b>Define/ clarify British values</b>	17	6	0	58	24	2	0	8	20	1	0	0	9	67	212	39%
<b>More debate/ discussion</b>	5	2	0	4	2	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	4	21	44	8%
<b>Welcome the emphasis</b>	10	3	0	2	3	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	5	17	44	8%
<b>Standards only amended in January 2013</b>	29	6	0	3	5	0	0	12	5	0	0	0	2	7	69	13%
<b>Box ticking exercise</b>	10	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	17	3%
<b>Marginalisation of Christianity</b>	2	1	0	15	5	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	14	45	8%
<b>Government control</b>	3	0	1	34	9	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	5	35	93	17%
<b>Already doing this</b>	29	5	0	6	2	1	0	10	8	0	0	0	1	3	65	12%
<b>Consultation too short/wrong time of year</b>	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	2%

Enforce Existing Standards	6	1	1	22	10	1	0	3	10	0	0	0	1	20	75	14%
Change wording eg don't use 'tolerate'	2	0	0	9	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4%

**2 b) The policy intention of the proposed changes to Part 2 is to make clear to schools that they should be actively promoting fundamental British values, not just acknowledging them. Do you consider the changes to Part 2 will achieve this aim? If not, why not and how else might they be achieved?**

There were 508 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy/free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Yes</b>	15	2	0	3	5	2	0	6	2	0	0	0	4	13	52	10%
<b>No</b>	32	8	1	115	45	1	0	20	26	2	0	1	8	98	357	70%
<b>Not Sure</b>	45	2	3	11	4	0	0	8	4	1	0	3	3	15	99	19%
<b>Leave it to schools/ teachers</b>	5	0	0	7	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	9	30	6%
<b>Not needed</b>	17	5	1	19	5	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	3	20	78	15%
<b>Resource implications</b>	15	3	0	2	1	0	0	7	2	1	0	0	1	3	35	7%
<b>Already doing it</b>	21	5	0	3	1	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	2	4	47	9%
<b>Precedent setting</b>	4	2	0	18	9	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	18	58	11%

**2 c) Maintained schools will also be required to promote fundamental British values. We are proposing to update the guidance to maintained schools to mirror the requirements set out here. Do you agree that the government should set the same expectations for maintained schools as for free schools, academies and independent schools with regard to their duty to promote fundamental British values? If not, why not?**

There were 475 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Yes</b>	43	9	3	14	15	1	0	18	14	1	0	3	8	31	160	34%
<b>No</b>	17	1	1	97	32	2	0	12	12	1	0	0	4	75	254	53%
<b>Not Sure</b>	28	2	0	8	3	0	0	4	3	1	0	1	2	9	61	13%
<b>Shouldn't apply to any schools</b>	3	1	0	14	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	32	7%
<b>Should be applied to all schools</b>	18	3	1	7	7	0	0	6	4	1	0	1	5	16	69	15%
<b>Consistent approach</b>	3	4	1	4	2	0	0	3	1	2	0	2	3	9	34	7%
<b>Waste of inspectors time</b>	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	4%
<b>Implication for school ethos</b>	4	0	0	12	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	21	46	10%
<b>Issues for certain communities</b>	1	0	0	14	5	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	12	37	8%

### 3 a) Do you agree that changes to Part 3 are required to ensure that these policies are not only drawn up, but are also effectively implemented?

There were 273 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	22	5	3	7	5	3	0	12	7	1	0	3	8	17	93	34%
<b>Disagree</b>	53	6	0	21	8	0	0	15	7	0	0	0	2	11	123	45%
<b>Not sure</b>	16	0	0	15	2	0	0	7	4	2	0	0	2	9	57	21%
<b>Already bound by H&amp;S/legislation requirements</b>	26	1	0	2	1	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	39	14%
<b>existing standards/process/inspections are adequate</b>	34	4	0	3	2	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	2	1	55	20%

**3 b) Do you agree that schools should be required to have in place risk assessment policies and be able to demonstrate that they are implemented effectively and that action is taken to address identified risks? If not, why not?**

There were 291 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	32	5	2	20	8	3	0	17	13	1	0	3	8	26	138	47%
<b>Disagree</b>	51	6	0	20	6	0	0	11	5	0	0	0	2	8	109	37%
<b>Not sure</b>	18	1	0	2	2	0	0	9	1	2	0	0	2	7	44	15%
<b>whars does 'Risk Assessment Policy' mean?</b>	40	1	0	1	1	0	0	8	3	1	0	0	0	5	60	21%
<b>existing policies/inspections already in place</b>	31	2	0	1	3	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	3	3	50	17%
<b>already bound by H&amp;S legislation/requirements</b>	45	6	0	4	1	0	0	12	5	0	0	0	2	4	79	27%
<b>More detailed guidance required</b>	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	8%
<b>Overly bureucratic</b>	13	1	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	26	9%



**4 These standards are quite detailed, but we would welcome comments on them. In particular, do you consider them to be sufficient and appropriate to ensure the suitability of independent school proprietors and those employed in independent schools? If not, why not?**

There were 245 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent/carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy/free school association	Headteacher/principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Yes</b>	46	6	2	6	4	1	0	16	6	1	0	2	4	10	104	42%
<b>No</b>	35	5	1	14	6	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	3	8	84	34%
<b>Not Sure</b>	9	2	0	11	3	0	0	5	3	1	0	1	4	18	57	23%
<b>Fully support</b>	8	4	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	4	25	10%
<b>Anomaly/error</b>	29	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	0	0	0	4	3	52	21%
<b>Governor role</b>	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	6%
<b>Important, but difficult to understand</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2%
<b>No right to work - Governor</b>	29	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	2	3	50	20%

**5 No significant changes are proposed to this Part as it was revised in January 2013 to align with requirements for maintained schools.**

There were 0 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent/carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy/free school association	Headteacher/principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	

**6 a) Do you agree with the proposal to remove the requirement for schools to make details of staff available to parents of students and prospective students? If not, why not?**

There were 247 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent/carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	60	11	2	6	4	2	0	25	7	1	0	2	2	7	129	52%
<b>Disagree</b>	17	1	0	16	6	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	7	17	75	30%
<b>Not sure</b>	14	0	1	11	3	1	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	7	43	17%
<b>Its good practice to make details available</b>	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	7%
<b>Why change- it works/its transparent/its important info</b>	7	1	0	4	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5	8	32	13%
<b>Yes- removes a burden</b>	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	21	9%

**6 b) Do you agree with the introduction of a new requirement for schools to publish their inspection reports on their websites? If not, why not?**

There were 272 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy/free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	72	10	2	27	9	3	0	26	13	2	0	3	7	29	203	75%
<b>Disagree</b>	9	1	0	7	3	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	5	31	11%
<b>Not sure</b>	12	1	1	8	1	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	3	6	38	14%
<b>unnecessary</b>	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1%
<b>Monitoring</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0%
<b>Yes- Should be widely available</b>	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	30	11%
<b>What about schools without websites or tech problems?</b>	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	19	7%

**7 The main changes are intended to ensure that schools record what action is taken as a result of a complaint and to no longer require schools to record all complaints, but to use their judgment to determine when to do so. Do you agree that changes to Part 7 are required and that the proposed changes will achieve this? If not, why not?**

There were 259 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	72	9	2	13	5	3	0	24	7	2	0	1	3	10	151	58%
<b>Disagree</b>	3	1	0	12	6	0	0	3	4	0	0	1	5	13	48	19%
<b>Not sure</b>	20	2	1	14	3	0	0	5	1	1	0	1	2	10	60	23%
<b>Guidance and clarification required</b>	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	28	11%
<b>Needs to be requirement to record all complaints</b>	1	1	0	4	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	7	22	8%
<b>schools already keep clear records/paper trail etc</b>	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	7%
<b>Sensible/Welcome change</b>	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	8%

**8 Do you agree that the new Part 8 standards are appropriate and will help drive up the quality of leadership and management in independent schools? If not, why not?**

There were 261 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Agree</b>	12	0	1	5	3	3	0	6	6	0	0	3	6	5	50	19
<b>Disagree</b>	78	9	0	13	3	0	0	22	4	2	0	0	3	5	139	53
<b>Not sure</b>	19	3	1	15	2	0	0	10	3	1	0	0	2	16	72	28
<b>ISI already assess leadership/management/governance</b>	59	7	0	0	0	0	0	19	2	0	0	0	1	2	90	34
<b>Misleading/confusing</b>	43	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	60	23
<b>How will it be measured?</b>	36	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	51	20
<b>Need clarity of roles- Governors Vs management/leadership</b>	65	6	0	0	0	0	0	21	3	0	0	0	2	2	99	38
<b>Not for the state to intervene here</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1

<b>9 a) Do you consider that any of the proposed changes to the regulations need to be amended from the draft text. Please explain why.</b>																
There were 252 responses to this question.																
	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Yes</b>	86	9	2	18	8	2	0	28	8	2	0	1	7	22	193	77%
<b>No</b>	7	1	0	8	4	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	28	11%
<b>Not Sure</b>	4	1	1	9	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	2	3	6	31	12%
<b>Clarity on distinction between Governor and Leadership/management</b>	28	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	2	0	43	17%
<b>No role to 'raise the bar' for independent schools</b>	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	10%
<b>Remove reference to 'national norms'</b>	35	4	1	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	49	19%
<b>Governors- Dont restrict on right to work basis</b>	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	10%
<b>Damaging impact on individuality/ethos of Ind schools</b>	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	11%
<b>Clarify/define- FBV</b>	5	3	1	6	4	1	0	3	1	2	0	0	2	9	37	15%
<b>21(3) Error</b>	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	12%

**9 b) If the standards as currently drafted were to form part of the new regulations, could you indicate the extent to which you see the new requirements adding a burden, including the likely cost of reviewing them and the cost of making any required changes to school policies? Please explain below.**

There were 226 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Yes</b>	77	8	1	11	3	2	0	23	6	1	0	2	7	8	149	66%
<b>No</b>	3	0	0	8	3	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	3	23	10%
<b>Not Sure</b>	11	4	2	11	3	1	0	4	3	1	0	0	3	11	54	24%
<b>Burden on staff/cost/time/general impact</b>	26	7	1	1	1	0	0	16	0	1	0	2	5	4	64	28%
<b>Independence of independent schools impacted</b>	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4%
<b>Risk assessment not needed- covered by H&amp;S</b>	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	20	9%

**9 c) Do you have any suggestions for how the Department might assist schools in meeting the new standards, particularly those that are small (fewer than 50, but more than 10 employees) or micro (fewer than 10 employees) businesses? If so, please set this out below.**

There were 195 responses to this question.

	Independent school	Independent school association	School inspector	Parent carer	Faith group	Academy free school	Academy/free school association	Headteacher principal	Governor	Proprietor	Maintained school	Local authority	Other representative body	Other	Total	
<b>Yes</b>	47	9	3	5	4	2	0	13	3	1	0	0	8	10	105	54%
<b>No</b>	16	1	0	12	3	0	0	8	3	0	0	1	2	9	55	28%
<b>Not Sure</b>	11	0	0	8	1	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	1	6	35	18%
<b>Consultation was rushed</b>	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	3	22	11%
<b>Guidance/templates/model policies etc</b>	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	8%
<b>Keep change to a minimum</b>	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	3%
<b>Time to implement/time before mandatory</b>	21	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	15%





Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2014

This document/publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3)

email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus)

download [www.gov.uk/government/consultations](http://www.gov.uk/government/consultations)

Reference: DFE-00719-2014



Follow us on Twitter:  
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:  
[facebook.com/educationgovuk](https://facebook.com/educationgovuk)