

Statement to parliament: EU Transport Council 11 December 2018

I attended the only formal Transport Council under the Austrian Presidency (the Presidency) in Brussels on Monday 3 December (2018).

The council reached general approaches on the social and market pillars of the first tranche of the 'mobility package'. The 'social pillar' is intended to establish a specific regulatory regime for the posting of workers in the road transport sector, and the 'market pillar' is intended to introduce new regulatory requirements for the operation of light commercial vehicles (vans) and to modify the 'cabotage' rules for vehicles operating in countries other than their country of establishment.

I welcomed the work that the Presidency had done to achieve compromises on these challenging proposals, give the range of view from Member States. During the discussion, I pressed for a further reduction in the proposed cabotage 'cooling-off period' (a period of time between cabotage operations) and for extending the period after which a vehicle should return to base to 10 weeks. After a lengthy debate a compromise was reached which included the reduction of the 'cabotage' cooling-off period to 5 days, clarifying when the posting of workers rules would apply to different haulage operations, removing altogether the requirement for the return of the vehicle, and retaining the original proposal to ban drivers from taking weekly rest in the cabin of their vehicles.

Following this, the Council reached a general approach on a proposal from the second tranche of the 'mobility package', to amend the current directive on combined transport. The existing directive liberalises cabotage operations when part of a freight journey that comprises a rail or sea leg. The general approach included an amendment to these cabotage provisions in line with the earlier compromise on cabotage rules.

The Council reached a general approach on the proposed directive on road infrastructure safety management (RISM), from the third tranche of the 'mobility package'.

The lunchtime debate consisted of ministers discussing how to address airspace capacity constraints and was followed by presentations from Eurocontrol Director General, Eamonn Brennan and Transport Commissioner, Violeta Bulc.

Later, the Council reached 2 general approaches on the proposed directive on minimum level of training for seafarers and the proposed regulation establishing a European maritime single window. In addition, the Council adopted conclusions on inland waterway transport.

The Council reached a partial general approach on the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF), endorsing the text presented by the Presidency. The

outstanding elements are those subject to horizontal negotiations on the multi-annual financial framework beyond 2020.

The Council noted the presidency's progress reports on discontinuing seasonal changes of time, rail passenger rights, streamlining the trans-European transport network, clean and energy efficient vehicles and electronic freight transport information.

Finally, there were several information points from member states, the Presidency and Commissioner Bulc under any other business. The Presidency updated Council on the provisional agreements reached with the European Parliament on electronic road tolling and exchange of information, safeguarding competition in air transport and aviation wet-leasing. Commissioner Bulc noted good progress in on-going EU-ASEAN aviation negotiations that she hoped would conclude this year. In reply to a joint declaration from Luxembourg, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany and the Netherlands on the social agenda in aviation, Commissioner Bulc noted that she would present a progress report on the social agenda identifying actions for potential completion. Ireland intervened to defend the value of new business models in aviation. Commissioner Bulc also drew attention to the 17 December conference on sustainable transport infrastructure charging and internalisation of transport externalities to be held in Brussels. The Presidency provided an update on the EU's space programme and the outcome of the informal meeting of Transport and Environment ministers held in Graz on the 29 to 30 October 2018. Finally, Romania presented transport plans for its incoming Presidency of the Council of the European Union.

[Speech: Lord Ahmad speech:](#) [International Human Rights Day 2018](#)

Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon to you all and a warm welcome to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and thank you Richard for your introduction.

When we look across the world, in headquarters of global institutions and in government ministries like this one, in the homes and offices of activists, and in classrooms and places of worship, today marks one of those days where people are coming together to mark Human Rights Day – 70 years to the day when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was signed.

But let us reflect on the last 70 years. 70 years ago the world was still reeling from global conflict. It was a world of families shattered by death, by destruction: a world in which people everywhere were calling on those in power to find peaceful ways to resolve their differences to show respect and understanding towards each other.

So when the United Nations was still only two years old, 48 leaders of the

most forward looking nations sought to do just that. They came together to proclaim the rights that every person should enjoy, each and every one of us should enjoy, regardless of age, regardless of their place of birth, their position in society, their faith, their religion, their race, their creed, their political views.

It was a bold aspiration and a courageous one, because so many of the two billion people on earth at that time did not enjoy these fundamental rights.

Let's fast forward 70 years, and I am amongst other things the Minister for the United Nations as well. And whilst our work continues on this important agenda there is no better word for it than a tragedy; the tragedy that today, in 2018, despite the progress that has been made in the seven decades after that Declaration was signed, millions, and yes it is millions as we all know to be true, still cannot rely on their governments, their communities, to protect their basic human rights.

That is why it is so important that all of us, each and every one of us who are committed to securing human rights for everyone, keeps coming together, keeps working together, to bring about a better future for all. You heard Richard say at the start, and it was quite deliberate on my part, that as a Minister, it is not me shying away from the questions. It is about hearing directly from the human rights defenders, those involved on the front line.

Human Rights Defenders

And I am delighted and honoured to be joined by the panel who represent such human rights defenders, who, like many in this room and tens of thousands of others around the world, dedicate their time, their efforts, their energy showing, great courage and great risk to their personal lives at times and great risk to the lives of their families.

It is poignant we focus on human rights defenders today, because yesterday was also the 20th Anniversary of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, which is why we chose to celebrate their work at the event this year.

Our panellists will tell you themselves about their work in a moment, but I'd like to introduce them briefly if I may, before I give a brief overview of some of our work from a British perspective on this important agenda on Human Rights, which I will also add is very close to my heart.

As we have already heard from Richard, we are joined by Dina Meza). She is a journalist in Honduras who is working to defend freedom of expression and information. And in case Dina, and after meeting her this morning, I would add this, a modest lady, and if she fails to tell you this herself is that she was named by Fortune magazine as one of the world's 50 greatest leaders of 2018. Why? Because of her work in this sphere. Thank you Dina for being here.

Another human rights defender joins us from a country I visited recently, Kenya. Wanjeri Nderu has created a network of civil society volunteers – including many lawyers and professionals – who use social media to defend the

human rights of those who are less able to defend themselves. Welcome to you as well, Wanjeri.

And I am also proud to welcome once again, someone I describe not just as someone who leads the charge on human rights defenders, but if I may say, someone who acts and provides sound advice, my good friend Kate Allen. Welcome Kate, who as many of us know champions the work of human rights, including as Director of Amnesty International UK, for the last 18 years. Thank you all for joining us here this afternoon.

The UK's Human Rights Work

I hope you will also agree, as I look around the audience, that the UK government has been a champion of human rights, fundamental freedoms, and democratic values. Let me assure you this will continue to be an absolutely integral part of what we do in Government as part of British foreign policy.

There are times, as I am sure you will all agree, for quiet diplomacy. But there are times for vocal campaigns, such as the call by our Prime Minister, Mrs May, on the ending modern slavery and human trafficking, to prevent sexual violence in conflict, or to ensure at least 12 years of quality education for every girl around the globe – our work, ladies and gentlemen, gives real momentum to a wide range of individual cases and indeed global issues.

In this respect, in the summer of this year, I was humbled and deeply honoured when the Prime Minister asked me to take on an additional role, as her Special Envoy on Freedom of Religion or Belief. Last month working with colleagues across the Department for International Development we announced a new programme of £12 million of Government funding and support programmes to support our shared vision of a world where people with different beliefs or no beliefs truly respect each other.

This is a responsibility I cherish, because when you look at the issue of Freedom of Religion or Belief, it is not just about the challenges we see abroad, regrettably, we still see these challenges on a domestic front; the rising tide of anti-Semitism both here and in Europe, and the issues of rising religious hate crime against minority communities. It is only through collective and collaborative action that we will not only face up to it, but we will defeat such divisive voices and actions.

My new role is a responsibility I greatly cherish and in recent months I have used it to promote the benefits of religious diversity around the world – recently in October I visited Indonesia; to raise our concerns directly with governments – I have also had the opportunity, amongst others, Sudan; and to convene conversations between leaders of all faiths – as I did in Israel earlier in the year, and as I do regularly through faith tables right here in London. I am delighted to see Archbishop Angaelos join us, who has been a constant support and friend in this respect. Thank you Archbishop for your support.

A failure to respect our differences while recognising and celebrating our

common humanity is at the root of so many of today's human rights abuses, and so many instances of the abuse of power. The United Kingdom government promotes good governance, for example through the Westminster Foundation for Democracy, and through our membership of the Community of Democracies, a grouping which we currently chair.

And as we use our position as a global leader to oppose the death penalty and to speak out against torture wherever it exists. Today also marks the close of 16 days of activism to end gender-based violence.

Ladies and gentlemen when you look around the world, it is unacceptable, it is tragic that one in three women, one in three women will experience physical or sexual violence in her lifetime – that is abuse on a truly, truly appalling scale.

In conflict situations, as I have seen myself through meeting some incredible women, courageous survivors both women and girls, but also men and boys, who experience violence and sexual abuse in even greater numbers.

This year, to mark the 16 days of activism on the issue, I was proud to host a film festival in London to draw attention to the experiences of survivors, through their direct sharing of experiences, about the appalling crime that is sexual violence in conflict. And also importantly to fight the important issue of stigma. Why should it be that these victims, who suffer the most horrendous crimes against their person, then not only have to relive that experience, but are then rejected by their very communities, at a time when they need their greatest support.

We must come together, stand united, to ensure not only are their rights protected, not only are perpetrators brought to account, but also that they are given the support they need to rebuild their lives.

The film festival began the countdown to the International Conference which the British Government will be hosting next year in November 2019, to mobilise the international community into further action.

Those who shine a light on the perpetrators of human rights violations and abuses are another increasingly vulnerable group.

Which is why the Foreign Secretary, Jeremy Hunt, is launching a new global campaign next year to champion media freedom, and to support journalists and campaigners who expose discrimination, corruption and injustice.

I am also delighted to report today that next June the United Kingdom will take over as co-chair of the Equal Rights Coalition, a grouping of 40 countries working together towards LGBT equality. This is an important area of our human rights work and we are particularly pleased that Argentina will partner us as the second co-chair.

Ladies and gentlemen those of you who have worked with me, know how close this issue is to the work I do. But I do so only as effectively as the deep collaborative partnerships and friendships that the Foreign Office has fostered with many of you in this room and beyond.

Conclusion I am proud, as the minister within the Foreign Office to be responsible for human rights. I am deeply humbled that by God's grace, I live in a country that not only respects but protects by law, the human rights of its citizens. But there is always work to be done.

But equally, I am proud and honoured to represent a country, the United Kingdom, that is committed to supporting, promoting and protecting the human rights of all people around the world.

It is a great honour to support the brave and committed people who carry out this most important of work, often at great personal risk. People like those on the panel today and those we are about to see on video; examples of human rights defenders drawn from Malawi, Mexico, Sierra Leone and the Philippines.

Ladies and gentlemen, today, on the 70th anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights, and indeed the 20th anniversary of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, let me take this opportunity on behalf of Her Majesty's Government to thank all of you, the panellists and those incredible and all human rights defenders around the world. We thank them for all their work on all aspects of this important agenda for their courage, their dedication, their devotion and incredible determination.

Let me say this to conclude, that we commit to continue strengthening our support for them as we collectively strive to build a better world.

I am not for a moment entertaining that this is an easy job; it is not. On a moment of personal reflection, when I meet with victims and survivors who have suffered the worst kind of human abuses against them, is both the heart-rendering moments, but then you reach deep; you reach deep into your own experience, you reach deep into the friendships that you have fostered over a number of years and you reach deep into the relationships that we have, with like-minded individuals, communities, groups and organisations around the world.

Sitting back and saying, "Isn't this terrible, what more can be done?" On a point of personal reflection, more can be done and often the question lies within yourself.

Because, if we collectively do more we will be able to start making the kind of differences we all wish to see. One of my biggest heroes in my life, who shaped many things in how I looked at the world was Ghandi. He famously said that "we must become the change we wish to see". Let us become that change, let us ensure we stand up with passion, with vigour, with commitment and emulate the bravery of human rights defenders around the world to ensure that we play our part, not just in government or leaders of NGOs and civil societies, but we play our part as human beings to ensure that we can live and say that we did our part in the defence and declaration of that Declaration envisaged all those years ago.

[News story: Transport Secretary and Aviation Minister meet leading UK airlines and airports](#)

The Rt. Hon. Chris Grayling MP, Secretary of State for Transport, and Baroness Sugg, Aviation Minister, this week hosted leaders from the aviation sector to discuss the advantages of the [Withdrawal Agreement with the EU](#).

The roundtable was attended by major airlines, tour operators and airports from across the UK that together carry millions of UK corporate and leisure travellers to their destinations each year.

Attendees discussed the Withdrawal Agreement and the importance of the stability provided by the implementation period. Airlines UK, the representative body for the sector, confirmed that “for UK aviation a Withdrawal Agreement is clearly in the interests of both the UK and Europe and so this agreement represents a path which can provide certainty and confidence for airlines, passengers and businesses alike.”

The Secretary of State and Baroness Sugg also highlighted positive and constructive discussions with the EU and Member States on aviation connectivity, and the recent EU proposed actions to ensure flights will continue in all circumstances as the UK leaves the EU.

A full list of attendees can be found below:

- Airlines UK
 - ADS Group
 - Airports Operators Association
 - BAR-UK
 - Birmingham Airport
 - CAA
 - easyJet
 - Heathrow
 - IAG
 - IATA
 - London City Airport
 - Manchester Airport Group
 - NATS
 - Manchester Airport
 - Thomas Cook
 - TUI
 - London Luton Airport
-

[News story: Updated approach to assessing applications from organisations promoting complementary and alternative therapies](#)



CHARITY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND AND WALES

The Charity Commission has concluded an in-depth review of its approach to assessing the charitable status of organisations which use or promote complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) therapies.

The review included an extensive public consultation, to which we received around 670 individual responses. A [report on the consultation responses](#) was published in December 2017.

We are grateful to all those who took part in the consultation and contributed to the review.

Our review concluded that the underlying legal principles around charitable status and the promotion of CAM remain unchanged. However, as a result of the review, we are updating our approach to assessing the charitable status of CAM organisations. That approach is reflected in [revised internal guidance](#), published today.

We have also published a [report setting out the outcome of the review](#).

Our guidance is now clearer that CAM organisations applying to register as charities will need to provide evidence that matches the claims that they make in order to demonstrate that they provide public benefit:

- those organisations that claim to treat or cure a disease or condition will need to provide appropriate scientific evidence.
- those organisations that instead claim to provide comfort and relief to patients, may be able to rely on other types of evidence, such as reports by patients, or observational studies based on patient responses, to demonstrate their public benefit.

The updated guidance will reduce the risk of CAM organisations that cannot evidence the claims they make benefiting from charitable status.

Published 11 December 2018

[Speech: Commentary on curriculum research – phase 3](#)

In January, I will consult on our new education inspection framework (EIF). As I have already announced, the heart of our proposals will be to refocus inspections on the quality of education, including curriculum intent, implementation and impact.

To ensure that inspection of the quality of education is valid and reliable, I commissioned a major, 2-year research study into the curriculum. I would like to thank the school leaders and teachers who have contributed to this work. We visited 40 schools in phase 1, 23 schools in phase 2 and now 64 schools in phase 3. When you add the focus groups, reviews of inspection reports and other methods, it's clear that this is a significant study and we can be confident in its conclusions.

Read Amanda Spielman's commentaries on [Phase 1](#) and [Phase 2](#) of Ofsted's curriculum research.

To recap, in phase 1 of the research, we attempted to understand more about the current state of curricular thinking in schools. We found that many schools were teaching to the test and teaching a narrowed curriculum in pursuit of league table outcomes, rather than thinking about the careful sequencing of a broad range of knowledge and skills. This was disappointing but unsurprising. We have accepted that inspection itself is in part to blame. It has played too great a role in intensifying performance data rather than complementing it.

Having found that some schools lacked strong curricular thinking, phase 2 sought to look at the opposite – those schools that had invested in curriculum design and aimed to raise standards through the curriculum. Although we went to schools that had very different approaches to the curriculum, we found some common factors that appear related to curriculum quality:

- the importance of subjects as individual disciplines
- using the curriculum to address disadvantage and provide equality of opportunity

- regular curriculum review
- using the curriculum as the progression model
- intelligent use of assessment to inform curriculum design
- retrieval of core knowledge baked into the curriculum
- distributed curriculum leadership

In phase 3, which is the subject of this commentary, we wanted to find out how we might inspect aspects of curriculum quality, including whether the factors above can apply across a much broader range of schools.

We also wanted to move beyond just looking at curriculum intent to looking at how schools implemented that thinking and what outcomes it led to. There has been some debate since we published my commentary on phase 2 about whether this would lead to an Ofsted-approved curriculum model. However, to reiterate there will be no 'Ofsted curriculum'. We will recognise a range of different approaches.

Phase 3 of our curriculum research shows that inspectors, school leaders and teachers from across a broad range of schools can indeed have professional, in-depth conversations about curriculum intent and implementation. Crucially, the evidence also shows that inspectors were able to make valid assessments of the quality of curriculum that a school is providing. Both parties could see the distinction between intent and implementation, and inspectors could see differences in curriculum quality between schools and also between subject departments within schools.

Importantly, what we also found was that schools can produce equally strong curricula regardless of the level of deprivation in their communities, which suggests that our new approach could be fairer to schools in disadvantaged areas. This is distinctly encouraging as we move towards the new inspection framework. You can read the [full findings of this research study](#). I have summarised the research design and main findings below.

Curriculum study – phase 3

In phase 3, we wanted to design a model of curriculum assessment that could be used across all schools and test it to see whether it produced valid and reliable results. Based on the phase 2 findings, discussions with expert HMI and our review of the academic literature, we came up with several hypotheses (detailed in the full report) and 25 indicators of curriculum quality to test (detailed at the end of this commentary). These indicators will not be directly translated into the new inspection framework. First, they were only tested in schools, not early years provision or further education and skills providers. Second, 25 indicators is too many for inspectors to use on an inspection, especially given the short timescales of modern inspection practice. What we were aiming to do was first to prove the concept (i.e. that it is possible to make valid and reliable assessments of quality) and second, to find out which types of indicators did that most clearly.

The 25 indicators were underpinned by a structured and systematic set of instructions for inspectors about how to use them for the research. Using conversations with senior leaders and subject leaders and collecting first-

hand evidence of implementation, inspectors were able to make focused assessments of schools against each of the indicators. Inspectors used a 5-point scale, where 5 was the highest, to help distance inspectors' thinking from the usual Ofsted grades. The full descriptors are at the end of this commentary, but by way of illustration:

- a score of 5 means 'this aspect of curriculum underpins/is central to the school's work/embedded practice/may include examples of exceptional curriculum'
- a score of 1 means 'this aspect is absent in curriculum design'

Within each school, inspectors looked at 4 different subjects: 1 core and 3 foundation. This allowed us to look at the level of consistency within each school, but also to find out more broadly which subjects, if any, had more advanced curricular thinking behind them. Inspectors also gave each school an overall banding, again from 5 to 1.

This gave us 71 data points for each school, based on all the evidence gathered. While this approach would not be suitable for an inspection, what it allowed us to do was to carry out statistical analyses to look at the validity of our research model and to refine and narrow the indicators to those that more clearly explained curriculum quality.

We visited 33 primary schools, 29 secondaries and 2 special schools. The sample was balanced in order to test the validity of our curriculum research model across a range of differing school contexts. The main selection criteria were: previous inspection judgements (outstanding, good and requires improvement (RI) only), geographical location (Ofsted regions) and school type (local authority (LA) maintained/academies), although we over-sampled for secondary schools and schools that were judged outstanding or RI at their last routine inspection. We ensured a wide spread in terms of performance data. Importantly, we also took care to select a range of institutions across an area-based index of deprivation. This meant that we had roughly equal numbers of schools in more and less deprived areas.

Primary/secondary

Figure 1: Curriculum overall banding by school phase

School phase	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Total
Primary	3	12	10	6	2	33
Secondary	–	3	10	17	1	31
Total	3	15	20	23	3	64

The 2 special schools are included in the secondary school data.

Figure 1 shows a clear difference in the distribution of the overall bandings between primary and secondary schools. Only 8 out of 33 (around a quarter) primary schools scored highly, i.e. a 4 or a 5 overall, whereas 16 out of 29 secondaries (over half) did.

Only 18 out of 64 schools scored poorly, i.e. a 1 or a 2, which is more encouraging than our phase 1 research might have suggested.

When we dig down into the subject-level data, we can begin to see why this might be.

Figure 2: Indicator 6a by subject departments assessed during the 33 primary schools visits

Subject area	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Total
Core						
English	–	1	6	9	1	17
Maths	1	1	8	6	1	17
Science	2	4	6	1	1	14
Foundation						
Humanities	7	7	11	5	–	30
Arts	4	9	6	2	1	22
PE	1	–	2	6	1	10
Technology	6	4	4	2	2	18
Modern foreign languages	–	–	2	1	3	6
Total	21	26	45	32	10	134

Indicator 6a: The curriculum has sufficient depth and coverage of knowledge in subjects. Includes 2 subject reviews conducted in the primary phase of an all through school.

Technology includes computer studies.

Figure 2 shows that when we look at subject depth and coverage in primary curricula, there are few low scores for the core subjects – just 8 scores of 1 or 2 out of 46 assessments. English and mathematics scores are particularly good. This would appear to be a result of two factors.

First, especially in key stage 1, literacy and numeracy are extremely important. Children cannot access other subjects if they do not have those basic reading, writing and calculation skills. This was recognised, albeit imperfectly, in the national strategies, which have given rise to the current modus operandi of many primary schools: English and mathematics in the morning and everything else in the afternoon.

Second though, it is a truism that what gets measured gets done. English and mathematics are what are measured in primary schools. It is hardly surprising, then, that they get the most lesson time and most curricular attention from leaders. It is clearly possible to do this badly, as we found in phase 1 where some schools were practising SATs as early as Christmas in Year 6 and focusing on reading comprehension papers rather than actually encouraging children to read. However, our results here appear to suggest that many more primary schools are doing it well.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the foundation subjects. It is disappointing to see so few higher scores in technology subjects, humanities and arts.

In phase 2 of our research, we saw that almost all of the primaries used topics or themes as their way of teaching the foundation subjects. However, the ones that were most invested in curriculum design had a clear focus on the subject knowledge to be learned in each subject and designed their topics around that. What appears to happen more often, though, is a selection of topics being taught that do not particularly link together or allow good coverage of and progression through the subjects. Figure 2 shows that 7 schools had a complete absence of curriculum design in humanities for example.

The picture appeared much stronger in secondary schools than in the primary schools we saw. There was considerably less difference between how well foundation subjects were being implemented compared with the core subjects.

Figure 3: Indicator 6a by subject departments assessed during the 29 secondary schools visits

Subject area	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Total
Core						
English	1	–	3	6	6	16
Maths	–	–	3	6	5	14
Science	–	–	2	4	2	8
Foundation						
Humanities	4	2	6	6	8	26
Arts	–	1	2	4	6	13
PE	–	1	1	1	3	6
Technology	–	2	2	2	2	8
Modern foreign languages	1	–	3	4	–	8
Other	2	–	5	4	4	15
Total	8	6	27	37	36	114

Indicator 6a: The curriculum has sufficient depth and coverage of knowledge in subjects. One of the secondary schools visited was an all through school. Only 2 subject reviews were carried out in the secondary phase for this visit.

Technology includes computer studies.

Arts subjects (art, music and drama) appeared particularly strong, with 10 out of 13 arts departments scoring a 4 or a 5. However, some subjects were still being implemented weakly compared with English and mathematics. In modern foreign languages, many of the features of successful curriculum design and implementation were absent or limited due to the lack of subject specialists. History was also less well organised and implemented in a number of schools, often to the detriment of a clear progression model through the curriculum. A lack of subject expertise, especially in leadership roles, contributed to these weaknesses.

The research visits to the 2 special schools in the sample showed that the curriculum indicators worked equally well in this context. We are unable to give more detail about the curriculum quality in these schools as it would be possible to identify which schools we are referring to. This would violate our research protocol and our agreement with the schools.

Ofsted grade, disadvantage and progress

Figure 4: Curriculum overall banding by the overall effectiveness judgement of the schools visited at their last routine inspection

Overall effectiveness	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Total
Outstanding	–	2	7	7	3	18
Good	2	7	9	12	–	30
Requires improvement	1	6	4	4	–	15
Total	3	15	20	23	3	64

Overall effectiveness judgements are based on data at time of sampling.

Figure 4 shows that there is a positive correlation between the banding schools received on their curriculum and their current Ofsted grade, albeit a weak one. This was being driven in part by relative curriculum weakness of the primary schools in the sample. The 3 schools that achieved the highest curriculum score all do have a current outstanding grade. However, we also assessed 9 outstanding schools as band 2 or 3 and 9 good schools as band 1 or 2.

It is worth remembering that some of the outstanding schools have not been inspected for over a decade, which means that the validity of that 'outstanding' grade is not certain.

A quarter of the RI schools visited were assessed as band 4, a high score. We know that under the current system it is harder to get a good or outstanding grade if your test scores are low, even if this is primarily a result of a challenging or deprived intake. This research suggests that some RI schools may in fact have strong curricula and should be rewarded for that

Figure 5: Curriculum overall banding by the income deprivation affecting children index quintile of each school

IDACI	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4	Band 5	Total
Quintile 1 (least deprived)	1	4	4	4	–	13
Quintile 2	–	4	5	3	2	14
Quintile 3	–	–	5	5	1	11
Quintile 4	1	4	3	5	–	13
Quintile 5 (most deprived)	1	3	3	6	–	13
Total	3	15	20	23	3	64

Deprivation is based on the income deprivation affecting children index. The deprivation of a provider is based on the mean of the deprivation indices associated with the home post codes of the pupils attending the school rather than the location of the school itself. The schools are divided into 5 equal groups (quintiles), from 'most deprived' (quintile 5) to 'least deprived' (quintile 1).

Figure 5 shows that there is no clear link between the deprivation levels of a school's community and a school's curriculum quality. In fact, there are more schools in the top 3 bands that are situated in the most deprived communities (69%) than there are in the least deprived (62%), although the

numbers of schools in each quintile are small. This is encouraging as we move towards the new inspection framework. It suggests that a move away from using performance data as such a large part of the basis for judgement and towards using overall quality of education will allow us to reward schools in challenging circumstances that are raising standards through strong curricula, much more equitably.

Figure 6: Curriculum overall banding by key stage 2 and key stage 4 progress measure bandings

Progress	Band 1 or 2	Band 3	Band 4 or 5	Total
Above average	3	4	8	15
Average	5	10	12	27
Below average	3	3	2	8
No data	7	3	2	12
Total	18	20	24	62

Key stage 4 progress 8 data (2018) and key stage 2 mathematics data (2017) have been merged for statistical disclosure control purposes. Proportion of schools in each banding differ between the various progress measures. Bandings and the key stage 4 progress measure encompasses more subjects than the single-subject measures used at key stage 2. Data for the 2 special schools is not included. Schools with no data are newly opened schools or infant schools. The progress bandings shown are based on the 5 progress measure bandings calculated by the Department for Education. 'Above average' combines 'above average' and 'well above average'; 'Below average' combines 'below average' and 'well below average'.

Figure 6 shows the link between published progress data and the overall curriculum banding given to each school. The vast majority of those scoring a band 4 or 5 have above average or average progress scores (20 out of 24). But there are clearly some schools in our sample where despite having strong progress scores, we found their curriculum to be lacking. It would be wrong to speculate on the reasons for this, but it is clearly something that inspections under the new framework would look to explore.

Intent and implementation

We carried out further statistical analyses of our research model. Although we had 25 indicators in the model, our analysis showed that the relationship between the scores for each one and the relationship to the overall banding really boiled them down to 2 main factors: intent and implementation.

Figure 7 visualises this statistical model of curriculum quality and the relationship between intent and implementation. There is more detail on how we calculated this in the main report.

Figure 7: Scores for the intent and implementation indicators at the individual school-level, grouped by phase

Figure 8 expands on the model and shows that the scores for intent and implementation factors for most schools were well linked. However, there are some schools in the top-left and bottom-right sections in which inspectors were able to see a difference in quality between the intent and the implementation. This reinforces the conclusion above that intent and

implementation can indeed be distinct. It should also dispel the suggestion by some commentators that our inspectors will be won over by schools that 'talk a good game' but do not put their intent into practice.

Most of the schools that scored well for intent but not so well for implementation (top left) were primaries. It is not hard to see primaries, particularly small ones, being less able to put their plans into action. It is difficult in many areas to recruit the right teachers. In small primaries, it is asking a lot of teachers to think about and teach the curriculum right across the range of subjects and even across year groups. Inspectors will of course consider these challenges when making their judgements.

Figure 8: List of curriculum indicators in the research model

In contrast, those schools that scored much better for implementation than for intent were all secondaries (bottom right). Again, it is not hard to imagine why that might be. Weak central leadership and lack of whole-school curriculum vision were more easily made up for in some of the secondary schools, particularly large ones, by strong heads of departments and strong teaching. This could also be a consequence of GCSE exam syllabuses playing the role of curricular thinking in the absence of a school's own vision. This is another nuance that inspectors will deal with under the new framework.

The variation between intent and implementation scores suggests that our research model is valid. It appears to be assessing the right things, in the right way, to produce an accurate and useful assessment of curriculum intent and implementation.

Despite the fact that relatively few schools scored highly across the board on these measures, particularly at primary, it is worth reiterating our commitment to keeping the overall proportions of schools achieving each grade roughly the same between the old framework and the new framework. We are not 'raising the bar'. That means explicitly that we will not be 'downgrading' vast numbers of primary or secondary schools. Instead, we recognise that curriculum thinking has been deprioritised in the system for too long, including by Ofsted. We do not expect to see this change overnight. The new framework represents a process of evolution rather than revolution. To set the benchmark too high would serve neither the sector nor pupils well. Instead, we will better recognise those schools in challenging circumstances that focus on delivering a rich and ambitious curriculum. At the same time, when we see schools excessively narrowing and gaming performance data, we will reflect that in their judgements.

Looking towards the EIF 2019

Through the autumn term, we have been piloting inspections under the proposed new framework. These pilots have drawn heavily from our curriculum research, including the indicators listed below. When we consult on our proposals in January, we will have behind us:

- the pilots

- our curriculum research
- research on lesson observation and work scrutiny
- an interrogation of the academic literature on educational effectiveness

The proposals will be detailed and firmly grounded in evidence.

It will be a full consultation and we genuinely welcome proposals for refinement. As the curriculum research has shown, there are still some challenges for us, particularly how we calibrate our judgement profile. Our aim over the spring term will be to listen to as many of you as possible, to address your concerns and hopefully hear your positivity about this new direction too. This research has given us a lot of confidence that our plans to look beyond data and assess the broader quality of education are achievable and necessary.

Figure 9: List of curriculum indicators in the research model

No. Indicator

- 1a There is a clear and coherent rationale for the curriculum design
- 1b Rationale and aims of the curriculum design are shared across the school and fully understood by all
- 1c Curriculum leaders show understanding of important concepts related to curriculum design, such as knowledge progression and sequencing of concepts
- 1d Curriculum coverage allows all pupils to access the content and make progress through the curriculum
- 2a The curriculum is at least as ambitious as the standards set by the National Curriculum / external qualifications
- 2b Curriculum principles include the requirements of centrally prescribed aims
- 2c Reading is prioritised to allow pupils to access the full curriculum offer
- 2d Mathematical fluency and confidence in numeracy are regarded as preconditions of success across the national curriculum
- 3a Subject leaders at all levels have clear roles and responsibilities to carry out their role in curriculum design and delivery
- 3b Subject leaders have the knowledge, expertise and practical skill to design and implement a curriculum
- 3c Leaders at all levels, including governors, regularly review and quality assure the subject to ensure it is implemented sufficiently well
- 4a Leaders ensure ongoing professional development/training is available for staff to ensure curriculum requirements can be met
- 4b Leaders enable curriculum expertise to develop across the school
- 5a Curriculum resources selected, including textbooks, serve the school's curricular intentions and the course of study and enable effective curriculum implementation
- 5b The way the curriculum is planned meets pupils' learning needs
- 5c Curriculum delivery is equitable for all groups and appropriate
- 5d Leaders ensure interventions are appropriately delivered to enhance pupils' capacity to access the full curriculum

- 6a The curriculum has sufficient depth and coverage of knowledge in the subjects
- 6b There is a model of curriculum progression for every subject
- 6c Curriculum mapping ensures sufficient coverage across the subject over time
- 7a Assessment is designed thoughtfully to shape future learning. Assessment is not excessive or onerous
- 7b Assessments are reliable. Teachers' ensure systems to check reliability of assessments in subjects are fully understood by staff
- 7c There is no mismatch between the planned and the delivered curriculum
- 8 The curriculum is successfully implemented to ensure pupils' progression in knowledge – pupils successfully 'learn the curriculum'
- 9 The curriculum provides parity for all groups of pupils

Indicators 1 to 2 are indicators framed around curriculum intent; 3 to 7 are implementation indicators and 8 to 9 relate to impact.

Figure 10: Categories applied in the rubric for scoring the curriculum indicators

5	4	3	2	1
This aspect of curriculum underpins/is central to the school's work/embedded practice/may include examples of exceptional curriculum	This aspect of curriculum is embedded with minor points for development (leaders are taking action to remedy minor shortfalls)	Coverage is sufficient but there are some weaknesses overall in a number of examples (identified by leaders but not yet remedying)	Major weaknesses evident in terms of either leadership, coverage or progression (leaders have not identified or started to remedy weaknesses)	This aspect is absent in curriculum design

List of schools visited

School name	Local authority	Type	Phase
Arnold Woodthorpe Infant School	Nottinghamshire	Community School	Primary
Babington Academy	Leicester	Academy Converter	Secondary
Birches Green Infant School	Birmingham	Community School	Primary
Broadwater Primary School	Wandsworth	Community School	Primary
Carville Primary School North	Tyneside	Foundation School	Primary
Castle Manor Academy	Suffolk	Academy Converter	Secondary
Chapelford Village Primary School	Warrington	Academy Converter	Primary
Chetwynde School	Cumbria	Free School	Secondary
Chingford CofE Primary School	Waltham Forest	Voluntary Controlled School	Primary

School name	Local authority	Type	Phase
Churchmead Church of England (VA) School	Windsor and Maidenhead	Voluntary Aided School	Secondary
City Academy Birmingham	Birmingham	Free School	Secondary
Corsham Primary School	Wiltshire	Academy Converter	Primary
Cosgrove Village Primary School	Northamptonshire	Community School	Primary
Cowley International College	St Helens	Community School	Secondary
Crossley Hall Primary School	Bradford	Community School	Primary
Ditton Park Academy	Slough	Free School	Secondary
Earlsdon Primary School	Coventry	Community School	Primary
Eden Girls' School Coventry	Coventry	Free School	Secondary
Elmridge Primary School	Trafford	Academy Converter	Primary
Figheldean St Michael's Church of England Primary School	Wiltshire	Academy Converter	Primary
Filey Church of England Nursery and Infants Academy	North Yorkshire	Academy Converter	Primary
Fir Vale School	Sheffield	Academy Converter	Secondary
Fowey River Academy	Cornwall	Academy Sponsor Led	Secondary
Harris Girls Academy Bromley**	Bromley	Academy Converter	Secondary
Holway Park Community Primary School	Somerset	Community School	Primary
Horndean Technology College	Hampshire	Community School	Secondary
Ixworth Free School	Suffolk	Free School	Secondary
JFS	Brent	Voluntary Aided School	Secondary
Ken Stimpson Community School	Peterborough	Community School	Secondary
Kettering Park Infant School	Northamptonshire	Academy Converter	Primary
King Edward VI Grammar School, Chelmsford	Essex	Academy Converter	Secondary
Lakenham Primary School	Norfolk	Foundation School	Primary
Lanchester Community Free School	Hertfordshire	Free School	Primary
Lansdowne School	Lambeth	Community Special School	Special
Linton Heights Junior School	Cambridgeshire	Academy Converter	Primary
Marfleet Primary School	Kingston upon Hull	Academy Converter	Primary

School name	Local authority	Type	Phase
New Haw Community Junior School	Surrey	Academy Converter	Primary
Ormiston Park Academy	Thurrock	Academy Sponsor Led	Secondary
Our Lady and St Patrick's, Catholic Primary	Cumbria	Voluntary Aided School	Primary
Parkside Primary School	East Riding of Yorkshire	Community School	Primary
Parley First School	Dorset	Community School	Primary
Pennington CofE School	Cumbria	Voluntary Controlled School	Primary
Penryn College	Cornwall	Academy Converter	Secondary
Princetown Community Primary School	Devon	Foundation School	Primary
Ravensbourne School	Havering	Academy Special Converter	Special
Ringway Primary School	Northumberland	Community School	Primary
Round Diamond Primary School	Hertfordshir	Community School	Primary
Sir Robert Pattinson Academy	Lincolnshire	Academy Converter	Secondary
Sir Thomas Boughey Academy	Staffordshire	Academy Converter	Secondary
Soar Valley College	Leicester	Community School	Secondary
Sompting Village Primary School	West Sussex	Community School	Primary
St Augustine's Catholic College	Wiltshire	Academy Converter	Secondary
St John the Divine Church of England Primary School	Lambeth	Voluntary Aided School	Primary
St Katherine's Church of England Primary School	Essex	Foundation School	Primary
St Mary Redcliffe and Temple School	Bristol	Voluntary Aided School	Secondary
The Barlow RC High School and Specialist Science College	Manchester	Voluntary Aided School	Secondary
The Bishop of Hereford's Bluecoat School	Herefordshire	Voluntary Aided School	Secondary
The Cottswold School	Gloucestershire	Academy Converter	Secondary
The Marston Thorold's Charity Church of England School	Lincolnshire	Voluntary Aided School	Primary
The North Halifax Grammar School	Calderdale	Academy Converter	Secondary
Trinity Catholic High School	Redbridge	Voluntary Aided School	Secondary
Upminster Infant School	Havering	Academy Converter	Primary

School name	Local authority	Type	Phase
Westwood College	Staffordshire	Academy Converter	Secondary
Winklebury Junior School	Hampshire	Community School	Primary

**The list of schools visited was amended on 19 December as Harris Academy Beckenham was included in error.