

# Consultation questionnaire

Integrated inspection of services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers and joint inspection of the local safeguarding children board

---

**Office for Standards in Education Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted)**

**The Care Quality Commission (CQC)**

**Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC)**

**Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMI probation)**

**Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMI Prisons)**



Corporate member of  
Plain English Campaign  
Committed to clearer communication

**361**

## Responding to this consultation

This document should be read alongside the full consultation document available at <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/140112>

The consultation will be open until 12 September 2014.

There are three ways of completing and submitting your response:

- Complete the online questionnaire:  
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/IntegratedInspection>
- Download this document from: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/140112>  
complete it on your computer and email it to [socialcare@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:socialcare@ofsted.gov.uk)
- Print this document, complete it by hand and post it to

Ofsted, Social Care Policy Team  
Floor 8, Aviation House  
125 Kingsway  
London  
WC2B 6SE.

## Confidentiality

The information you provide will be held by us. It will only be used for the purposes of consultation and research to help us to become more effective, shape policies and inform inspection and regulatory practice.

We will treat your identity in confidence if you disclose it to us. However, we may publish an organisation's views.

### Are you responding on behalf of an organisation or as an individual?

Individual response	<input type="checkbox"/>
On behalf of an organisation, please specify : This response has been drawn up by Family Rights Group and is endorsed by the following organisations: Action for Prisoners' Families, The Grandparents' Association, Grandparents Plus, NAGALRO, Open Nest, Siblings Together	

### Do you work in any of the following areas?

Social care	<input type="checkbox"/>	Education	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Policing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Probation services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Youth offending team	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provider of custodial or detention services	<input type="checkbox"/>	For a charity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
For a voluntary sector organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	None of these	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other (please tell us)			

### Are you a:

local authority Director of Children's Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	local authority Chief Executive	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local Safeguarding Children Board Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other local authority director or assistant director	<input type="checkbox"/>
practitioner in education	<input type="checkbox"/>	senior manager in education	<input type="checkbox"/>
practitioner in social care	<input type="checkbox"/>	senior manager in social care	<input type="checkbox"/>
General practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	other primary care professional	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other practitioner in health	<input type="checkbox"/>	other senior manager in health	<input type="checkbox"/>
Office of Police and Crime Commissioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	Police Officer/staff – Child Protection Specialist role	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police Officer/staff – other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Senior Police Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
YOT practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	YOT manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRC practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	CRC manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
NPS practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	NPS manager	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Practitioner in custodial services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Senior manager in custodial services	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practitioner in detention services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Senior manager in detention services	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lawyer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Elected representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
Child or young person	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parent/carer	<input type="checkbox"/>
No / Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other (please tell us) Cathy Ashley is the chief executive of Family Rights Group, the charity in England which specialises in advising and supporting parents and families whose children are in need, at risk, or in the care system. We advise more than 8,000 parents and relatives per year about their rights and options when they are involved with, or require local authority children's services. We promote			

policies and practices that help children to be raised safely and thrive within their families and communities and give families a voice when decisions are being made about their children's lives. We campaign for effective support to help struggling parents and family and friends carers who are raising children who cannot live at home.

# Proposal 1: How and where we will inspect

## How we will inspect?

Inspectors will look closely at the experiences of children and young people who have needed or still need help and/or protection This includes children and young people who are looked after and young people who are leaving care and starting their lives as young adults.

Inspectors will try to understand what the local authority and the partner agencies know about how well they are performing and the difference they are individually and collectively making for children and young people.

Each inspectorate will gather evidence in line with their own criteria. Throughout the inspection, the inspectorates will share findings and lines of enquiry

See paragraphs 33–37 of the full consultation document for further detail

**Q1a.** To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal for how we will conduct the integrated inspection?

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

We welcome the opportunity to contribute to this consultation on the proposed intergrated inspection of services for the specified group of children and joint inspection of the local safeguarding children board.

We note that in the description of the Ofsted "single inspection framework" (para 8) kinship care (also known as family and friends care) placements are not mentioned; therefore the experience and progress of children living with relatives are omitted from the inspection framework. Some of these kinship carers have no legal order for the child and are caring for the child under a private arrangement, others are approved foster carers, whilst and others have obtained parental responsibility under residence, child arrangements or special guardianship orders. The 2001 census analysis found that over 140000 children in England were not living with their parents and were being raised by relatives - more than are adopted or are in unrelated foster or residential care. Research shows that placements of children in family or friends care make a major contribution to stability for children who cannot live with their parents and there outcomes are generally better that for those in unrelated care (Selwyn J et all: The Poor Relation

Buttle UK).

We strongly recommend, therefore, that family and friends care be added to the list of areas on which the "single inspection framework" focuses. This would reinforce Government statutory family and friends care guidance (2011), which unfortunately we are all too aware is not being consistently implemented across the country.

We are pleased to see that it is proposed that inspectors will, wherever possible, talk to children, young people and their families (para 33) but we suggest that it be clarified that this includes children in kinship arrangements, parents and family and friends carers, for the reasons highlighted above.

We further suggest that, as part of the inspection process, consideration is given to how Children's Services and their partner agencies respond to referrals; again with specific reference to referrals from relatives and family and friends carers. We would like to see greater attention paid to how referrals are received and processed from parents and family and friends carers when they seek support to help their children thrive at home or within their family network or where they need help to keep their children safe. We are aware that families often receive a limited or variable response and their concerns and support requirements are not always fully explored or services provided, as they could be, in accordance with sections 17 and 20 of the Children Act 1989 (Ashley C & Kanow C (2014) 'Desperate for help: report analysing calls to FRG's advice service from families of children in need and at risk). Moreover, research has shown how levels of support (if any) provided to family and friends carers are more likely to be related to the child's legal status (e.g. whether they are in or out of the care system) than the extent of their needs. often struggle to have their needs addressed (Hunt J and Waterhouse S (2013) "It's Just Not Fair: support, need and legal status in family and friends care" FRG).

## Where we will inspect?

We will conduct an integrated inspection in 20–25 local authority areas between April 2015 and November 2016. These local authority areas will be identified in a number of ways:

- where Ofsted would be returning following a previous inadequate inspection judgement
- where other inspectorates have concerns about practice that suggest we should evaluate the quality of multi-agency work
- a sample of areas that don't meet these criteria will be inspected so that good practice can be identified and disseminated.

See paragraphs 38–39 of the full consultation document for further detail.

**Q1b.** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the criteria to identify the local authority areas where we will conduct an integrated inspection?

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

In addition to the criteria listed, we suggest that consideration be given to selecting local authority areas where there is evidence (via a pattern of complaints to local authority complaints services or referrals to Local Government Ombudsmen) which indicates that parents, kinship carers, children and young people have raised concerns about practice, services, multi-agency working, decision-making or how they have been supported. This would help ensure that the inspection processes are meaningful for the families engaged with the inspected services and that the learning from this process should promote better practice.

## Proposal 2: the judgement structure

We propose that the judgement structure used by CQC and HMIC will mirror the judgement structure used by Ofsted in its single inspection:

- The overall effectiveness of services and arrangements for children – one on each of the local authority, health services and police force.

This is a cumulative judgement for each of the local authority, health service and police derived from:

- The experiences and progress of children who need help and protection – one on each of the local authority, health services and police force
- The experiences and progress of children looked after and care leavers – one on each of the local authority and health services
- Leadership, management and governance – one on each of the local authority, health services and police force.

See paragraphs 40–45 of the full consultation document for further detail.

Questions on the specific evaluation criteria are asked later in this questionnaire.

**Q2a.** To what extent do you agree or disagree that Ofsted, CQC and HMIC should use the same judgment structure?

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

The summaries provided in paragraphs 43 - 45 are helpful in bringing together the basis for the same judgement structure for the individual agencies (local authority, health services and police) and the shared judgement about the effectiveness of the LSCB (which additionally includes probation, youth offending and prison services, where relevant).

In para 43 it would be very useful to name the child in need process which has not been specifically referred to in the sentence which states "Thresholds between early help and statutory child protection work are appropriate, understood and operate effectively". It is important that this vital area of family support for those children who have additional requirements for their safety, health and/or development, or because they are disabled, is included in the judgement structure so that how agencies recognise, respond to and provide support to children "in



need" is judged.

It is positive that there is an emphasis on social workers building relationships with children and their families. However, whilst the summary refers to this relationship-building with regards to assessing the likelihood of, and capacity for change, it does not mention how parents and families will be supported to promote change, an important role for children's services and the health service, in particular. Nor is reference made, despite the significance of health professionals, to mothers whose children are removed, including helping them manage their relationship with their child from who they are living apart, support with their feelings of loss and with addressing the reasons why their child was removed and maximising their chances of successfully keeping subsequent children.

Legislation and guidance provides for support and services to be given to families to safeguard and promote children's welfare and research indicates that this can prevent the need for children to enter the care system.

Paragraph 44 which summarises how judgements will be made about the experiences and progress of Looked After children, including care leavers, clearly emphasises how social workers and professionals should listen to the children and young people they are supporting. We recommend that this be strengthened to include a specific reference to mothers, fathers and family and friend carers also being listened to and encouraged to be as involved as is appropriate. This is important in recognition of the parental responsibility that parents and some family and friend carers hold, and also in view of their ongoing relationship with the children (before, during and after time spent in care). The lack of explicit reference to fathers in the inspection framework is concerning, because consistent research findings (Ashley et al (2013) Working with Risky Fathers) has found that fathers, including those in prison (and paternal relatives) are not consistently engaged by statutory services in decision by the state about their children.

The single inspection framework (which we previously responded to consultation on) does include as evidence of good practice use of family group conferences and pre-proceedings planning and states that families should be made aware of and encouraged to access legal advice and advocacy. As this proposed integrated inspection framework seeks to mirror the single inspection framework, we would recommend that these advice and advocacy and family group conferences are specifically highlighted for all of the agencies e.g. Care Quality Commission and HMIC so that all professionals actively consider how to effectively engage with and promote participation from parents and carers and be fully aware of these mechanisms as a powerful means for doing so. This would be consistent with Government guidance which specifically recommends early involvement of family members and that consideration be given to a referral for an FGC to support parents to care or to identify suitable family placements where a child may not be able to remain in their parents' care (Department for Education statutory guidance: Volume 1 Court Orders and pre-proceedings, 2014, paras 22 - 24).

At the same time all five inspectorates will make a shared judgement about the effectiveness of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB). This shared judgement will take account of the contribution of the local authority, health services, police force, probation services and (where relevant) the prison service.

See paragraph 42 of the full consultation document for further detail.

A question on the specific evaluation criteria is asked later in this questionnaire.

**Q2b.** To what extent do you agree or disagree that the inspectorates should make a shared judgment about the effectiveness of the LSCB?

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

## Proposals 3 and 4: the evaluation criteria

### Ofsted

Ofsted will continue to make judgements using the evaluation criteria outlined in the single inspection framework: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/130216>

The evidence to support these judgements will be triangulated with the findings of the other inspectorates where relevant to ensure that any strengths and weaknesses in practice are attributed to the right part system.

See paragraphs 47–48 of the full consultation document for further detail.

**Q3a.** To what extent do you agree or disagree that Ofsted should continue to use the judgement criteria outlined in the single inspection framework when conducting an integrated inspection?

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

FRG (as part of the Kinship Care alliance) responded to the consultation on Ofsted's inspection of services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers, in July 2013, whereby we highlighted our areas of agreement and put forward suggestions for clarification and improvements.

As the single inspection framework is now in place our concern is that the issues we identified in our response to Q1a above be addressed i.e:

- that the omission of family and friends care as one of the areas of focus be rectified
- that how Children's Services response to referrals particularly from parents and family and friends carers be included.

## The Care Quality Commission

The characteristics of 'good' in the CQC proposals have been developed from their single agency inspection programme key lines of enquiry. To ensure that there is a coherent approach across inspectorates, this has to include some additional detail. Once the characteristics have been finalised, there will be a review back to the single agency methodology to update the key lines of enquiry and ensure consistency in the areas of activity assessed.

See paragraphs 49–70 of the full consultation document for CQC's proposals.

**Q3b.** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the criteria CQC propose for evaluating the effectiveness of health services:

The overall effectiveness of health services? (paragraphs 63–67)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

The experiences and progress of children who need help and protection – health services (paragraph 68)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

The experiences and progress of children looked after and care leavers – health services? (paragraph 69)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

Leadership, management and governance – health services? (paragraph 70)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

# Her Majesty's Inspectorate Of Constabulary

HMIC's contribution to the integrated inspection includes the review of the overall service that is provided by police forces to safeguard children who need help and protection. HMIC will focus on the experiences and outcomes of children within the geographical boundaries of the local authority area and report on the performance of the police serving that area.

See paragraphs 71–81 of the full consultation document for HMIC's proposals.

**Q3c.** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the criteria HMIC propose for evaluating the effectiveness of the police force:

The overall effectiveness of the police force? (paragraphs 75–79)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

The experiences and progress of children who need help and protection – the police force? (paragraph 80)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

Leadership, management and governance – the police force? (paragraph 81)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal



# Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation

HMI Probation will inspect a small sample of cases held by providers of probation services and youth offending teams in the local authority area. We are proposing that the quality of the work to protect children, including, in the case of youth offending services, children looked after, be assessed against the criteria set out in the full consultation document.

See paragraphs 82–97 of the full consultation document for HMI Probation’s proposals.

**Q4a.** To what extent do you agree or disagree with criteria HMI Probation propose for evaluating the effectiveness of:

The National Probation Services and Community Rehabilitation Companies?  
(paragraphs 84–90)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

Youth offending teams? (paragraphs 91–97)

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

## Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons

When an integrated inspection is carried out where there is a custodial establishment or detention facility within the local authority area, HMI Prisons will endeavour to align its own inspection schedule so that the work can be completed simultaneously.

See paragraphs 98–107 of the full consultation document for HMI Prison’s proposals.

**Q4b.** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the criteria HMI Prisons propose for evaluating the effectiveness of custodial and detention services?

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

# Proposal 5: how we will report

We will not make an aggregate judgement, but we will bring together the key findings from all agencies about the help, protection and care of children and young people into a summary report.

In addition, we intend to produce individual agency reports that will focus on the key strengths and weaknesses in the individual agencies.

The summary report and individual agency reports will be combined into one document for publication.

See paragraphs 108–111 of the full consultation for further detail.

**Q5.** To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposals for how we will report our findings?

<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

## Proposal 6: joint inspection of the LSCB

All the inspectorates will together evaluate the effectiveness and influence of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) and the contribution of partners to making a difference to the lives of children and young people locally. We will make a shared judgement and produce a joint report.

See paragraphs 112–118 of the full consultation document for our full shared criteria for the inspection of the LSCB

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with our shared criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the LSCB?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No answer
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any comments on our proposal

It is positive to note that para (h.) describes how the experiences of children and young people are used as a measure of improvement when judging a LSCB as "good". However, we recommend that this be broadened to also specifically refer to the experience of children living in formal and informal family and friends care arrangements.

Furthermore, we propose that this descriptor is amended to include feedback from parents and family and friends carers about how they are helped to care for and protect their children and address any difficulties they may be experiencing in their own right.

We note that Professor Eileen Munro in her recent review of the first Ofsted inspections under this new framework also commented on the importance of feedback which addresss not only the the longer term effects of service involvement but also the quality of the experience of receiving a service. She highlighted how inspection can encourage the development of ways in which feedback from families in contact with services can be obtained.

( E.Munro, "Review of first eleven Ofsted inspections of services for children in need of help and protection, children looked after and care leavers, and Local Safeguarding Children Boards" March 2014, pages 11 - 12) .

We would like therefore to see feedback from parents and family and friends carers specifically included in this descriptor.



## What did you think of this consultation?

Thank you for taking part in our consultation.

Please tell us what you thought of this consultation. Your views will help us to improve our consultations.

How did you hear about this consultation?

- Ofsted
- CQC
- HMI Constabulary
- HMI Probation
- HMI Prisons
- Other (please specify)

	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Don't know
I found the consultation information clear and easy to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I found the consultation easy to find.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had enough information about the consultation topic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would take part in a future Ofsted consultation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Is there anything you would like us to improve on or do differently for future consultations? If so, please tell us below.

Q 3a asks if respondents agree or disagree that Ofsted inspectors should make judgements using the judgement criteria outlined in the single inspection framework when undertaking an integrated inspection. However, this framework is not attached or explained in any detail; instead an online link is provided on the consultation form and the respondent then has to access a copy of the 46 page, recently published (June 2014) document. Attaching the document would make it more accessible and the process more transparent. It would also encourage the respondent to review this important document which the consultation describes as the "spine" of the integrated inspection (para 19).

## Additional questions about you

Your answers to the following questions will help us to evaluate how successfully we are gathering views from all sections of society. We would like to assure you that all responses are anonymous and you do not have to answer every question.

Please tick the appropriate box.

### 1. Gender

Female	<input type="checkbox"/>	Male	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------

### 2. Age

Under 14 <input type="checkbox"/>	14–18 <input type="checkbox"/>	19–24 <input type="checkbox"/>	25–34 <input type="checkbox"/>	35–44 <input type="checkbox"/>	45–54 <input type="checkbox"/>	55–64 <input type="checkbox"/>	65+ <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

### 3. Ethnic origin

(a) How would you describe your national group?

British or mixed British	<input type="checkbox"/>	English	<input type="checkbox"/>
Northern Irish	<input type="checkbox"/>	Irish	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scottish	<input type="checkbox"/>	Welsh	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>		

(b) How would you describe your ethnic group?

<b>Asian</b>		<b>Mixed ethnic origin</b>	
Bangladeshi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Asian and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indian	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black African and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/>	Black Caribbean and White	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other Asian background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other mixed ethnic background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Black</b>		<b>White</b>	



African	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any White background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Any other ethnic background</b>	
Any other Black background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Chinese</b>			
Any Chinese background (specify if you wish)	<input type="checkbox"/>		

#### 4. Sexual orientation

Heterosexual <input type="checkbox"/>	Lesbian <input type="checkbox"/>	Gay <input type="checkbox"/>	Bisexual <input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

#### 5. Religion/belief

None	<input type="checkbox"/>	Christian (including Church of England, Catholic, Protestant and all other Christian denominations)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Buddhist	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hindu	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jewish	<input type="checkbox"/>	Muslim	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sikh	<input type="checkbox"/>	Any other, please state:	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 6. Disability

Do you consider yourself to be disabled?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------