

Accountability through Inspection: Monitoring and Evaluating Jewish Schools

conducted between September 2003 and April 2007

An overview of 25 inspections

by Dr Helena Miller

Supported by



© 2007

Pikuach, Board of Deputies of British Jews, 6 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2LP
Tel: 020 7543 5400 Fax: 020 7543 0010 email: info@bod.org.uk

Foreword

The publication of *Accountability through Inspection: Monitoring and Evaluating Jewish Schools, September 2003 - April 2007* is a significant accomplishment in the history of what have come to be known as the Pikuach reports. First published in 2000 as the culmination of a ground breaking inspection service launched by the Board of Deputies of British Jews in 1996 and supported by the United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA), Pikuach is the UK Jewish community's response to the Government's requirement to ensure that denominational religious education is systematically inspected under the framework set down by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). As a consequence, the Pikuach evaluation process has become an indispensable means of monitoring and improving professional standards in the teaching of Jewish Studies in Jewish schools throughout the UK.

The present report by Dr. Helena Miller constitutes the third publication of its kind and is the successor to *Inspecting Jewish Schools, September 1999 to June 2003*. It is more than an updated version of earlier reports however. On the one hand, its findings provide valuable data and insights regarding the progress Jewish schools have made over the years – especially when looking at how they have built on the recommendations that grew out of earlier inspections. More significantly, however, the current report reflects the changes in the way State funded schools are accountable to the government – including a changing educational climate that puts a particular emphasis on self-evaluation. Additional Ofsted requirements include shorter, sharper inspections, shorter notice of inspections as well as more frequent inspections.

The present report is also a reliable index of how the evolved Pikuach framework has served as a catalyst for improving the overall character of Jewish Studies teaching – one that also takes into account a new focus on pupils' personal development and well-being, increased provision in Special Educational Needs (SEN), learning about other faiths and cultures as well as the use of Information and Communications Technology (ICT).

Most importantly, the fact that Pikuach is now being used by schools across the religious spectrum, from Progressive, to Pluralist to United Synagogue to Charedi, and services almost three quarters of all Jewish schools in the UK – is an eloquent testimony to the role it plays in our community's ongoing quest for educational excellence in Jewish learning.

Henry Grunwald, QC
Board of Deputies of British Jews

Anthony Warrens
United Jewish Israel Appeal

Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Conducting an Inspection	8
3. Overall effectiveness of the schools' provision for Jewish Education	11
4. What the schools can do to improve further	13
5. Achievement and Standards	14
6. Personal Development and Well-Being	16
7. Quality of Provision	18
8. Leadership and Management	21
9. Discussion and Recommendations	23
10. Bibliography	28
11. Appendix 1: List of Schools inspected by Pikuach June 2003 - April 2007	29
12. Appendix 2: List of Pikuach Inspectors	30
13. Appendix 3: Governance and Management of Pikuach	31
14. Appendix 4: Glossary of Jewish and Educational Terms	32

Preface

I warmly welcome this report, which highlights the good progress that Jewish schools are making, as well as identifying key areas for improvement. The report demonstrates a commitment to openness, transparency and continuous improvement on the part of Pikuach. Good religious education contributes to the spiritual and moral development of pupils and underpins the faith ethos of Jewish schools. I am pleased that the report recognises the need for all schools to contribute to community cohesion and inclusion. I also appreciate the way in which Pikuach and the schools within the Jewish community have responded to the challenges presented by the Government's new approach to school inspection, particularly the way in which self-evaluation has been embraced and incorporated.

Lord Andrew Adonis

Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Schools

1

Introduction

1.1

More than 35% of British children attend single faith schools (*DfES 2001*). That number is growing and in the last thirty years, the provision of full time Jewish schooling in Britain for children from four to eighteen years old has risen sharply. In 2007, it is estimated that the proportion of Jewish children in full-time education has risen to approximately 60% (*Board of Deputies of British Jews 2007*) and still rising annually. Within the last three years, we have seen one Jewish secondary school expand from an annual intake of 240 pupils to 300 pupils, we have seen a new secondary school open, another in the process of development, and a new primary school. This expansion of provision has to be balanced by a slowly shrinking Jewish population in Britain and by demographic shifts that cause many of our schools to be highly over-subscribed, whilst others are fighting to remain open.

1.2

There are currently 93 full-time Jewish educational institutions in the UK, serving approximately 30,000 children of compulsory school age (five – sixteen). Of these schools, 48 are primary, 24 secondary with the remaining 21 providing education at both primary and secondary levels. Currently, 37 (41%) are in the voluntary aided sector (*Board of Deputies of British Jews 2007*). Pikuach currently serves the majority of the schools in the

voluntary aided sector, as well as a small proportion of the independent schools.

1.3

The Pikuach inspection service came into being in 1996, an initiative of Laurie Rosenberg, then education officer at the Board of Deputies, London. Pikuach was the response of the Jewish community in Britain to the government requirement that schools have their denominational religious education inspected by teams of inspectors using a uniform framework drawn up by Ofsted – the Office for Standards in Education (*UK Education Acts 1992, 1996*). It is supported financially by the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and the United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA). In addition, lay leaders and professionals from both the Board of Deputies and the UJIA sit on the Pikuach Management and Advisory Boards.

1.4

In state aided denominational schools, which include Jewish schools, the distinctiveness of religious education and the schools' contribution to a child's spiritual development are inspected under Section 48 of the Education Act 2005 (previously under Section 23 of the 1996 Act) and the school's governing body has the responsibility for selecting inspectors of denominational religious education and collective worship.

1.5

To this day, Pikuach has upheld its four main objectives which seek to support standards of Jewish education within Jewish day schools. These are:

- To provide Jewish schools with a framework for evaluating their Jewish education programmes.
- To enable Jewish voluntary aided schools to satisfy statutory requirements.
- To help Jewish schools evaluate the spiritual development of their pupils.
- To contribute to the development of quality Jewish education in Britain.

1.6

Two previous reports on the inspection of Jewish schools (*Felsenstein 2000, Miller 2003*) reflected upon and evaluated the findings from the more than fifty inspections carried out between 1996, when Pikuach was created and 2003. Overall it was found that schools achieved well against the standards they set themselves, and against which they were being inspected. Whilst, however, much evidence of good practice was found, there were areas for development in every school that was inspected. Furthermore, many of the areas highlighted for action in the 2000 report were the same as those areas highlighted in the 2003 report. This raises questions related to how closely schools addressed issues for action following inspection. Particular areas for concern included the standard of Hebrew teaching – both *Ivrit* (modern Hebrew) and

Classical, as well as the lack of attention paid to Special Educational Needs (SEN). Other areas highlighted in 2003, but not in 2000, reflected the changing Jewish and general educational scene in Britain, one example being that in 2000, no cross-curricular or integrated initiatives were reported, whereas in 2003, this was a focus for comment in many of the reports. Within the Jewish primary school system in Britain, there has been an increasing effort to integrate Jewish Studies and secular studies as appropriate over the last five years.

1.7

Between June 2003 and April 2007, education in Britain has faced many changes, in particular to the way in which State-funded schools are accountable to the government. With respect to inspection, since 2006, all State-funded schools have had to relate to a completely re-focused inspection framework. This framework emphasises self-evaluation, and through posing a comprehensive series of questions (*Ofsted 2006*) enables schools to both judge themselves and identify action for improvement. The inspection process is an opportunity for schools to show the inspectors how well they know themselves. The Pikuach framework and processes of inspection have changed during this period to take account of government legislation in addition to the changing educational climate. As a result, Pikuach has revised all its documentation and processes to enable Jewish education to also be inspected through a self-evaluation framework (2006).

1.8

The implications of these changes for Pikuach however, went beyond developing a new framework – in itself a major piece of work involving Pikuach inspectors as well as headteachers and heads of Jewish Studies of fifteen Jewish schools. Pikuach inspectors, however experienced they were in conducting inspections within the old framework, had to be retrained to understand the new, self-evaluation framework, and headteachers and heads of Jewish Studies needed, and continue to

need, training and support in order to be able to write their self-evaluation forms in the ways that truly reflect the quality and day-to-day running of their institutions with respect to the Jewish Education they provide. Self-evaluation gives schools the opportunity to reflect on what is happening in their settings in three ways: firstly, through description; secondly, through giving evidence to illustrate that description; and thirdly, to evaluate that description and evidence in order to be able to identify action for improvement.

2

Conducting an Inspection

2.1

Since the inception of Pikuach in 1996, it should be stressed that all our schools have been inspected according to their own aims and goals. This has always been necessary within the Jewish community as there is no absolute aim or expected standard of Jewish education. As described in the previous Pikuach report 'the Jewish day school system in England has grown organically, with no central guidance or accountability' (*Pikuach* 2003, p.4). The variety of schools, from Progressive, to Pluralist to United Synagogue to Charedi has created a system of institutions and small groups of institutions, with curricula and expectations reflecting the individualism of each school's governing body and stakeholders.

2.2

Since June 2003, of the 25 schools that have been inspected by Pikuach, only five inspections took place prior to the Self-Evaluation Framework being put in place. As you will see from Appendix 1, the Jewish community was also fortunate that although the new Framework regulations came into being in September 2005, no Jewish school was targeted for inspection until January 2006. This gave Pikuach a generous amount of time to ensure that our re-modelled framework was ready, and that our inspectors were re-trained in the new Framework.

2.3

Of the 25 schools inspected in the period relating to this report, only four had not previously been inspected by Pikuach. All of these schools were religiously to the right of the community. Of the schools that had been previously inspected by Pikuach, the length of time between inspections varied from eight years to two years, with an average of six years between inspections. These fluctuations can be explained by various reasons, for example: a school moving location resulting in a longer gap between inspections, or a school which had previously achieved a poor Ofsted report, resulting in a shorter gap between inspections.

2.4

The schools inspected between September 2003 and April 2007 fell into the following categories:

Primary	17 schools
Secondary	7 schools
Special education	1 school

2.5

The schools inspected during the previous reporting period 2000-2003 included only one secondary school, and it was valuable to be able to investigate trends based on a wider pool of secondary schools this time. The previous reporting period also included two independent schools. This time, all schools fell within the State-maintained sector. Between 2000-2003,

nine schools outside the greater London area were inspected, since then only six non-London area schools have been inspected.

2.6

The following report broadly follows the order of an inspection report, as it is normally written, after a school inspection based on a self-evaluation framework. The period that this report covers, however, overlaps the time span encompassing both the “old” style inspections and the “new”. This section, therefore, precedes the findings of inspections to enable the reader to understand how the differences to the Ofsted framework brought into force in 2006 affected subsequent Pikuach inspections.

2.7

The government has been committed to bringing forward changes to the statutory basis of school inspection in order to require inspectors to report on the contributions made by schools as set out in the current *Children Act (2004)* and in the document *Every Child Matters (2003)*. The consultation on the *Framework for Inspecting Schools (2003)*, set out requirements for school inspections in England from September 2005. It incorporated significant changes in the policy for school inspection as set out in *A New Relationship with Schools (2004)*. In 2005, Pikuach re-designed its inspection framework so that it would be in line with Ofsted.

2.8

The main features of the new style inspections for both Ofsted and Pikuach have been:

- Shorter, sharper inspections taking no more than two days in school, taking self-evaluation evidence as the starting point.
- Shorter notice of inspections to avoid schools carrying out unnecessary pre-inspection preparation and reducing the levels of stress often associated with inspection. The intention has been that shorter notice should help inspectors see schools as they really are.
- An intention to conduct more frequent inspections with the maximum period between inspections to be reduced from six to three years, although more frequent in schools causing concern.
- Emphasis to be placed on the school’s own self-evaluation evidence as the starting point for the inspection.
- A common set of characteristics to inspection across all phases of education.

2.9

The Ofsted common inspection schedule seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How effective is the provision of education, training and care in meeting the needs of learners and why?
2. What steps need to be taken to improve provision further?
3. How well do learners achieve?
4. How effective are teaching, training and learning?
5. How well do programmes and activities meet the needs and interests of learners?
6. How well are learners guided and supported?
7. How effective are leadership and management in raising achievement and supporting all learners?

2.10

The inspection report broadly follows these categories and a common grading scale for all categories has been developed as follows:

Grade 1	Outstanding
Grade 2	Good
Grade 3	Satisfactory
Grade 4	Unsatisfactory

2.11

The new Pikuach framework parallels the new Ofsted framework with its strong emphasis on the school's self-evaluation as a basis for inspection. Inspectors take full account of the school's analysis of its own performance; this features clearly in every aspect of inspection, from discussions with senior staff, to classroom observation, to scrutiny of work.

2.12

Prior to the inspection, inspectors gain an understanding of the school through close reading of the school's self-evaluation form, good communication with the head teacher and clear identification of issues for inspection.

2.13

During the inspection, the time is mainly used for gathering first hand evidence leading to conclusions about the effectiveness of the Jewish Education in the school; its main strengths and issues for development. The self-evaluation form is continually used as a reference point.

2.14

The outcomes of inspection are explained to the senior managers and key governor(s) towards the end of the second day of inspection and then recorded within the Pikuach report, written by the inspectors, which is published by the Board of Deputies.

2.15

The transfer of Pikuach from the old to the new style of inspection has raised many issues – from timing and organisation of inspections, to training and development of inspectors, to follow-up of inspection outcomes. These will be discussed in more detail in the discussion and recommendation section of this report.

3

Overall Effectiveness of the School's Provision for Jewish Education

3.1

This section replaces the summary of main findings and key issues for action as reported through Ofsted and Pikuach prior to Autumn 2005. Whilst five of the schools reported here were inspected under the old regulations, the relevant comments related to all the schools inspected after June 2003 until April 2007 are included under this heading 'Overall effectiveness'. All references refer exclusively to the Jewish education in the schools inspected and each area mentioned below is commented in greater detail under the appropriate heading which follows, together with less significant issues, which are not highlighted in this summary.

- The quality of provision of Jewish Education, evidenced through teaching and learning, is most often good, never less than satisfactory overall and at times, outstanding.
- Spiritual, moral, social and cultural development, including collective worship, care, guidance and support, is often outstanding and always good in every school that was inspected.
- The Jewish ethos of every school was at least good and often outstanding, evidenced by the atmosphere in the schools and the enthusiasm for Jewish Education witnessed during the inspection process.
- In all schools inspected for a second or third time, at least some of the issues that were documented in previous inspections had been addressed. In some schools, there are still outstanding issues from previous inspections that have not yet been satisfactorily addressed.
- Where the quality of leadership is good or outstanding, this is clearly reflected in the performance and standards of the school.
- Almost every school shows accuracy and perception in its self-evaluation of all areas of Jewish Education, as evidenced through inspections based on the new *Pikuach Framework (2006)* with its emphasis on the *Self-Evaluation Framework*.
- Curriculum development in Jewish Studies and Hebrew is satisfactory but only good or better in some schools.
- The teaching of Biblical Hebrew reading and writing is overall satisfactory, but is not consistently better than that.

- Assessment and marking in Jewish Studies needs addressing to achieve consistency and help for teachers and students in achieving student' potential.
- Special Educational Needs (SEN) in Jewish Studies is satisfactory in most schools, but needs to be further developed to provide a good or better level of provision.
- Information Communication Technology (ICT) is not employed in schools as well as it is in general subjects, thereby missing opportunities to take advantage of the latest published learning resources.

4

What schools should do to improve further

- Address outstanding issues from previous inspections that have not yet been satisfactorily addressed.
- Ensure that good or outstanding leadership is in place which will reflect in the raising of performance and standards.
- Work with current Curriculum development initiatives in Jewish Studies and Hebrew Studies to raise standards of curriculum and its delivery.
- Continue to raise the standards of the teaching of biblical Hebrew reading and writing by re-evaluating curricula, providing continuity and progression.
- Develop clear assessment and marking guidelines in Jewish studies and Hebrew Studies.
- Further develop the provision for pupils with Special Educational Needs in Jewish Studies to ensure that the needs of all children are being addressed through clearly differentiated learning opportunities.
- Improve Information Communication Technology by taking advantage of the latest published learning resources.

Three schools, of which one was a primary and two were secondary were deemed by inspectors to have no areas for improvement.

5

Achievements and Standards

5.1

The performance data from the leadership team and on the self-evaluation form provides the most important evidence in schools for evaluating standards and progress. Factors taken into account include; a) the school's expectations, b) examination and test results, c) standards achieved by pupils in other schools, and d) progress in relation to their prior achievement. This is supported by first-hand lesson observation during the inspection and a scrutiny of samples of the pupils' written work.

5.2

The overall picture in both previous Pikuach reports (2000, 2003) shows 'considerable and varied achievement'. In 2007, standards achieved by most pupils were for the most part good, and rarely less than satisfactory. In most schools, pupils are self motivated, responding well to teachers' advice and support, and are expected to do well, which produces good standards. In the previous Pikuach reports, no mention was made of differentiated learning as a concept, although streaming and grouping by ability were occasionally mentioned. In the 2007 report, this phrase recurs frequently and reflects the wider educational scene, as well as a genuine attempt by schools to ensure that work is appropriate for each individual child.

5.3

In many of our schools, the level of Jewish knowledge of pupils on admission to the school is variable. The progress of most of these pupils is mostly good and usually in line with the school's expectations. Potential for progress and higher achievement is better overall in Foundation and Key Stage 1 than in Key Stage 2 in primary schools, although in most schools, achievement and progress are at least satisfactory in relation to age and ability. In secondary schools, pupils in the higher streams make greater progress overall, and those schools where external examinations are taken at the end of Key Stages 4 and 5, show outstanding achievement through their examination results. In schools where most or all pupils have good or better prior Jewish knowledge, standards of achievement and progress are very good. In schools across the religious spectrum, a strong and supportive Jewish home background results in better progress and higher achievement overall than where Jewish home backgrounds and support are weaker.

5.4

Pikuach does not inspect Hebrew as a modern foreign language, but does inspect Hebrew where it impacts on Jewish Education. Pikuach found that Hebrew reading and writing is still

variable in our schools. Teachers need to be clearer about when and how Hebrew reading and writing is taught and there needs to be greater coherence between key stages Hebrew curriculum aims and content, in order to achieve the highest standards and progress possible. In the best cases 'the school has systematic procedures to assess students' knowledge and attainment' and appropriately challenging targets can then be set. Some progress has been made since the previous Pikuach report of Inspections (2003) although for Israeli pupils, who are often orally fluent in Hebrew, performance in reading and writing is in some cases 'below expectations' in relation to age and ability. Results from parents' surveys, which were overwhelmingly positive on the whole about their children's Jewish education, most frequently commented critically about the standard and quality of teaching and achievement in learning in Hebrew reading and writing.

5.5

Under-achievement is most often confined to those children with identified learning or emotional difficulties and disabilities. Achievement and progress for SEN was not reported under a separate heading in the 2003 Pikuach Report. It is reported in individual school inspection reports under this heading since 2003. In some cases, the school's own evaluation identifies SEN provision as an area for further development and the inspectors agree with this evaluation. In the best cases, where SEN in Jewish Studies is part of the

overall strategy for the school, then individual learning plans and appropriate strategies ensure that SEN pupils achieve their potential.

5.6

What does emerge is that in many schools, although provision for SEN has developed since it was previously inspected, there is still some way to go. As one report states:

"The school has made significant progress in SEN". However, other reports state that "relatively little progress has been made ..." and in some schools, "There is no formal provision for SEN". Furthermore, one school is "...not fulfilling requirements of the Code of Practice of SEN". These comments are offset by some encouraging statements in some of the reports which show how progress is carefully monitored by the Head of Jewish Studies, and where the SEN Co-ordinator integrates a whole school policy of SEN to include Jewish Studies and Hebrew as well as the National Curriculum. But, of all areas reported in Pikuach reports, this is the one which has the least consistency of approach in our schools.

5.7

To summarise, the main action points from this section to be addressed are:

- raising standards in primary schools at key stage 2
- Achievement and standards in Hebrew Studies
- Improvement and consistency of provision of SEN.

6

Personal Development and Well Being

6.1

Evidence of pupils' personal development and well-being is gathered through observation, discussion with pupils, parents, governors and staff and inspection of pupils' involvement in all aspects of school life, both in and out of the classroom.

6.2

In 2003, collective worship and spiritual development were described as 'a major strength' of Jewish schools. In 2007, spiritual, personal, moral and cultural development, were at least good in every school inspected and outstanding in one third of all schools inspected. This is evidenced by the following quotes:

"Children take an enthusiastic part in *tefillah* (prayer)."

"School practice in harmony with the ethos and values of the school community."

"Pupils behaviour displaying an impressive degree of *derech erez* (politeness and courtesy)."

"Links with the wider community so that pupils learn about other faith traditions and cultures and appreciate the value of tolerance."

"Excellent attendance at lunchtime and after-school clubs."

Occasionally there is a critical comment:

"In all assemblies, the majority of pupils were totally disengaged".

6.3

But this is an anomaly and in general, many more positive quotes could have been added to this list. The best examples of collective worship were observed in primary schools, all of which comply with the legislation calling for a daily act of worship to take place for all pupils. Not all secondary schools are fully compliant: in some schools this is because pupils *daven* (pray) before coming to school and in others, *tefillah* is optional and takes place before school starts or, in the case of *Mincha*, during lunch break, attracting only a small number of pupils.

6.4

A significant difference under this heading between the 2003 and the present Pikuach report is the emphasis in 2007 on learning about other faiths and cultures. Prior to this current phase of inspections, very few inspection reports mentioned any initiatives in this area of curriculum or school life. Now, the majority of reports mention work in this area, evidenced through documents, displays around school, photographs, pupils' work. This no doubt reflects the current climate in the general educational world and the roles that the faith schools are being asked to

play by the government to address issues such as social cohesion, citizenship and multi-culturalism.

6.5

The emphasis, from *Every Child Matters* (2003) of promoting a healthy lifestyle, is also mentioned extensively in this section of the current batch of inspection reports. It was not yet published at the time of writing the Pikuach report of 2003. Phrases such as:

“Food and snacks are healthy as well as kosher”

“Pupils understand the importance of adopting a healthy lifestyle”

reflect an attention to the wider educational world and its requirements, and show how these can be accommodated within a strong Jewish ethos and values system.

6.6

To summarise, the main action points from this section to be addressed are:

- *Tefilah* in some secondary schools
- Issues of inclusion, multi-culturalism and citizenship.

7

Quality of Provision

7.1

Three areas are inspected under this heading:

- a) Teaching and learning
- b) Curriculum and other activities
- c) Care, guidance and support.

7.2

The outcomes for the pupils in terms of their standards, progress, personal development and well-being are the primary evidence for the quality of teaching. Where, for example, the outcomes are good, the teaching is likely to be good. But contextual factors also have to be taken into account, such as pupils who are facing challenging circumstances, where sometimes only moderate progress may be being made, even when the teaching is good. Strategies used to inspect this area of school life includes lesson observation, scrutiny of work and lesson monitoring, discussions with pupils, teachers and senior staff. Pikuach inspectors try to arrange to undertake some joint observation work in a school – where members of staff in the school will jointly observe a lesson with the inspectors. This gives good opportunities for quality assurance, and determines how accurately a school is able to self-evaluate.

- a) Teaching and Learning: The majority of schools were graded at a 2 (good), with a small minority achieving an outstanding judgement (grade 1) and a significant

minority achieving a satisfactory judgement (grade 3). Where schools were outstanding, planning and delivery of lessons was of a very high quality, and assessment was used both to identify issues and assist in the progress being made. But in some schools effective assessment of pupil progress and achievement was not rigorous, most often due to a lack of a whole school policy. Comments such as:

“assessment of pupils’ work remains weak” illustrates this situation.

7.3

Marking work is a further area for development in a significant minority of schools. Where marking was used well, it helped the pupils identify targets for improvement and comments related closely to the work itself. Where marking was misused, accompanied comments were either not present, or were limited and did not provide the pupils with encouragement to improve. The most frequent comment was that marking was not used consistently within a school, and that while one teacher gave helpful and positive comments, other teachers in the same school gave little guidance at all through marking procedures.

7.4

The use of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) in schools varies enormously and reflects an emerging resource in our schools.

Comments range from one school which is proud that:

“the first of the department’s recently installed interactive whiteboards is fully operative”, to schools which have “extensive use of ICT” to those schools which have “missed opportunities to use computers and ICT”.

7.5

One report astutely recognises that a particular school needs to take advantage of ‘targeted training to learn to use the ICT [in this case an interactive whiteboard] with confidence’. In the inspection reports prior to 2003, interactive whiteboards were not mentioned once; in 2007 mention is made of them in more than a third of the reports. This variation in the use of ICT in schools reflects both the fact that technologies are developing at a faster rate than the educational world can learn how to use them, and also that the financial and training resources needed are not readily available to all schools equally.

b) Curriculum and other activities: A wide range of approaches to curriculum can be seen amongst our schools. Comments ranged from:

“Since the last inspection the school has made great advances with its curriculum”

“The school has no formalised *Kodesh* curriculum”

“There is a skeleton curriculum”

“The curriculum is in a period of change.”

7.6

Many comments showed that despite a lack of direction in terms of a formalised and structured curriculum, the work of the teachers in the classrooms enabled content to be taught in a way that is well-matched to the needs of the pupils and to the aspirations of each school. No school scored lower than grade 3 (satisfactory) in this area. The individualism of each school, however, does not help resolve this issue of curriculum design and development. Each school tries to design a curriculum that is suited to its particular needs, but often the resources are not available to do this properly. Where resources have been employed towards curriculum design, frameworks are in place which really enhance the quality of curriculum delivery and these schools are outstanding in this area. In several of the secondary schools inspected, the Jewish Studies curriculum is supplemented by GCSEs and A levels in Jewish Studies, Ivrit and Biblical Hebrew.

7.7

The introduction, in 2007, of the UJIA sponsored Jewish studies curriculum project in some schools and the L.A. Pincus Foundation sponsored Jewish Studies curriculum in other schools should help to improve matters somewhat. Experience shows however, that the successful implementation of any curriculum relies on appropriate training and support for the teachers who will be delivering it, as well as adequate resources with which to work.

7.8

Extra-curricular and informal studies are often a strength of a school. Many of the schools inspected run after school and lunch time clubs, for example in *leyning* (*Torah* chanting), Israeli dancing and choir. A significant minority of schools mentioned strong links between the Jewish and Secular curriculum, notably with regard to the teaching of citizenship and PHSE (personal, health, social, education). In particular moral and family values, interpersonal relationships and sex education are taught from a Jewish perspective through Jewish Studies lessons. Schools enjoy close links with other Jewish communities and organisations through speakers, visits and projects both in and out of school. Other links between the Jewish and National Curricula were noted, particularly through the Humanities and the Arts. Some reports identified opportunities to link with schools and communities outside the Jewish community in order for pupils to learn about other faith traditions and culture as well as appreciating the value of tolerance, as has already been described earlier in this report.

c) Care, guidance and support: A majority of schools achieved 'outstanding' in this category and no school achieved less than 'good'. It is clear, as reflected in the previous findings related to personal development, that our schools achieve particularly well in this area. Equality of opportunity was mentioned in several reports, but this does not necessarily mean exactly the same in every school. In one school for example, it may mean

that both boys and girls have equal access to the whole curriculum, including *tefillah* (prayer). In another school, it may mean that each pupil has equal access to the curriculum in the context of the religious or curriculum guidelines. A majority of reports mention procedural and policy guidelines in place related to anti-bullying, health and safety and child protection as well as effective arrangements for safeguarding pupils through the school day. Security arrangements were specifically mentioned by nearly one quarter of the reports. Pupils are given clear and helpful advice for transfer to the next phase of education, whether to secondary school or beyond. A majority of reports note that if students need advice or have a difficulty, there is an adult to whom they feel they can talk. In both primary and secondary schools, older pupils act as mentors and role models to younger pupils, for example through paired reading schemes. The current emphasis within schools as a whole on the 'Every Child Matters' agenda, and on the importance of the care and guidance of each child, is reflected explicitly through the Jewish ethos and practice of our schools.

7.9

To summarise, the main action points from this section to be addressed are:

- Development and consistency of assessment
- Development and consistency of marking
- ICT provision
- Design and implementation of Jewish Studies curricula.

8

Leadership and Management

8.1

Where the leadership and management are outstanding, there is a clear articulated vision, a sense of purpose and high aspirations for the school. A significant minority of schools have an absence of a suitably qualified, experienced Head of Jewish Studies. In some schools, there is no person in that post at all. Remarkably, even in those schools without a head of department, or without a suitable person in that role, there is no school which achieves less than a 'satisfactory' grade under 'Leadership and Management'. This is usually because the headteacher takes on an additional role as 'caretaker' of Jewish Studies, or as in more than one school, employs someone part-time to support the Jewish Studies staff and curriculum in the absence of permanent leadership. The strength of the leadership and management of schools directly relates to the success of curriculum development. In other words, where a school is judged good or outstanding in its leadership and management, its curriculum is usually good or outstanding. No school deemed satisfactory in its leadership and management achieved better than satisfactory in its curriculum and other activities. In many schools, however, satisfactory leadership and management did not correlate with personal development or care, guidance and support, where judgements were often good or better in those schools.

8.2

The effectiveness of the governing body is directly related to the leadership of the school and in the best schools

"the governing body supports the school well".

8.3

In schools which achieve good or outstanding in this area, schools benefit from a strong chair of governors and from a long term and stable governance of the school.

8.4

In-Service Training (Inset) for the teaching staff in our schools is described positively more often than in the 2003 report of inspections. In more than half the reports, mention of regular inset can be found and in the schools which achieved good or outstanding in leadership and management, the commitment to staff development is reflected in effective induction and continuing professional development strategies for all Jewish Studies staff. It is expected that all teachers participate in whatever training is offered, but this varies from one school where the weekly staff meetings gives regular opportunities for staff development in Jewish studies, to another school which runs an annual staff development day in Jewish Studies. In several reports, the fact that all teachers have contracts and job descriptions was mentioned and the proportion of non-qualified teachers in our

schools seems to be decreasing. The two reports which mention the lack of qualified Jewish studies teachers, also reported that non-qualified teachers in those schools are being put on government run teacher training schemes.

8.5

To summarise, the main action points from this section to be addressed are:

- Community strategies must develop strong professional and lay leadership for our schools
- Professional development of teachers must continue to be developed and prioritised.

9

Discussion and Recommendations

9.1

All the schools inspected since 2003 achieved well or better against the standards they set themselves. In addition, of the schools inspected against a self-evaluation framework, the inspectors agreed in every case with the judgements of the schools in terms of its overall effectiveness, and with almost every other judgement made through the categories of the self-evaluation process. This not only reflects a welcome and honest approach to self-evaluation and critical analysis of schools by their leadership teams, but also reflects an enormous commitment to the hard work needed to be undertaken by each school since 2005 to 'learn' an entirely new approach in order to be able to complete a written self-evaluation process. Pikuach has been instrumental in this process. Firstly, by re-writing the Ofsted self-evaluation framework to make it appropriate for Pikuach inspections of Jewish Education. This process involved a core team led by the Pikuach consultant and Chair of Pikuach, supported by two open consultation seminars which took place at different stages of the process at which a total of fifteen schools were represented. Pikuach has learnt that in order to work well with our Jewish schools, schools need to feel invested in the initiatives which Pikuach is promoting. Secondly, by supporting the schools to enable them to write self-evaluation forms that fulfil the criteria expected by both Ofsted and Pikuach. This has involved two

seminars led by Pikuach staff as well as outside speakers to ensure that schools are able to describe themselves accurately, give evidence to support their descriptions and evaluate their descriptions and evidence, leading to articulation of action to be taken leading towards improvement and development.

9.2

A further strand of the work of Pikuach which has been cemented since 2003, is the training and development that both existing and potential Pikuach inspectors receive. Whilst this has always been a clear remit of Pikuach, in the past two years, training and development seminars have intensified. This has been partly in recognition of the change to the inspection process, but also out of a need for renewed professionalism of Pikuach as an organisation and a desire to support as broad a range of Jewish schools as possible. Indeed, we have seen that Pikuach is now being used by schools across the religious spectrum, and that we now service almost three quarters of all Jewish schools in the UK.

9.3

As with the previous Pikuach reports, both the areas highlighted positively, as well as the areas for further development are broadly the same as in this current report. The Jewish ethos of the school and its impact on spiritual, moral, social and cultural development is most often good and at times, outstanding, whereas

curriculum development still needs attention. This is a phenomenon worth exploring: Why is it that schools find it harder to achieve excellence in the quality of the curriculum they provide and the standards of achievement that they seek, and easier to produce an outstanding atmosphere and ethos through the practice of Jewish values? These are all aspects of an overall, holistic Jewish Education. A tentative hypothesis is related to the resources needed and available for different aspects of a Jewish Education. The development of a good Hebrew Studies curriculum across Foundation and key stage one and two is a far larger piece of work than the development of a programme to learn about other faiths. The level of teacher training required for example to run a great Israeli dancing after-school club is not as great as the level of teacher training required to deliver a Jewish Studies curriculum. But, this is also an issue of the affect and the intellect. Schools seem to be able to work on the affect - the enthusiasm, the ethos, the atmosphere, with great success. Intellectual development, on the other hand, requires a degree of resource provision that not all our schools are yet able to deliver to the same high standards.

9.4

The teaching of Hebrew reading and writing continues to be satisfactory, but overall, no better than that. In 2003, Pikuach reported that 'community resources should be deployed into the effective training of teachers as well as into the production of high quality books

and materials' (2003, p.12). In the last two years, central agency resources have been used to work on curriculum projects and initiatives aimed at raising the quality and standards of Hebrew teaching in our schools. This has so far been a slow process, without measurable outcomes yet. Our goal must be for significant improvement in Hebrew standards and quality by the time the next Pikuach report is written in 2010.

9.5

In 2003, Special Educational Needs was highlighted for the first time as an area for development. Evidence in this report shows that some development has taken place but that across the schools, there is not yet consistency of provision of special needs support within the curriculum in Jewish Studies and Hebrew. This is directly related to the existence or not of good staff support in special needs, good teacher development in this area, and resourcing.

9.6

One of the key recommendations from the 2003 report was the necessity for schools to address issues that were, four years ago, rising to the top of the government agenda in education, namely admissions, access to faith schools and the broadening of curriculum to address citizenship. We have seen since 2003, how these issues have begun to affect our schools in practical ways. DfES Admissions codes, as well as the government suggestion in 2006 that 25% of all faith school places be reserved for those outside of that faith have preoccupied all faith communities in this country. It is due to the work carried

out under the auspices of the Board of Deputies as well as a working party set up by the Secretary of State for Education in 2006 that the integrity of our faith schools has been preserved. What is clear, however, is that all our maintained schools will have to look towards our policies of social cohesion, multi-culturalism and inclusion and broaden our curricula to include learning about other faiths and taking a full part in the wider communities in which our schools are placed. This agenda has already begun to have been taken up by the majority of our schools, although it is interpreted very widely. In the coming few years, government agendas are likely to challenge the curriculum and populations of faith schools further. Jewish schools and central agencies need to be prepared to meet whatever issues are the educational debate of the time.

9.7

On a positive note, this 2007 report shows that many government initiatives from the general educational world have had a positive impact on our schools. Apart from the changes to Ofsted and the impact that these have had on Pikuach, the emphasis on *Every Child Matters* (2003), and on differentiated learning, assessment and marking have affected our schools for the better. This is an evolving improvement. Certainly we have seen that assessment and marking is not uniformly as effective as it should be, and this is an area for development in the coming few years.

9.8

Schools undergoing a second Pikuach inspection during the period of this report have shown improvement and

development in areas noted during their first inspection. In 2003, we were also able to report that an inspection usually led to some improvement of school effectiveness over the coming years. With the 'old' style of inspections, the action plan generated as a result of the inspection has been crucial to that development. With the self-evaluation framework, development should be even more easily identified, as recommendations based on the inspection should tie in very clearly with the school's own identified areas for development. This will be an area for monitoring during the coming period.

9.9

A further area for monitoring and addressing is related to the relationship that Pikuach has with Ofsted. As can be seen from the list of schools inspected in the period covered by this report (Appendix 1), inspections of Jewish schools have not been evenly spread out between 2003-7. Of the 25 schools inspected within that period, eight of those inspections took place within a four month period during 2006, whereas only one inspection took place in the whole of 2005. This uneven spread of inspections affects not only the number of inspectors needed (and therefore has implications for our training and development programme for inspectors), but also puts an uneven amount of pressure on the Pikuach office. This in turn also affects the budget and finances of Pikuach, set by both the UJIA and the Board of Deputies, who finance Pikuach. Pikuach must try to engage with Ofsted to ensure that the next round of

inspections takes place more evenly through a time period.

9.10

The new style inspections, since 2005, have raised other issues within Pikuach. Under the new Ofsted regime, schools only receive two working days notice of inspections. Whilst we have been able to inform Pikuach inspectors in absolute confidence several weeks earlier of impending inspections, in most situations, there have been occasions where Pikuach has also not received more than a few days notice of inspections. Trying to recruit Pikuach inspectors at short notice in order that Pikuach and Ofsted inspections can take place simultaneously is not always possible. In addition, some schools have stated, as is within their legal right, that they would prefer Ofsted and Pikuach inspections to take place at different times. Pikuach is presently working out a system in order that in such cases, schools are not at an unfair advantage because they have weeks or months notice of a Pikuach inspection.

9.11

In looking forward in 2003, Pikuach recognised that it must undergo a period of reflection and evaluation in order to continue to develop its services to the Jewish community. The last two years have indeed been a period of development for Pikuach. There have been two catalysts for this development. The first has been the external demands of the government as detailed throughout this report. The second has been the need to react to internal situations at Pikuach itself. The retirement of the Pikuach co-ordinator

in 2005 led to a review of the staffing and governance of Pikuach, and indeed of its terms of reference. None of these internal considerations have been debated in isolation, and the external demands have impacted on all discussions held and on decisions taken. The result has meant that whilst the primary remit for Pikuach is still as an inspection service for Jewish Education, supported by training for current and new inspectors, the terms of reference are now broadening out to provide support for schools both before and after their period of inspection. To this end we are, for example, now training Pikuach inspectors to be School Improvement Partners for Jewish Education, mirroring government and local authority initiatives in the general education world. This should provide support for schools to act on their inspection reports and improve provision. We are providing personnel to work with schools prior to inspections, observing teachers, supporting senior management teams in the completion of their self-evaluation forms and giving advice. This work complements the work of the main educational agencies in our community, namely the Leo Baeck College and the Agency for Jewish Education. In addition, Pikuach has started running training and development for the schools themselves, for example the already mentioned preparation for self evaluation seminars. There is no doubt that in the coming years, both internal and external factors will cause Pikuach to change again, as education changes and develops in the UK and within the Jewish community.

9.12

More than anything, this report reflects a period of change. We have seen how Pikuach has responded to those changes, and welcomed the opportunities they have given to us to develop our partnerships with the schools we serve. Many positive outcomes have shown that we have been able to improve provision in Jewish Education, but we have also seen that our developments are inconsistent and there are still too many areas mentioned for improvement in 2003 which are still high on the agenda for improvement in 2007. In the coming few years, strategies must be put into place to ensure that these same issues do not appear again in the next Pikuach report. We must address the

issue of Hebrew Studies teaching, of curriculum development, of special educational needs, of assessment, and of ICT provision. The ultimate goal of Pikuach is to raise the standards and quality of Jewish Education in the UK, in order that the graduates of our schools will grow into knowledgeable, confident, young Jewish adults, proud of their heritage and enthusiastically ready to lead full Jewish lives. Pikuach as a service is uniquely placed to be able to contribute, in partnership with educational agencies and schools, to the future of Jewish life in the UK.

10

Bibliography

Department for Education and Employment (1992) *The Education (Schools) Act 1992*, HMSO: London

DfES (1996) *The Education Act 1996*, HMSO: London

DfES/Ofsted (2004) *A New Relationship with Schools*, HMSO: London

Felsenstein D et al (2000) *Inspecting Jewish Schools 1996-9*, Board of Deputies of British Jews: London

Miller H (2003) *Report on Inspections conducted between September 1999 and June 2003*, Board of Deputies of British Jews: London

Ofsted (2003) *Framework for Inspecting Schools*, HMSO: London

Ofsted (2005) *Every Child Matters: Inspection of children's Services, key judgements and illustrative evidence*.HMSO: London

Ofsted (2006) *Self Evaluation Framework for Schools* HMSO: London

Pikuach (2006) *Every Child Matters: the Pikuach Framework for the Inspection of Jewish Schools from January 2006*, Board of Deputies of British Jews: London

Additional numerical information supplied by the Board of Deputies of British Jews (2007) unpublished document.

11

Appendix 1: List of Schools Inspected by Pikuach June 2003 - April 2007

Hasmonean Primary School, London: Barnet	14-16	June 2004
Hasmonean High School, London: Barnet	6-9 & 12	November 2004
Wolfson Hillel Primary School, London: Brent	29-30 2	November, December 2004
Simon Marks Primary School, London: Hackney	8-12	November 2004
King David High School, Manchester	11-15	April 2005
Moriah Jewish Day School, London: Harrow	11-12	January 2006
Hertsmere Jewish Primary School, Hertfordshire	22-23	February 2006
Simon Marks Primary School, London: Hackney	28 1	February 2006 - March 2006
Beis Yaakov High School, Salford	22-23	March 2006
Jews' Free School, London: Brent	3-4	April 2006
Brodetsky Primary School, Leeds	24-25	May 2006
Broughton Jewish Cassel Fox Primary School, Salford	3-4	July 2006
Ilford Jewish Primary School, Redbridge	5-6	July 2006
Lubavitch Girls' Primary School, London: Hackney	12-13	September 2006
Delamere Forest Special School, Cheshire	12-13	September 2006
Yesodeh Hatorah Senior Girls' School, London: Hackney	12-13	September 2006
King David High School, Liverpool	20-21	September 2006
Rosh Pinah Primary School, London: Barnet	26-27	September 2006
Menorah Primary School, London: Barnet	13-14	November 2006
Pardes House School, London: Barnet	12-13	December 2006
Clore Shalom Jewish Primary School, Hertfordshire	13-14	December 2006
Michael Sobell Sinai School, London: Brent	8-9	January 2007
King David Junior School, Manchester	17-18	January 2007
King Solomon High School, Redbridge	23-24	January 2007
King David Infants School, Manchester	27-28	March 2007

12

Appendix 2: List of Pikuach Inspectors

Rev. Michael Binstock
Mr. Ronnie Cohen
Mrs. Esther Colman
Mrs. Sorrel Fisher
Ms. Angela Gluck Wood
Mr. Gabi Goldstein
Mr. John Gordon
Rabbi Moshe Haliwa
Mrs. Loretta Harstein
Mrs. Louise Heilbron
Rabbi Yaakov Heimann
Mrs. Naomi Hollander
Mrs. Enid Korn
Mr. Jeffrey Leader
Rabbi Malcolm Lebrecht
Mrs. Fayge Levenberg
Mrs. Rena Lichtenstein
Dr. Helena Miller
Mr. Marvyn Moore
Mrs. Beverley Perin
Rabbi David Radomsky
Mr. Rafi Salasnik
Mrs. Leonie Sher
Mrs. Jean Shindler
Rabbi Geoffrey Shisler
Mrs. Sandra Teacher
Rabbi Dr. Yonosan Yodaiken
Mrs. Golda Zafer Smith

13

Appendix 3: List of Governance and Management of Pikuach

Pikuach Consultant:

Sandra Teacher

Administrator:

Gina Rubner

Management Team:

Mr. Jon Benjamin

Mr. Alexander Goldberg

Mrs. Naomi Greenwood

Dr. Helena Miller

Mrs. Jean Shindler

Mrs. Sandra Teacher

Advisory Team:

Rev. Michael Binstock

Mr. Jeffrey Leader

Mrs. Fayge Levenberg

Dr. Helena Miller (Chair)

Mrs. Jean Shindler

Mrs. Sandra Teacher (Pikuach Consultant)

14

Appendix 4: Glossary of Jewish and Educational Terms

Achievement	how nearly pupils reach standards set by the school
Charedi	strictly orthodox
DfES	Department for Education and Skills (government)
Good/Grade 2	school responding well to standards and targets set Corresponds to 'good' in old style inspections
Governing bodies	those appointed, elected and co-opted to run the school
Key Stages	Foundation: ages 3-5, Nursery and Reception years Key Stage 1: ages 5-7, years 1 and 2 Key Stage 2: ages 7-11, years 3, 4, 5, 6 Key stage 3: ages 11-14, years 7,8,9 Key Stage 4: ages 14-16, years 10 and 11 Key Stage 5: ages 16-18/19, years 12 and 13
Maintained	schools which are funded by the State
National Curriculum	Government prescribed curriculum for all secular subjects in maintained schools (England and Wales)
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education – National Schools' Inspection Service
Outstanding/Grade1	nothing or very little could be bettered Corresponds to 'excellent' in old style inspections
Pikuach	Literally 'Supervision' (Hebrew) – Jewish Education inspection service
Pluralist	schools catering for pupils with a wide range of affiliation and Jewish practice
Primary	school catering for 4 – 11 year olds
Satisfactory/Grade3	no major educational weaknesses or particular strengths Corresponds to 'satisfactory/sound' in old style inspections
Secondary	school catering for 11 – 18 year olds
Self-Evaluation Framework (SEF)	enables schools to both judge themselves and identify action for improvement
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	school catering for pupils with special education needs
United Synagogue	organisation of London-based orthodox synagogues
Unsatisfactory/Grade4	significant weaknesses affecting pupils' progress Corresponds to 'unsatisfactory' in old style inspections
Voluntary Aided	schools which are financially supported by the State for all secular running costs and salaries etc. and which ask for voluntary aid from the parents to pay for the Jewish education in the school.