ı ve пап тіте to do the reform." Foday we accept free primary and ondary education as a national birthat. But pre-war, things were very erent. Most pupils left school at 14. :ler's act introduced compulsory ication to 15, with a clause to raise) 16; any fee-paying at state schools forbidden; and church schools were ught into the national system. o the 1944 Education Act provided chances of social mobility, someıg educationalists ever since have d to build on.

ut passing the 11-plus didn't necesy guarantee working-class pupils ld take up their place at grammar ool. Shirley Williams, who was our education secretary between and 1979, says: "I had several ids whose parents couldn't afford iniform. They never went to gramschool at all. Others didn't go use they were expected to stay at least 15 and their parents wanted

ever neem arrempted by a responsible government'

Winston Churchill

Butler's legacy remained relatively unscathed until Kenneth Baker's 1988 Education Reform Act, which dismantled much of what he had created, with directives from Whitehall about curriculum and testing, the birth of GCSEs and the advent of local management of schools, which challenged the historic role of local authorities. Now headteachers and governors had control of their budgets, and teachers naturally became nervous of pay and conditions being worked out by individual schools rather than through national agreements.

But if Baker was controlling, Blair and Blunkett were even more centrist and interventionist when they delivered

manua in 1997. where the Butler act was localist, New Labour actively challenged schools' autonomy through targets, strategies and league tables, which overwhelmed the profession. Relations with the teaching unions hit a nadir, with ballots and strikes in the late 1990s. Blunkett is unapologetic. "If you're going to bring about change, you're going to break eggs, and the grump in the staffroom was always going to have one foot in the grave," he says.

Today, Gove seems just as happy to incur the wrath of teachers. Sir David Bell, permanent secretary at the Department for Education under both Labour and coalition governments, tells the programme: "There was clearly a quite significant attempt by the coalition government to reset the relationship with the trade unions."

Despite all the criticisms of academies, free schools and excessive testing of pupils, schools are unquestionably better places to be than in 1944. There is now investment in state education which

dreamed about. And while social mobility challenges persist, university participation has risen in a way the reformers in 1944 could not have imagined.

What will the education system look like in 70 years' time? Blunkett, who has been reviewing education policy for Labour, is clear about his party's next steps. "I think the changes are irreversible," he says, "although we'll want to build on them and we'll want to reintroduce the glue." So he is rejecting the idea of thousands of schools working alone, preferring a rejuvenation in counties or regions of ambitious and inspiring political and

headteacher leaders. "Academies are here to stay, but we need something like the Cleggs of West Yorkshire rather than the Cleggs of the modern era."

National politicians since 1944 have been unable

to resist thinesting with and sometimes meddling in the nation's classrooms. Greater autonomy has often felt as if it has come with conditions attached: you are free to run your own schools as long as you do it the way we want you to. At times, teachers have responded naively and crudely - Gove is certainly not the first education secretary to bring them out of the classroom on to the street in protest.

The story since 1944 has been one of conflict and consensus, with varying degrees of intensity. What is needed is mutual trust in education: between central government and teachers, and between local and national politicians. The successful future of our schools is one in which governments meddle less, and trust more. And teachers demonstrate an altogether new professionalism.

Teachers vs Government: 70 Years of Education Policy, presented by Roy Blatchford, is on Radio 4, 8pm, 22 April

ultiple choice

w can Ofsted win er disgruntled chers?

d is "no longer just disliked, but ined", according to last week's er conferences. What changes the inspection body introduce to confidence among the teaching sion?

Robin Bevan, headteacher, Southend high school for boys, Southend-on-Sea One thing that they could do quickly is adopt a jury 2-style group of classroom teach-

I school leaders to join inspection on a random basis. willingness to invite teachers

CMYK

and staff to inspections would show transparency. The problem we have at the moment is there are so many myths about what Ofsted does, and so many allegations - right or wrong - about them not being competent. In a system that's as high-stakes as Ofsted, teachers need to have confidence in those visiting schools.



Helen Cook, maths teacher in Berkshire

As a maths teacher, I would like to know that the person who watches me is - or has

very recently been - a teacher in a maths class of a similar age group.

I don't see how a primary school teacher could assess a secondary lesson any more than I, as a secondary school teacher, would ever consider myself capable of teaching a primary class - it's not something I'm trained for. It would

also be nice to have some constructive feedback. At the moment teachers feel Ofsted is just there to tear us apart, rather than to offer support.

If they want to come and watch, it would be nice to talk to them afterwards and say: "You didn't like that, why? You thought that was good why?" Otherwise, it's a waste of time, and it's very undermining - which it's not meant to be.



Ross Morrison Mcgill, assistant vice-principal at Greig City academy, Haringey, London Allow inspectors to visit

classrooms, but do not record a graded evaluation for teaching.

Ofsted holds such a major - perhaps damaging - influence on educational orthodoxy and any sound regime would be one that improved the quality of education, and did not have teachers second-guessing pedagogical preferences.

Hold all schools to account, but consider different types of inspections such as school evaluations, and allow the data to speak for itself.



Abbie Saxby, teacher at Castledown primary school, Hastings Ofsted could reduce the

pressure on school leaders to have data tracking students. A lot of the data I have to produce doesn't necessarily help my teaching, it's just there so that I have a paper trail of evidence ready for when Ofsted comes.

If you're a teacher, you accept that paperwork is part of the job, but it is pretty extreme at times; and if you're a newly-qualified teacher with tons to do, it's an extra pressure.



Geoff Barton, headteacher at King Edward VI school. Suffolk

I think Ofsted needs to decide what it is actually

for. It's as if Michael Wilshaw has felt that he is still the headteacher in his own school, pontificating in his own staffroom. It's given an impression that Ofsted can comment on everything, rather than knowing what its core business is. For schools that are under pressure, it gives a sense that Ofsted is more important than it really is.

Most parents keep Ofsted in proportion - they will read the reports but they also listen to local opinion. But, as a school leader, if you're constantly seeing comments about what the head of Ofsted thinks about all sorts of issues, you perhaps think that they carry more clout than they actually do.

Interviews by Rebecca Ratcliffe

