

To: Durell Barnes - Head of Communications, ISI

Sent: Fri 07/12/2007 16:05

Dear Mr Barnes,

Below is a summation of the questions which remain unanswered in recent correspondence and more particularly the emails of the 7th 27th and 29th November 2007. Even as stand alone questions these are understandable – but in case the context is forgotten please refer to my original emails.

- How many inspectors are involved in the Child Protection element of an ISI inspection?
The answer you provided: **I cannot give you a number of inspectors involved.**
- Are all referrals inspected against by the inspector (responsible for Child Protection inspection) to satisfy him/herself that there is no, or minimal likelihood of similar circumstances occurring again?
The answer you provided: **I do not understand the question.**
- Please provide the qualification of the Inspector responsible for the child protection element of the ISI inspection and the training requirement he/she is required to undertake to maintain their (Child Protection) inspection “licence” for want of a better description? I would also appreciate knowing the name and address of the training supplier.
The answer you provided: **I cannot give you the qualification of the inspector responsible for the child protection element as the judgments are made corporately**¹
- Would you please confirm that non-qualified ISI inspectors are not involved in Child Protection Inspection in any way?
The answer you provided: **No reply given.**

¹ This reply has no meaning and is shamefully opaque.

In my email of the 27th November I asked the following questions all of which remain unanswered by you:

- If, when the inspectors ask (*about notifications*), and the school says they do have names and notification/s prior to the April date, what does the inspector then do with this information – what is the ISI protocol at this point both on inspection and documentation?
- As the ISI is dependent on the school providing truthful or unmistakable responses to this question, how does the ISI establish that they have been given a truthful reply by the school?
- Placing a dependence on a school to tell the truth in these circumstances is hugely unwise for many reasons some of which are unlikely to have been considered by the ISI. Without a confirmation on the veracity of the schools reply how can parents depend on the ISI's inspections on this subject?

In my email of the 29th November I asked the following questions all of which remain unanswered by you:

- On what date did ISI Inspectors commence asking schools (presumably the Headmasters – but please confirm), about notifications pre-dating April 2005?
- Does the Headmaster/CPO sign for their answer i.e. that either there have been no notifications, or the digit and the ‘relevant information’ (whatever this is) has been provided to the ISI inspector for which the Inspector signs receipt?
- Is the Headmaster provided with a copy of this receipt?

I cannot believe it is in the interests, or is indeed it is your intention, not to answer these questions. They are all in the public interest, we are entitled to know the answers.

Why will you not answer these questions which concern the children's safety and welfare and Britain's independent schools all of which are members of the Independent Schools Council? If you are unable to give a reply to these questions which are in the public interest please tell us why?

Similarly if you are unwilling to reply to these questions I need an explanation.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely

Tom Perry