Inspection spoken here? Governing schooling at several distances.
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Introducing Inspection¹

Inspection has been identified as one of the forms of ‘governing at a distance’ associated with the rise of what has been variously defined as audit culture, audit society, performance management, the evaluative state or the competitive-evaluative nexus (see Strathern, 2000; Power, 1997; Pollitt et al, 1999; Neave, 1998 and Clarke, 2005). It takes its place alongside a battery of other technologies and practices that address the problem of governing organisations indirectly. Inspection appears to be a practice invented by nineteenth century European states to enable surveillance of problematic – or potentially problematic – sites and practices. In England, for example, inspectorates were established to deal with a variety of public functions (prisons and police as well as schooling) and with sites of public concern (the factory inspectorate, for example). Inspectors represented a form of embodied expertise, with powers of access to otherwise closed settings (whether the prison or the school), and a responsibility to report publicly on their findings. Inspection is then, from the outset, a very particular form of governmental practice, involving distinctive boundary crossing powers, based on a conception of expert observation and inquiry, and discharging defined sets of public responsibilities through investigations and reports. Inspectors were both part of the state, yet were endowed with a certain independence from departmental structures – they were always marked as Her/His Majesty’s Inspectors. Their persistence into contemporary state formations and governmental arrangements is itself a puzzle, one which

¹ Governing by Inspection: School Inspection and Education Governance in Scotland, England and Sweden (ESRC RES-062-23-2241-A). I am deeply grateful to my colleagues in this project for the uses that I have made of their work and for our discussions of the issues explored here.
requires some attention to the ways in which inspection has itself been reformed and remade to operate in these new environments.

At the core of the renewed role for inspection is the problem of control in the disaggregated/disintegrated/dispersed state (Clarke and Newman, 1997) or 'control at a distance' (Hoggett, 1996). 'Performance' is one way of naming the problems of control at a distance and the proposed solutions to them. Scrutiny, inspection, evaluation, and audit emerge as potential solutions to the problems of 'arm's length' control (Clarke et al., 2000). It is this 'arm's length' that marks these processes as means of 'governing at a distance'. All of the agencies associated with the rise of the competitive-evaluative nexus – varieties of audit, target setting and monitoring, forms of external performance management and inspection – appear in the gap between centralisation and decentralisation (or between strategy and implementation). In the dissolution of the forms of institutional coordination centred on hierarchically integrated professional bureaucracies, such forms of performance management and evaluation are attempts to bridge the distance between the governmental centre and specific sites of practice (hospitals, schools etc).² Put another way, they are a means of mediating the principal-agent relationship (and the problem of relatively autonomous agents that the relationship implies). But other than the rhetorical 'arm's length', what are the distances that are at stake in the processes of governing at a distance? After sketching some of the arrangements of school inspection in our three case studies, I will use them to explore this question of distance.

Inspecting schools.

Our investigation reveals a problem for the seemingly simple claim that 'inspection is one strategy for governing at a distance', since it is not clear that there is one practice that is common to all three national settings. In a mundane comparative sense, inspection is currently imagined,

² There are some interesting issues associated with the sorts of spatial and scalar metaphors through which these distance – and their relationships – are mapped (national-local; top-bottom; centre-periphery, etc). They typically involve the images of hierarchy and encompassment that Ferguson and Gupta (2002) see as central to the idea of the state.
institutionalised and practised in rather different ways. Less mundanely, it may be productive to think of these different institutionalizations of inspection as particular governmental assemblages: combining distinctive clusters of elements (places, policies, personnel, practices) institutionalized in temporary, yet apparently solid, formations (Newman and Clarke, 2009). This would help us to think not only about the nature of comparative difference, but also about the capacity for transformation over time. All three ‘national’ cases have seen considerable institutional change, even during the short life of the research project. It would also draw attention to Inspection as something to be assembled, rather than being an ‘off the shelf’ product readily available for use by a needy government. There are, then, subsequent questions about the ‘aura’ that may be acquired by giving a specific assemblage the name ‘inspection’ (rather than some other title: oversight, surveillance, support, etc).

Here I want to summarise some of the key features of the three national assemblages, along with a note about the emergence of Inspection as an element of European (EU) approaches to education. The summaries are intended to accomplish two main tasks. First, they need to indicate something of how Inspection is being imagined, spoken and institutionalized in the three different settings (how is it being articulated?). Second, they need to indicate something of the distinctive assemblage that Inspection involves in the different settings (what combinations of policies, people, places and practices are being put together?).

*Inspecting in Sweden*³

Although Sweden operated its schooling system with an inspectorate from the late nineteenth century, the function was abolished in the 1980s during the creation of a National Agency for Schools (*Skolverket*). School inspections were reinstalled in Sweden in 2003. The then Social-democratic government decided to make *Skolverket* responsible for the reinstated inspections and for design and implementation. This agency was also responsible for national follow-ups, evaluations and for the national testing programme. In the

---

³ Much of this section is borrowed from a paper by Lindberg, Hult, Segerholm and Rönnberg, (2011).
election in 2006, the Liberal Party campaigned for a tougher inspection, more directed to assess subject knowledge, and organised in a new national agency – a separate inspectorate. As part of a conservative-liberal-centre coalition, they won the post as minister for education and *Skolinspektionen* was opened in October 2008.

Inspection in Sweden is expected to assess the quality of education being provided by schools, both in terms of compliance with national standards and as a means of providing information to parents (as potential choice makers about schools). Inspection is also supposed to establish that schooling is maintaining the key Swedish political principle of equivalence, whose meaning has been subject to different inflections during the post-war period of social democracy and after. Although associated with a sense of equality, it is increasingly inflected towards the public responsibility to enable the full flourishing of each individual child (according to their individual needs and abilities). The Inspection process (in its official representations) is marked by an increased stress on success/good results and comparisons, the signs of ‘juridification’ (particularly in relation to parent and pupil rights) and the construction of the inspect-able school. These tendencies can be read as part of an overall shift in the way in which citizens conceive their relation to education, i.e. as consumers and legal subjects.

The schooling system has become more ‘diversified’, with the encouragement of non-state school providers (the so-called ‘free schools’). Evaluative comparison is thus doubly articulated – reporting to central government on standards and to parents (as consumers) on comparable performance. Another underpinning idea is the notion of schools as independent or self-acting entities decoupled from local contextual factors. Schools are responsible for their own success and failure according to the prevalent essentialist perspective. Another example is the continuing emphasis on equivalence that is fuelled by continuing school segregation (Skolverket 2010). An ideological analysis of the contemporary usage of this keyword is that it is used – not only in order to combat inequality in the

---

4 Identified as the ‘Swedish model’ by the UK coalition government of 2010.
school system – but also in order to preserve the notion of equivalence as feasible within a de-regulated school market.

Inspection was reintroduced into the Swedish system as a distinct agency, alongside, but separate from, Skolverket. It is responsible for conducting inspections and responding to complaints made by pupils and parents about the actions of schools. Inspectors have been recruited to the agency from two sorts of professional formation: those with experience of teaching and those with legal training. Inspections are carried out by teams composed of both sorts of expertise and are conducted in accordance with an extensive manual that defines expected/good practice for the process. Swedish inspection appears to combine evaluative and developmental practices, with inspection expected to contribute to the improvement of individual schools. Because the same agency also investigates complaints against schools, the mix of educational and legal expertise represents a complex – and unique in our project – mixture of modes of authority.

*Inspecting in Scotland*

Education policy in Scotland increasingly diverged from that of the UK government from the 1980s onwards. For example competition between schools was much more limited in Scotland, there was no national testing regime, and importantly, the mode of operation of Her Majesty’s Inspectors of Education (HMIe) in Scotland was less confrontational than that of their English counterparts in Ofsted. Political devolution in 1999 and the election of the minority Nationalist government in 2007 marked a break from previously dominant UK New Labour policy influence on the Scottish political scene, and brought about considerable change in style of government (Arnot and Ozga 2010). Minority status forced the new regime to work through persuasion and compromise, and to use discursive strategies to reach beyond the sphere of traditional politics and seek to co-opt partners in government and connect to a wider audience. These were considerable departures from conventional governing practices in Scotland, which had a history of highly centralised control especially, perhaps, in education policy, where central directives were implemented at the local level, and monitored by the inspectorate. The new government used a strong narrative that shapes
and drives the governing framework, through an overarching theme that links economic recovery with public good to achieve a ‘wealthier and fairer, healthier, safer and stronger, smarter and greener Scotland’. Government has been presented as strategic, and improvement in performance is discursively aligned with quality of life for 'people in Scotland'.

A priority has been to build a sense of trust between government and its partners significant element in building trust and co-opting partners in governing is *self-evaluation*, and in this respect we understand the shift in governing strategy to be coherent and consistent from the national government through the local authorities to the individual schools. HMIE, then, become important teachers and mediators in the new governing relations, and the mobilisation of knowledge about one's own performance becomes a very important governing activity at all levels. HMIE, in this new context, have also embraced enthusiastically the agenda of ‘teaching’ other systems, which is supported by the strongly internationalist and pro-European focus of the Scottish government.

Most recently, HMIE has been merged with the Learning and Teaching Scotland to create Education Scotland (2011), stressing support for self-evaluation and self-improvement. At the same time, inspection has continued to emphasise building good relations with local schools and local authorities in the drive for improvement, developing the PRAISE best practice framework for inspections and reviews (Purpose, Relationships, Awareness, Information gathering, Sharing information, Enabling; HMIE, 2011).

Inspection in Scotland has, until recently, been located in a single institutional location (the Inspectorate), albeit with shifting organisational relationships to the school system and the rest of government. The approach to inspection has been shaped by the conjunction of a long history of a powerful inspectorate and the recent development of the school self-evaluation model as a foundation for inspecting. Inspectors are recruited from serving teachers and head teachers and are viewed as ‘close’ to the schools being inspected. The development of a partnership view of inspection places a premium on support and developmental practices, reinforced by psychological training that seeks to develop appropriate skills.
Inspecting in England

The continued presence of Her Majesty’s Inspectors for education in schools from 1839 to 2010 conceals some radical discontinuities in its organisation and practice. One critical break occurred in 1986 when the inspection function was relocated in the newly created Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), following attacks on the Inspectorate from both Labour and Conservative governments. The attacks centred on the Inspectors’ perceived collusion with (if not actual advocacy of) liberal/progressive/permissive child centred pedagogy. What had been a professional exercise conducted within the world of schooling and involved advising governments on the basis of professional judgement became an explicitly evaluative practice. It was exercised over schools, producing public judgements and classifications for a set of assumed non-governmental as well as governmental audiences (teachers, parents, pupils, local authorities, employers, sponsors, local communities: the field of potential ‘stakeholders’. Inspection also became a sub-contracted process, with a smaller number of centrally appointed HMIs being supplemented by inspectors recruited through three agencies for the conduct of inspections.

Ofsted links inspection explicitly to school improvement: ‘Improvement through inspection is one of our key objectives’ (Ofsted, 2009a: 6). In Ofsted discourse, improvement relates primarily to the raising of standards of educational performance (measurable and comparable), but it must also involve improving ‘value for money’ and the ‘efficiency and effectiveness’ of providers (as well as the aim to ‘reduce bureaucracy’). The shifting assemblage of Inspection as Ofsted is also associated with a changing discourse of Accountability, which has been closely entangled with notions of Independence (as I have argued elsewhere, Clarke, 2005b). Independence is an Ofsted keyword, recurrently asserted: ‘We prize our independence and we report impartially’ (Ofsted, 2009b: 2). It is sometimes rephrased: ‘We will … report the outcomes of inspection and regulation without fear or favour’ (Ofsted 2009b: 5); or Inspectors will ‘evaluate objectively, be impartial and inspect without fear or favour’ (Ofsted 2009b: 21). This is an assertive, if not
abrasive, view of independence, reflecting a judgemental distance from schools and teachers.

The arrival of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition Government in 2010 has produced further changes in school inspection. In a White Paper on Education in 2010, it was announced that Ofsted inspections would focus on the core business (teaching, learning and pupil behaviour), eschewing the wider social agenda imposed by the previous Labour vision of schooling (social inclusion etc). New inspection methods are currently being piloted (autumn 2011) and a new Chief Inspector has just been appointed: Sir Michael Wilshaw, formerly head teacher of Mossbourne Academy. BBC News reported his appointment:

Sir Michael has told the BBC he is prepared to shake up England’s schools and that he will not tolerate any school being given an Ofsted rating of "outstanding" unless it achieves outstanding academic results. Currently, some schools can be awarded the top rating even if pupils only achieve average results. Sir Michael also said he wanted to challenge schools to do better because the UK was falling behind comparable nations in international league tables. ([http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-15294805](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-15294805))

In this respect, the new Chief Inspector seems committed to maintaining the combative approach to schools for which Ofsted has become famous, originally under the controversial Chief Inspector Chris Woodhead during the 1990s who led a campaign against ‘failing schools’, promising to ‘name and shame’ in the quest to protect pupils and parents from poor teaching. This orientation continues to mark Ofsted as a distinctively different assemblage of inspection by comparison with the other two cases.

---

5 Ofsted has also launched Parent View (20.10.2011), an online questionnaire that will allow parents and carers to give their views on their child's school. ‘Covering over 22,000 schools across England, the 12-question survey will help other parents as they make important choices about their child's education and provide Ofsted with information about schools that will help inform priorities for inspection’ [http://parentview.ofsted.gov.uk/](http://parentview.ofsted.gov.uk/)
Its policies are more focused on critical evaluation (eschewing support/developmental orientations). Indeed, Ofsted makes much of its ‘independence’ and its capacity to report ‘without fear or favour’. Inspections are conducted by a mix of inspectors, drawn from teaching backgrounds but some being directly employed by Ofsted, others recruited through three ‘partner’ organisations (SERCO, CfBT Education Trust, and the Tribal Group) who supply additional inspectors. Ofsted inspections have been heavily routinised through handbooks, guidance and training. These devices are, in part an attempt to ensure comparability between inspectorial judgements, but also aim to diminish the potential variability associated with ideas of inspection as ‘professional connoisseurship’.

The three national approaches to school inspection thus differ somewhat in both the elements (places, policies, people and practices) and how they are assembled into a unified organisational form. Although they all share the embodied entry to the school and classroom that appears as the fundamental characteristic of inspection, they are different in terms of who conducts inspection; the purposes that inspection is intended to serve, and the practices of conducting inspections. They are also located differently in the architectures of government and governance (including their place in shifting systems of schooling).

_Inventing European inspection?_

Our project also explores the transnational circulation of inspection through a particular interest in the Standing International Conference of Inspectorates (SICI) based in Brussels and founded in 1995. SICI brought together representatives from different (national and regional) inspectorates in Europe (itself a space subject to shifting definitions) to share experiences, update about changing educational systems, and find ways to improve working methods. The European space provides a potential new source of legitimacy and authority for nationally based actors – and this legitimacy was intensified for inspection following the EU’s Lisbon summit that developed a strongly education-focused social agenda (Grek and Lawn, 2009).
Inspectors in at least some national settings perceived a certain professional and institutional vulnerability in the face of other methods of governing schooling at a distance, most obviously the growth of performance data (Ozga et al., 2011). Such data – claiming to accurately represent the internal workings of individual schools – called into question the necessity or value of embodied, but intermittent, inspection. What could inspection deliver that could compete with ‘real time’ monitoring of school performance? SICI provided both a setting in which answers to such questions might be developed, as well as providing new forms of symbolic capital for national inspectorates.

SICI was not simply an association that was run through meetings. It was also active in promoting specific agendas through the organisation of workshops, where teaching of ‘best’ practices could take place, as well as conducting specific studies, in order to acquire ‘evidence’ to inform practice. Osler, in his speech at the International SICI Congress in Utrecht in 2000, spoke about ‘The future of school inspectorates in the 21st century’, stressing that inspecting was no longer enough: there was now a need to focus on continuous improvement which could only come from working together (SICI Newsletter 2000). SICI also became a site for the development of inspection methodologies that might enable reliable and replicable comparisons, not just between individual schools but also between different country systems. One point of conjunction for these concerns was the concept of ‘self-evaluation’ by schools. Between 2002-5 SICI ran a project on Effective schools self evaluation project (ESSA) in which the Scottish influence dominated and through which the ‘Scottish model’ of self-evaluation came to circulate widely.

SICI thus forms both a product of, and a site for, the ‘Europeanisation’ of education (including the exploration of common approaches and the work of ‘teaching inspection’ to new members). But SICI also embodies Europe as a network, and as a constantly expanding horizon through the enrolment of the accession countries. Inspection has been re-valORIZED in SICI:

*that’s why we, the European inspectors, are the only people going into the classroom, going to see how qualitative lessons are given.*
All the others don’t do it, they just have data. Also it is not so easy for us to ‘teach’ schools to manage the data because we use data to communicate with schools, and they have to learn statistics. Not every teacher can read the tables we make. We are investing in how schools learn data.

Fundamentally, when society hires an inspector, it hires the ability to make judgements and to establish relationships (SICI 2010: 15)

Governing at several distances?

Drawing on the three national case studies (and the place of education, schooling and inspection in the EU), I want to explore how we are to understand distance in the concept of ‘governing at a distance’? In its original Foucauldian usage, it denotes the form of liberal governmentality in general – the elaboration of ‘self-governing subjects’ who can be expected to conduct themselves appropriately without the exercise of direct domination or coercion (see Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1999; Rose and Miller, 1992). For example, Rose has argued that:

Political forces instrumentalize forms of authority other than those of ‘the state’ in order to ‘govern at a distance’. In both constitutional and spatial senses – distanced constitutionally, in that they operate through the decisions of non-political modes of authority; distanced spatially, in that these technologies of government link a multitude of experts in distant sites to the calculations of those at the centre – hence government operates through opening lines of force across a territory spanning time and space. (1999: 50).

It has proved to be an unusually fecund concept, being deployed in a diverse array of studies including those in which states have been finding ways to govern the social and varieties of social provision without direct lines of command and control. Both organisations and individuals have, it seems, been increasingly invited to imagine themselves as auditable or inspectable performative selves (see Power, 1997). Certainly, in the education context, the evaluative state has articulated self-evaluation as a demand that connects pupils (and parents, of course), teachers, schools, and systems.
However, as John Allen (2003) has argued, this ‘distance’ over which governing takes place implies forms of spatial relationship that might benefit from more careful attention. Our study of inspection makes visible several different forms of ‘distance’: most obviously, the governmental distance associated with a disaggregated or dispersed state (Slaughter, 2004; Clarke and Newman, 1997). This is the distance between the central state and locally produced and delivered services (schooling/education). It is the distance – the ‘arm’s length’ – between strategy (or targets) and implementation; and it is traversed by a number of devices: policy statements, targets, regulatory agencies, forms of conditionality (e.g., attaching to performance standards), data collection, display and publicity (e.g., in ‘league tables’) and inspection itself.

Nevertheless, this governmental distance is itself constituted differently in the three cases – in geographical, political and social terms. The physical distances between places – especially between centres of government and local schools differ; while Scotland and Sweden identify themselves as ‘small societies’. In the three societies, the distance between centre and local is politically mediated in different ways (with greater roles for local authorities/municipalities in Scotland and Sweden than in England). How does Inspection function across these different arms’ lengths? It appears that in both Sweden and Scotland, Inspection operates as though the distance is shorter, as though professional, collegial, supportive-developmental practices of inspection solicit the participation (and indeed self-evaluation) of the inspected. In England, by contrast, Ofsted appears to have maintained – if not actively constructed – the arm’s length. It represents itself, and is experienced (not always happily), as an external, ‘independent’ agent of critical evaluation and judgement.

These observations point to other sorts of distance that are a stake here: varieties of institutional, organisational and professional distance. In Scotland, and possibly to a lesser extent in Sweden (given the role of legal rationality and juridification), Inspection has been understood as both evaluative and developmental. That is, there has been an effort – in theory and practice – to reduce the institutional and professional distance between inspectors and inspected. In Scotland, this extends to a participatory
approach to the inspection visit (inspectors interacting in the classroom) and, most recently, towards the PRAISE framework for inspector training and the intention to build psychological and counselling skills into the training of inspectors. By contrast, Ofsted seems committed to producing and maintaining a more formalised and distant relationship between inspectors and inspected. The recent House of Commons Committee report emphasised (in the face of contesting arguments), the importance of observation and judgement over active involvement in improvement:

32. ...The role of the Education Inspectorate should be, firstly, to inspect institutions and to provide judgments and recommendations which can drive better outcomes for individual children, young people and learners; and, secondly, to provide an overview of the education system as a whole. It should not aim to be an improvement agency, although inspection should of course hold up a mirror to an institution’s failings and recommend areas for improvement without dictating how that improvement should come about. (House of Commons Committee on Education, 2011: 14)

Finally, it is worth reflecting on the geo-political-cultural distances between national inspection regimes and how they locate themselves in different spatial imaginaries. Ofsted imagines itself as the national agency of school inspection in England (and apparently the United Kingdom at moments where the UK is constructed as the performative educational system for purposes of comparison). It also locates itself as a globally competitive actor (see the comments from the new Chief Inspector above), and occasionally as an exporter of inspection methods to other places. The Scottish Inspectorate, in contrast, has imagined itself as European (and as not English). The European space is understood as a space of collaboration, support and development. Sweden also locates itself as European, but also as Nordic – a framing that places Swedish education is a strained and uncomfortable proximity to Finland (a world leader in the PISA comparisons). In these imaginaries, Brussels is located at very different distances from the three national systems.
Trying to take ‘distance’ seriously (in terms of both real and imagined geographies) makes visible differences in national assemblages of school inspection, in particular the different ways in which the ‘arm’s length’ between government and school is understood and bridged. As a result, I think there may be some value in exploring more widely how different strategies and practices that have been clustered under the concept of ‘governing at a distance’ both imagine those distances and enact governing across them.

Postscript: Speaking Inspection

This study involves an attempt to compare several different national models in ways that avoid locking us into the methodological nationalism of comparative policy studies by recognising the ways in which systems of schooling (and their governance) are not clearly bounded entities. But nor do we think that the development of homogenising narratives of Europeanisation or globalisation are adequate to analysing the persistence and reinvention of school inspection (and inspection talk).

However, we are reluctant to imagine that these different assemblages of inspection could plausibly be accounted for by simple dynamics of policy transfer, in which policies and practices have a point of origin and a point of arrival. Our three ‘national’ cases highlight very different assemblages and very different trajectories of reinvention and consolidation. Inspection may be spoken in all these three settings, but its meanings and its practices (and even its embodiments in inspectors) are rather different. Inspection is articulated with different national political contexts, education systems and governing apparatuses. But, of course, these cases are not simply national – they are enmeshed in multiple spatial relationships that constitute specific spaces and sites (Massey, 2004). In this context, national spaces are being reconstituted in relation to a variety of transnational dynamics: the internationalisation of educational performance comparison (most notably through PISA); the Europeanisation of educational objectives and practices after the Lisbon summit; the growth of SICI as a nexus for the promulgation of Inspection as a governing knowledge and practice; and the multi-national formation of the UK as a complex educational space.
So we see multiple processes of translation that connect – and disconnect – different sites and spaces. Education and inspection translations involve international comparisons and national imagery (of success in particular, see the case of Finland); intersections of competition and collaboration; and the reworking of national educational spaces as governable objects. In these we see the almost continuous reinvention or re-assemblage of national forms of inspection.

The mobile quality of discourses and practices of inspection poses interesting questions for us as researchers, too. How do we imagine, investigate and compare forms of inspecting as governing? We have tried to attend to how different sorts of actors and agents in the processes of inspection imagine and articulate it. We have, for example, tried to borrow Raymond Williams’ approach to ‘keywords’ (1988) to examine the different (and changing) national discourses in which inspection is articulated. But the cultural richness that Williams’ approach implies is hard to reconcile with translation between languages (e.g., the Swedish concept – or ‘semantic magnet’ – of ‘equivalence’). In this context, the concept of assemblage has strong attractions, drawing attention to the composition of heterogeneous elements, the animating, if not constitutive role, of multiple contexts and the governmental work/labour of assembling (Newman and Clarke, 2009).

Although our sites share a similar practice – the embodied observation of classrooms and schools – they differ in many other respects:

- the location of inspection in the wider architectures of government and governance;
- the location of inspection in the schooling system;
- the recruitment or enrolment of embodied forms of expertise and authority;
- the training of inspectors;
- the intended relationships between inspectors and inspected;
- the reporting of inspectorial judgements (style, varieties of mediation, imagined/intended audiences, consequences).

The idea of assemblage offers one way in which we can try to address this set of variations around the idea of inspection. The continuing puzzle for our
project is: who wants to speak inspection – and why? What is the difference that embodied observation and judgement makes to governing schooling at a distance?
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