

BARNESLEY ALLIANCE

EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY 2019-21

Support and Challenge (risk assessment and evaluation)
July2019

Introduction

In Barnsley, all schools (including academies) are expected to provide an education that is good or better as set out in the Education Improvement Strategy 2019-21. Schools are responsible for their own improvement and we expect them to make effective use of the support and challenge available through the Barnsley Schools' Alliance (BSA).

Barnsley Local Authority (LA) has a statutory duty to promote high standards of education in all schools and settings. Within the Directorate for People (Education, Early Start & Prevention), colleagues champion the rights of children and parents by challenging every school to deliver a good education for all. We strive to ensure fair access to all schools for every child and provide effective support for vulnerable pupils (including children looked after, those with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) and those outside mainstream education). Through the BSA, high quality school-to-school support is brokered, and often commissioned, to support schools' continued self-improvement.

Within a culture of transparency and rigour, our schools welcome support and challenge as an integral part of their school improvement journey. Those causing concern are identified early to ensure that timely intervention can be applied to prevent further decline and secure the rapid improvements required. Schools are expected to fund their own school improvement programme, but the BSA uses its allocated budget to ensure that schools are not further impeded by a lack of funded support.

Risk Assessment Overview (Primary)

The LA collates performance and attendance information about all schools. This is analysed thoroughly by the school evaluation officers (SEOs) prior to the annual risk assessment conversation with the HT and chair of governors (or academy equivalent). The risk assessment information provides leaders and governors with a summary of their school's performance over time and is used to form a headline judgment.

The school's own internal data is then taken into consideration to ensure that any future dips in attainment are identified and addressed early to sustain strong outcomes.

The BSA also undertakes school reviews where there are concerns about a school's performance or to support the baseline process for a new headteacher (HT). These are always conducted in partnership with school leaders as a developmental process and the outcomes used to inform the school's risk assessment outcome.

The filter function on the master risk assessment spreadsheet is used to check the performance of vulnerable groups as this is also considered when reaching an agreement about the categorisation of a school. If there are any concerns about the implementation and effectiveness of a school's provision for vulnerable groups by the virtual HT for children looked after and the SEND team, the risk assessment outcome would reflect this.

The extent to which outcomes compare with other schools in a similar context is also considered when evaluating a school's effectiveness and its priorities for improvement. Consideration is made to performance at the end of EYFS, KS1 (including phonics) and KS2 for all pupils and for vulnerable groups.

The attendance of pupils is also taken into account.

During the academic year, SEOs and system leaders use their ongoing evaluations to identify where a change in risk assessment category is required to prevent further decline.

Risk Assessment Categorisation Criteria (Primary)

GREEN SCHOOLS: Outcomes are secure.

A school will be placed in the ‘green’ risk assessment category if the following applies:

- Attainment (RWM combined) by the end of KS2 is at least in line with national.
- KS2 progress measures are positive. If any progress measure is negative, this figure is less than 1 point below 0.
- There are no major concerns in relation to attainment and/or progress at any other key stage (including phonics).
- Attendance is broadly in line with (or above) national.
- There are no concerns in relation to the progress of disadvantaged pupils and/or those with SEND.

If a school’s attendance figure falls between the Barnsley average and the national average (and improving) this would not prevent the school from being categorised as ‘green’. Following the risk assessment conversation, some schools may move into the green category if leaders are able to demonstrate that overall attendance is adversely affected by a minority of outliers who are negatively impacting on the whole-school attendance figures. SEOs will establish the ‘typicality’ of attendance.

AMBER (yellow): Outcomes are generally secure but there may be an aspect of the school’s performance that should be better.

A school will be placed in the ‘yellow’ risk assessment category if any of the following applies:

- Progress measures are at least average. However, there may be an unusual drop in performance this year for further discussion.
- Schools not meeting the criteria for ‘green’ or ‘orange’ will automatically fall into the ‘yellow’ category.

These factors are then considered:

- New leadership
- Where attendance is not in line with national, it is improving.
- An aspect of the school’s performance does not compare favourably with other schools with a similar deprivation indicator.

AMBER (orange): Outcomes may not be secure and the school requires additional support to sustain further improvement.

A school will be placed in the ‘orange’ risk assessment category if any of the following applies:

- There are concerns in relation to attainment and/or progress in a number of areas (EYFS, Phonics, KS1 or KS2)
- Lack of sustained improvement over time.
- External evaluation suggests school may be judged to require improvement by Ofsted if inspected at this time, but is showing signs of improvement.
- Last Ofsted section 8 indicates next inspection will be section 5 (declining school).

- Ofsted category: Requires Improvement but external evaluation evidences notable improvement. School will remain 'orange' until next inspection.

These factors are then considered for placement in the 'Orange' category:

- New leadership
- Concerns re: attainment and progress for vulnerable groups.
- Outcomes do not compare favourably with schools in a similar context.
- Where attendance is not in line with national, it is not improving.

RED: These schools are our most vulnerable schools requiring significant support.

A school will be placed in the 'Red' risk assessment category if any of the following applies:

- Ofsted category: Inadequate (*until significant improvements are noted*).
- Ofsted category: Requires Improvement (*until significant improvements are noted*).
- External evaluation suggests school vulnerable of inadequate Ofsted judgment if inspected at this time.
- External evaluation suggests school vulnerable of requires improvement judgment if inspected at this time – insufficient improvement.
- KS2 attainment remains low and there is a lack of sustained improvement.
- KS2 progress below or well below average for the second consecutive year.
- The progress that disadvantaged/SEND pupils make is identified as 'below average' or 'well below' average over time.

These factors are then considered for placement in the red category:

- Internal data for other cohorts raises concerns about future outcomes.
- Vulnerability of leadership, including governance.
- Where attendance is not in line with national, it is not showing sustained improvement.

Additional evidence to support an evaluation of the school's curriculum will be gathered throughout the year. When evidence suggests that a school's curriculum is not sufficiently developed to provide learners with a good quality of education, the school's risk assessment categorisation will reflect this vulnerability.

- Red and orange: The curriculum is not sufficiently developed to meet the needs of all learners (especially disadvantaged pupils and those with SEND).
- Yellow: The curriculum is generally well-developed and meets the needs of all learners but there may be aspects which are currently under review.
- Green: The curriculum is well-developed and meets the needs of all learners.

Risk Assessment Overview (Secondary)

The LA collates information about the performance of all schools (including academies). Performance trends for all students and specific groups are reviewed, with a particular emphasis on progress across the curriculum. This is analysed by the BSA secondary representative prior to the annual risk assessment conversation with the HT/Principal and Chair of Governors/CEO (or delegated representative). During this discussion, priorities for the next academic year are discussed and a summary is captured in Appendix PS3 of this document.

In line with the HASIP (Headteachers As School Improvement Partners) programme (see Appendix S2), peer reviews are undertaken where there are concerns about a schools' performance or to support the baseline process for a new HT/Principal. These are always conducted in partnership with school leaders as a developmental process and the outcomes used to inform the schools' risk assessment outcome.

When determining a school's risk assessment category, the attendance and exclusions data for students is also taken into account.

During the academic year, the secondary school representative will maintain regular contact with the HT/Principal, and governing body where appropriate, to inform their ongoing evaluation of the school. If a change in risk assessment category is required at any point during the year to prevent further decline, this will be discussed with members of the Quality of Education Group.

Risk Assessment Categorisation Criteria (Secondary)

GREEN SCHOOLS: Outcomes are secure.

A school will be placed in the 'Green' risk assessment category if the following applies:

- Progress in English, Maths, EBacc basket or open basket is positive.
- Results are not declining.
- Ofsted category is good or better.
- There are no significant concerns about the progress of any particular group of students.
- Internal data and/or local intelligence does not suggest any serious concerns.
- Attendance and exclusions data is broadly in line with (or above) national and does not suggest vulnerability.

Following the risk assessment conversation, some schools may move into the green category if leaders are able to demonstrate that overall attendance is adversely affected by a minority of outliers who are negatively impacting on the whole-school attendance figures. The secondary representative will establish the 'typicality' of attendance.

AMBER (yellow): Outcomes are generally secure but there may be an aspect of the school's performance that should be better.

A school will be placed in the 'Yellow' risk assessment category if any of the following applies:

- Schools not meeting the criteria for GREEN or ORANGE will automatically fall into the yellow category.

These factors are then considered:

- Leadership capacity
- Appropriateness of the curriculum.

AMBER (orange): Outcomes may not be secure and the school requires additional support to sustain further improvement.

A school will be placed in the 'orange' risk assessment category if it is not quite or no longer meeting the criteria for a 'red' school, but has not yet demonstrated enough progress to instill confidence that it ought to be categorized as a 'yellow school'. Any of the following may apply:

- Lack of sustained improvement over time
- External evaluation suggests school may be judged to require improvement by Ofsted if inspected at this time, but is showing signs of improvement
- Attendance and/or exclusions data suggests vulnerability.

These factors are then considered for placement in the 'Orange' category:

- Leadership capacity
- Appropriateness of the curriculum

RED: These schools are our most vulnerable schools requiring significant support.

A school will be placed in the 'Red' risk assessment category if any of the following applies:

- Ofsted category: Inadequate (*until significant improvements are noted*).
- Ofsted category: Requires Improvement (*where there is no significant upward trend in Progress 8*)
- External evaluation suggests school vulnerable of inadequate Ofsted judgment if inspected at this time.
- External evaluation suggests school vulnerable of requires improvement judgment if inspected at this time – insufficient improvement.
- Progress 8 is significantly below national.

These factors are then considered for placement in the red category:

- Vulnerability of leadership, including governance
- Appropriateness of the curriculum
- Attendance and/or exclusions data is of concern and not improving sufficiently.

Schools Causing Concern

Following the risk assessment process, a 'Red' school may receive a LA Pre-Warning Notice for the following reasons:

- Ongoing concerns in relation to attainment and progress
- Red risk assessment category for three years

- Issues with leadership and/or governance are hampering the progress of children or the development of the school (including pupils' safety and well-being).
- Attendance is too low, persistent absence or exclusion rates are too high and not improving.

Statutory Guidance on Schools Causing Concern defines a school causing concern as follows:

1. the standards of performance of pupils at the school are unacceptably low and are likely to remain so;
2. there has been a serious breakdown in the way the school is managed or governed which is prejudicing, or likely to prejudice, such standards of performance; or
3. the safety of pupils or staff at the school is threatened (whether by a breakdown of discipline or otherwise).

In addition to a pre-warning notice, school leaders and allocated system leaders will be invited to attend a half-termly Schools Causing Concern Accountability Meeting with the LA and chair of the BSA (where this is deemed necessary). The purpose of this meeting is to:

- hold the HT and governing body to account for securing the required improvements;
- to monitor and evaluate the extent to which funding from the BSA is being used to good effect;
- to evaluate the effectiveness of leadership and establish the capacity to sustain improvement.

When a school's outcomes remain stubbornly low, or fail to improve quickly enough, we use our intervention powers to secure improvement in maintained schools, such as replacing governing bodies with an interim executive board (IEB) or issuing a formal warning notice. We provide effective challenge and support, encouraging schools to secure a strong academy sponsorship solution, when appropriate. Although we have no direct intervention powers in academies, where concerns are raised, discussion takes place with school leaders to ensure that appropriate improvement plans are in place. If an academy did not appear to be addressing its poor performance adequately, this would be discussed with the RSC. Regular discussions are held with our link HMI to ensure that schools causing concern are clearly identified and subsequently improve at the required pace.

School Improvement Strategy Group (SISG)

In primary schools, a SISG will be established in all red schools where there is not an IEB in place. Discussion between HT, SEO and Chair of Governors will take place as to whether SISG is required in orange schools.

The purpose of this group is to monitor and evaluate:

- the school's response to the issues requiring improvement
- progress against the agreed improvement plan
- the deployment of the school's resources to meet identified needs.
- the impact of improvement strategies on outcomes for pupils
- the effectiveness of leadership at all levels
- the quality of learning and teaching across the school

- the exit strategy, reducing support as the school increases its capacity to sustain improvement.

The SISG should endeavour to evaluate the impact of school improvement activity on improving the quality of education, behaviour and attitudes, personal development, leadership and management and early years (in line with school improvement priorities).

The SEO will keep the Head of BSA updated with progress.

- i) Is the school making reasonable progress given the evidence provided?
- ii) If not, why not and what can be done about it?

The SISG will be made up of the HT; chair of governors; one or more other governors; SEO; system leader and diocesan representative in aided schools. SISG minutes will be confidential but the chair of governors will share summary information with the full governing body.

BSA Offer of Support and Challenge (Primary)

Working with LA Maintained Schools

Once the initial risk assessment has been completed, the HT is invited to a 'Tailored Support for Schools' meeting with the SEOs, system leaders (where appropriate) and teaching school directors to determine their support requirements. NLEs/LLEs/SLEs are deployed accordingly and liaise closely with the SEO to monitor progress and report to the Quality of Education Group. At this meeting it will be made clear to HTs that, if they are requesting assistance from the BSA, they are expected to engage in a peer review to support the school improvement process.

Schools receive their risk assessment information in the third week of September. Shortly after, they will be sent a password which will enable them to access their school's risk assessment spreadsheet via Perspective Lite and all of its filter functions to assist leaders with data analysis and support self-evaluation.

The HT, Chair of Governors, SEO (and NLE/LLE where appropriate) will meet to discuss the risk assessment information. Agreement will be reached about the most appropriate category to ensure that the school continues to move forward.

Universal Offer for LA Maintained Schools

- SEO identified for LA maintained schools to work in partnership with the HT and GB to monitor and evaluate:
 - The quality of education
 - Behaviour and attitudes
 - Personal development
 - Leadership and management
 - Early years
- SEO recommends changes in risk assessment status, following school evaluation visits, to the Quality of Education Group.

- SEO to complete ‘Building A Picture’ following visits and discuss with governors (where appropriate).
- SEOs and trained system leaders will undertake a ‘deep dive’ in reading (or other priority subject) in each school, alongside school leaders, during the academic year 2019-2020.
- All schools and academies are expected to fund their own support and development. However, this should not be a barrier to a school or academy receiving the support it needs in order to improve. Where this is the case, HT will discuss funding support required with the Chair of the BSA.
- SEO and HT discuss the school’s priorities, including any budget concerns that may necessitate additional funding. SEO to share identified priorities with the Teaching Schools who will broker the required support.
- SEO to evaluate the impact of external support and report back to the Quality of Education Group.
- SEO will support governing bodies with the recruitment of a new headteacher.
- Free access to the leadership programme and other LA CPD events funded by the BSA.

Graduated Offer for ‘Red’ Schools

- SEO attends full governing body meeting in the autumn term to discuss the risk assessment outcome and outline the BSA offer of support and its expectations for improvement.
- NLE, LLE or SEO allocated to make the necessary brokerage arrangements and complete documentation.
- Where a school has an allocated NLE or LLE to manage the brokerage process, the SEO will continue to undertake half termly monitoring and evaluation visits and report back to the Quality of Education Group.
- SISG established to meet half-termly
- External review of governance completed, if required.
- Where there are concerns re: insufficient or slow progress, Service Director will be alerted and accountability discussion arranged with school leaders which may include the issuing of a warning notice.
- School Resource Management Adviser to undertake a finance audit (as appropriate).

Graduated Offer for ‘Orange’ Schools

- LLE or SEO allocated to make the necessary brokerage arrangements and complete documentation.
- Where a school has an allocated LLE to manage the brokerage process, the SEO will continue to undertake half termly monitoring and evaluation visits and report back to the Quality of Education Group.
- SISG established to meet half-termly, if required. If not, SEO to attend GB meetings for BAP agenda item, if required.
- External review of governance recommended.

Graduated Offer for ‘Yellow’ Schools

- SEO will be allocated to make any necessary brokerage arrangements and complete documentation.

- Termly SEO visits, if required.

Graduated Offer for ‘Green’ Schools

- SEO and HT to structure a follow-up enquiry day, or two half days, during the academic year.
- Mid-year data collection exercise to monitor expected outcomes. SEO and HT telephone conversation if required to explore any anomalies.
- SEO advises Teaching Schools if support is required.

Working with Primary Academies

Academies will receive their risk assessment information in the third week of September. Where aspects of the schools’ performance are of concern, academy principals and their CEO (or representative) will be invited to attend a risk assessment/tailored support meeting. In attendance will be the LA SEOs, Chairs of the BSA and representatives from the Barnsley teaching schools. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the academy’s priorities and how the BSA can support their plans for improvement.

Academies rated ‘Green’ or ‘Yellow’ receive their pack with a covering letter. Academies are encouraged to contact the Head of BSA should they feel this is not the correct decision, based on other internal factors.

Universal Offer for Academies

- All schools and academies are expected to fund their own support and development. However, this should not be a barrier to a school or academy receiving the support it needs in order to improve. Where this is the case, HT/Principal will discuss funding support required with the Chair of the BSA and Trust (if appropriate).
- Annual discussion re: outcomes with LA representative to agree priorities for further improvement (red and amber academies only).
- Any support requests should be submitted to a teaching school in order to establish the availability of SLEs/LLEs/NLEs as required. Brokerage documentation is completed by the relevant teaching school. Once work is completed, the teaching school will make arrangements to evaluate impact.
- Where support has been funded by the BSA, an impact report will be shared with the Quality of Education Group. Where there is insufficient impact, the Chair will explore reasons for this with HT/Principal and agree next steps.
- Free access to the leadership programme and other LA CPD events funded by the BSA.

Graduated Offer for ‘Green’ academies

- Autumn term risk assessment data and letter.

Graduated Offer for ‘Yellow’ academies

- Autumn term risk assessment data and letter.

Graduated Offer for ‘Orange’ academies

- Autumn term risk assessment data and conversation with the BSA.
- Access to CPD offer, according to priority.
- Consideration given to funded support, if appropriate.

- External review of governance recommended.

Graduated Offer for 'Red' academies

- Autumn term risk assessment data and conversation with the BSA.
- Priority access to CPD available from Teaching Schools.
- Priority access to BSA funded support, if appropriate.
- LA SEOs to evaluate impact of funded support.
- External review of governance recommended.
- Where there are concerns re: insufficient or slow progress, a discussion between the LA and RSC may result in a warning notice.

If the LA has a concern about the performance of an academy, then these will be raised directly with the academy and its sponsors. If the LA feels that these are not being adequately addressed by local action, the LA will communicate with the RSC.

BSA Offer of Support and Challenge (Secondary)

For red and orange schools, the secondary representative will attend the full governing body meeting in the Autumn term to discuss the risk assessment outcome. Additional support will be brokered by the Quality of Education Group and may lead to NLE, LLE or SLE involvement as required. The BSA's expectations for improvement will be communicated clearly to the HT/principal and governors.

In the spring term, the secondary representative will undertake an evaluation visit to consider some or all of the following:

- Internal data for year 11 and other year groups including:
 - a review of P8 in Basket 1(Maths and English), 2 (EBACC) and 3 (open)
 - progress of specific student groups (including disadvantaged and SEND (school support))
 - differences in girls and boys attainment
- Key indicators drawn from the IDSR
- The effectiveness of leadership and management at all levels
- The quality of education
- Behaviour and attitudes
- Personal development
- Sixth Form (where appropriate)
- Attendance and exclusion data (with reference to EHE, PA and truancy approaches)
- Progress on key areas for development identified in the previous inspection
- Involvement of the Academy Board / Governors in the self-evaluation / school improvement process
- How support and challenge is being given and received
- Role of the academy trust in offering support and challenge (where relevant).

The outcome of this will be captured in the school's Building A Picture report (Appendix PS3)

PROCESS FOR TAILORED SUPPORT 2019-20



SEO/TS and HT meet and complete brokered support proposal document (Appendix P1). HT financial declaration to be completed on the support proposal document.

Is the school requesting financial assistance from the BSA?

YES

SEO to approve work up to £7500 (agreed by Quality of Education group members).

Has the funding request been approved?

YES

System Leader to email the support proposal document to SEO and teaching schools to deploy their staff.

NO

SEO to communicate funding decision to HT and explore next steps.

Teaching Schools to complete their brokerage documentation making specific reference to the expected outcomes, timescales and cost. Ensure that System Leaders, and SEOs are copied in to email communication.

Once deployments are finalised, teaching school to update and share the brokerage documentation with KC, SEOs and system leaders (using SharePoint when in operation).

If BSA funding has been agreed, Teaching School will invoice KC for the agreed amount when the work has been agreed.

Once work has been completed, Teaching School to send all completed action plans/notes of visit/brokerage documentation to SEO who will liaise with the school re: evaluation.

SEO to share evaluation of impact report with the Quality of Education group and make any recommendations re: next steps.

Appendix P1



**TYKES
TEACHING
SCHOOL
ALLIANCE**



**Tailored Support for Schools
(Barnsley School's Alliance)
2019-20**

Name of School:	Headteacher:	SEO:
Risk assessment:	Date and outcomes of last inspection:	

2019 Headlines					
EYFS	Phonics	KS1	KS2 Attainment	KS2 Progress	Attendance

Priority	Code + PO	Expected Impact	Support requested	Finance	Next steps	Deadlines	Evaluation of Impact

Once work has been completed, Teaching School to send all completed action plans/notes of visit/brokerage documentation to SEO who will liaise with the school re: evaluation.

elContent.Outlook\UIQRUIMX\P
np'vemt Strategy) (Rev'd App.

School Budget						

Appendix S2: Headteachers as School Improvement Partners (HASIP) Programme

Philosophy:

School improvement is a complex process involving large numbers of people, many of whom have different expectations of the education system. This process is based on a belief that sustainable and lasting school improvement involves embedding change over many years, and that this change should be focussed on improving outcomes for young people. This programme is underpinned by a belief that the people who understand the school improvement process best are those who work within it as practising HTs. The philosophy of this approach supports a view that the people who understand the school improvement process best are most likely to be effective in supporting and challenging their colleagues in securing sustainable improvement.

Principles:

- Practising HTs are best placed to support and challenge school improvement.
- Practising HTs are more likely to accept high levels of challenge from people they respect, have good personal relationships with, who understand the school improvement process and who understand the HT role.
- The best professional development for practising HTs is founded in visiting other schools, understanding their contexts and discussing specific leadership and management challenges with HT colleagues.
- High quality school improvement addresses specific areas for improvement (termed ‘areas of interest’ in the HASIP programme) in detail and leads to long term sustainable positive change.
- Three people working closely together and getting to know their schools in detail are most likely to be able to offer relevant support and challenge.
- Senior leaders and governors in the receiving school should be involved in helping to identify the areas of interest which may reflect the areas for improvement identified in the schools most recent Ofsted report.
- The HASIP programme, if successful, should allow schools to become increasingly self-supporting and reduce the need for external support in the school improvement process.

Practice:

C:\Users\rachels\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\NetCache\Content.Outlook\UIQRUIMX\People Directorate Cabinet Report (Barnsley Alliance and Education Imp'vent Strategy) (Rev'd App. 4).doc

- 1) Three HTs will agree to operate the HASIP programme annually.
- 2) Each school will be visited once per year by two HT colleagues, one school in each of the three terms.
- 3) The HT will spend a full day in the school following the areas of interest.
- 4) The HT of the host school will be responsible for logistical arrangements to ensure the smooth running of the day.
- 5) A more detailed feedback meeting will take place at the end of the day with the HT before final feedback to the SLT, and governors as appropriate.
- 6) The visiting HTs will be responsible for producing a short evaluative report.
- 7) An action plan for addressing the findings of the review will be developed by the HTs.
- 8) The receiving HT should approve the final report and action plan within two weeks.
- 9) The school's progress will be formally re-evaluated the following year following the same process.

Appendix PS3

Barnsley Education, Early Start and Prevention People Directorate	<i>Building A Picture</i> 2019-2020	
--	--	--

School:		Links to other documents	Risk Assessment
Head Teacher:			
Chair of Governors:		Dates of Visits:	
SEO:			
EYFS Consultant:			
NLE/LLE:			

Previous Ofsted Judgments	
Last inspection	
Overall Effectiveness	Section 8: School continues to be good Section 8: Next inspection will be section 5 Section 5:
Effectiveness of Leadership and Management	
Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment	
Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare	
Outcomes for Pupils	
Early Years / Sixth Form Provision	
Areas for Improvement at last inspection	

What does this school do well? <i>Headlines from 2019 outcomes</i>		What does this school need to improve? <i>Headlines from 2019 outcomes</i>
EYFS		
Phonics		
KS1		
KS2		
KS3		
KS4		
Sixth Form		

Risk Assessment
The school has been placed in the *red/*orange/*yellow/*green category and school leaders *are/*are not in agreement with this decision. The chair of governors (or representative) *was/*was not present at the discussion.

Agreed follow-up actions	Who by	When

School to School Support
Is the school giving or receiving support? What impact is it having?

Quality of Education	School Self-Evaluation Grade:
INTENT: Evaluate the extent to which leaders have embedded a coherently planned and sequenced broad and balanced curriculum that is ambitious and meets the needs of all learners, particularly the most disadvantaged and those with SEND, to ensure they acquire the knowledge and skills they need to be successful.	
<i>Evaluation</i>	
IMPLEMENTATION: Evaluate the extent to which leaders provide effective support for teachers so they have good subject knowledge in order to teach curriculum content clearly. Do they make systematic checks on understanding, and adapt teaching so learners remember and integrate knowledge into larger concepts? Does the use of assessment, resources and the environment effectively support the intent? Is there a rigorous approach to the teaching of reading with materials closely matched to learners' phonics knowledge?	
<i>Evaluation</i>	
IMPACT: Evaluate the extent to which learners develop detailed knowledge and skills across the curriculum and, as a result, achieve well. Are learners ready for the next stage of education? Do they read widely and often, with fluency and comprehension?	
<i>Evaluation</i>	

Date	Recommendations	Date	Progress against recommendations

Behaviour and Attitudes		School Self-Evaluation Grade:	
Do leaders demonstrate high expectations and apply these consistently and fairly to secure learners' good behaviour and conduct? Evaluate learners' attitudes, pride, resilience and commitment to learning. Do pupils attend well and are they punctual? Do relationships among learners and staff reflect a positive and respectful culture? Do learners feel safe, experience bullying or discrimination?			
Evaluation			
Date	Recommendations	Date	Progress against recommendations

Personal development		School Self-Evaluation Grade:	
Evaluate the extent to which the curriculum extends beyond the academic. Does it enable learners to develop and discover their interests, talents and character? Resilience, confidence and independence? Do pupils know how to keep physically and mentally healthy? Are they prepared well for future success and life in modern Britain?			
Evaluation			
Date	Recommendations	Date	Progress against recommendations

Leadership and Management		School Self-Evaluation Grade:	
Evaluate the clarity and ambition of leaders' vision as reflected in shared values, policy and practice. Are leaders improving staff's professional knowledge to enhance teaching and assessment? Is there any evidence of off-rolling? How effectively do leaders engage with all stakeholders, manage staff workload and protect them from bullying and harassment? Effectiveness of governance and safeguarding?			
Evaluation			
Date	Recommendations	Date	Progress against recommendations

Early Years/Sixth Form		School Self-Evaluation Grade:
School context and attainment on entry information:		
INTENT		
IMPLEMENTATION		
IMPACT		

Additional Comments (SEO or Head Teacher)	

C:\Users\rachels\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\NetCache\Content.Outlook\UIQRUIMX\People Directorate Cabinet Report (Barnsley Alliance and Education Imp'v'mt Strategy) (Rev'd App. 4).doc

Appendix A

F2 cohort 2019-2020: Is this cohort typical for the school?

Attainment on Entry:

Year 1 Cohort 2019-2020 <i>Please provide cohort context (number of pupils in cohort, SEND, PP, LAC, EAL etc)</i>	Reading	Writing	Mathematics	GLD				
% working at (or above) the expected standard for their age at the end of EYFS in July 2019	sch	nat	sch	nat	sch	Nat	sch	nat
		77%		74%		79%		72%
% working above the expected standard for their age at the end of EYFS in July 2019	sch	nat	sch	nat	sch	nat		
Have any initial screening checks taken place for pupils currently in Y1? What is this information telling leaders? Is this cohort significantly different to previous cohorts?								

Year 2 Cohort 2019-2020 <i>Please provide cohort context (number of pupils in cohort, SEND, PP, LAC, EAL etc)</i>	<u>End of EYFS 2018</u>				<u>End of Y1 (July 2019)</u>			
	R	W	Numbers	GLD	R	W	M	RWM
% working at (or above) the expected standard for their age	% (Nat 77%)	% (Nat 74%)	% (Nat 80%)	% (Nat 72%)				
% working above the expected standard for their age.	% (Nat 19%)	% (Nat 11%)	% (Nat 16%)					

Year 3 Cohort 2019-2020 <i>Please provide cohort context (number of pupils in cohort, SEND, PP, LAC, EAL etc)</i>	<u>End of EYFS (July 2017)</u>				<u>End of Y2 (July 2019)</u>			
	R	W	M	GLD	R	W	M	RWM
% working at (or above) the expected standard for their age.	% (Nat 77%)	% (Nat 73%)	% (Nat 78%)	% (Nat 71%)	% (Nat 75%)	% (Nat 69%)	% (Nat 76%)	% (Nat 65%)
% working above the expected standard for their age.	% (Nat 19%)	% (Nat 11%)	% (Nat 12%)		% (Nat 25%)	% (Nat 15%)	% (Nat 22%)	% (Nat 11%)

Year 4 Cohort 2019-2020 <i>Please provide cohort context (number of pupils in cohort, SEND, PP, LAC, EAL etc)</i>	<u>End of Y2 (July 2018)</u>				<u>End of Y3 (July 2017)</u>			
	R	W	M	RWM	R	W	M	RWM
% working at (or above) the expected standard for their age.	% (Nat 75%)	% (Nat 70%)	% (Nat 76%)	% (Nat 65%)				
% working above the expected standard for their age.	% (Nat 26%)	% (Nat 16%)	% (Nat 22%)	% (Nat 12%)				

Year 5 Cohort 2019-2020 <i>Please provide cohort context (number of pupils in cohort, SEND, PP, LAC, EAL etc)</i>	<u>End of Y2 (July 2017)</u>				<u>End of Y4 (July 2019)</u>			
	R	W	M	RWM	R	W	M	RWM
% working at (or above) the expected standard for their age.	% (Nat 76%)	% (Nat 68%)	% (Nat 75%)	% (Nat 64%)				
% working above the expected standard for their age.	% (Nat 25%)	% (Nat 16%)	% (Nat 21%)	% (Nat 11%)				

Year 6 Cohort 2019-2020 <i>Please provide cohort context (number of pupils in cohort, SEND, PP, LAC, EAL etc)</i>	<u>End of Y2 (July 2016)</u>				<u>End of Y5 (July 2019)</u>			
	R	W	M	RWM	R	W	M	RWM
% working at (or above) the expected level for their age.	% (Nat 74%)	% (Nat 65%)	% (Nat 73%)	% (Nat 60%)				
% working above the expected level for their age.	% (Nat 24%)	% (Nat 13%)	% (Nat 18%)	% (Nat 9%)				