



## *Derby Winners*

Every School Good or Better

*September 2014*

---

---

# Derby Winners – Strategy for school improvement

## Introduction

---

School Improvement is about making sure that pupils' consistent experience is high quality learning. Schools are responsible for school improvement. Derby City's School Improvement and Governor Support team, in partnership with other teams across Children and Young People, is the team that fulfils the Council's statutory school improvement duties. These include:

- promoting early action to tackle school underperformance so that it does not become entrenched and lead to formal school failure;
- ensuring that effective support and challenge is provided when an unacceptable standard of education is identified, so that improvements can be made quickly;
- decisive action if a school in special measures fails to make sufficient improvements, so that the education and life chances of pupils are protected.

These are seen as core duties, although other statutory requirements linked to school improvement include assessment & moderation, the Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education (SACRE), Equalities and Safeguarding. Schools themselves now play a leading role in school improvement, with '*school to school support*' being the preferred model. Structured solutions including Cooperative Trusts are part of the strategy. There is now a strong focus on school to school support and networking via the Heads' Liaison Group (HLG).

*Derby Winners* provides the framework for this partnership approach, designed to draw on the best practice in order to secure continuous improvement for all Derby's schools.

## *Derby Winners: A Three Year Rolling Plan*

---

*Derby Winners* contributes to the Derby Plan corporate aspiration that *all people in Derby will enjoy achieving their learning potential*, as well as delivering the Learning and Inclusion action plan, for example through targeted SSIO work, closing gaps, working with school leaders and addressing under-performance. *Derby Winner* echoes corporate and business plan principles and priorities for improving outcomes and early intervention.

In that context, we aspire through *Derby Winner* to continue the improving trend in Derby with the result that by 2016:

1. Schools are exciting –pupils enjoy coming to school and achieve well.

2. No Derby schools are below national floor standard (or similar national indicator).
3. Overall attainment and levels of progress at EYFS, KS1 and KS2 are consistently above national levels.
4. Overall GCSE achievement of Derby's secondary schools is consistently above the national average and moving to secure top quartile performance in terms of attainment and progress; sixth form provision is effective and student outcomes post 16 continue to improve.
5. Progress is evidenced from baselines for special school and Pupil Referral Unit pupils, which continues on re-entry to school and/or alternative education for the latter.
6. Gender and fsm gaps are closing, and attainment for all vulnerable pupils at each key stage is improving, particularly for:
  - Free School Meals (fsm) Pupils
  - Looked After Children
  - Pupils with disabilities and Special Educational Needs
  - English as an Additional Language pupils and new arrivals
7. All schools to be good and outstanding with no schools in an Ofsted category.

Each year, performance on track to meet relevant CYP and Business Plan targets

## *Derby Winners: Shared Principles*

---

- A system for Derby's children and young people, with self evaluation as the starting point
- Improvement planned in a transparent way in partnership with headteachers and chairs of governors, securing schools' influence over Local Authority (LA) implementation by headteacher representation in decision-making bodies.
- An evidence based approach, drawing on both the performance data and shared understanding of each school in order to identify which are performing well, which are underperforming and which are vulnerable.
- Categorisation processes to focus support, not impede improvement. All schools re-evaluated each term so that no school is left unsupported, none categorised inappropriately and improvements are acknowledged and celebrated.

# Collaborative processes

School Self Evaluation: first hand understanding of performance continues to be the starting point for understanding improvement. Schools are asked to share their self evaluation with LA colleagues to inform the process. SSIOs support schools in the implementation of self-evaluation strategies.

Intelligence Gathering is based on this evidence (see categorisation ), in an annual cycle of school visits by LA colleagues to schools. These termly visits are charged as part of a core service; schools may purchase additional sessions from the LA teams or from elsewhere.

Internal School Review Board oversees this process, meeting the principles of transparency and influence. SRB will meet three times a year, linking its agendas with the cycle of *Derby Winners* visits, but, as with visits, able to address sudden changes in circumstances.

Action plans linked to school development plans will record expectations of improvement for vulnerable schools identified by these processes, with a common template recording milestones to be achieved by specified Partnership Board meeting dates.

Partnership Board (PB) meetings will monitor progress in schools causing concern. PB will be half termly LA meetings involving head teachers, chairs of governors, Heads of Service, Head of Learning and Inclusion and partners/ stakeholders.

Formal action, intervention and structural solutions will be used consistent with needs for them and with LA duties (see introduction). Involvement of the Council member with responsibility for CYP , Council Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet will reflect local commitments and national expectations. Professional links, Cooperative Trusts, school partnerships and federations are likely to be positive options for many schools, and have LA support among a range of nationally available improvement frameworks.

## Derby Winners: Criteria for Categorisation

---

The schedules of criteria in the appendices (see below) are intended to inform professional debate and judgement, not replace them. For the purpose of arriving at a category and support model with any school, a “best fit” approach is likely to apply. The most salient criteria may vary according to the circumstances, and may also relate to Ofsted criteria. Issues arising from the categorisation process will be shared and will inform further action/ next steps.

## Derby Winners: Models of Support

---

Category	LA support *
Outstanding (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 visits (1 for schools not purchasing package) from Senior School Improvement Officer (SSIO) per year</li> <li>• Facilitate provision of support to other schools</li> <li>• Support for school staff in their roles as potential National/Local/Specialist Leaders in Education (NLE/LLE/SLE)</li> </ul>
Good school with potential to become outstanding (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 visits (1 for schools not purchasing package) from Senior School Improvement Officer (SSIO) per year</li> <li>• Facilitate provision of support to other schools</li> <li>• Support for school staff in their roles as potential Local/Specialist Leaders in Education (LLE/SLE)</li> </ul>
RI ( Requires Improvement) school with potential to become good (3a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 3 visits from Senior School Improvement Officer (SSIO) per year (focus as agreed with HMI)</li> <li>• Brokered support from LA teams as required</li> <li>• Support commissioned via LA</li> <li>• Facilitate provision of school to school support for specific areas of strength</li> </ul>
RI (Requires Improvement) (3b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 10 days SSIO/ LA team support per year</li> <li>• Link with partner school or other structural solution</li> <li>• NLE/LLE/SLE or other lead practitioners for specific areas needing improvement</li> <li>• LA co-ordinated/support and challenge</li> <li>• Termly Partnership Board meetings and /or SSIO meetings with Chair of Governors</li> <li>• LA support for Post Ofsted Action Plan ( as agreed with HMI)</li> </ul>
Inadequate (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 30 days SSIO /LA team support per year</li> <li>• NLE/LLE/SLE or other lead practitioners for specific areas needing improvement</li> <li>• Link with partner school or other structural solution</li> <li>• LA co-ordination/support and challenge</li> <li>• Partnership Board (PB) involving Director Learning and Inclusion if applicable</li> <li>• LA support for Post Ofsted Action Plan ( as agreed with HMI where applicable)</li> </ul>
Category 1 or Category 2 temporarily vulnerable (1TV) , (2TV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As for Category 1 or 2</li> <li>• Additional SSIO/LA team support as required</li> </ul>

\*Schools and academies contribute to the costs of LA support via the Sold Services package.

# Derby Winners: Structured Solutions and Formal Action

Consideration of structured solutions is underpinned by the principles above (page 3). Structured solutions are considered as a matter of course for all category 3b & 4 schools, although a structured approach to planning improvement is likely to be seen in high performing schools too. Formal action such as removal of delegation or establishing an Interim Executive Board (IEB) or partnership may be a precursor to another structural solution, and would be preceded by a Warning Notice. Both head and chair would have prior indication from the LA if a Warning Notice were to be sent.

Structural, organisational and partnership options for school improvement		
Context	Structured solutions / formal action to secure improvement	Comprising in discussion with LA:
Most schools improve under their own self-determined actions, supported by SSIO and/or other short term school-commissioned consultancy or partnerships	Continuous improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Development Plan (SDP) with clear milestones, accountabilities, outcomes and recorded agreements</li> <li>• Evaluation identifies appropriate time-limited internal/LA/external support</li> <li>• All inputs deliver defined outcomes which are mutually supportive and coherently accounted for.</li> </ul>
Some schools will agree to formalise links or relationships for a range of reasons connected with shared interests, mutual support and timescale	School/school partnership agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of partner school</li> <li>• Appointment of partner/ associate headteacher (head of partner school)</li> <li>• Clarification and agreement of roles and responsibilities and deliverable outcomes of the partnership</li> <li>• Clarification of accountabilities for each school's governing body</li> </ul>
Where a strategic partnership is appropriate for the foreseeable future and governors decide a single governing body is the best option for the schools	Federation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of federation partners</li> <li>• Governors' agreement</li> <li>• Appointment of executive headteacher (head of partner school)</li> <li>• Clarification and agreement of deliverable outcomes of the federation</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities for school leaders</li> <li>• Management and oversight of the legal process for federation</li> </ul>

Structural, organisational and partnership options for school improvement

Context	Structured solutions / formal action to secure improvement	Comprising...
Alternative structure providing for a school to retain individual governance strengthened by strategic partnerships involving schools and other agencies	Trust status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of trust partners</li> <li>• Confirmation of existing leadership or appointment of executive headteacher</li> <li>• Clarification and agreement of outcomes of proposed status</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities for school improvement plans</li> <li>• Clarification of accountabilities for governance</li> <li>• Management and oversight of legal processes for conversion</li> </ul>
Specific kind of trust linked to Co-operative values and national network	Co-operative Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trust status as an LA maintained school</li> <li>• Governance mechanisms that directly engage key stakeholders - parents and carers, staff, learners and the local community - through membership.</li> <li>• An ethos drawn from the globally shared co-operative values, recognised in the trust constitution.</li> <li>• A curriculum and pedagogy that embraces co-operation, using the global co-operative sector as a learning resource and drawing on co-operative approaches to teaching and learning</li> <li>• Links to the Schools Co-operative Society and the Cooperative College</li> </ul>
A small number of schools might seek this change in order to share expertise as a focal point for CPD	Teaching school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligible (outstanding) school designated to lead Initial Teacher training, CPD partnerships and improvements in an area</li> <li>• Teaching school alliance including schools and other strategic partners</li> </ul>

Structural, organisational and partnership options for school improvement

Context	Structured solutions / formal action to secure improvement	Comprising...
<p>Converter academies change status by governors' decision</p> <p>Sponsored academies change status as an intended means of addressing performance issues</p>	Academy status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of Academy sponsor or for converter academies, consideration of a co-operative model</li> <li>• Confirmation of existing leadership or appointment of executive headteacher</li> <li>• Clarification and agreement of outcomes of proposed status</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities for planning</li> <li>• Clarification of accountabilities for governance</li> <li>• Management and oversight of legal processes for conversion</li> </ul>
<p>LA statutory powers to lead improvement may be invoked if a school causing concern is unsuccessful in embedding improvement</p>	<p>(a) Standards and Performance Warning Notice</p> <p>(b) Requirement "to enter into arrangements" ie improvement partnership with another school</p> <p>(c) Appointment of additional governors</p> <p>(d) Withdrawal of governors' delegated powers</p> <p>(e) Asking the Secretary of State to invoke the power to establish an Interim Executive Board (IEB)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of evaluation of overall effectiveness of school's governing body (consistent with guidance)</li> <li>• Prior indication of LA concerns at PB or dedicated meeting</li> <li>• Management of legal processes</li> <li>• (a) would set out concerns and establish performance targets, failure to meet which would render the school "eligible for intervention" by the LA or Secretary of State</li> <li>• (b) might be achieved voluntarily or under "eligible for intervention" status</li> <li>• (c) might be considered a means of strengthening governance</li> <li>• (d) would be most likely if there were serious concerns about financial, procurement or HR decisions.</li> <li>• (e) subject to LA consultation &amp; the Secretary of State's decision, the IEB would replace the governing body with a small strategic group focused on improvement</li> </ul>



# Derby Winners: Roles and Responsibilities

## School/ LA Leadership

- Individual schools have prime responsibility for their improvement. New emphases in accountabilities include securing, delivering and supporting partnership support and the governors' support and challenge role.
- The Secretary of State has ultimate responsibility for non-maintained schools, however there is an expectation that LAs must intervene or inform the Secretary of State about any concerns in order to prevent underperformance.

## National/Local /Specialist Leaders of Education (NLE/LLE/SLE) commissioned by LA

Responsible for:

- Support for all headteachers to assist in securing improvement or in developing a fresh perspective on issues presenting considerable challenge
- Contribute to the support for the headteachers of category 3b and 4 schools

Accountable to:

- Their governing bodies
- Partner schools
- DCC Head of Service

## Headteachers' Liaison Group

Responsible for:

- Ensuring that effective dialogue between heads and the LA provides due influence and evaluative reflection for all parties to promote the development and delivery of policies for Derby City schools

Accountable to

- Derby City headteachers, Director of Children's Services.

## School Review Board

Responsible for:

- Update of LA categorisation of all schools
- Risk assessment for all schools
- Accurately assessing the performance of all schools

- In-depth assessment of the performance of category 3b and 4 schools

Accountable to:

- Derby City Council Children & Learning Directorate Management Team (DMT) & head teachers

## Derby School Improvement and Governor Support Team

Responsible for:

- Implementation of the Derby Winners plan

Accountable to:

- Derby CC Children and Learning DMT and thus to the City Council
- School Review Board

## Derby City Council

Responsible for:

- Statutory duties on page 2 above
- Meeting standards set out by Ofsted in the Handbook for the Inspection of Local Authority Arrangements for Supporting School Improvement
- Championing the interests of children and young people, especially those who are disadvantaged

Accountable to

- Derby City Council elected members and the communities they represent
- Derby City headteachers through the Headteachers' Liaison Group
- Other Derby stakeholders in private, public and PVI sectors
- The Secretary of State for Education
- Ofsted

Quality Assurance of all processes will be ensured through Derby City Council supervision and performance arrangements. The Head of Quality, Standards and Performance will monitor SSIO visits, judgements and reports, and be accountable to the Director of Learning and Inclusion for delivery of *Derby Winners* and identified sections in the Learning and Inclusion business and action plans. Head teachers will contribute to this by returning questionnaires on services received by their schools, and through the Headteachers' Liaison Group.



Appendix 1 – criteria for LA categorisation ( best fit model)

Category	School likely to have most of the following characteristics	Role of SSIO <i>(Schools and academies contribute to the costs of LA support via the Sold Services package)</i>
Outstanding school (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership and management are judged to be outstanding based on current Ofsted criteria.</li> <li>• Attainment at the end of each key is (in most cases) at least in line with the national average with many pupils attaining above this.</li> <li>• The learning, quality of work and progress of groups of pupils, particularly those who are disabled, SEN pupils and those eligible for pupil premium, and the most able is consistently good or better.</li> <li>• From each different starting point, the proportions of pupils making expected progress and the proportions exceeding expected progress in English and maths are high compared with national figures. For pupils for whom the pupil premium provides support, the proportions are similar to, or above, those for other pupil in the school or are rapidly approaching them.</li> <li>• The achievement of pupils for whom the pupil premium provides support at least matches that of other pupils in the school or has risen rapidly.</li> <li>• Teaching quality is judged to be outstanding overall based on current Ofsted criteria.</li> <li>• Recent (within 3 years) Ofsted report judges most aspects to be good or outstanding.</li> <li>• School self-evaluation is accurate and an</li> </ul>	<p>Agree LA category            Discussion with lead inspector during Ofsted inspection            Attend Ofsted feedback            Identify good and outstanding practice within the school and facilitate sharing of this expertise across and beyond LA            Production of written report (s)</p> <p>Tailored programme of visits and support as agreed with headtacher</p>

	<p>effective improvement plan demonstrates impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school shares good practice with other schools and stakeholders and can evidence impact of this partnership working.</li> <li>• Headteacher is designated as or meets the criteria for a National Leader in Education (NLE).</li> <li>• Sixth form LA category at least 2b ( see appendix 1a)</li> <li>• EYFS provision is in line with Ofsted grade descriptors for outstanding or good</li> <li>• The work of EYFS leaders and managers has impacted positively on children's achievement</li> </ul>	
<p>Good school with potential to become outstanding (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership and management are judged to be at least good based on current Ofsted criteria.</li> <li>• The learning of groups of pupils, particularly those who are disabled, SEN pupils and those eligible for pupil premium, and the most able is generally good.</li> <li>• From each different starting point, the proportions of pupils making expected progress and the proportions exceeding expected progress in English and maths are close to or above national figures. For pupils for whom the pupil premium provides support, the proportions are similar to, or above, those for other pupil in the school or are improving.</li> <li>• The achievement of pupils for whom the pupil premium provides support at least matches that of other pupils in the school or is rising.</li> <li>• Where attainment is low overall it is improving at</li> </ul>	<p>Agree LA category  Discussion with lead inspector during Ofsted inspection  Attend Ofsted feedback  Identify good and outstanding practice within the school and facilitate sharing of this expertise across and beyond LA  Production of written report (s)</p> <p>Tailored programme of visits and support as agreed with headteacher</p>

	<p>a faster rate than national over a sustained period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching quality is judged to be at least good overall based on current Ofsted criteria.</li> <li>• School self-evaluation is accurate and an effective improvement plan is in place.</li> <li>• Sixth form LA category at least 3a( see appendix 1a)</li> <li>• EYFS provision is in line with Ofsted grade descriptors for at least good or moving rapidly towards good.</li> <li>• Leaders and managers of EYFS accurately evaluate provision and are taking steps to make improvements which impact on children's achievement.</li> </ul>	
<p>RI ( Requires Improvement) school with potential to become good (3a)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school meets some but not all the criteria for a good school.</li> <li>• Where the above criteria are not met, the school has effective strategies in place to address areas which are not yet good and can demonstrate the impact of these strategies.</li> <li>• The school acts on advice from LA and HMI colleagues and (where appropriate) is addressing issues identified by the most recent inspection.</li> <li>• HMI monitoring judges the school to be making 'effective' progress.</li> <li>• School self-evaluation is accurate and an effective improvement plan is in place.</li> <li>• Sixth form LA category at least 3a( see appendix</li> </ul>	<p>Agree LA category  Discussions with lead inspector / HMI during inspections  Discussion with HMI to agree joint programme of work  Attend inspection feedbacks  Attend Ofsted seminar with head and chair of governors  Production of written report(s)</p> <p>Programme of support to support school in addressing specific issues, for example:  Quality assure headteacher and SLT self</p>

	<p>1a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EYFS provision is in line with Ofsted grade descriptors for at least good or moving rapidly towards good</li> <li>• Leaders and managers of EYFS accurately evaluate provision and are taking steps to make improvements which impact on children's achievement</li> </ul>	<p>evaluation by carrying out joint monitoring activities  Discuss improvement plan and agree school priorities  Support school in presentation of self evaluation information  Signpost potential sources of training and support  Enlist multi agency support for school issues where appropriate</p> <p>Support school in brokering targeted support from LLEs/ leading teachers across City</p>
<p>Requires Improvement (RI) school (3b)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership and management require improvement and are not yet demonstrating the capacity to secure improvements.</li> <li>• Pupils' achievement does not currently meet the criteria for a good school as defined by the current Ofsted framework.</li> <li>• There is some evidence of improvement in pupil achievement and in closing the achievement gap but the pace of improvement is not rapid enough.</li> <li>• Teaching quality is judged to require improvement overall and there may be some examples of inadequate teaching which are being addressed.</li> <li>• Issues identified in the most recent inspection have been partly addressed but impact has been limited.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree LA category  Discussions with lead inspector / HMI during inspections  Discussion with HMI to agree programme of work  Attend inspection feedbacks  Attend Ofsted seminar with head and chair of governors  Work with school to draw up and monitor a post-Ofsted action plan aimed at bringing about rapid improvement in performance  Report progress with plan to Chair of Governors via regular meetings /PB meetings Broker strategies to significantly enhance the school's current capacity to make improvements (eg leading teachers, LLE, additional governors, secondees to SLT, school to school support)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sixth form LA category 3b( see appendix 1a)</li> <li>• EYFS provision is in line with Ofsted grade descriptors for Requires Improvement</li> <li>• Outcomes for EYFS are not yet good and there is insufficient evidence that leaders and managers are addressing weaknesses</li> </ul>	<p>Quality assure headteacher and SLT self-evaluation by carrying out joint monitoring activities  Signpost HR support for competency issues  Produce written report(s)</p>
<p>Inadequate (4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The leadership team does not demonstrate the capacity to bring about rapid improvements</li> <li>• Improvements which have been made are fragile, too slow or dependent on external support</li> <li>• The school is currently subject to or is likely to be subject to Serious Weaknesses or Special Measures</li> <li>• Attainment is consistently below the floor standards or is in decline and shows little, fragile or inconsistent improvement</li> <li>• From the different starting points, the proportions of pupils making expected progress, and the proportions exceeding expected progress, in English or in maths are consistently below national figures and show little or no improvement</li> <li>• Particular groups of pupils are underachieving</li> <li>• Teaching quality is judged to require improvement and there may be some examples of inadequate teaching which are not being</li> </ul>	<p>Agree school category and timescale to remain in this category  Produce LA statement of action with Head of Service  Set up half termly Partnership Board (PB) meetings involving relevant teams, Head of Service and Chair of Governors/IEB  Carry out (with colleagues) a termly review of teaching and learning, behaviour and school leadership  Support leadership team in collecting and presentation of self evaluation information  Work with school to draw up and monitor the post-Ofsted action plan aimed at bringing about rapid improvement in performance  Report progress against milestones in Plan to governors and senior LA staff/DfE/HMI Commission/broker strategies to transform the school's current capacity to make improvements (eg Federation, appointment of SLEs, NLE/LLE/executive head, establishment of IEB</p>



	<p>addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of pupil exclusions</li> <li>• Attendance is consistently low for all pupils or groups of pupils and shows little sign of improvement</li> <li>• The school is currently relying on a high level of support provided by an executive headteacher/NLE from another school</li> <li>• Sixth form LA category 4 or 3b( see appendix 1a)</li> <li>• EYFS meets at least one of the criteria for inadequate</li> </ul>	<p>or additional governors, secondees to SLT, school to school support)  Provide pre and post Ofsted support and attend feedback/ HMI seminars  Be part of recruitment and appointment process for key staff  Produce written reports evaluating progress</p>
<p>Outstanding school (1 temporarily vulnerable)  Good school ( 2 temporarily vulnerable)</p>	<p>School meets criteria for good /outstanding but is temporarily vulnerable. This is likely to be the result of one or more of the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant change in senior leadership</li> <li>• Sudden high levels of staff turnover/staff absence</li> <li>• Unexpected high levels of pupil turnover</li> <li>• Potential merger</li> <li>• Parental complaints to LA/DfE</li> <li>• Serious issues around HR, governance, finance, Child Protection</li> <li>• Sudden high level of governor resignations</li> <li>• Inadequate sixth form or EYFS provision</li> </ul>	<p>SSIO role as for or good or outstanding schools  Additional support to be provided by SSIO or brokered via LA teams/external agencies to address school specific issues as required</p>

