Local Authority Annual Review - Autumn Term 2018

Cleaswell Hill School

Headteacher: Mike Jackson
Chair of Governors: Tim Chrisp
School Improvement Partner: Lynn Watson
Date of Visit: 19/10/2018

PLEASE MAKE A COPY OF THE TEMPLATE BEFORE EDITING

Part 1	Last Ofsted Judgement	SEF Judgement	SIP Judgement
The Overall Effectiveness of the School	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Effectiveness of Leadership and Management	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Outcomes	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
Sixth Form/Early Years	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding

Date of Last Ofsted Inspection: 2-3 March 2017

This school has the following strengths:

- Leadership and management by the HT, senior leadership team and Governors remains visionary as detailed evaluation and analysis informs further improvements, prioritised within the Schools Development Plans and linked to best practice initiatives. Improvement Plans include Ofsted action points, key goals related to feedback from all stakeholders and an ambitious approach to ensuring best outcomes for all pupils in school.
- The schools culture is inspiring. There is evidence of a high quality, team approach to meeting the needs of some of the most vulnerable children in society. Staff challenge and support one another in individualising the curriculum and tailoring a bespoke approach to ensure all pupils access learning. This approach has supported new admissions into school this term.
- The last phase leader will be appointed before half term. All phase leaders are now part of a strategic vision to drive standards in the quality of teaching, learning and assessment further utilising a new progress and achievement data tracking system. This system is robust and valid and will support curriculum change and

- Monitoring schedules are embedded and data used to inform interventions. Regular learning walks by the HT include classroom visits and discussions with staff. Formal monitoring arrangements involve the HT, DHT and AHT who then moderate findings to validate data and consider areas for further development. Staff who are identified as requiring additional support (1- SEPT 2018) are monitored and robust strategies put in place swiftly to enable teachers to improve within a positive and supportive environment. This approach has been highly successful this term as evidenced in a classroom visit by the SIP. Appraisal systems are embedded and targets clearly triangulated to data analysis.
- Post 16 has further improved outcomes since inspection as evidenced in this summer's accreditation results. Opportunities maximise pupils strengths and support independence.
- The curriculum offer is highly personalised and the schools approach is under regular review to ensure all pupils have breadth and depth in their studies.
- Behaviour management and the schools proactive personal development approach,

individual pupil interventions leading to rapid progress commensurate to pupils ability. ● The culture in school is a strength and palpable as observed throughout the days visit by the consistent and purposeful approach. Staff are professional and highly committed to meeting the children's needs.	including a counselling service, is highly valued and as a result pupils well-being is prioritised. This is a strength of the school.

● Provide evidence of the new iASEND data tracking system improving outcomes for pupils. This includes the alignment of the PLIMs system and iASEND, seamlessly to ensure no barrier, which impedes the sustained progress of all pupils. Ensure recording and reporting systems including written pupil feedback is fit for purpose, robust and valid. ● Focus on embedding written feedback, which is used across the whole school, within the context of recent advice on teacher workload to ensure feedback leads to challenge and measurable progress. ● Consider improvements to the website to reflect the vision, ethic and culture within Cleaswell.	● Include 'impact statements' in improvement and reporting documentation. Share this with leaders and Governors as this will support the schools vision and expectations on what the achievement of targets looks like. Further link this information to the appraisal targets of new phase leaders appropriately. ● Consider the leadership approach within school and explore senior leaders and Governors views of the culture and values within school and what evidence is available to assess this in order to sustain an outstanding grade. ● Further support phase leaders to ensure measurable impact. ● Support parents to contribute to 'Parent View'

Has the Headteacher/Governing body ensured that:

Single Central Register is compliant?	xYes/No
All staff have read 'Keeping Children Safe in Education part 1, Sept 18	xYes/No
Website is compliant with the most recent statutory guidance?	xYes/No
Parent view feedback has been reviewed?	xYes/No
Ofsted 'requested' documents are in place (see page 20 Ofsted Handbook)?	xYes/No

Type of school	SEND	**Current number on roll**	181
% of SEND pupils	100%	**% of disadvantaged pupils**	40%

Part 2: Detailed Analysis and Evaluation of the Outcomes Achieved by Pupils:

Early Years

● Pupils in EYFS have distinct and appropriate provision to meet their needs. Children are significantly disadvantaged due to their SEND diagnosis, however a highly personalised approach ensures they are motivated to learn and interventions meet assessed need. Pupils do not meet Early Learning Goals due to their SEND. Attainment data is statistically irrelevant as a result. However all pupils make progress from a baseline and detailed ongoing assessment using 'Personal Learning Intention Maps' (PLIMs) details achievements and informs further targets. Further development to ensure PLIM outcomes can be integrated into the new whole school data tracking system are underway.

KS1

- KS1 outcomes remain outstanding. Data has been analysed at the end of the summer term and improvements in outcomes has been a growing trend. Incremental improvement, in all areas of the curriculum, are well documented and this leads to further targeted support. There are no statistical differences between cohorts, including LAC,(3) PP, gender.

KS2

- KS2 outcomes remain outstanding. Pupils with severe and complex needs access a therapeutic approach including the 'Picture Exchange System' (PECS), which enables them to express their needs, preferences and supports their independence. There are no statistical data differences within cohorts.

KS3

- KS3 outcomes remain outstanding. Highly experienced staff, including subject specialists, motivate learners to enable them to access a highly differentiated approach. A specialist science teacher effectively integrated literacy and numeracy into a lesson on experimenting on the fat content of crisps. Highly structured feedback challenged pupils learning. there is no statistical cohort differences.

KS4

- KS4 outcomes are outstanding. The school manages its class profiles to ensure pupils access learning commensurate to ability. As a result able learners are highly motivated and prepared for accreditation. A small cohort of KS4 pupils access Post 16 provision to support independence, preparing them for the next stage in their education. There are no statistical data differences between cohorts.

Post 16

- Post 16 outcomes are outstanding as pupils achieved accreditation in line with or exceeding expectations. All school leavers in July 2018 now attend further education or training. There are no statistical differences in data between cohorts.

Which pupil outcomes are the key priorities for improvement in 2018-19?

- The school has sustained outstanding outcomes for its pupils following Ofsted. Ambitious plans to further extend the data tracking and analysis systems will lead to intensive targeted support for identified cohorts. The HT wishes to further strengthen EYFS assessment systems to ensure the youngest children in school have an in depth baseline leading to highly tailored interventions, including therapeutic approaches.

SIP's overall judgement for outcomes

- The HT was challenged to explain the 'outstanding' SEF judgements following the introduction of a new data tracking system. The confidence and detailed analysis of data and a raft of additional evidence in support of an 'outstanding' judgement is convincing.

Part 3: Leadership

Does the leadership's approach to monitoring and evaluating pupil progress and attainment (including groups of pupils) enable them to succinctly present and articulate the outcomes achieved by pupils in all year groups?

- The data is secure and leaders and staff understand and explain any variance. Judgements on priorities ,utilising data effectively, ensures they have maintained a very high standard of progress and achievement following in depth baseline assessment. Staff are swift to intervene and introduce further bespoke approaches to meet the needs of the most vulnerable children in school.This is effective as analysis leads to change and progress is recorded and reported accordingly.

Do reports presented to governors ensure that they are well informed about the progress and attainment of pupils (including groups of pupils) in each key stage, in a range of subjects, compared to national averages?

- The Vice Chair articulated the approach governors adopt in relation to challenge and support. The governors board includes a range of skills including leaders and managers in business and education, as such their level of understanding of performance and standards is well defined. They understand attainment against national averages is not a bench-mark useful in supporting further challenge. Governors ensure pupils receive highly structured and specialist support to 'diminish the gap' between them and their peers in mainstream. Data is presented and articulated well in governor meetings and follow up visits enable governors to secure their understanding of progression and challenge further as appropriate. The reporting of cohort data is well established and a range of evidence to support governors in considering areas of development is included in the HT repor**ts.** Governors look forward to **t**he data analysis results from the new iASEND system and support comparative analysis with local schools using this system to strengthen provision further.

Does the school's self-evaluation include the 2018 outcomes and reflect an accurate self-assessment?

- Evaluative evidence is collated in all areas of school performance including detailed analysis of data on outcomes and impact. School leaders model a are highly reflective approach, which supports on-going valuable evaluation on a daily basis. The SIP is a detailed and well informed document utilising evaluative evidence in all areas of school standards.
  Outcomes have been analysed and for example KS4 accreditation results have met or exceeded expectations.

Does the school's development plan include precise, measurable targets which reflect priorities identified from the school's analysis of 2018 pupil outcomes?

- Targets are measurable and relate to in depth data analysis related to outcomes and expected impact. For example children who find formal work in the classroom difficult, for short periods of time,have bespoke approaches to assessment, which informs specialist interventions, which results in measurable outcomes.

Part 4: Feedback

Feedback from Headteacher on the impact of the SIP in support and challenge:
Ensure this is completed

Requests for further school support:
(Refer to the [Northumberland Education Professional Development Training Directory and School Support Packages Menu (2018)](#) only add "none" if the Headteacher does not request further support)

Agreed next SIP visit date: TBC

The Spring SIP visit will concentrate on the quality of teaching, learning and assessment and the effectiveness of leadership and management.

Please agree activities from the following:

- **Joint classroom observation with headteacher and/or senior or middle leaders to ensure consistency in assessment of strengths and weaknesses of teaching**
- **A review of the effectiveness of school's approach to monitoring the quality of teaching and learning**
- **A scrutiny of pupils' work and discussion with pupils jointly with the headteacher and/or senior or middle leaders**
- **A review of the school's process for performance management of teaching and/or support staff**
- **A review of the effectiveness of the school's approach to assessment and leaders' success in ensuring accuracy of assessment**
- **A review of the quality of teaching in a particular subject or phase or for a particular pupil group, including a review of assessment information, pupils' work and a brief learning walk.**

    Or an alternative activity to meet the precise needs of the school (detailed below)

Note: SIPs are required to send the completed report to jackie.garton@northumberland.gov.uk within 5 working days of visit.

Appendix 1 – Guidance for School Improvement Partners

Responses to each question must be included in the main body of the report.

Questions focus on the key groups of pupils (boys/girls, disadvantaged pupils, pupils with SEND, most able). Where schools have another significant group of pupils (eg LAC, EAL, service children), a comment should be made about their progress/attainment.

Special Schools: *Where special schools have learners who participate fully or partially in national assessments, SIPs should comment on the performance of those learners using the questions below. For those learners not able to access national assessments, the SIP should comment on their achievement as measured by the school.*

Small cohorts: *Where cohorts are small it will be difficult to to make comments on some groups, where this is the case every effort should be taken to consider those groups across key stages and overtime to increase statistical validity.*

Early Years

1. What is the school's summary assessment of children's starting points? Does it fit with the contextual information available for the school?
2. What does the school's monitoring(of outcomes) information show about the progress made by children from their starting points to the end of Reception in 2018?
3. Are there any significant differences in the attainment in specific areas of learning (including in the proportion of children exceeding the Early Learning Goals)? Are the differences reducing over time?
4. What does the school's monitoring information show about the progress of disadvantaged children from different starting points (including the most able disadvantaged)?
5. Are differences in the attainment of disadvantaged/non disadvantaged children (compared to national averages), diminishing?
6. Are there any significant differences in the progress/attainment of boys/girls? Are the differences reducing over time?
7. What does the school's monitoring information indicate about the progress of children with SEND from their starting points? Are differences in attainment (compared to non-SEND children nationally) reducing?

KS1

1. What does the school's monitoring (of outcomes) information show about the progress made by pupils from their starting points to the end of KS1 in 2018?
2. Are there any significant differences in the attainment in different subjects? Are the differences reducing over time?
3. What do KS1 2018 outcomes indicate about the attainment/progress of the most able pupils?

4. What does the school's monitoring information show about the progress of disadvantaged pupils from different starting points (including the most able disadvantaged)?
5. Are differences in the attainment of disadvantaged/non disadvantaged pupils (compared to national averages), diminishing?
6. Are there any significant differences in the progress/attainment of boys/girls? Are the differences reducing over time?
7. What does the school's monitoring information indicate about the progress of SEND pupils from their starting points? Are differences in attainment (compared to non-SEND pupils nationally) reducing?
8. Does the school's monitoring information demonstrate consistently strong progress for groups of pupils in each year group and across a range of subjects?
9. Do the outcomes achieved by pupils in the phonics check in Year 1 2018 indicate an increasing proportion working at national expectations when compared to % of pupils reaching the Early Learning Goal in reading in Reception in 2017? Are all groups of pupils attaining equally well?

KS2

1. What do progress scores indicate about the progress made by pupils with similar starting points from KS1 to the end of KS2 in 2018 in reading, writing and mathematics?
2. Are there any significant differences in pupils' attainment in different subjects compared to national average? Are the differences reducing over time?
3. What do KS2 2018 outcomes indicate about the attainment/progress of the most able pupils?
4. What does the school's monitoring (of outcomes) information show about the progress of disadvantaged pupils from different starting points (including the most able disadvantaged)?
5. Are differences in the attainment of disadvantaged/non disadvantaged pupils (compared to national averages), diminishing?
6. Are there any significant differences in the progress/attainment of boys/girls? Are the differences reducing over time?
7. What does the school's monitoring information indicate about the progress of SEND pupils from their starting points? Are differences in attainment (compared to non-SEND pupils nationally) reducing?
8. Does the school's monitoring information demonstrate consistently strong progress for groups of pupils in each year group and across a range of subjects?

KS3

1. Does the school's monitoring (of outcomes) information demonstrate consistently strong progress for groups of pupils with similar starting points (including the most able) in each year group and across a range of subjects?
2. What does the school's monitoring (of outcomes) information show about the progress of disadvantaged pupils from different starting points (including the most able disadvantaged)?
3. Are differences in the attainment of disadvantaged/non disadvantaged pupils (compared to national averages), diminishing?
4. Are there any significant differences in the progress/attainment of boys/girls? Are the differences reducing over time?
5. What does the school's monitoring information indicate about the progress of SEND pupils from their starting points? Are differences in attainment (compared to non-SEND pupils nationally) reducing?

KS4

1. What do 2018 Attainment 8 and Progress 8 scores indicate about the progress and attainment of pupils with similar KS2 starting points (including the most able)?
2. How does the proportion of pupils (including groups of pupils) achieving EBacc compare to the national average? Are any differences compared to the national average diminishing?
3. What do the proportions of pupils (including groups of pupils) achieving grade 5+ in English and Mathematics indicate about progress and attainment in these subjects? Where attainment is below average, is there evidence of improvement?
4. What does the school's monitoring (of outcomes) information show about the progress of disadvantaged pupils from different starting points at KS2 (including the most able disadvantaged)?
5. Are differences in disadvantaged pupils' attainment (compared to non-disadvantaged pupils nationally) diminishing?
6. Are there any significant differences in the progress/attainment of boys/girls? Are the differences reducing over time?

7. What does the school's monitoring information indicate about the progress of SEND pupils from their starting points? Are differences in attainment (compared to non-SEND pupils nationally) reducing?
8. Does the school's monitoring information demonstrate consistently strong/improving progress for groups of current pupils in all year groups from their KS2 starting points and across a range of subjects?

Post 16

1. How successful is the school in securing good progress towards Level 1 and 2 outcomes in English and mathematics for learners from different starting points, including disadvantaged learners?
2. Do learners, including different groups of learners, make strong progress from their starting points?
3. Does value-added data indicate above average progress in a wide range of subjects for Level 3 qualifications? Where progress is not above average, is there evidence of improving trends?
4. Does the school meet the 16-19 minimum standard?
5. Are retention rates high? Are any gaps in retention rates for groups of learners with similar starting points reducing?
6. Does destinations data compare favourably to the national average for different groups of learners? For disadvantaged learners, are differences diminishing when compared to the destinations of non-disadvantaged learners?