

**Date written:** March 2017

**Report author:** Mike Glavin

**Date of meeting where the report is being considered:** Friday 14<sup>th</sup> March 2017

**Appendices attached:** Four reports outlining the progress against each of the four recommendations.

## **Issue: Reporting Progress Against Estyn's Recommendations**

### **Summary**

1. The attached reports indicate the degree of progress made against each of the four recommendations, in addition to the extent of the progress anticipated by July 2016.
2. The table below summarises the progress made.

Recommendation	Current Progress	Progress anticipated by July 16
1	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
2	Strong	Strong
3	Strong	Strong
4	Strong	Very Good

### **Recommendation**

3. It is recommended that Members note the progress made in addressing each of the recommendations.

### **Background**

4. Estyn inspected the Central South Consortium in Feb/March 2016. They identify a number of strengths and a number of areas for improvement.
5. The report of the inspection makes four recommendations:
  - R1- Ensure that school improvement services address the variability of performance across schools and local authorities, particularly at KS4.
  - R2-Improve the accuracy of the evaluations of schools by challenge advisers in order to ensure a greater focus on improving teaching and leadership.
  - R3- Strengthen the procedures for monitoring and evaluating the impact of school improvement work
  - R4-Evaluate progress against the regional consortium's operational plans more effectively.
6. The report refers to a number of additional areas that need to be addressed that do not fit directly under any of the four recommendations.
7. The suggested reporting format has been agreed previously and now ensures that the consortium and those that hold it to account monitor regularly the progress made towards meeting the recommendations. The extent of the progress made is judged using the criteria that Estyn use. It is summarised in the following table.

<b>Judgements</b>	<b>Addressing the recommendations</b>	<b>Aspects still requiring attention</b>	<b>Impact on standards and/or quality of provision</b>	<b>Work required on the next monitoring visit</b>
<b>Limited progress</b>	Does not meet the recommendation	All or many important aspects still awaiting attention	No impact on standards and/or quality of provision (e.g. standards have declined since core inspection in key indicators)	Much work still to do and many aspects still to consider
<b>Satisfactory progress</b>	Addresses the recommendation in majority respects	A few important aspect still require significant attention	Limited impact on standards and/or quality of provision	Majority aspects addressed but still significant work to do in important areas
<b>Strong progress</b>	Addresses the recommendation in most respects	Only minor aspects still require attention	Positive impact on standards and/or quality of provision	Most aspects covered already with little significant work left to do
<b>Very good progress</b>	Addresses the recommendation in all respects	No aspects require further attention	Very good impact on quality of provision	School to maintain and build on improve practice

### **Success measures**

8. The consortium and those that hold it to account regularly review the progress made in addressing the developmental need identified by Estyn during its inspection of the consortium.
9. Focussing on what needs to be done and comparing that with what has been achieved to date, will ensure that all developmental need is addressed in a systematic and rigorous way.

### **Options**

10. Members may choose to drill down on aspects of the progress.

### **Implementation issues – cost, timescale etc.**

11. The reports are reviewed at SLT meetings and used to report on progress to The Joint Committee, Directors and others who hold the consortium to account.

12. Improvement work is identified within business planning and so resources have already been allocated to addressing the developmental need identified by Estyn.

**Links to CSC Business Plan and Risks**

13. The business plan 16/17 and the draft business plan for 17/18 address the developmental need identified by Estyn. The reports now indicate links between the recommendations and business plans 16/17 and 17/18.

**Background papers**

14. A report on the quality of the school improvement services provided by the Central South Consortium, Feb 2016. Estyn.

**Recommendation 1: Ensure that school improvement services address the variability of performance across schools and local authorities, particularly at key stage 4.**

**Progress Report**

**Background**

During the February/March 2016 inspection of the consortium, Estyn found that:

- Since September 2012, only a minority of secondary schools inspected had been judged good or better for their standards.
- Boys' performance across the local authorities was far too variable.
- The Level 1 performance in the region has been the lowest in Wales for the previous two years.
- Performance at 5A\*/A or GCSE equivalent was too variable across the local authorities
- Performance in mathematics was the weakest of the core subjects.

This progress report evaluates progress since the inspection.

**Overview of progress since the inspection**

Progress against this recommendation is considered to be satisfactory.

There has been continued improvement in all phases and less variance in key stage four performance. Outcomes in both categorisation and inspections have improved for secondary schools.

Developmental need remains in some of the aspects noted by Estyn.

**Progress**

Year on year improvements in nearly all performance indicators in each phase has resulted in the CSC now matching or exceeding the national average.

The key measure of L2+ has improved at a greater rate in this consortium than any other and now exceeds the national average.

The gap in performance between those pupils entitled to free school meals and those that are not entitled is narrowing in each phase, but less slowly at key stage four.

There is evidence of a reduction in variance at KS4 in that:

- There has been a year on year reduction in the number of low attaining schools re L2+
- There has been a year on year reduction in the number of schools below the 3yr weighted L2+ eFSM floor target
- Benchmarking for L2+ performance shows that the percentage of schools in the first or second quarter improved to 64% in 14/15 and 63% in 15/16, with a significant reduction in the percentage of schools in quarter four.

Categorisation outcomes also indicated the improvement in the secondary sector:

Standards Group: For the consortium the increase in the percentage of schools in standards group 1 continues increasing by 21.2pp from 30.3% in 2015 to 51.5% in 2016. 53.0% of primary schools and 42.1% of secondary schools are now in standards group 1.

The percentage of schools in standards group 2, 3 and 4 has decreased. There is now only 1.6% of schools in standards group 4 and 13.5% in standards group 3. The percentage of secondary schools in these two groups is greater than the percentage of primary schools. (Group 3: 10.5% primary/29.8% secondary. Group 4: 1.0% primary/5.3% secondary).

Capacity To Improve: At a consortium level the percentage of school in group A has increased by 4.6pp to 35%. 33.9% of primary schools and 34.5% of secondary schools are now in group A.

The percentage of schools with a capacity to improve of D has decreased overall by 2.5pp. The reduction is larger in secondary schools (-5.3%) than for primary schools (-2.2%). 1.2% of primary school and 3.4% of secondary schools are now in group D.

Support Category: The percentage of schools requiring green level support has increased by 5.6pp to 35%. 34.2% of primary schools and 32.8% of secondary schools are in the support category of green.

There has been a decline in the percentage of schools within the consortium requiring red support (-2.5%) and an increase (0.5%) of schools requiring amber support. 1.2% of primary schools and 6.9% of secondary schools require red support whilst 14.6% of primary schools and 20.7% of secondary schools require amber support.

With regard to the specific measures raised by Estyn:

Inspection outcomes (published) since the inspection:

Of the twelve secondary schools inspected, standards were judged as "Excellent" in one school, "Good" in three schools, "Adequate" in six schools and "Unsatisfactory" in two schools. One additional secondary school in the region was inspected under the "New Inspection Arrangements" since September 2017 and was judged as "Good" in standards.

Outcomes for boys, particularly in language, remain below that of girls in all key stages at the expected and above expected level for all main performance indicators.

For CSC the performance for L1 in 2016 increased by 0.9%, which is the same as the improvement seen nationally. This maintains the CSC performance (95.4%) as 0.1pp above the Welsh average. In addition, the performance of CSC for L1 is the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest performance when compared to the other regional consortia, which the highest performance region achieving 96.2% for this measure.

#### A\*/A GCSE

The variation across local authorities for this performance indicator is reducing, as performance in the lower performing LAs improves. The variance between highest and lowest performing LA has reduced from 11.2pp in 2014 to 11.0pp in 2015 and 10.0pp in 2016.

#### Performance in mathematics

Foundation Phase: At the expected level for mathematical development, in four of the five LAs, improvement continued for a third consecutive year. The improvement over four years is greater in the CSC and in four of the five LAs than it is nationally.

At KS2 for the expected level, all LAs have improved performance in mathematics again this year, as they have for the last four years.

At KS3 at L5+, L6+ and L7+ there has been continued improvement in all five LAs for mathematics, placing the CSC performance above the Welsh average.

At KS4, the improvement of 1.3pp in L2 mathematics last academic year is underpinned by variable LA performance. However, performance improved in the remaining four LAs for the third consecutive year.

Early entry mathematics results indicate that performance is lower in numeracy than mathematics. Two secondary schools in particular are showing concerning low attainment and officers have arranged to visit the school to support.

- Headteachers of secondary schools have been engaged in workshop to identify those areas in which more support is required.
- Intervention strategy is being used to provide the required framework for schools causing concern.
- Target setting process is being used to challenge underperformance.

#### Evidence

All Wales core data sets  
 StatsWales Website  
 Outcomes of workshops with secondary headteachers  
 Intervention strategy and support plans for individual schools.  
 Target setting data.  
 Categorisation outcomes

#### Business Plan Links:

16/17: Priority one  
 17/18: 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.3

**Next steps:**

Continue to develop the work with secondary schools to ensure that the needs of secondary schools are fully met.

Continue to monitor targets set and in year data returns to look for underperformance.

This report is not yet addressing the variation between LAs. This needs consideration.

Ensure that new business planning has clearly identified action around:

- the performance of eFSM (secondary school floor target) and boys in literacy
- leadership in vulnerable schools
- recruitment in key schools-Teach First
- Support around vulnerable schools
- Deployment of CAs, directing resources where needed and strengthening secondary team.

**Recommendation 2: Improve the accuracy of the evaluations of schools by challenge advisers in order to ensure a greater focus on improving teaching and leadership.**

**Progress Report**

**Background**

During the February/March 2016 inspection of the consortium, Estyn found that:

- In a few cases, challenge adviser notes of visit to schools did not focus on the most important aspects requiring improvement, such as the quality and consistency of teaching.
- In a few instances, reports provided to Estyn in advance of an inspection did not reflect well enough the findings of the inspection team, especially regarding the evaluation of teaching and leadership.

This progress report evaluates progress since the inspection.

**Overview of progress since the inspection**

Progress against this recommendation is considered to be strong.

Professional development, alongside guidance and exemplar material, is leading to more secure judgements being made and more accurate reports being written. More direct and focussed action is being taken where challenge adviser performance is less than good.

## Progress Since The Inspection

- The consortium's framework for challenge and support continues to be used by challenge advisers, local authority officers and schools as a main point of reference. It has been revised to emphasise the high expectations set with regard to report writing. The changes made include:
  - Service's writing protocol revised to provide more specific guidance
  - Guidance concerning categorisation reports, pre-inspection briefings and inspection follow up progress reports revised and strengthened.
  - Written examples of all types of report provided to promote consistency.
  - Expectations concerning evaluation of teaching and leadership made explicit and included in examples.
- In addition support and professional development has been provided:
  - For senior challenge advisers provided through workshop in July with former HMI to support quality assurance role.
  - For new and existing challenge advisers through workshops and seminars provided in September 16 that focus on expectations about writing, including evaluation of teaching and leadership
  - For challenge advisers through the quality assurance of categorisation reports. All reports were quality assured by senior challenge advisers and a significant sample of 70 quality assured by the head of school improvement. Feedback was provided in all cases and where required intense coaching sessions provided.
  - A development day with a focus on making judgements in teaching and learning is being planned for 27<sup>th</sup> April 2017.
- In addition to quality assuring written reports, senior challenge advisers have conducted joint visits with all challenge advisers to quality assure the categorisation process. Written and oral feedback was provided in each case. Continue practice where line manager accompanies each challenge adviser at one review, challenge and support meeting.
- Many challenge advisers have participated in a self-evaluation activity through which they considered the clarity with which they recorded judgements for teaching and for leadership in the categorisation reports that they had written. A minority recognised that their performance in this aspect could improve, particularly when making judgements about leadership.
- Performance management objectives relate directly to accurate judgements about teaching, learning and leadership.

## Evidence

Framework For Challenge And Support with linked documentation.

Training programme and materials used with challenge advisers in September 16.

Quality assured reports with tracked changes.

Written Feedback from joint visits.

Self- evaluation undertaken by challenge advisers

### **Business Plan Links:**

**16/17:, 3.1.5**

**17/18:**

## Next steps:

Prepare an analysis comparing the judgements made in CA reports on teaching and leadership with inspection outcomes for the academic years 15/16 and 16/17 for the same areas. Insert in report above.

Deliver the development day focussed on making judgements in teaching and learning that has been planned for 27<sup>th</sup> April 2017

When reviewing the use and deployment of challenge advisers, consider ways in which best practice can be shared and coaching provided, perhaps for example in teams.

## **Recommendation 3: Strengthen the procedures for monitoring and evaluating the impact of school improvement work.**

### **Progress Report**

#### **Background**

During the February/March 2016 inspection of the consortium, Estyn found that:

- It was too early to judge the impact of a number of aspects of the consortium's key strategy for school improvement, 'Central South Wales Challenge'.
- Procedures for evaluating the impact of peer enquiry were underdeveloped.
- The procedures for monitoring and evaluating the impact of work on standards, teaching and leadership were underdeveloped.

This progress report evaluates progress since the inspection.

#### **Overview of progress since the inspection**

Progress against this recommendation is currently considered to be strong.

Nearly all processes are in place but need time to embed and impact on standards/provision

Many of the actions identified in 'Next Steps' have been completed.

Self evaluation systems have been developed and extra capacity and expertise is provided through the research and evaluation board. The first survey has been completed and initial data collected. The SER is a live document that informs planning and practice.

Increasingly comprehensive system ensures that the consortium is able to measure the impact of its work.

## Progress Since The Inspection

The self-evaluation report and associated processes have been strengthened.

- The self-evaluation report, SER is a live document that is updated regularly in light of the outcomes of self-evaluation activities. There is clarity with regard to who 'owns' the different aspects and is responsible for updating them.
- A calendar of self-evaluation activities is being systematically developed
- The SER informs practice and business planning.

A Research and Evaluation Board has been established.

- The board provides to the consortium guidance and extra capacity to measure the impact of its work. A project manager and researcher have been employed.
- One aspect from six main areas of the consortium's work (Hubs, SiGs, leadership, peer enquiry, closing the gap, challenge adviser work, has been selected for evaluation. The tools to be used and timescales have been determined. The outcomes will feed into the SER.
- A comprehensive survey has been developed and a sample of 15% of schools engaged to complete the survey on an annual basis. The survey is designed to gather evidence of the impact of the consortium's work. The outcomes will feed into the self-valuation report.
  - The first survey has been completed and an initial report produced.
  - Further analysis of the data collected is currently being undertaken.
  - In addition to determining pupils' views about school and teaching/ learning, the outcomes facilitate evaluation of impact on:
    - Collaboration and professional learning
    - Leading learning and collaborative working
    - School level leadership
    - Collaboration with other schools
    - Effectiveness of professional learning
    - Successful futures

LA performance review meetings are a fundamental part of the self-evaluation process.

- LA performance meetings are held each term in the third week of each term and report on the progress made in the previous term.
- The template for the report continues to be amended to ensure the presentation and analysis of key data and evidence to feed into LA and consortium SERs

Improvement planning is based around the outcomes of self-evaluation and national priorities. (This section links to recommendation 4.)

- Staff are more fully engaged with the improvement plans that they are responsible for delivering. This includes the development of clear success criteria that facilitates the evaluation of progress and impact of the work undertaken.
- Named leads are assigned to each key aspect and fully understand what is to be delivered and how they are to be held to account for their work.

Peer enquiry has been evaluated after each phase and the strategy changed in light of the outcomes.

- A full review of the peer enquiry strategy took place in June 2016 and a report produced.
- The issues raised by the report have been addressed and significant changes made to the phase 3 model.
- The phase 3 model has a number of evaluation systems built in that will facilitate future judgements about the quality of the impact of this strategy.

All SiG activity is monitored and evaluated:

- All SiG plans identify the work to be undertaken and it is then related to standards/provision/leadership.
- Nearly all SiG plans identify how the impact of their work is to be measured
- Half year reports indicate progress
- Termly convenor meetings include training on 'planning for evaluation'
- End of year reports outline progress against initial baseline.
- A summative SiG report is produced that identifies direct and indirect impact of work and feeds into the SER.

All pathfinder activity is monitored and evaluated.

- An SLA is agreed and contains a baseline against which progress is to be measured
- Evaluations are required after two terms and help determine if the collaboration should continue.
- There is a requirement that the collaboration evaluate against standards/provision/leadership/building capacity.
- A summative report is produced that shows impact on pupils/teaching/leadership. The outcomes feed into the SER.

All programmes offered by hub schools are aligned to the analysis of regional needs and follow an enquiry- led approach.

- All hub schools have a service level agreement outlining how capacity will be built;
- All programmes have been created following a detailed analysis of schools improvement plans from all schools;
- All programmes are planned collaboratively with strategic teams
- Strategic advisers visit all hubs each term and meet with the named person of the school to form an overall termly evaluation; (The purpose of the report is to monitor activity and discuss programmes.)
- All hub schools have received training to support red and amber schools.

## Evidence

Self-evaluation report

Self evaluation calendar

Research and evaluation board minutes.

Act Evaluation plan and outcomes for six aspects

Survey and results

LA progress review reports and minutes of associated meetings.

Bringing It all Together Report for Directors.

Peer enquiry review report. And documentation regarding the new model

SiG plans and reviews.

Pathfinder SLAs. Evaluations and summative reports.

### **Business Plan Links:**

**16/17: 3.1.1, 3.1.2**

**17/18:5.1**

## Next steps:

Ensure that the evaluation action plan for each aspect of the consortium's work is completed within time scales and that the outcomes feed into the self-evaluation report and inform practice.

School based peer quality assurance of programmes in the spring term alongside visits from CSC officers.

## **Recommendation 4: Evaluate progress against the regional consortium's operational plans more effectively.**

### **Progress Report**

#### **Background**

During the February/March 2016 inspection of the consortium, Estyn found that:

- Plans did not always identify clearly a lead individual to be held to account for progress.
- Plans lack clarity and specific success criteria, making it difficult for senior leaders to measure progress accurately.
- Senior leaders tended to focus on process rather than outcomes when monitoring progress
- Arrangements to monitor the progress of operational plans are often too complicated and are unclear about what is being measured.

This progress report evaluates progress since the inspection.

#### **Overview of progress since the inspection**

Progress against this recommendation is currently considered to be strong. It has the potential to be very good by the time Estyn visit.

Further improvements have been made to both the development of improvement planning and to monitoring progress against that planning. The changes made now need to become embedded to lead to the desired impact.

## Progress Since Inspection

Improvement planning processes have been reviewed and changed. They now:

- Include greater engagement with staff so that their expertise contributes to the plan , increasing ownership
- Include engagement with LA officers in key areas such as Inclusion.
- Include associate headteachers
- Have a drive team for each priority facilitating ownership and accountability.

Success criteria and milestones are written by the authors of the plans so that there is clarity regarding how leads are to be held to account. Success criteria increasingly relate to outcomes not process.

Key actions from the business and action plans form the basis of the organisation's operational monitoring spreadsheet. This is updated through half termly meetings between the drive teams and the operations manager. In addition, each drive team meets with assistant director, business manager and operations manager towards the end of each term in 'impact review meetings'.

Following the half termly meeting, the drive team summarises the noteworthy progress/impact, barriers, actions and who will be responsible for their completion and risks. This summary will then be included in the dashboard for discussion at the following SLT performance board. The performance dashboard has been reconfigured as intended and now provides better focus on barriers to progress and action to be taken in response.

Monthly meetings align with the financial processes to facilitate the monitoring of the overall budgets. These meetings are with the senior accountant. The senior accountant provides an update to the Business Manager and Managing Director highlighting any under spends as well as additional pressures within budget headings. A summary of all plans is provided to the SMT at the following meeting who agree the re-profiling of budget areas.

Where appropriate, evidence of progress/impact is collated and often leads to an update of the SER.

At the SLT – Performance meeting each month some of the following aspects of the Dashboard are discussed:

- School Improvement (Monitoring of SIPs / SERs etc Commentary from head of school improvement)
- Termly & Half Termly Progress reports (Commentary from senior challenge advisers)
- Inspection Outcomes (led by Caryl Stokes)
- Inspection Categories (including analysis from Head of D&IU)
- Finance Report on the progress with the action plans (including commentary from business manager highlighting risks and actions agreed at monthly monitoring meeting)
- Finance summary report on core budgets

- Business Plan Milestones (detailing risks as well as reviewing impact of milestones achieved)
- Risk Register (Risks identified within the monthly operational plan meetings / budget meetings will be discussed and decisions taken to their status)
- School to School Support Summaries Performance Management

A timetable ensures that all aspects are covered with a full review taking place at the end of each term.

A new information management system was introduced in September 2016. Aspects have been reviewed and improvements made. Project initiation documents have been produced, assessed and ranked to ensure that the next phase of its development is increasingly underpins school improvement.

### Evidence

Business plan and action plans 16/17  
Dashboard.  
SLT- Performance minutes  
Project initiation documents and assessment

#### **Business Plan Links:**

**16/17: 3.1.3, 3.3.1, 3.2.3**

**17/18:**

### Next steps:

The monthly meetings have been planned for next financial year in order to reduce bureaucracy and allow a more in depth evaluation of aspects of performance. These will begin in April.

This page intentionally blank