

Havering LA

Learning and achievement service

Self-evaluation of the Authority's Arrangements

For School Improvement

January 2014

Introduction and context

I am pleased to introduce the Education and Learning service's self-evaluation of education provision in Havering.

The evaluation is in four sections. **Section one** is a summary of performance at all the main education stages – the early years foundation stage, key stage 1, key stage 2, key stage four and post-16, focusing mainly on 'key stage 5'.

In this section, we look at the trend, strengths and areas for development in terms of regulator judgements, attainment and progress, the gap between average attainment and progress and that of our vulnerable groups.

The context is our performance when compared with the 151 other English LAs, the other 31 boroughs and the City of London, and our statistical neighbours. Our ambition is to out-perform other areas taking into account a key contextual factor – deprivation. Using this, Havering is just within the top half of upper-tier LAs but is ranked at 28/32 London authorities.

In **section two** we evaluate our effectiveness in the areas set out by Ofsted under paragraph 17 of its framework for the inspection of local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement.

There are nine separate areas, and our self-evaluation comprises an outline of key strengths, the evidence supporting areas of strength, the

areas for development, the link with the LA's 2013/14 and 2014/15 service / implementation plans, and the lead officer accountable for each set of actions.

While we are justifiably proud of some of the strength of the education system in Havering, we are aware that there are a number of areas where urgent improvement is required. In summary these are:

- EYFS: getting more settings to good; increasing the average point score; narrowing the gap between children from poor homes and the rest;
- Primary: increasing the number of good and outstanding schools; supporting schools that are vulnerable to a judgement of requires improvement or worse; and ensuring we narrow the gap for children in poverty;
- Secondary: the number of schools rated as satisfactory or requires improvement by Ofsted; levels of progress and overall attainment; and the gap between most vulnerable groups and the average of all other pupils;
- School VI forms and colleges: to develop outstanding providers; the average points score (APS); the percentage of pupils getting three good A levels;
- NEETs: the low percentage of young people aged 17 and 18 in full-time education

compared with London and England; and NEET levels amongst some vulnerable groups (most minority groups have very low NEET levels);

- Special schools: none outstanding as rated by Ofsted; ensuring we develop robust attainment data;
- Primary and secondary attendance: levels of absence are higher than London and England averages;
- Secondary exclusions: permanent exclusions are higher than the average of London and English LA areas

In summary, our key priorities therefore are to, together, increase the percentage of good and outstanding providers and narrow the performance gap, particularly for those children in poverty.

LA officers are committed to working with colleagues in settings, schools and colleges on plans and actions to address the challenges set out in section two of the self-evaluation.

A 15 month action plan, focusing on areas for development, will be completed and in place by early 2014.

I know that, given the strength of the partnership we have here, our settings, schools and colleges will work with us to implement the plan and continue to build and strengthen their provision. **Mary Pattinson, Head of L&A**

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Section 1 – summary of performance

Area	Trend	Strengths	Areas for development / action
Early years settings – Ofsted judgements	Ofsted inspection outcomes have improved consistently between 2009 and the present – 74% of settings are good or better compared with 67% in 2009; although this is marginally below the national average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High quality specialist team providing quality assurance, challenge and support; Improved Ofsted inspection outcomes despite a tougher framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of provisions moving to good from satisfactory / requires improvement; the number of child minders rated good or better (currently over a quarter are not)
EYFS attainment	Good level of development' (GLD) has improved between 2008 (55%) and 2013 (60%), although the rate of improvement plateaued from 2010; APS 32.2 is similar to national, however, Havering's performance is ranked 26/32 authorities in London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attainment significantly above average – 59% GLD compared with 52% nationally in 2013; Children understand technology very well; Good preparation of children for KS 1, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the average points score for the cohort; the percentage of pupils with a GLD; reading, writing, numbers and shape, space and measurement within specific learning goals
EYFS narrowing the gap	The gap between the lowest 20% and the median increased between 2010 and 2012 and the APS of the bottom 20% declined by over 4 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> there is no information about the performance of individual vulnerable groups, and therefore areas of potential strength 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the gap between attainment levels of the bottom 20% of pupils and the median; the performance of the key vulnerable groups
Primary schools – Ofsted judgements	79% of primary schools are now rated good or better, marginally above the national average of 79% (April 2013) but we remained ranked at 21/32 authorities in London; with only one judged to have serious weaknesses, and one with special measures; while the percentage of outstanding schools is two points lower than nationally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary performance is above average for good or better provision; Improving trend in Ofsted performance despite more challenging framework; Schools that go into categories generally recover swiftly - 3 out of 5 straight to good. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of schools rated good; the number of schools rated outstanding; the primary schools in an Ofsted category; support of schools vulnerable to going into a category (the schools of concern list).
Key stage 1 attainment and value added	Attainment at KS1 has improved in all subjects from 2009 to 2013 (L2+): reading 87% to 92%; writing 83% to 90%; maths 91% to 94% ; and RWM 59% to 69%; L2b+ shows similarly good performance and even bigger points gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2012 RaiseOnline was sig+ for almost all characteristics – a high performance system; Attainment has been significantly higher than the all-area average consistently over 5 years;; progress; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the attainment level for writing - currently lower than reading and maths;

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	Trend	Strengths	Areas for development / action
Key stage 1 narrowing the gap	The gap at L2b+ has narrowed consistently from 2009 to 2013 on the main measure – poverty: reading 24 to 18%; writing 23 to 19%; maths 19 to 14%; RWM 21 to 19%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> attainment is strong, and improving, across most ethnic groups – with poor Bangladeshi and black Caribbean pupils out-performing non-poor; EAL pupils performed well – marginally above the average; Poor and EAL pupils attain extremely well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the gap between boys and girls - currently 16 points the continuing gap between FSM and non-FSM pupils – while improving it is still greater than the national gap; the gap between previously low attainers and others – exacerbated further by poverty
Key stage 2 attainment and value added	Attainment at KS2 has improved in all subjects from 2010 to present, with RWM L4+ 79% up from 66% in 2009, with only one school under floor targets. Havering ranks 13/32 authorities across London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attainment was significantly higher than the English average at KS2 in 2011, 2012 and 2013; Attainment using the 2013 measure – RWM – is good and expected to be significantly above national. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VA progress – only average in 2011 and 2012?; Schools just above the national floor target
Key stage 2 narrowing the gap	There is a 23 point gap on the main measure – poverty; and a 67 point gap with pupils with statements of SEN. This places Havering 29/32 in London. Ethnic minority groups mostly attain well, even when poor, except for travellers – a near 40% gap – and Caribbean pupils (black and mixed race). Against 2 levels of progress, most groups are close to the overall conversion rate, exceptions being pupils with SEN, travellers and other white / Asian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The achievement of most minority groups is very strong, and above the national averages – in nearly all cases, some by a significant margin; The attainment of boys at level 5 is good (sig+ against national, and higher than girls); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of vulnerable groups achieving sig+; The attainment of pupils on FSM - gap is wider than national; The gap between girls and boys; The attainment of pupils with statements, especially in English; The attainment of pupils who are looked after, who did less well than nationally; Poor progress of the previously lower-attaining boys; Our lowest attaining pupils at ks 1, who make less progress than expected in ks 2, in both English and maths.
Secondary schools – Ofsted judgements	72% of secondary schools are now rated good or better (61% in 2009) with none judged to have serious weaknesses; with fewer outstanding than expected. This places Havering at rank 29/32 authorities across London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two outstanding schools; 12 good schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of schools rated ‘satisfactory’ or ‘requires improvement’ only one in 10 schools outstanding, compared with the national average of 26%
Key stage 4 attainment and value added	Now 63% 2013, up from 58.1% in 2009, and above the national and London average, but still below the 2011 level; above average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved results in 2013 compared with 2012 2013 rates of progress in English and maths above national average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> performance in science, languages, art and design, business studies; Expected progress (3 levels) in English;

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	Trend	Strengths	Areas for development / action
	ATPS for GCSEs; strong performance in English and maths. Value added declined in the 'best 8' and core subject areas between 2011 and 2012 and the LA ranks poorly – ranked 30/32 across London		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conversions from L2 to E, L4 to C and L5 to B. • Accelerated Progress (4 levels) in English; • Value added between ks 2 and ks 4
Key stage 4 narrowing the gap	In 2013 the biggest gaps are between non FSM / FSM and non-SEN / SEN groups, and boys and girls – our performance is ranked 22/32 compared to other authorities in London. Ethnic minority attainment is good, with only mixed race Caribbean groups significantly below the average. In terms of value added, all groups under-perform when compared with national	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attainment levels of most minority groups are good; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attainment of pupils entitled to FSMs; • Attainment of LAC – this is low, although there were none in the 2013 GCSE cohort • Attainment of pupils with statements; • Attainment of boys; • Value-Added in 2012 for all groups.
Post-16 providers – Ofsted judgements	Of the 5 schools, 4 are rated as 'good' and one satisfactory. The FE college was rated 'good' at its last inspection; the VI form college was judged to require improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentage of post-16 providers rated as good or better is high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving all providers to at least good; • The lack of outstanding schools and colleges.
Key stage 5 attainment and value added	In 2012 A level results are above the national average, and below (743 against 762) for APS per student. The APS trend has declined overall since 2009, significantly in the colleges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes for 6th form students in Havering are better in all key measures compared with other LAs; • Free school meals pupils do well, with a relatively narrow gap c/w all other pupils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentage of pupils getting 3 good A levels; • The decline in APS overall in VI forms since 2009; • The steep decline in APS in the colleges; • The breadth of the vocational offer(?).
Key stage 5 narrowing the gap	This information is only available for schools where APS per pupil is higher overall, and for pupils who are poor, or who have SEN, than the national average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good APS for schools with VI forms; • Good outcomes compared with other areas for pupils entitled to FSM; • Good outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on the achievement of vulnerable groups; • Data on attainment and progress of vulnerable groups in the VI form and FE colleges
NEET number and percentages	Just under 5% of residents in the cohort are NEET (August figure). This is well under the England average and east London, but on the London average. The percentage of the cohort that is 'unknown' is a third of the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low percentage cohort are NEET; • Unknown numbers are comparatively low; • Most minority groups have low NEET levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The low percentage of young people in learning compared with many neighbours and London; • NEET levels of, asylum seekers, pregnant and teenage mothers; • 17 year-old participation in education and training

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	Trend	Strengths	Areas for development / action
	national average, and well under the London / east London average		
Special schools – Ofsted judgements	In 2009, one was outstanding, and two good; Now, all three are rated ‘good’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special schools are all good, with some outstanding features; • One school has improved from RI to good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To support all the special schools so that they are able to self-evaluate as ‘outstanding’;
Special schools - attainment	There is little nationally available data relating to attainment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ofsted judgements on attainment in special schools are positive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support of teachers in special schools to monitor progress of pupils with SEN more effectively
Special schools – NtG	See above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ofsted judgment of Corbets Tey noted good progress amongst all pupil groups, including all ethnic minorities, both sexes and autistic pupils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data on attainment for special school pupils at all key stages
Primary attendance	Total absence has improved from 5.4% in 2009 to 5.1% in the spring term 2012, but remains above London and SN (4.6%/4.9%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pupil absence level fell between 2009 and spring 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of authorised and unauthorised absence; • Challenging reasons for absence from school
Secondary attendance	Pupil absence level has reduced by 1.2 points from 2009 to 2012, but at 6% is higher than London 5.7% and SN 5.9%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pupil absence level fell between 2009 and spring 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of authorised and unauthorised absence; • Challenging reasons for absence from school
Primary exclusions	There were no permanent exclusion in the last school year, c/w 0.1% of pupils in SN and London schools, 0.2 Eng. 0.44% of pupils were f/p excluded, c/w .97 SN, .7 London and .9 national	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No permanent exclusions; • Fixed period exclusions much lower than SNs, London and English primary schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for pupils excluded for a fixed period; • Support for pupils excluded returning to the primary school / or those placed in another school • Continue to develop Primary IFAP processes
Secondary exclusions	Permanent exclusions have increased from 16 to 33 per 1000 between 2009 and 2013, with 0.2% excluded in 2012, c/w .19% in London / SN and .14 in England. 5.8% of pupils were FP excluded, lower than Sn, London and England – 8.8, 7.5 and 7.8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fixed period exclusions are low compared with SN, London and English secondary schools; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent exclusion levels; • Fixed period exclusion levels; • Attainment of pupils permanently excluded from school • Continue to develop secondary IFAP processes • Work in partnership with schools to enhance “pre-exclusion” preventative support offer
Pupil Referral Service (PRS)	Outcomes from the PRS, and the 4 campus’s, remain lower than those in mainstream schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newly formed PRS should have the capability to address rapidly the issues to bring the PRS to “good” and improve outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate curriculum offer across the PRS • Effective teaching and learning • Rapid increase in successful reintegration into main

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	Trend	Strengths	Areas for development / action
------	-------	-----------	--------------------------------

stream

Section 2 – Havering’s arrangements for supporting school improvement

ASPECT 1: THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CORPORATE AND STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
Elected members and senior officers have an ambitious vision for improving education provision, which is clearly demonstrated in public documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong, comprehensive strategy, approved by members; A learning and achievement service with the leadership strength, knowledge and skills to deliver the strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E and S strategy (1.1); Improving outcomes in all key stages in 2013; (1.2); Good levels of progress in all early years and primary stages? (1.3). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrowing the gap between average attainment and key vulnerable groups, especially poor pupils
Elected members articulate the local authority’s (LAs) strategic role, and enhance providers’ ability to self-manage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member understanding of the principle of schools’ responsibility for their own improvement; but also of the critical quality assurance role held by the LA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of member support for teaching schools / school to school support / overview and scrutiny evidence (2.1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure rapid engagement with any new lead members following the May 2014 local elections
Accountability is transparent and efficiently monitored in a systematic way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent data processing capability; Good data analysis and sharing with all schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular and wide ranging presentations to members with clear links to key priorities (3.1); Annual reporting of LA impact on outcomes; Monthly meetings between Lead Member and officers on outcome data / issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide Information for ward members about settings and schools in their local area
Members’ challenge of officers is well informed by high quality information and data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge through the scrutiny function is focused, and appropriately challenging re process and outcomes in the system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scrutiny is planned on an annual cycle, taking account of challenges in the system (4.1); Regular challenge and support meetings take place between HT/Chair of Governors/Lead Member and Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of an annual cycle of reports to all members

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
There is coherent and consistent challenge to schools and other providers to ensure that high proportions of children and young people have access to a good quality education	<p>The delivery strategy is supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A quality assurance plan; • Universal annual visits; • A categorisation strategy that identifies schools of concerns; and • An intervention protocol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QA plan (5.1); • annual visit framework (5.2); • risk assessment flow-chart (5.3); • Havering powers / policy re intervention using stat powers (5.4). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the challenge through the consideration of formal warning notices to aid early intervention with schools of concern.
Communications and consultation are transparent and lead to a shared understanding with schools and other providers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All schools aware of the LA's QA policy and procedures, and its categorisation framework • More than nine out of 10 primary schools buy into SI services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • letter to schools re QA process (6.1); • list of schools buying into LA traded services (6.2); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications setting out statutory powers are relatively recent ; • Schools need to made aware of that the authority will use warning notices if needed
Schools and other providers respect and trust credible senior officers, who listen and respond to their views and advice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a good relationship between schools, including academies, and council officers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All schools, including academies, have responded positively to universal annual QA visits (7.1). • Attendance at key meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining dialogue and trust while using statutory intervention powers
Senior officers ensure that strategies for improving education provision are understood clearly by schools, other providers and stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education and skills strategy, 2013/14 quality assurance business and action plan, the quality assurance policy and procedures, and the intervention framework have all been formally shared with school head teachers and governors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See agendas for cabinet, scrutiny and chief inspector meetings (8.1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to develop the relationship with schools, in the context of the LA's position as a statutory authority responsible for QA of the education system in the area
There is tangible evidence that the strategy is effective in preventing failure, securing higher proportions of provisions 'getting to good' and eroding inequality in different areas of the LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of schools not causing concern has improved from 79% to 85% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of category 3 schools with the last three Ofsted inspection dates and overall grades (9.1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The incidence of schools whose Ofsted grading has declined from good or satisfactory since September 2012
Elected members and senior officers exercise their duties in relation to securing sufficient suitable provision for all 16-19 year olds and in respect of raising the participation age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 14+ strategy is in place with partnership priorities agreed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14+ strategy (10.1); • Good data sharing with all partners (10.2); • Sufficient places for 17 year olds (10.3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising further awareness of RPA required with parents, partners and employers; • Increasing the number of

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
(RPA) requirements		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual planning meetings with schools with VI forms (10.4). 	apprenticeships and training with employment

ASPECT 2: THE CLARITY AND TRANSPARENCY AND STRATEGY FOR SUPPORTING SCHOOLS AND OTHER PROVIDERS' IMPROVEMENT AND HOW CLEARLY WE DEFINE OUR QA AND SI ROLE

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
Priorities in the LA's plans for school and other providers' improvement (including commissioning plans) are clearly articulated and reflect both national priorities and local circumstances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current SI strategy – taken as an example of effective practice by HMI, and has clear priorities; The training programme offer from SI is linked to areas for development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School improvement strategy (1.1); Training programme for 2013/14 (1.2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of quality assurance in the secondary sector; The development of a traded offer in secondary QA in the post-16 sector
Schools and other providers / stakeholders have been fully consulted and agree the strategy / priorities for school improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategies, plans and policies have been taken to consultative groups, amended as appropriate and agreed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about all recent consultation processes is available to schools (2.1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultative documents for all stakeholders, and not just consultative groups.
Plans for school and other providers' improvement show close integration with the programme for differentiated LA support and intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiated support is explicitly set out in the school improvement strategy; Support is flexible and tailored to specific needs in given schools. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school improvement strategy (3.1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of the school improvement offer to secondary schools; Clarification for academies of the role of the LA
Reliable and valid measures are used to monitor progress of the school and other providers' improvement strategy. Evaluation of its impact is comprehensive and regular and its effect on standards and effectiveness of schools and other providers is identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard Ofsted measures used to assess effectiveness; Good risk assessment framework; Experienced and skilled school improvement / QA staff; Monitoring boards / progress review process is effective / well-understood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring board case studies (4.1); Five schools have come out of categories in the past two years, with three going straight to good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More focus on some of our schools – particularly secondary schools – that are good; Post-16 performance management needs to be fully integrated into QA work; There needs to be still more focus on the impact of QA / SI work
The rationale for support is explicit, flexible, tailored to need and endorsed by schools and other providers. Every effort is made to coordinate partnership arrangements and expertise residing within schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have a number of established, successful school partnerships; The partnerships have increased the LA's capacity to support schools of concern School Improvement Alliance (SIA) / 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership summary, review and evaluation (5.1); Example SCC action plans (5.2). Role and Remit of SIA / S4SBS (5.3). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increased focus on high impact secondary school partnerships and the building capacity to support secondary schools of concern; More systematic recording and disseminating of successful partnerships

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
Support for Schools by Schools (S4SBS) Programme has the full support of all schools			
The LA promotes the effective participation of all 16- and 17-year-olds in education and training and makes arrangements identify young people who are not participating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14+ strategy agreed and in place; • Targeted IAG contract running, focusing on maximising participation and NEET reduction; • Full use of the targeting toolkit; • Engagement with the pan-London drop-out process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14+ strategy and priorities (6.1); • IAG contract (6.2); • Targeting toolkit (6.3); numbers engaged in targeted interventions (6.4) • Information about engagement (6.5). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further reduction of NEETs to meet targets; • Engagement with specialist providers to support vulnerable pupils
The LA's definitions, arrangements, procedures and criteria for monitoring, challenge, intervention and support are clear, sharply focused, comprehensive and understood by all school education providers, leaders and governors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All working arrangements are clear in the school improvement strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School improvement strategy (7.1); • Quality assurance team business and implementation plans (7.2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all heads and governors of all schools and academies are clear about the LA's statutory duties and powers in the area of quality assurance

ASPECT 3: THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE LA KNOWS ITS SCHOOLS AND OTHER PROVIDERS, THEIR PERFORMANCE AND THE STANDARDS THEY ACHIEVE AND HOW EFFECTIVELY SUPPORT IS FOCUSED ON AREAS OF GREATEST NEED

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
Senior officers, schools and other providers make intelligent use of pertinent performance data and management information to review and/or revise strategies for their improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LA officers make wide use of DfE, Ofsted and KEYPAS data, carefully analyse it and use it to categorise; • A detailed strategic needs analysis for post-14 providers is completed and made available annually • LA uses data to address key priorities eg FSM gaps at all key stages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of data packs (1.1); • 2012/13 SNA (1.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the impact of the data analysis; • Post-16 performance management to be integrated into the QA team's work planning.
The LA systematically and rigorously uses data and other information effectively to identify provisions which are underperforming. It uses this information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are clear criteria for categorising schools, including their GBs, and settings, , with resultant differentiated levels of support; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for categorisation (2.1); • Examples of support offered to schools in categories 3a, b and c (2.2); • Examples of monitoring board agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier and more assertive intervention needs to be considered in some schools where there is a slow response to a recognised need for improvement in key

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
consistently to channel its support to areas of greatest need, resulting in interventions and challenge that lead to improved outcomes in schools and other providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge is well developed and widely understood, and involves senior officers, school leaders and governors 	and meeting records (2.3)	performance areas
The LA provides a comprehensive range of performance data, including data about the local performance of different pupil groups, local benchmarking and post-16 destinations comparative data. Schools and other providers have high regard for this, which is influential in helping them to identify their performance priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are excellent data both at year-group and LA level for overall performance and progress, and for different pupil groups (by sex, ethnicity, LAC / adopted and SEN; The LA benchmarks against London, SN and national data sets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Example data set for a primary school (3.1); Evidence of action taken and impact (3.2); LA benchmark information for setting, primary and secondary schools, and post-16 providers (3.3). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More intervention in cases where performance improvement is either insufficient, or not sufficiently speedy; Post-16 performance information to be discussed with college principals
Education improvement teams are well equipped to use data and to challenge and support schools and other providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our QA and SI staff are all expert in a) the data available to them; b) expert in analysing it; and c) experienced and skilled in its use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case studies of use of data, with evidence of challenge (4.1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post-16 performance management to be integrated into the QA service work planning

ASPECT 4: THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LA'S IDENTIFICATION OF, AND INTERVENTION IN, UNDERPERFORMING PROVISION, INCLUDING THE USE OF FORMAL POWERS AVAILABLE TO THE LA

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
Where appropriate, the LA deploys its formal powers of intervention promptly and decisively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LA is considering its use of powers available in every case where a school is a) of significant concern; and b) is not responding appropriately or working with LA advice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case study of intervention (1.1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earlier use of formal warning notices at very early stages of concern
Weaknesses are typically identified early and tackled promptly and incisively. Headteachers, staff and governors in all provisions, especially schools and settings causing concern to Ofsted and the LA, and those schools requiring improvement to become good, receive well planned, co-ordinated support, differentiated according to their needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns / declining trends are identified early; Solid support for all schools judged to be RI (and which are satisfactory and judged to need LA QA support to be at least good); Fully integrated QA and SI services allows for good synergy and co-ordination on key issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case study of a school where a declining trend was reversed with LA support (2.1); Case study of support for a SM school that became good in 15 months 2.2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further development of comprehensive QA, linked in with support and intervention, in the secondary sector; The development of support and challenge in the post-16 sector

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
The LA engages system leaders to support and challenge those in need and actively promotes sector led improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is strong brokerage of partnerships in most cases where schools are 'of concern'; • There are strong links with the teaching school; • A HT mentor programme is in place and is well received 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of recent partnerships, with data showing evidence of (rapid) progress (3.1); • Information about the mentor induction scheme, with information about numbers and impact (3.2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the capacity of the system to self-support through developing the School Improvement Alliance; • Support and encourage more local schools to work together.
Progress of schools and other providers is monitored regularly and to a planned programme. Reports to head teachers and governing bodies are fit for purpose. The work of the LA with its underperforming schools and providers results in sustained improvements in standards and provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools monitoring group meets monthly, with members who, between them, know many of our schools well; • Mid-Ofsted reviews are available, and valued by most heads; • Standards at KS 1 and 2 are high and consolidating, while ks 4 results have improved following a dip 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMG minutes and alerts; • Case studies of progress of schools of concern (4.1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a formal process – shared with and understood by head teachers – for consideration of the issue of warning notices; • Improve our intelligence with regard to 'good' and better schools – including academies – to help to reduce the numbers going into RI or a category
The progress of 'schools causing concern' is kept under continuous review by senior officers and scrutinised by elected members frequently and regularly. Robust action is taken where progress is judged to be insufficient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All schools causing concern are kept under close review and reported to SMG; • Information is presented to lead members on a monthly basis; • Mid-Ofsted reviews are used, with other tools, to check progress and trigger further action if required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review process and SMG reports (5.1); • Example of monthly member report (5.2); • Example of a mid-Ofsted review report (5.3). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put in place a protocol for the use of warning notices; • Circulate guidance to heads and chairs of governors on the powers and duties of LAs in the context of quality assuring education standards

ASPECT 5: THE IMPACT OF LA SUPPORT AND CHALLENGE OVER TIME AND THE RATE AT WHICH SCHOOLS AND OTHER PROVIDERS ARE IMPROVING

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
Timely, differentiated intervention and coordinated strategies to support the leadership in schools and other educational provision contribute to the improvement of school performance. All services recognise and actively support the autonomy of schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual leadership programme for HTs, DHTs and aspiring senior leaders • Termly subject leader meetings in core subjects and aspects; • In-school leadership support from experienced SI professional; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership programme schedule / evaluation (1.1); • Example of subject leader agenda and record of a meeting (1.2); • Example of leadership support in 2012/13 (1.3); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish termly head teacher forums; • Ensure that subject leader network meetings are maintained and attended by appropriate senior school teachers

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
and other providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership arrangements brokered • Mentor programme for new HTs; • Monitoring boards in SCC support improvement in leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of specific s-s support (1.4); • The programme and evaluation (1.5); • Monitoring board eg agenda and record (1.6). 	
Support services, either provided or procured, are well coordinated and accurately focused to make a sustainable improvement to overall educational standards and performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LA statutory role integrates well with school support traded services (finance, HR, governance, data); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case study – QA and traded work at a school (2.1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation of a single Havering brand for all school support and quality assurance
The number of providers on the LA's own list of 'schools causing concern' is reducing rapidly. Inequalities in the quality of education in schools and other providers in different areas of the LA are minimal and reducing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of providers on the LA's own list of 'schools causing concern' is reducing rapidly; • Quality of provision is improving and school concerns are reducing; • There is no geographical pattern regarding SCC; • School sixth forms, colleges and providers are challenged at annual strategic planning meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List in 2011 against 2013 list (3.1); • Data on schools of concern 2010 - 2013 (3.2); • Map of LA area with current schools of concern (3.4); • where current data is used to identify areas for development and any good practice (3.5). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey schools to establish more information about providers in Havering and heads / governors views of the quality of service.
The support and challenge of the LA to its providers is rigorous, sharply focused on areas of greatest need, and results in sustained improvements in standards and provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good support and challenge of early years settings and primary schools; • Improving engagement with secondary schools, with agreement that QA visits now include all schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes for pupils at the foundation stage, ks 1 and ks 2 (4.1); • Improved ks 4 results in 2013 (4.2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More challenge to secondary schools, including academies; • The engagement of VI forms, the VI form and FE college and other post-16 providers in developing the LA QA role
With very few exceptions, provision is either at least good or improving rapidly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes for pupils are improving and are top or second quartile nationally at foundation, key stage 1 and 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundation and key stage 1 and 2 (5.1); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of attainment of pupils at ks 4; • The attainment of post-16 students

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

ASPECT 6: THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE LA COMMISSIONS AND BROKERS SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS AND OTHER PROVIDERS

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
Schools and other providers are clear about what is provided by the LA or brokered or commissioned from other sources. Support brokered (and monitored) by the LA leads to sustained improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LA has a colour-coded management chart showing LA funded QA staff, DSG and traded SI staff; The LA provides schools with clear information about its traded offer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Havering school improvement booklet (1.1); Traded services information (1.2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implementation of a single Havering quality assurance and school support brand
The LA has comprehensive knowledge of best practice within and beyond the LA that is drawn from wide sources of information and routinely shared with providers. Local networks and collaborative work between providers are well established and linked to an identified strategy, with evidence of sustained improvement. There are well developed links with partners, including further education, vocational providers and higher education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our work with schools and settings external to Havering has given exposure to alternative practice approaches; HR and governor services participate in London wide Education networks and has links with other services to share / increase knowledge of best practice A well-developed 14+ Partnership in place across schools and colleges, local providers and other stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of good practice elsewhere (2.1); Examples of HR service links (2.2); Examples of GB service links (2.3) The partnership has led on a number of linked projects, including shared curriculum development (2.4). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More systematic collection and dissemination of good practice in other LA areas, in both quality assurance and school support, including commissioning / brokerage.

ASPECT 7: THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT HIGHLY EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS AND OTHER PROVIDERS

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
The LA provides or secures expert advice and differentiated training for head teachers, governors and middle managers. This support and training is improving the capacity of schools and other providers to develop accurate self-evaluation and secure continuous improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LA runs long-standing and well-used programmes for head teachers and middle managers; Governor services run a range of training and support programmes for governors, including on-line training; SEN services provide an 10 module training programme for SENCOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from senior managers, with correlations with regulator judgements and pupil attainment (1.1); Feedback from governors and evidence of impact on school governance (1.2) Feedback and impact evidence (1.3); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To report annually on the impact of training programmes offered; To improve the use made of feedback of all training and support activity guidance and advice to Headteachers and governors to support them as leaders as well as competent in HR management and practice
The LA identifies accurately all provisions that need support or intervention for leadership and management and governance, including	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual QA visits to all school including academies; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QA visit letters and visit plan (2.1); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the need for early intervention through formal warning notices

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
the prompt application of statutory powers when necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QA work by SI staff are backed up by the availability of data; • Data are analysed regularly to provide timely intelligence, which is used to update school categorisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LA data pack (2.2); • Examples of data made available to QA officers and SMG (2.3) 	
The LA brokers or commissions effective school-to-school or other support for leadership and management in weaker schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LA has good experience of brokering school to school support; • The LA uses NLEs, LLE and NLGs to support schools of concern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of brokerage 2010/12, and impact (3.1); • Examples of use of NLEs, LLEs and GLEs, and impact (3.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidate further the capacity of Havering schools' ability and willingness to offer and receive support from other schools, including teaching schools

ASPECT 8: SUPPORT AND CHALLENGE FOR SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
Where school performance and effectiveness is a cause for concern, the LA acts promptly to remedy concerns, including using powers of intervention, with demonstrable evidence of rapid and sustained improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional governors put in place in two schools causing concern; • Self-evaluation and external reviews of governance are available to all 'level 3' schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress of schools where extra governors put in place by the LA (1.1); • Progress of schools where governors have reviewed and audited skills (1.2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To use the LA's intervention powers at the early intervention stage, when governance issues are impeding rapid improvement to good
The LA has a successful strategy for managing governor recruitment and retention of high quality governors. The LA has access to experienced governors who are prepared to be deployed to, or support, governing bodies of schools causing concern or those schools not yet good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LA governor appointment including heads, members and governors, determines LA governors for GB approval. • Training offered via online provision; face to face sessions; whole GB training; • Regular termly meetings for chairs and vice Chairs of gBs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example governor appointment process (2.1); • Governing body training modules and programmes (2.2); • Agendas and records of meetings, with feedback from participants (2.3). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop existing links with school governor one stop shops • Develop existing links with school governor one stop shops
Governors are deployed where they are needed and any weaknesses in governance are being acted on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experienced governors have agreed to be IEB chairs and members • Additional governors in place at SCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of potential IEB chairs and members with evidence of successful experience (3.1); • Evidence of the appointment of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement IEBs with appropriately experienced members to schools of concern – including schools requiring improvement as well as those in a

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerks have training log for all governors available at each GB meeting we clerk –share with link gov 	<p>additional governors and impact (3.2);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of training log (3.3). 	<p>category</p>
<p>Training programmes for new governors and chairs are of good quality, well attended and highly valued, utilising a range of modes of delivery</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Induction offered each term; • Meetings offered to new chairs and new head teachers with HGS Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor induction programme (4.1); • Example meeting agenda and evidence of impact (4.2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide more written evidence of the impact of programmes on Ofsted judgements and pupil attainment?

ASPECT 9: THE WAY THE LA USES ANY AVAILABLE FUNDING TO EFFECT IMPROVEMENT, INCLUDING HOW IT IS FOCUSED ON AREAS OF GREATEST NEED

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
<p>Resourcing decisions are based on an accurate analysis of the needs of schools and settings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The schools forum plays a key role in the allocation of resources, and allocations have strong support; • The LA targets resources to where they are most needed through analysis of data - eg SEN, EAL attainment; • The L and A service is structured to meet statutory requirements; • LA has used appropriate funding to support school improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of SF decisions on funding (1.1) • Funding provided to support the implementation of the teachers' pay changes (1.2); • L and A service structure and costs (1.3); • School improvement budget and allocations in 2012/13 (1.4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that new revenue funding arrangements for 2014/15 are implemented; • Ensure that further revenue budget reductions to the QA service do not compromise the LA's statutory quality assurance functions
<p>The LA undertakes regular and thorough reviews of the cost-effectiveness of any resource allocation and acts decisively and effectively on its findings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough annual reviews of central expenditure ensures services are provided efficiently; • SEN costs are reviewed annually; • Allocations to schools for staffing severance and organisational review are kept under review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service restructures (2.1); • SEN annual review of resource allocation (2.2); • Budget and allocations to schools for staff severance / restructuring (2.3); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop reviews of specific services, with benchmarking information, to ensure continual service development
<p>The LA's budget-setting process is based on a thorough and detailed review of spending needs and is both timely and transparent. Consultation on the budget ensures that the deployment of LA resources are well</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are required to produce 3 year budgets; • Reviews and spending options are fully documented and decisions clearly communicated to schools; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of schools undertaking the exercise (3.1); • Schools forum decisions in 2012/13 and communication with schools (3.2); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring the LA, its statutory partners and schools are prepared for the implementation of the current children and families bill, and in particular the local offer and personalised budgets;

Havering LA – a self-evaluation of our arrangements for supporting school improvement

Area	strengths	Evidence of strengths	Areas for development / action
understood by schools and other providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new HNB has been implemented with little turbulence with timely information for schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HNB funding allocations and variance in schools' budgets (3.3). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure schools are provided with comprehensive information about HNB budget turbulence in 2014/15
The LA rigorously monitors and challenges the sufficiency and use of resources, including those delegated to schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School expenditure is monitored quarterly; High school balances are challenged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring procedure and documentation (4.1); Evidence of challenge (4.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the LA modelling of future SEN need includes new factors in inward migration (eg the benefit cap).