



# WiSS

2016-17

Work  
in  
Support of  
Schools





# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and context</b> .....	<b>2</b>
----------	---------------------------------------	----------

<b>2</b>	<b>Expected outcomes from the revised WiSS document 2016-2017</b> .....	<b>2</b>
----------	---	----------

<b>3</b>	<b>Procedures to achieve the outcomes</b> .....	<b>3</b>
----------	---	----------

<b>4</b>	<b>Formal powers of intervention</b> .....	<b>9</b>
----------	--	----------

<b>5</b>	<b>Review</b> .....	<b>10</b>
----------	---------------------	-----------

<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool - Nursery School</b> .....	<b>11</b>
-------------------	---	-----------

<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool - Primary</b> .....	<b>12</b>
-------------------	--	-----------

<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool - Secondary</b> .....	<b>13</b>
-------------------	--	-----------

## 1 Introduction and context

The local authority has a **statutory duty** to **promote high standards** in schools and other providers so that children and young people **achieve well and fulfil their potential**.

Section 72 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 places a statutory duty on all local authorities in England, in exercising their functions in respect to schools causing concern, as set out in Part 4 of the 2006 Act, to have regard to any guidance given by the Secretary of State. Local authorities must have due regard to this guidance. The 'due regard' is set out in this document, the WiSS.

'Schools', in this instance, means all Islington Nursery, Primary, Secondary and Special Schools and provision through Pupil Referral Units and the Virtual school.

Section 1 of the Childcare Act 2006 places a duty on local authorities to improve the wellbeing of young children, reduce inequalities between them and continue to improve outcomes and the quality of provision for children and young people is a key priority for the Council and a critical element of the wider corporate priorities of 'Fairness' and 'Reducing Poverty'. There is strong corporate leadership within the council to support this. Working in partnership with all schools and settings, the Council is continuously ambitious for the young

people of Islington, and the revised WiSS document sets out proposals and procedures to support the delivery of this ambition. The document embraces all schools within Islington's Community of Schools, though precise arrangements will differ according to the status of the school.

The Council is committed to providing a school and early years improvement service and a strong infrastructure of pupil support services to all schools and settings in Islington. These services are accountable to the Council and the Education Improvement Strategy Group (EISG).

The WiSS has been developed in conjunction with EISG and is updated annually, involving members from the School Improvement Service (SIS) and EISG. Schools Forum and EISG have high expectations that the number of schools in Category 2 and 1 will reduce over time and where there are risks identified with individual schools, a coherent plan is in place to secure outcomes.

The Local Authority engages with the Department for Education and the Regional Schools Commissioner in order to facilitate an effective dialogue regarding the progress of schools who are judged as Requiring Improvement or in Special Measures.

## 2 Expected outcomes from the revised WiSS document 2016-2017

- 100% of schools are judged good or outstanding
- All schools are above national floor standards at each Key Stage. Where progress measures are released, the local authority is at or above the inner London average. Outcomes in the Early Years Foundation Stage meet or exceed national expectations
- 65% or more of pupils achieve the expected standard in RWM **and/or** pupils make sufficient progress in **all** three subjects. Sufficient progress in maths and reading is not below -5 and in writing is not below -7.
- At Key Stage 4, all schools consistently meet and exceed expected attainment 8 and progress 8 measures
- From 2016 the DFE will define schools as potentially "coasting". This is determined by the following criteria:
  - ▶ For secondary schools, a coasting school will be one where fewer than 60% of children achieve 5A\* - C including English and mathematics and they are below the median level of expected progress (2014-2015) and in 2016 they fall below a level set against the new progress 8 measure. By 2018 the definition of "coasting" will be set entirely on progress 8 and will not have an attainment element
  - ▶ For primary schools, the definition will apply to those schools (2014-15) who have seen fewer than 85% of children achieving level 4, the secondary ready level for reading,

writing and maths, and which have also seen below average proportions of pupils making expected progress between ages 7 – 11, followed by a year (2016) below the defined sufficient progress judgement as previously stated: reading and maths below -5 and writing below -7

- ▶ Outcomes for Behaviour, Attendance and Inclusion are at least good in all schools
- ▶ Attendance: 96% + over 3 terms
- ▶ Persistent Absenteeism: 11% or below over 3 terms
- ▶ Inclusion: All schools have a secure capacity to promote inclusion as set out in the SEND Code of Practice. All schools effectively support the progress and attainment of Looked After Children (LAC)

- All schools meet their duty to promote personal development and wellbeing
- All schools meet their duty to safeguard children, including the safe recruitment of staff and volunteers
- Schools are committed to ensuring the future employability of pupils and take action to ensure that young people do not become NEET
- Schools benefit from, and contribute to, the Islington Community of Schools. Where required, there are effective arrangements in place to ensure school-to-school support

### 3 Procedures to achieve the outcomes

There are a number of principles underpinning the procedures:

- A commitment to working as a partner within the Islington Community of Schools. This includes a shared commitment across all Islington schools to participate in Strategic Partnerships at some point of their school improvement journey. Schools will share a range of practice and expertise. This may also involve any of the following:
  - a. Accredited Teaching schools
  - b. National Leaders in Education
  - c. Ofsted trained Head teachers who can provide challenge and support to schools, brokered by the local authority
  - d. Clear service agreements and effective quality assurance procedures to ensure high quality services
  - e. Formal support arrangements between governing bodies to support individual governors and share expertise
  - f. School Business support: short or long term
- A commitment to securing high quality support and challenge in order to further raise standards and improve the quality of provision, including provision for young people's safety and wellbeing
- Transparency in the procedures that are in place to achieve these outcomes
- A commitment to ensuring that support and challenge are planned in partnership with schools and are consistent and coherent in delivery
- A commitment to working in partnership with schools, Head teachers, EISG, Schools Forum and other advisory groups to ensure that resources are used effectively to support those most in need
- A commitment to ensuring that support and challenge, including the use of formal powers of intervention, is robust, timely and proportionate
- A commitment to monitoring and evaluating the impact and effectiveness of these procedures
- A commitment to looking outside the school gate to establish effective school-to-school partnerships, purposeful and effective cluster arrangements based on a premise of sharing good practice with all schools and settings in Islington. This will include:
  - ▶ formal Strategic Partnerships
  - ▶ Accredited Teaching schools
  - ▶ National Leaders in Education
  - ▶ Ofsted trained Head teachers who can provide challenge and support to schools, brokered by the local authority

- ▶ Clear service agreements and effective quality assurance procedures to ensure high quality services

### Evidence base and process for notification

The category of support will be formally agreed with the Head teacher and Chair of Governors in the Autumn term each academic year. This process will be led by the Heads of School Improvement. The category of support will be based on evidence and an evaluation of the overall performance of the school. It will be mindful of the current Ofsted framework, the guidance provided to inspectors and the outcome of the school's last Ofsted inspection. The expectation is that the category of support will reflect the school's own evaluation of its performance. Schools will receive notification in writing from the Heads of School Improvement of the category of support by the 31 October each academic year. The processes will normally be annual but the category of support can be reviewed at any time during the academic year.

The evidence base for the categorisation will include:

- A scrutiny of pupil progress, attainment and achievement. This will include data sets provided by the local authority including the School Management Information File (SMIF), RAISE, the Ofsted data set and any other available data including school based data. It will focus on:
  - ▶ End of Key Stage outcomes, annually and over time
  - ▶ Performance in relation to floor standards at the end of each Key Stage
  - ▶ An analysis of achievement gaps and the performance of particular groups including Looked After Children (LAC)
  - ▶ Progress measures for individual pupils and groups of pupils
  - ▶ The outcomes for children at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage, in particular the gap between the lowest 20% of children and the rest
  - ▶ The evidence base of projections for the progress, attainment and achievement of future cohorts
- An evaluation with the school of the quality of teaching and the arrangements that are in place to improve teaching, particularly in relation to securing good or better teaching in every lesson
- The most recent Ofsted report or letter after

a subject inspection and progress against key issues identified

- An evaluation with the school on outcomes in relation to behaviour and safety, particularly behaviour for learning and the steps the school takes to eliminate low level disruption
- Evidence of the school's capacity to improve further, including the impact of the leadership on improving teaching and achievement, issues relating to financial management, the management of personnel and the effectiveness of governance
- An analysis with the school of other key indicators, for example attendance, persistent absence and exclusions
- Schools will, as part of the categorisation process, complete an audit of good practice that will then be shared across all Islington schools
- Additional data trends which might, in some circumstances, prompt the local authority to investigate the leadership in and management of a school. These may include:
  - ▶ Outcomes over a 3 year period as defined by the DFE for "coasting" schools. Outcomes at all Key Stages will be reviewed
  - ▶ Declining school popularity, possibly revealed through school rolls falling more rapidly than might reasonably be expected from demographic changes
  - ▶ High or increasing absence or truancy rates
  - ▶ High rates of staff turnover, or numbers of staff grievances
  - ▶ Feedback from parents, or significant or increasing numbers of parental complaints
  - ▶ Review of school balances and the use of resources which may indicate that the school is not achieving value for money. This would include the school's ability to meet an arrangement that is in place to eliminate a deficit
  - ▶ Review of recent financial audits and the current categorisation of the school's financial procedures. Schools with no or limited assurance will become project group schools for a limited time until the school has a follow up audit
  - ▶ The support for schools is funded from Schools De-delegating DSG from the schools block. Schools were thoroughly consulted on the proposals to provide additional financial and management

support to support schools who are, or are at risk of being in a category. The support is also extended to those schools who require or support Strategic Partnerships or those who are reorganising. There are 10-15 schools per year who fall into this category. All schools receive a termly visit from the Head of School Improvement and those schools in priority support receive additional support from finance, capital, ICT and HR management teams

- ▶ Any safeguarding concerns, including what actions the school has undertaken to meet the new “Prevent Duty” and the actions undertaken by the school to eliminate and/or reduce the risk of pupils and the community to radicalisation and extremism
- ▶ Where schools opt to buy services from external providers, where the local authority is the responsible body, the council will reserve the right to check that such external providers are fulfilling their responsibilities. This would apply to services such as Health and Safety and Payroll providers
- In most instances the Head teacher, Chair of Governors and Heads of School Improvement will be able to agree the recommendation for categorisation. Where there is disagreement, the local authority will reserve the right to determine the categorisation. Recommendations for categorisation will be reviewed, and formally agreed, by Children’s Services Management Team (CSMT)

## The Categories of Support

There will be 3 differentiated categories of support.

These categories are not based solely on the most recent Ofsted report. The WiSS encompasses a range of performance information, both hard and soft to inform the overall categorisation of a school.

To support schools an Evaluation Tool has been included to guide school leaders and the local authority to identify the most appropriate categorisation that best support a school led improvement system. The Evaluation Tool for nursery school, primary and secondary schools is located **in Appendix A (Nursery School), Appendix B (Primary) and Appendix C (Secondary).**

This process does not apply to Academies and Free Schools.

## Category 3

- ▶ Schools judged grade 2 (Good) or grade 1 (Outstanding) at the last Ofsted inspection and, where evidenced from the analysis of outcomes, school arrangements for self-evaluation and improvement planning demonstrate that the capacity to continue to improve is secure and effective
- ▶ Where schools were judged to be grade 1 (Outstanding) at the last inspection, but since the inspection the provision of teaching is judged grade 2 (Good), there must be secure and substantial evidence that measures to secure an outstanding judgement for teaching are in place

### Support provided

- ▶ Category 3 schools will receive a core entitlement from the School Improvement Service and other services, for targeted schools or where the school requires specific support for a particular issue, there will be additional resourcing or support from other services
- ▶ As part of the Islington Community of Schools they will be able to fully access any resource or programme that is in place
- ▶ Schools will be able to purchase additional support from a range of services

## Category 2

- ▶ Schools where significant areas for improvement have been identified and agreed with the Head teacher and Governing Body, but there is substantial evidence that the school has the capacity to improve and is moving quickly to address the areas for improvement. This is particularly in relation to:
  - pupil attainment and progress
  - the quality and consistency of teaching
  - the performance of vulnerable groups
  - behaviour and attendance
  - any issues relating to the leadership in the school or the management of the school, or any issues in relation to safeguarding

- schools where a new Head teacher has been appointed will be Category 2 schools for a defined period

- ▶ Where a school Requiring Improvement is judged in a HMI monitoring visit to be making good or better progress and the capacity for further improvement is secure, it may become a Category 2 school
- ▶ Schools in this category will be expected to work effectively with the local authority. Where progress is too slow, schools will become Category 1 schools
- ▶ These schools will have a Project Group and will receive support proportionate to the areas for improvement that have been identified. This will include those services indicated in Category 1
- ▶ At times schools that have been previously judged as Good or Outstanding may be placed in this category. The WiSS clearly outlines the criteria for reaching this judgement

### Support provided

- ▶ The Director of Learning and Schools and the Head of School Improvement, in discussion with the Head teacher and Chair of Governors, will come to a view as to whether a Project Group will be required to support a Category 2 school in bringing about improvement. The effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan will be scrutinised and where this is not sufficiently robust the school will be required to produce an Action Plan to specifically address areas of concern
- ▶ Where a Project Group is required it will operate as in Category 1. The Project Group, and in its absence the Head of School Improvement, will monitor and evaluate the progress of the school in addressing weaknesses and the progress on the actions identified in the Action Plan. Where progress is too slow or other significant areas of weakness are identified, the school will become a Category 1 school
- ▶ The Head of School Improvement will report on progress in addressing the school's key issues to CSMT through the formal reporting mechanisms. The

categorisation of the school will be kept under review

- ▶ The School Improvement Service and all other services within the local authority will prioritise the school for support
- ▶ Through the Project Group, or through the agreement of the Head of School Improvement and the Director of Learning and Schools, the school will be able to bid for additional resources; for example: teaching and learning consultant days, support from other services including HR and Finance, specific support from within the Islington Community of Schools, support from local and national initiatives or other projects which they have identified
- ▶ A proforma will be issued to schools in order to ensure that funding applications are robust and detailed. Costs for consultancy support or specific projects will be agreed with providers prior to the bid being submitted. The use of funds or a defined resource will be monitored by the school and an evaluation of impact will be provided as required to Project Group meetings
- ▶ Schools are encouraged to purchase the School Improvement Service Annual Support Package and other support packages including Early Years, HR, Finance and Governance where they are likely to enhance the school's capacity to improve and ensure that both challenge and support are delivered coherently

### Category 1

- ▶ Category 1 schools are schools judged by Ofsted as grade 4 (Inadequate) and therefore requiring Special Measures or having serious weaknesses, schools judged by Ofsted as grade 3 (Requiring Improvement), or schools where a Warning Notice has been issued. These schools would be deemed to be a 'School Causing Concern' and would be eligible for intervention under the 'Schools Causing Concern Guidance' for local authorities

► Schools in this category are also schools about which the local authority has serious concerns, which include the following:

- outcomes at the end of Key Stages remain consistently below floor standards
- where performance has declined over a significant period
- where there is evidence that teaching is not consistently good or outstanding
- where there are concerns over the leadership in the school, the management of the school and the capacity to bring about improvement quickly enough
- where there is breakdown of discipline
- where the safety of pupils or staff at the school is threatened
- where a financial audit outcome is judged as inadequate or through financial monitoring the local authority and the school identify an unplanned deficit

These schools may be at risk of a grade 4 or grade 3 judgement at the next inspection. In this instance the local authority may issue a Warning Notice.

- These schools will have a Project Group and receive priority support from all appropriate services including School Improvement, Early Years, HR, Finance, Governance and Data/Performance
- The local authority may put in place, or propose that an Interim Executive Board (IEB) or a Strategic Partnership be formed in order to secure strong governance and continued rapid and sustained improvement. The Strategic Partnership arrangements will vary depending on the needs of the school. Further guidance on this is published in conjunction with this document

### Support provided

- These schools will have a Project Group, chaired by the Head of School Improvement or the Director of

Learning and Schools. The Project Group will monitor and evaluate the progress of the school in addressing weaknesses and the progress on the actions identified in the school Action Plan and the local authority Action Plan. Progress will be reported to CSMT every 6 weeks and the categorisation will be reviewed by the Corporate Director of Children's Services

- The school must put in place an Action Plan to quickly address the key issues and indicate what the evidence will be for improvement (this will include issues set out in the most recent Ofsted inspection and must take account of any issues raised in a Warning Notice where that has been issued). Where practicable this will form part of the School Improvement Plan
- The local authority will put in place an Action Plan which will state clearly the action that the local authority will take to support and challenge the school, what the expected outcome of that action will be and by when, any specific arrangements that the local authority intends to make, for example in brokering school to school support or strengthening governance and any action the local authority intends to take in relation to the use of its formal powers. The school will be expected to cooperate fully with the actions set out in the local authority Action Plan, including arrangements for school to school support
- The School Improvement Service and other identified local authority services will prioritise the school for support and challenge
- Through the Project Group the school will be able to bid for additional resources, for example: teaching and learning consultant days, support from other services including HR and Finance, specific support from within the Islington Community of Schools, support from local and national initiatives or other projects which they have identified. A proforma will be issued to schools in order to ensure that funding applications are robust and detailed. Costs for consultancy support or specific projects will be agreed

with providers prior to the bid being submitted. The use of funds or a defined resource will be monitored by the school and an evaluation of impact will be provided as required to Project Group meetings. There will also be generic reporting to Schools Forum

- ▶ It is expected that the school will purchase the School Improvement Service Annual Support Package and other support packages including Early Years, HR, Finance and Governance, where they are likely to enhance the school's capacity to improve and ensure that both challenge and support are delivered coherently

### Additional resources in each category

- Through Schools Forum, additional resources have been identified to support schools in Categories 1 and 2. Schools will be able, through the Project Group, to bid for specific resources to support improvement. The impact of these additional resources will be monitored by a subcommittee of the Schools Forum and reported generically to the full Forum
- The bids will make clear why the additional resources are needed (this will include a scrutiny of the school's current budget position), what the impact will be for children and young people and how the school will know. The Project Group will monitor the impact of the resource allocation reporting back to the Schools Forum on the outcomes. Where there is a clear need, schools in Category 3 will also be considered for additional resource

### Strategic Partnerships

- To maximise school improvement and long term sustainability of a school led self-improving system, schools will have the option of entering into a partnership with another school or schools. These partnerships can include hard and soft Federations, partnership with a similar school or schools to develop leadership and management and/or teaching, learning and the curriculum. Guidance on these partnerships and the timeline for implementation can be obtained from School Improvement Service. Further information is published in conjunction with this document

- In light of the new DFE definition of "coasting" schools, the use of Strategic Partnerships are a legitimate and preferred option for the local authority and schools within Islington
- Strategic Partnerships will consist of a Strategic Board which will monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership. The Board will report to the respective governing bodies involved in the partnership. The Board will meet in line with governing body meetings and consist of representatives from all schools involved and a local authority representative.

### Project Groups

- Schools in Category 1, and where required Category 2, will have Project Groups. The Project Group will consider, monitor and evaluate actions taken by the school, the local authority and any other services or agencies used to bring about improvement. It will hold to account all those services or agencies employed or brokered to provide support
- The Project Group will normally meet once each half term or more frequently if that is required. The Project Group will be chaired by either the Head of School Improvement (who will make arrangements for a formal note of each meeting to be kept) or the Director of Learning and Schools. This note will specify the actions to be taken when and by whom
- Where a school is in Category 1, the Head teacher and Chair of Governors will meet with the Director of Learning and Schools and the Head of School Improvement every six weeks to evaluate progress. If required, there will be a summary evaluation meeting with the Corporate Director of Children's Services
- At the first meeting the Project Group will agree the key issues to bring about improvement at the school. This will be formalised and set down in the School Improvement Plan, or a separate Plan in a format agreed at the Project Group. At each meeting the Head teacher or a designate will report back on progress against these key issues, and identify other key issues as they emerge. The Project Group will agree the support to be provided by the local authority and other services to bring about improvement. There is a generic agenda for Project Groups which can be modified for a specific school. This is to ensure that progress can be consistently tracked, monitored and evaluated

- The core members of the Project Group will be the Head teacher, Chair of Governors, Head of School improvement and Director of Learning and Schools
- Other senior staff at the school, officers from the local authority or other internal and external providers will attend as required by the Project Group
- All Projects Groups are evaluated on a yearly basis. The evaluation is completed by all stakeholders and will help to inform the following:
  - value for money
  - effectiveness in bringing about change
  - impact of key actions agreed and undertaken by stakeholders

## 4 Formal powers of intervention

Part 4 of Schedule 6 of the 2006 Act sets out that a school causing concern is one which is 'eligible for intervention'. This is where a:

1. **Performance standard and safety warning notice has been given and the school has failed to comply.**
2. **Teacher's pay and conditions warning notice has been given and the school has failed to comply.**
3. **A school requires significant improvement.**
4. **A school requires special measures.**

However the DfE guidance to local authorities on schools causing concern is clear that:

*... 'schools causing concern' are not just those schools 'eligible for intervention' within the meaning of Part 4 of the 2006 Act but are also those about which the local authority has other serious concerns, such as those consistently below the floor standards where the local authority may want to consider using their intervention powers and give those schools a warning notice.*

### Performance standards and safety warning notices – DfE guidance

The DfE guidance states:  
*Performance standards and safety warning notices*

*should be used as an early form of intervention where standards are unacceptably low and other tools and strategies have not secured improvement.*

*A performance standards and safety warning notice may be given by a local authority in one of three circumstances. Where:*

1. *The standards of performance of pupils at the school are unacceptably low and are likely to remain so unless the authority exercise their powers under Part 4 of the 2006 Act; or*
2. *There has been a serious breakdown in the way the school is managed or governed which is prejudicing, or likely to prejudice, such standards of performance; or*
3. *The safety of pupils or staff at the school is threatened (whether by a breakdown of discipline or otherwise).*

*The definition of what constitutes low standards of performance is set out in section 60 (3) of the 2006 Act. This is where they are low by reference to any one or more of the following:*

1. *The standards that the pupils might in all circumstances reasonably be expected to attain*
2. *Where relevant, the standards previously attained by them; or*

3. *The standards attained by pupils at comparable schools.*

*Cases where schools are performing below the floor standard would be covered by point 1 above.*

Additionally the DfE guidance states that:

*If following an inspection under section 5 of the Education Act 2005, Ofsted considers a school to be inadequate (Grade 4), it will give a judgment that the school requires either 'significant improvement', or 'special measures'. If the school has already been given a warning notice by a local authority, this judgment means that the school is eligible for intervention whether or not the period of compliance in the warning notice has expired or the governing body has made representations to Ofsted.*

Also the guidance states that:

*The Secretary of State now has the power to direct a local authority to give a warning notice in specified terms where he has previously directed the local authority to consider doing so, but the local authority has decided not to.*

*If after considering the reasons of the local authority the Secretary of State still believes one is necessary he may direct the local authority to give such a warning notice in those terms.*

### **Powers and types of intervention where a school is 'eligible for intervention'**

The DfE guidance states that:

*Where a school is eligible for intervention there are a number of powers the local authority or the Secretary of State may use to drive school improvement. These interventions are set out in sections 63-66 of the 2006 Act in respect of*

*local authorities and sections 67-69 in respect of the Secretary of State. Local authorities must give reasonable notice that they propose to exercise their powers under any one or more of sections 63 to 66.*

### **Local authority - powers of intervention**

1. To require the Governing Body to enter into arrangements:
  - a) to enter into a contract or other arrangement for specified services of an advisory nature with a specified person (who may be the Governing Body of another school)
  - b) to make arrangements to collaborate with the Governing Body of another school
  - c) to make arrangements to collaborate with a further education body
  - d) to take specified steps for the purpose of creating or joining a federation
2. The appointment of additional Governors.
3. The appointment of an IEB.
4. The suspension of delegated authority for the Governing Body to manage a school's budget.

### **Schools Regional Commissioner on behalf of the Secretary of State - powers of intervention**

1. Power to appoint additional Governors.
2. Power to direct closure of a school.
3. Power to provide for the Governing Body to consist of interim executive members.
4. Power to make an Academy order.

Where appropriate the local authority will make full use of the powers embodied in the Act and any further amendments to those powers.

## **5 Review**

The document will be reviewed in August 2017.

## Appendix A - Nursery School Evaluation Tool 2016

Category	1 High performing and self-improving	2 Self improving	3 Challenge and possibly intervention required	4 Serious concerns - intervention
EYFS specific areas of learning and development	75%+ children have achieved competence in the 30-50 month age band and are working in the 40-60 month age band by end of nursery	The percentage of children achieving competence in the 30-50 month age band and working in the 40-60 month age band is increasing year on year, moving towards the 75% target	Below 60% of children achieve competence in the 30-50 month age band and/or are working in the 40-60 month age band by the end of nursery and attainment shows a decrease over time	Attainment shows a decrease over time and/or is a serious concern with less than 50% of children achieving age related expectations by the end of nursery
EYFS Primes	80%+ children are working with competence in the 30-50 month age band and are working in the 40-60 month age band by end of nursery	The percentage of children working with competence in the 30-50 month age band and working in the 40-60 month age band is increasing year on year, moving towards the 80% target	Below 65% of children achieve competence in the 30-50 month age band and/or are working in the 40-60 month age band by the end of nursery and attainment shows a decrease over time	Attainment is a serious concern with less than 50% of children achieving age related expectations by the end of nursery
Progress	Very precise tracking across the school which shows very good and accelerated progress from children's starting points; gap is narrowing between groups of children	Effective tracking shows good progress by individuals and all groups of children from their starting points	Tracking system does not allow detailed analysis of progress. Progress inconsistent across areas of learning and groups.	Poor tracking in place. Limited or no progress evident.
Welfare requirements	Very effective, no concerns or complaints	Effective; very occasional complaints made to Ofsted or the LA	Some concerns and more than 3 concerns raised by Ofsted or the LA in 1 year	Ineffective
Attendance	Attendance is well above the national average ( 2% or more above the national average)	Attendance is broadly in line with national average (1% below/1% above the national average)	Attendance is below the national average (between 2% and 5% below the national average)	Attendance is well below the national average (6% or more below the national average)
Governors	Governors are effective	Vacancies exist within the governing body – committee members or leadership	Number of parental complaints is a concern	Statutory duties are not being undertaken and the governing body is ineffective
Ofsted report	School is good or better	School requires improvement to be good	School is inadequate – Serious Weakness but leadership is judged as a 3	School is inadequate – Special Measures
Previous WiSS	Light touch	Additional support	Intensive support	Warning Notice issued
Finance	School budget is balanced and monitoring is responsive to financial challenges	School budget is now balanced following organisational change and is responsive to financial challenges	School budget is at risk of being in deficit.	School budget is in deficit and the LA meets regularly with the school to monitor progress
Safeguarding	Is effective; LA audit shows very strong practice with very effective early help strategies in place	Is effective – LA audit shows good practice with effective early help strategies in place	Is not consistently effective; LA audit raises areas for development	Is not consistently effective; LA audit raises up to 3 areas for development and concerns raised by Ofsted or the LA in 1 year; audit reveals serious weaknesses
SEND	UFAG funding used effectively; early identification of other children with SEND; high quality practice with evidence that children with SEND make very good progress from their starting points.	UFAG money used effectively; early identification and good practice with evidence that children with SEND make good progress from their starting points	Setting not consistently identifying or meeting the needs of children with SEND	Setting not identifying or meeting the needs of children with SEND Serious concerns about quality of practice for children with SEND.
HR (Recruitment / Payroll / Casework)	General issues. Little or no HR involvement in recruitment / casework.	Casework with regular involvement from HR advisers	High volume of casework and HR issues, with additional HR support  Serious / complex casework, including organisational change	High volume of serious and complex casework and HR issues  Serious long term / ongoing casework

## Appendix B - Primary Evaluation Tool 2016

Category	1 High performing and self-improving	2 Self improving	3 Challenge and possible intervention	4 Serious concerns – intervention required
Combined KS2	Combined attainment at Key Stage 2 is well above the national average (5% or more above the national average)	Combined attainment at Key Stage 2 is broadly in line with national average (1% below to 4% above the national average)	Combined attainment at Key Stage 2 is below the national average (between 2% and 5% below the national average)	Combined attainment at Key Stage 2 is well below the national average (6% or more below the national average)
KS2 progress	Progress in reading, writing and mathematics is within the expected range and the confidence levels are above zero.	Progress in reading, writing and mathematics is within the expected range and the confidence levels are at/above zero.	Progress in reading, writing and mathematics is within the expected range for RWM and the confidence levels are at/below zero.	Progress in reading, writing and mathematics are below the expected range for RWM.
KS1 outcomes	Attainment at Key Stage 1 is well above the national average (5% or more above the national average)	Attainment at Key Stage 1 is broadly in line with national average (1% below to 4% above the national average)	Attainment at Key Stage 1 is below the national average (between 2% and 5% below the national average)	Attainment at Key Stage 1 is well below the national average (6% or more below the national average)
Phonics Y1	Attainment is well above the national average (5% or more above the national average)	Attainment is broadly in line with national average (1% below to 4% above the national average)	Attainment is below the national average (between 2% and 5% below the national average)	Attainment is well below the national average (6% or more below the national average)
EYFS GLD	Attainment is well above the national average (5% or more above the national average)	Attainment is broadly in line with national average (1% below to 4% above the national average)	Attainment is below the national average (between 2% and 5% below the national average)	Attainment is well below the national average (6% or more below the national average)
EYFS Primes	Attainment is well above the national average (5% or more above the Islington average)	Attainment is broadly in line with national average (1% below to 4% above the Islington average)	Attainment is below the national average (between 2% and 5% below the Islington average)	Attainment is well below the national average (6% or more below the Islington average)
Attendance	Attendance is well above the national average ( 2% or more above the national average)	Attendance is broadly in line with national average (1% below/1% above the national average)	Attendance is below the national average (between 2% and 5% below the national average)	Attendance is well below the national average (6% or more below the national average)
Governors	Governors are effective	Vacancies exist within the governing body – committee members or leadership	Number of parental complaints is a concern	Statutory duties are not being undertaken and the governing body is ineffective
Ofsted report	School is Good or better	School Requires improvement to be Good or is currently Good with increasing capacity to improve.	School Requires improvement to be Good but leadership is judged as good as there is capacity to improve	School is inadequate – Special Measures
Previous WiSS	Light touch	Additional support	Intensive support	Warning Notice issued
Finance	School budget is balanced and monitoring is responsive to financial challenges	School budget is now balanced following organisational change and is responsive to financial challenges	School budget is at risk of being in deficit.	School budget is in deficit and the LA meets regularly with the school to monitor progress
Safeguarding based on Safeguarding Report	No current safeguarding concerns	Some concerns identified but school working with the LA to resolve matters	Challenge and possibly intervention needed	Current and serious safeguarding concern under investigation
SEN identification	SEND identification is in line with the borough average (15%)	SEND identification is broadly in line with borough average 15% (6% below/8% above the borough average)	SEND identification is well above/below the borough average 15% (12% below/18% above)	Not applicable
HR (Recruitment / Payroll / Casework)	General issues. Little or no HR involvement in recruitment / casework.	Casework with regular involvement from HR Advisers	High volume of casework and HR issues, with additional HR support  Serious / complex casework, including organisational change	High volume of serious and complex casework and HR issues  Serious long term / ongoing casework

## Appendix C - Secondary Evaluation Tool 2016

Category	1 High performing and self-improving	2 Self improving	3 Challenge and possibly intervention required	4 Serious concerns - intervention
Attainment 8	Attainment 8 is well above the national average	Attainment 8 is broadly in line with national average	Attainment 8 is below the national average	Attainment 8 is well below the national average
Progress 8	Progress 8 is well above the national average	Progress 8 is broadly in line with or above national average	Progress 8 is below the national average	Progress 8 is below the floor target
EBacc	EBacc is well above the national average	EBacc is broadly in line with national average	EBacc is below the national average	EBacc is well below the national average
GCSE English and mathematics at C+	Attainment is well above the national average	Attainment is broadly in line with national average	Attainment is below the national average	Attainment is well below the national average
Attendance	Attendance is well above the national average ( 2% or more above the national average)	Attendance is broadly in line with national average (1% below/1% above the national average)	Attendance is below the national average (between 2% and 5% below the national average)	Attendance is well below the national average (6% or more below the national average)
Governors	Governors are effective	Vacancies exist within the governing body – committee members or leadership	Number of parental complaints is a concern	Statutory duties are not being undertaken and the governing body is ineffective
Ofsted report	School is Good or better	School Requires improvement to be Good or is currently Good with increasing capacity to improve.	School Requires improvement to be Good but leadership is judged as good as there is capacity to improve	School is inadequate – Special Measures
Previous WiSS	Light touch	Additional support	Intensive support	Warning Notice issued
Finance	School budget is balanced and monitoring is responsive to financial challenges	School budget is now balanced following organisational change and is responsive to financial challenges	School budget is at risk of being in deficit.	School budget is in deficit and the LA meets regularly with the school to monitor progress
Safeguarding	No current safeguarding concerns	Some concerns identified but school working with the LA to resolve matters	Challenge and possibly intervention needed	Current and serious safeguarding concern under investigation
SEN identification	SEND identification is in line with the borough average (15%)	SEND identification is broadly in line with borough average 15% (6% below/8% above the borough average)	SEND identification is well above/below the borough average 15% (12% below/18% above)	Not applicable
HR (Recruitment / Payroll / Casework)	General issues. Little or no HR involvement in recruitment / casework	Casework with regular involvement from HR Advisers	High volume of casework and HR issues, with additional HR support  Serious / complex casework, including organisational change	High volume of serious and complex casework and HR issues  Serious long term / ongoing casework

For more information on the **Work In Support of School (WiSS)** document, please contact:

- ▶ SIS Primary Lead: Anthony Doudle      t: 020 7527 3387      e: [anthony.doudle@islington.gov.uk](mailto:anthony.doudle@islington.gov.uk)
- ▶ SIS Secondary Lead: Jeff Cole      t: 020 7527 7668      e: [jeffrey.cole@islington.gov.uk](mailto:jeffrey.cole@islington.gov.uk)