



## QUALITY STANDARDS FOR SELF-EVALUATION – September 2005

These quality standards are based on 5 strands: the quality of procedures; links between evaluation & planning; the involvement of stakeholders in improvement planning & the review of performance; the quality of evidence to support judgements; & the impact of evaluation on standards, quality & school improvement.

	<b>GRADE 1: OUTSTANDING</b>	<b>GRADE 2: GOOD</b>	<b>GRADE 3: SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>GRADE 4: INADEQUATE</b>
<b>Quality of Procedures</b>	Self-evaluation drives improvement: decisions taken by staff & governors are based on careful evaluation of current strengths & weaknesses & options for improvement and this can be evidenced.	All weaknesses are accurately identified & tackled energetically.	The school has a detailed, accurate understanding of its strengths & weaknesses. Evaluation is frank, rigorous and accurate.	Evaluation is ineffective; in a number of key areas in the worst cases, procedures are unclear & unreliable, while in others the procedures are fulfilled but to little effect. Procedures for Monitoring and Evaluation are unsystematic
<b>Links between evaluation &amp; planning</b>	The SEF & SIP are two halves of a single document: planning is based on evaluation & all plans include the means of evaluation.	SIP priorities are clearly based on addressing the weaknesses & disseminating the strengths identified in the SEF.	Major weaknesses are addressed in the SIP but the school does not always challenge some long-running areas of relative weakness.	Planning is not linked clearly to the outcomes of evaluation or planned actions lack focus and clarity. Actions are not likely to lead to improvements it is not clear how planned actions will be evaluated.
<b>Involvement of stakeholders</b>	A culture of improvement based on evaluation pervades the school. All Staff & governors routinely review performance & use evaluation data to make decisions. Benchmarking within & with other schools is routinely used to challenge performance	Continuous review of performance is part of school routines & the roles & responsibilities of staff. Leaders (incl. governors) understand the strengths & weaknesses of their areas of responsibility & contribute to the SEF	Responsibility for evaluation is too focused on the head and SMT. There is a structure to evaluate the performance of teams (subjects, years, sections) & feed the results into the school SEF. Staff know the contents of the SEF. Clear procedures exist for involvement of governors.	Staff and governors are unaware of the school's performance in relation to other schools. Neither are they aware of the strengths & weaknesses of the performance of their area of responsibility.
<b>Quality of evidence</b>	The quality of evidence is thorough and comprehensive and is very well organised.	The quality of evidence is detailed, relevant, relates directly to the judgments made, and is well organised	The quality of evidence to support judgments is broadly adequate in the majority of Key areas including Standards & Attainment, Pupils Personal Well-Being, Quality of Provision and Leadership & Management.	The quality of evidence is not sufficiently robust to support the judgments made by the school.
<b>Impact of evaluation on standards</b>	Challenging targets for the achievement of all individual pupils & for school improvement are set and met. Teaching & learning are consistently good or better; the curriculum meet the needs of all pupils.	SSE leads to high standards/good value added & high-quality provision for the majority of learners. In the weaker areas there is evidence of rapid improvement. Pupils make good progress; value-added is good and/or improving Teaching & learning are consistently good.	Evaluation leads to actions which secure improved outcomes for pupils. Quality improves steadily but inconsistencies remain. Where targets are not met appropriate interventions are put into place to address weaknesses	SSE has little impact on continuous improvement. The school is coasting or, at worst, declining. High-attaining schools still show only modest or low value added. There is unchallenged under-achievement in subjects, phases or among some groups of pupils.