States of Jersey

Education Department

Safeguarding Review
Victoria College

Report

January 2016

Prepared by:

Steve Rowe

Contents

Section	Page

Appendices:

Section 1: Contexts for the Review

1.1   This review was commissioned in the light of a number of unfortunate and tragic incidents experienced by Victoria College students during the previous 18 months. Several of these events received considerable media attention. All have led to significant distress for the pupils involved, their families, friends and the College community as a whole. These incidents will not be addressed in this review, however.

1.2   College stakeholders need to feel confident that safeguarding at the College meets the standards that would be expected in other schools. Other agencies are investigating the serious incidents mentioned in paragraph 1.1 and investigations are ongoing. It is inappropriate, therefore, to review safeguarding at the College in relation to those events.

1.3   All maintained schools in Jersey receive advice, support and guidance from the Education Department on safeguarding, child protection and other issues. Another context for a review of this nature, therefore, is the effectiveness of interactions between the Department and its schools and the clarity of advice, guidance or feedback given. The quality, reliability and accessibility of such guidance has a bearing on the effectiveness of the safeguarding in schools.

1.4   Jersey's maintained schools are not subject to regular inspection. The expectation is that the island and its schools will compare their performance with standards in the UK. The island's schools are organised along similar lines to those in the UK and students take UK-based qualifications. In many areas, however, there is no statutory requirement for schools to adopt specific practices or policies that apply routinely on the mainland.

1.5   Jersey's central provision for advice, support and guidance has developed, over time, in this context. Schools look to the Education Department for advice but they are equally able to seek advice from other agencies based on the mainland. There is limited experience of formal, centrally organised review of schools in Jersey. Reviews are generally commissioned from individuals or organisations with experience of the UK context.

1.8   In 2013 the College commissioned a review of its pastoral care provision. An experienced inspector of independent schools undertook the review. The review's purpose was to judge whether the College was likely to meet the Independent Schools Inspection Service (ISI) standards for overseas schools. The focus was on pastoral care, rather than safeguarding *per se*. Nevertheless, as outlined in **Appendix IV**, pastoral care is inextricably entwined with any judgements made about a school's safeguarding provision.

1.9   The broad conclusion of the 2013 review was that there were many gaps in the College's pastoral provision and that many of the ISI standards were unlikely to be met. The report made several recommendations for the College to consider. A context for the *current* review, therefore, is the extent to which the College introduced those changes and whether or not they have had an impact.

1.10   Schools in the UK are required to self-evaluate as part of the inspection process. Schools' evaluations of the quality of their provision and the achievements of their pupils are the starting point for any inspection team. Self-evaluation is optional in Jersey, however. The Jersey Self Evaluation Document (JSED) invites schools to evaluate their performance against the full range of Ofsted / ISI criteria, including safeguarding. The school's JSED judgements also form part of the context for this review.

Section 2: Review Team Members and Review Aims

Three team members are experienced in inspections: two working as independent consultants, the third a member of the Education Department. A member of the College's senior leadership team was also attached to the team. The review is specifically designed to:
- Establish whether safeguarding at the College meets the expected standard
- Explore what evidence base would be necessary to demonstrate that the College's safeguarding and welfare provisions might be judged as outstanding
- Identify learning points for the Education Department about their interactions with schools in respect of safeguarding
- Induct the College into the review methodology so that, in future, it has the ability to monitor and evaluate its own safeguarding provision with confidence
- Trial the review methods with a view to their suitability for application more widely in other schools across the island

Steve Rowe	**Lead Reviewer**
	Education Consultant
Alwyne Jolly	**Team Member**
	Education Consultant and school inspector§
David Berry	**Team Member**
	Professional Partner, Jersey Education Department
Mark Gosling	**Team Member**
	Assistant Headteacher, Victoria College

Section 3: Review Process and Evidence Base

3.1   This is a peer review **(see Appendix VI).** It uses as its base the Ofsted framework, but makes reference to the ISI framework where appropriate. The main reasons for this are:

i.   Both frameworks are well established. The UK government validates both systems. Ofsted inspects all maintained schools in the UK, acting on behalf of the taxpayers who fund them. ISI inspects independent schools. Parents in the UK who choose to send their children to independent schools are opting out of the state system. Some criteria that apply under Ofsted do not, therefore, apply under ISI. Victoria College is not an independent school, under the Jersey system. Ofsted criteria have therefore been used as the starting point. Further details on the ISI framework are at **Appendix II**

ii. Unlike most of the safeguarding self-review frameworks available, the Ofsted and ISI frameworks offer criteria relating to the quality of provision. Audit frameworks based on whether or not statutory requirements are met do not always comment on how effectively the provision is expected to work. However both Ofsted and ISI include criteria relating to the quality of outcomes as well as whether provision meets statutory requirements.

4

3.2   Although based on Ofsted and ISI criteria, the review does not use the conventional language of inspection reports to describe its conclusions. This is because:

- With 4 reviewers over 3 days, far more evidence is available than is normally the case. There is scope to incorporate advice on systems and procedures as well as summative evaluations. Neither Ofsted nor ISI are permitted to give advice in their reports.

- The review addresses interactions between the College and Jersey's Education Department. The language of a school-based inspection framework does not easily fit into the context of the work of an Education Department.

- Other schools may use this model to explore their own safeguarding provision. It is important, therefore, that the language used is accessible to schools and does not rely on technical jargon or specialist knowledge.

3.3   **Appendix IV** gives details of the links, in the Ofsted and ISI frameworks between the Safeguarding judgement and various judgements under their Behaviour and Welfare sections. There is no sliding scale of grade to distinguish 'outstanding' safeguarding from 'good' or 'adequate' safeguarding. There are, however, levels of distinction between the component elements of Behaviour and Welfare. A grade of 'outstanding' <u>can</u> be achieved in relation to these aspects.

3.4   Under both frameworks, however, the responsibility for delivering outstanding Behaviour and Welfare outcomes lies within the 'Leadership and Management' section. It is the role of leadership, for example, to *"create a culture of vigilance where pupils' welfare is actively promoted"* or ensure that *"the ethos and culture of the whole school prevents any form of direct or indirect discriminatory behaviour"*. The need to mobilise a whole school around creating an ethos is easily said but harder to achieve or evidence. The methodology of this review and the language used is designed to help school leaders understand how these ambitions might practically be realised.

3.5   Rather than be organised around conventional inspection report headings, therefore, the review has set out to pursue 3 key lines of enquiry relating to a journey towards excellence in the fields of safeguarding and welfare. These are:

1. To what extent has Victoria College made changes to its safeguarding and pastoral provision in the light of the 2013 Review of Pastoral Care? (This enquiry is unique to the College and would not be relevant to reviews in other schools.)

2. What systems has Victoria College put in place to underpin the leadership and management of its pastoral care programme? What evidence is available to demonstrate their impact?

3. To what extent has leadership at Victoria College created an ethos and culture, across the whole school, to promote welfare and protect pupils from discriminatory behaviour?

3.6   At all times, the College leadership and staff were accommodating and open with the review team. Information available to the team, such as survey results, briefing notes and emerging judgements were available to the College leadership team. Inspection criteria were used to help focus discussion but the *process* used was partnered, professional review. Judgements were formed with the College, rather than about the College. Not all judgements were positive. Well beyond the publication of this report, it is hoped that the College will be able to use the techniques and frameworks used for its own benefit and future development.

3.7   Because this is a review, intended for a wider audience, many of the judgements have been explained, rather than merely stated. This is intentional and designed to be educational, especially for readers unfamiliar with inspection methodology.

3.8   Similarly, as the report moves forward through its various sections, there is a gradual shift from evidence followed by judgement towards evidence followed by advice. In inspection contexts, advice is not generally permissible, except in terms of a list of "recommendations for action" at the end of a report. The review team feels able to give advice, however, for two main reasons:

i.   many of the team discussions, in which the school's attached representative participated, were as much about explaining the evidence as well as merely describing it;

ii. the final part of the report concerns ethos and culture. Perhaps more than any other aspect of a school's outcomes, describing ethos and culture is easier than changing them. In this context it may be helpful to provide guidance as well as definitions

Details of the evidence base:

Documentary Evidence	Interviews / Observations
• Parent, staff and pupil surveys • The Single Central Record • Evidence of Safer Recruitment • Safeguarding policies • The Child Protection Register • Child Protection records • Case study exemplars of child protection • The school development plan • PSE development plan • The staff handbook • Records relating to behaviour • Records relating to bullying • Records relating to other aspects of welfare • Health and safety records • Risk assessments • Staff training records • Staff induction procedures • Records of extracurricular and off site trips • The scheme of work for PSHE • The SEN Provision Map • Minutes of SLT meetings and • Job descriptions	• The Headmaster • Housemasters • House Tutors • Teachers • Heads of Department • Assistant Head: Pastoral Care • Pupils in Years 7, 9, 11 and the sixth form. • Anti-bullying Ambassadors • The E-safety coordinator • The Head of PSHE • The Child Protection Coordinator • The SENCo • A Governor • The Education Welfare Officer • The School Counsellor • The Assistant Head of 6th Form • Head of Staffing • The Wellbeing Coordinator • The Head of Transition • The Headmaster of Victoria College Preparatory School • Learning Support Unit Staff • Staff responsible for health, safety and risk assessments • Brief observations of PSHE lessons • Observations in playgrounds, House Rooms and communal areas

Section 4: Summary of main findings

1. The recommendations made in the 2013 review of pastoral care have been met. In 2013, had ISI inspected the College, it would not have met the expected standards. Since 2013 additional improvements have been made to the College's capacity to support pupils' personal development and welfare.

2. Safeguarding arrangements at Victoria College meet the standard that would be expected by Ofsted in a Section 5 inspection. Staff training has been improved significantly. Procedures for referring vulnerable children are widely understood. Child protection records are thorough and well maintained. Protocols for information sharing with outside agencies are in place.

3. The Education Department's guidance for schools on welfare and safeguarding is not as clear as it should be. There is a particular lack of clarity about whether guidance is advisory or backed by the authority of law. This lack of clarity in some areas is compounded by the absence of regular compliance monitoring in several areas.

4. Undoubted improvements have been made to the College's pastoral provision. Positive additions to the support available include the success of House Rooms, increasing numbers of volunteer peer mentors and anti-bullying ambassadors and the development of the Learning Support Unit. Improvements are being made in the areas of SEN and PSHE, though timetabling constraints for PSHE inhibit its effectiveness.

5. Individual pastoral team members, at their own initiative, are making many helpful improvements in provision. A more systematic approach to school improvement planning, with clear, measurable targets and success criteria would speed the process of change and, in the process, generate a deeper evidence base.

6. Where pastoral data is readily available, such as for attendance, the College is easily able to demonstrate its effectiveness. However, evidence about pupil welfare is not collected as systematically as, for example, evidence of academic progress.   In consequence, the College cannot readily provide convincing evidence of its impact - most notably on bullying and e-safety.

7. This peer review has explored the extent to which the College might achieve a grade of 'outstanding', in inspection, for pupils' welfare and personal development. The evidence is that it does not yet meet that standard. More systematic gathering of data would put the College in a better position to demonstrate a *culture of vigilance*. More regular and systematic gathering of survey information from pupils, staff and parents would better enable the College to demonstrate *an open culture*. At present there are several key areas where the views of parents, pupils and the school do not fully align.

Summary of recommendations:

Recommendations for the College:

1. Agree and systematically collect the key data that will enable the College to demonstrate the effectiveness of pastoral provision and identify areas for improvement. Wherever possible, include the views of stakeholders in this process.
2. Improve the rigour of development planning to incorporate clear success criteria, measurable targets and systematic monitoring arrangements.
3. Use these improved planning frameworks to create a strategic plan to address all aspects of bullying. Monitor its impact systematically.
4. Review the extent to which the pastoral programme makes appropriate provision for addressing religious, racial, sexual and homophobic issues.

Recommendations for the Education Department:

1. Review and revise the guidance document *Safeguarding Policies – An Overview* with a view to making it more accessible for use in schools
2. Clarify the expectations for schools and central Human Resources with regard to the Single Central Record and Safer Recruitment. Ensure schools have the records they need to meet the requirements of external inspection.
3. Provide a clear, simple and accessible digest for schools outlining which areas of their operation carry statutory authority and which are advisory.
4. Establish regular, manageable monitoring procedures that will reassure both the Department and its schools that they are complying with recommended or mandatory practice.

Section 5: Review Findings

Part 1: *To what extent has Victoria College made changes to its safeguarding and pastoral provision in the light of the 2013 Review of Pastoral Care?*

5.1.1   The 2013 report raised doubts about the level of understanding of safeguarding evidenced by staff at several levels. In particular it was felt that Housemasters were unclear about safeguarding principles. There was uncertainty on the part of house tutors about the levels of concern that might trigger a referral and of the information that might be expected to flow back to them in the event of a referral. Significant gaps were identified in the framework of policies underpinning safeguarding. Detailed recommendations were given on 10 separate policy areas.

5.1.2   Scrutiny of the College's current documentation confirms that all recommended changes have been made to the policies noted in the earlier report. Documents related to risk assessments and health and safety aspects around the College are thorough, with evidence that they are regular reviewed. Risk assessments are clearly not generic and are tailored appropriately to different circumstances.

5.1.3   Interviews with Housemasters revealed a sound understanding of what was expected of them in the event of a child protection disclosure. A similar level of clarity was evident in interviews with house tutors and members of staff with no specific child protection responsibilities. Newly appointed staff confirmed this had been an aspect of their induction process. In the staff survey, alone across all survey questions, a 100% positive response was given to the question *"I am confident that I would know who to report to should I suspect incidents of bullying, neglect, sexual or substance abuse."*

5.1.4   This is compelling evidence that understanding in this area has moved on since 2013. Interview questions about the flow of information that might be expected after a referral elicited similarly consistent responses. Guidance in the staff handbook about this aspect was also accurate, though some policies are lengthy and would be helpfully made more accessible by the addition of a summary top sheet. For example, though staff were very clear about how and why they might refer a child protection issue, they were less clear about how and why they might report inappropriate behaviour by a colleague. Information about whistle blowing is held in the staff handbook but some effort is required to locate it.

5.1.5   Scrutiny of the staff training records shows a considerable change in the frequency of staff training in safeguarding since 2013. The number of general training opportunities for safeguarding has increased overall. The number of individual teachers attending specialised or technical welfare and safeguarding courses has also risen considerably. It is clear that increased investment in staff training has contributed towards the high level of consistency and understanding shown during interviews.

5.1.6   The Headmaster says that he sought a review of pastoral care in 2013 as he believed this area of the College's provision to be limited. Evidence supports his judgement because other elements of pastoral care, not mentioned in the 2013 report, have since been added to the College's pastoral support capacity. These include a more robust SEN provision, timetabled PSHE lessons, expansion of the role of the Learning Support Unit (LSU), a Wellbeing programme, provision for e-safety and the creation of House Rooms, where pupils can relax and socialise in a safe environment. The impact of this additional provision will be considered in the next section. Nevertheless, **a finding of this review is that the College has implemented fully, and expanded upon, the recommendations of the previous report.**

5.1.7   In reaching its judgements the review team looked closely at the guidance provided by the States of Jersey's *Safeguarding Policies – An Overview*. The team found this document unwieldy and difficult to use. This is because it is a reference document for many institutions, each with varying safeguarding needs. References in the document to further information available on websites were unhelpful. Many of these additional resources proved not to be applicable to school settings. Over-complexity in this document may well have contributed to the inclusion of similarly complex policies in the staff handbook. **It is recommended that the Education Department produce a more accessible version of this document, tailored specifically to the needs of schools.**

5.1.8   Some aspects of safeguarding provision, mandatory in the UK, are not fully available in the College's Single Central Register (SCR). The SCR designed to ensure, among other things, that individuals barred from working with young people cannot be employed in schools. School recruitment in Jersey is more complex than in the UK because all teachers in Jersey's maintained schools are employed centrally. Recruitment administration is handled by the Education Department's Human Resources section. This report makes no judgement on the efficiency of this arrangement. It is clear, however, that information required by schools to prove that adults are safe to work with children, that qualifications are genuine and references reliable is not always passed back to them for their own records. This is confusing and frustrating for schools and potentially dangerous for pupils. **It is recommended that the Education Department clarifies and publishes the relative responsibilities and expectations of schools and central human resources in this important area.** Schools need to be certain that they have sufficient, validated information about their employees to satisfy themselves, parents and external agencies that recruitment procedures do not compromise safeguarding.

5.1.9   A recurring theme, throughout this review, is the extent to which statutory UK regulations have similar authority in Jersey. For example, in the UK the designated lead person for safeguarding is required to update his or her training every 2 years. Similarly it is expected that child protection training will be renewed on a 3-year cycle. The College, in line with advice received, follows this 3-year cycle. It is not clear, however, whether in doing so it is meeting statutory requirements or merely following good practice? Is a lapse in this regularity a breach of regulations or merely poor practice?

5.1.10   There were numerous occasions where the review team sought clarity on these matters. Is the Single Central Register statutory? Are visitors to the school (such as the review team) required to carry Disclosure and Barring certificates? Are child protection arrangements mandatory? Are the policies listed in *"Safeguarding Policies – An Overview"* statutory or advisory? Is the existence of a public right of way through the College grounds a matter of historical misfortune or a clear danger to pupil safety? Answers to these questions may well exist but they were not readily available to the review team, nor clear to the College. Occasionally a view was expressed that changes could not be made without changes to Jersey Law. Is this true, or merely apocryphal? If it is true, is a change to Jersey Law unthinkable? By what channels might a request to change a law be made? **It is recommended that the Education Department provide a clear, simple and accessible digest for schools outlining which areas of operation carry statutory authority and which are advisory.**

5.1.11   This section of the review report makes more recommendations about the Education Department than about the College. This will not be the case throughout the report. It is the duty of schools to deliver their responsibilities, whether educational or statutory, to the best of their abilities. The clarity of guidance received from the

Education Department at this most fundamental of levels, however, contributes significantly to the effectiveness with which schools carry out their duties.

5.1.12 This is even more important where it is certain that requirements are statutory. Another recurring theme, emerging from interviews, is that schools submit policy documents and audit forms to the Department but receive no feedback on them. The review team is unable to corroborate these assertions, other than in terms of the balance of probability. It would be surprising, however, if the Department was not interested in the quality of schools' policies or provision. If the Department clarifies its expectations as outlined in paragraph 5.1.9 above, it would be reasonable to visit schools regularly to check that their policies and procedures meet expectations. **It is recommended that the Education Department establishes manageable procedures to reassure itself and its schools that they are complying with recommended or mandatory practice.**

5.1.13   In Jersey most maintained schools are not obliged to have a governing body. Where governing bodies are in place, as in the case of the College, there is no assumption that their purpose is to hold the headteacher to account. Interview evidence during the review suggests that the role of the College's governing body is largely one of offering practical support to the Headteacher. Some issues attract the attention of governors more than others. However matters of technical or educational practice are generally regarded as being the responsibility of education professionals. If not being held to account by the governing body, as in the UK model, who should challenge the headteacher in relation to technical or compliance issues and how often? This is a fundamental question for the Education Department to consider.

Part 2: *What systems has Victoria College put in place to underpin the leadership and management of its pastoral care programme? What evidence is available to demonstrate their impact?*

5.2.1   **Appendix IV** makes clear that the criterion "safeguarding is effective" draws upon high quality outcomes from *Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare* to elevate the judgement about the school in the *Leadership* section from 'requires improvement' to 'good' to 'outstanding'. Judgements are complex and interrelated.

5.2.2   Significant elements of the College pastoral system have only recently been put in place. The nature and focus of SEN provision has been changed, reportedly from a low base. The new SENCo has been in post for little more than a year. PSHE has only recently been built formally into the timetable. In most other secondary schools, SEN provision and PSHE are well established. Without positive corroborative evidence of improving impact from these areas, overall judgements about *Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare* will be diminished.

5.2.3   New arrangements have to start somewhere and the school's provision in these areas is best described as a work in progress. Nevertheless, today's pupils need to benefit from the current pastoral arrangements as well as those who will come in future.

5.2.4   The PSHE Coordinator has a strong vision for her area of responsibility. The PSHE curriculum is built around on appropriate topics and at age-appropriate stages. However, a site with widely separated teaching areas involves pupil movements that further reduce available teaching time. PSHE lessons that are split over two days, at the end of the day, reduce continuity and imply to the students that the subject is not valued. This impression is not ameliorated if the staff survey reveals that a majority of

the teachers do not feel confident to teach the subject and pupils say that sometimes their lessons do not happen at all.

5.2.5   The SENCo, helpfully, is able to provide evidence that pupils are tracked and that the most recent GCSE results show that students on the SEN register achieved better value added than for the cohort as a whole. This data, though useful and valid, is too recent to be evidence of a trend. Ultimately there should be a correlation between SEN progress indicators and the different elements of the SEN provision map. At present progress data is linked to pupils, as it should be, but it could also be used to evaluate the impact of the different types of interventions they received.

5.2.6   Many review interviews were held in the Learning Support Unit (LSU). This provided numerous opportunities for unplanned observations of the unit in operation. It is clear from the number of pupils making use of the informal, drop-in opportunities at break times that they value this facility. In the UK, LSUs are more frequently associated with poor behaviour and internal exclusions. Students go to them reluctantly. The College's approach to this type of facility is refreshing, however, and relationships between staff and students in the LSU are very good.

5.2.7   There appear to be clear conceptual links between the LSU's provision (support for vulnerable pupils), the work of the School Counsellor, Wellbeing provision (especially peer mentoring) and PSHE provision (anti-bullying ambassadors etc.). Between them, these elements appear to make a valuable, nurturing contribution to pupils' social development. There is the potential to create a coherent and powerful team. To the review team's external perspective, provision in these areas appeared individually good but collectively fragmented. This may be an area that the College might productively revisit. Traditionally, is hard to measure the impact of social development other than impressionistically during the artificial context of inspections. An agreed set of impact measures around this area (see paragraph 5.2.19 below) might further strengthen the evidence base.

5.2.8   Positive evidence from well-established areas of pastoral care can be a proxy indicator of the College's capacity to secure strong outcomes from its overall provision. For example, attendance at the College is very good. Figures for the school as a whole and for each year group are uniformly consistent. This data would place the College in the upper end of the top quintile for comparative schools in the UK. Similarly, transition arrangements are also a strength of the College. The Head of the Preparatory school, pupils interviewed and most parents in the survey speak highly of transition arrangements from the primary and preparatory phases. In relation to older pupils, sixth formers speak very positively about the quality of their preparation for the next phase of their education.

5.2.9   These three areas of high quality provision are also, of course, vital to the College's ethos, reputation and long term success. New pupils have to be recruited, they need to attend regularly and achieve well prior to moving on to high quality opportunities beyond school. If systems supporting the pastoral programme are similarly robust and can be evidenced for impact, this would show that the College places equivalent value on its wider welfare provision.

5.2.10   A virtuous circle of this nature, for example, is evident in relation to the provision and use of House Rooms. In interview, pupils say they enjoy these rooms and that they feel safe there. Parents, in the parental survey, respond positively to the question *"My son frequently uses the house room or common room"*. The review team observed good use of House Rooms and positive interactions between younger and older boys. Even without corroborative numerical data showing trends in House Room use, this aspect of pastoral provision has clearly had a positive impact.

5.2.11   Much of the evidence gathered by the review team came from observations and sampling opinion through interviews. Gathering evidence in these ways is resource intensive, time consuming and has the potential for subjectivity. Evidence of opinion via surveys involving a wider range of stakeholders is more persuasive. For the purposes of the review, survey evidence for some elements of safeguarding and welfare provision is highly positive.

5.2.12   Once concerns come to the attention of pastoral staff, regular meetings ensure that information is shared appropriately with House staff and subject teachers. In interview, teachers, house staff, tutors and other post holders describe the system in the same ways. They say that the two-way flow of information is helpful for carrying out their responsibilities and knowing how pupils need to be supported. The staff questionnaire elicited a relatively low response to the question *"I receive timely and useful information if the school has safeguarding concerns about a boy I teach"*.   It is clear, however, that any additional names added to the safeguarding register are flagged rapidly. Pastoral staff are clear, in addition, that further details are passed to teachers only if there are specific actions or monitoring tasks required of them. Teachers interviewed confirmed that they had occasionally received information of this nature but did not expect to be provided with every detail of the case.

5.2.13   Survey evidence adds depth to these judgements. For example, the staff questionnaire asked: *"Overall there are clear systems in place to allow me to report any safeguarding concerns"* and *"Overall, I feel that boys are well looked after in this school"*. These two questions elicited very high positive responses. Parents responded very positively to the questions: *"my son is well looked after in this school"* and *"my son is happy and feels safe at this school"*. Scrutiny of Child Protection records shows that they are very well kept and thorough. Exemplar case studies show good evidence of appropriate referral, intervention, information sharing and engagement with outside agencies.

5.2.14   This combination of judgements and evidence aligns closely to the Ofsted criterion: *"Safeguarding is effective. Leaders and staff take appropriate action to identify pupils who may be at risk of neglect, abuse or sexual exploitation, reporting concerns and supporting the needs of those pupils"*. Accordingly, **a finding of this review is that safeguarding is effective**. A summary of how this judgement relates to the relevant inspection guidance is at **Appendix III**

5.2.15   Seeking stakeholder opinion through surveys is not an established tradition at the College. The survey data quoted above was gathered at the request of the review team. Interview data was also gathered as part of the review. Where the review team found relevant numerical data it was produced largely at the initiative of individual post holders. A lack of rigour and consistency in the gathering of evidence diminishes the College's capacity to identify issues accurately, deal with them strategically and evidence improvements convincingly.

5.2.16   Most numerical data seen had been collected in relation to perceived problem areas. For example the Assistant Headteacher collects some basic data about behaviour and bullying. Numbers of bullying referrals are recorded, as is the incidence of Friday and Saturday detentions. Some basic trends emerge from this information – for example it is apparent that incidents of bullying fell for a few months and then stabilised. It is not possible at this stage, however, to identify which types of bullying declined, nor the year groups involved. It is not possible to link a reduction in bullying incidents with changes to the College's organisation. Might improvements be linked to the greater use of House Rooms, perhaps, or to the staggering of lunch servings, or changes to the entrance to the Bistro? Similarly, what types of behaviour are leading

to school punishments? Is low level disruption more frequent than, use of mobile phones or rudeness to teachers?

5.2.17   Similarly, the e-Safety Coordinator has a wealth of information about websites visited and inappropriate usage. It is vital that the College has access to this kind of information. At present, however, it is not analysed by, for example, year group or type of website, or timing or frequency. Knowing what type of offence is most likely to happen where, in which year groups and at what times enables a more strategic response towards solutions. There is also the potential for targeted monitoring and clearer links to potential interventions by trained pastoral staff. Ideally the College might also be able to evidence that some types of inappropriate usage are declining. Monitoring e-safety is an essential starting point. There is not yet a system, however, focused around clear data and pastoral input.

5.2.18   Analysis of rigorously and regularly collected, layered data is not merely useful to persuade external reviewers of the merits of the College's provision. The survey question *"This school deals well with any cases of bullying"* elicited the lowest level of positive parental response. Staff response to a similar question was also quite low. It is clear that a significant number of people are working very hard to address and reduce bullying. Are their efforts focused in the right direction? Are strategies working? Any successes, shared with stakeholders, could be very helpful, over time, in celebrating improvement, building confidence and, where relevant, dispelling myths. Incremental change over time, robustly evidenced, can help confirm the positive direction of travel and engage or sustain the support of all stakeholders.

5.2.19   Some post holders collect data under their own initiative because they feel it will help them and their teams do their jobs better. These initiatives are helpful on an individual level. For the College as a whole, however, the leadership team should collectively decide the agreed range of required information. If the same range of information is collected over an extended period, shared and evaluated across the school there will be no ambiguity about leadership's priorities or its determination to achieve them. **The review recommends that the College's leadership team identifies and collects the key management information that will enable it to demonstrate the effectiveness of provision and identify areas for improvement.** In making this recommendation the review team is assuming that, in addition to numerical data, regular and consistent surveys would form part of this process.

5.2.20   This key recommendation would also improve the College's approach to strategic planning. Several development plans were seen during the review.   These relate both to the College as whole and to individual areas of responsibility. All of these plans, while identifying appropriate areas for development, lack clear targets or measurable success criteria. As such, they are weak vehicles for driving change and monitoring impact across a large school with many staff and pupils.

5.2.21   A 10-year plan for the College as a whole is valid only if it can build in new and unexpected priorities, or be adapted in the light of emerging evidence. The lack of measurable targets or success criteria renders this difficult. Team plans, such as the plan for pastoral development, are written in response to current priorities. It is impossible, however, for the team meaningfully to link their actions and targets to a wider College plan that was written some time earlier. Equally, if the overarching College plan is being monitored and evaluated, it will have no bearing on the priorities being pursued under pastoral care. **The review recommends that the College improve the rigour of its development planning process to incorporate clear success criteria, measurable targets and systematic monitoring arrangements.** It would be helpful if this process began with the College's plan in response to this review. Paragraph 5.3.15 (below) is also relevant in this context.

Part 3: To what extent has leadership at Victoria College created an ethos and culture, across the whole school, to promote welfare and protect pupils from discriminatory behaviour?

5.3.1   Without quoting the relevant criteria in full, inspection frameworks link 'outstanding' leadership and management to *"a culture of vigilance"* where pupils' welfare is *"actively promoted".* In the related *'Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare'* section criteria include *"pupils work hard with the school"* to prevent bullying, the *"rare"* examples of bullying are dealt with effectively and the "*school's open culture*" *"actively promotes all aspects of welfare".* Criteria also cover parents, staff and pupils who will *"have no well-founded concerns"* about behaviour, personal development or welfare. This section reviews the evidence available at the College in respect of the highlighted criteria.

5.3.2   Terms such as culture, ethos and 'actively promote' are capable of many interpretations. **Appendix V** offers some working definitions, in layman's terms, that might be of assistance. None have statutory authority. Any school reviewing its own provision should perhaps agree some definitions of its own. A school trying to decide whether parental concerns are *"well founded"* or not will need to begin by finding out what issues concern parents the most before gathering its evidence.

5.3.3   A *"culture of vigilance"* suggests that all staff are sensitive to, and consistently on the alert for evidence that pupil welfare is at risk. A culture is evident if all staff are broadly consistent in their responses. Paragraph 5.1.3, evidences consistent College responses towards vulnerable pupils whose serious issues might require action under child protection. If a boy discloses sensitive information, documentary records and interview evidence suggests that his disclosure would be treated similarly and appropriately regardless of whom he spoke to.

5.3.4   Consistent approaches are not as clear in relation to important, but less urgent welfare issues. Staff at all levels stated consistently, in interview, that if they heard or noticed something that concerned them they would deal with it. They would regard not dealing with it as unprofessional. Such consistency represents a clear and positive aspect of the College culture in relation to pupils' welfare.

5.3.5   How robustly staff respond to issues is more variable, however. For example, parental survey responses continue to question whether staff view banter as bullying or as boyish high spirits. This issue was also raised in the 2013 Pastoral Review and remains unresolved. Until a clear view is taken and a strategy adopted, it is unlikely that a consistent culture will evolve around it or that parents will start to notice changes. Girls' schools invariably take overt action to challenge female stereotypes and expose their pupils to suitable role models. They see this as preparing the girls for adult life, whether in study or employment. The strength of the College culture around preparing students for application and entry to higher education is palpable, successful and deeply embedded. Will stereotypically boyish behaviours be appropriate or accepted in 21st century, mixed gender university or work settings however?

5.3.6   Since the 2013 report, new software is in place to enable the College to monitor the use of inappropriate or dangerous websites. Consistent use of this system has the potential to form a key part of a *culture of vigilance*. As noted in paragraph 4.2.18, *vigilance* would be further sharpened by systematic and regular analysis of data to identify emerging trends. The *culture* around vigilance might be strengthened and made more coherent if responses inappropriate e-safety issues are coordinated across the pastoral team.

5.3.7   Identifying and preventing inappropriate website visits is one important aspect of e-safety. A very different but equally important aspect is to help pupils feel safe to report cyber bullying, grooming or hurtful images of them being posted on Facebook or Snapchat. It is clear that inappropriate website visits are challenged robustly and that e-safety issues are raised in assemblies. It is less clear that pupils are yet comfortable enough to report them proactively. In the pastoral survey, significantly more pupils said that they would discuss bullying (including cyber bullying) with friends and relatives rather than with a teacher. A very high proportion said *"boys do not want to inform on other students to teachers"*. Changing such common or frequently repeated pupil attitudes and behaviours is a key element of changing a culture.

5.3.8   The active promotion of *"all aspects of welfare"* begins with the level of resource that a school devotes to it. The College has taken numerous positive steps towards this goal. Many of these are noted elsewhere but they include the investment in House Rooms, improved training provision, improved e-safety provision, improvements to Learning Support, increased Wellbeing provision, increased PSHE provision and so on. In some areas, for example SEN and PSHE, the College is moving forward from a low base. This does not undermine the message of increased attention to pupil welfare, however.

5.3.9   The provision of anti-bullying ambassadors and the training of peer mentors is a good example of active promotion. The fact that more pupils are putting themselves forward as mentors is good evidence that a message is getting through. In most other areas of pastoral provision, as noted in section 4.2, there is a lack of data to show whether actively promoted welfare messages are impacting on outcomes. If the College implements the recommendations made in 5.2.19 it may be better able to find corroborative evidence in future. Scrutiny of the College JSED shows that many of the *"how do you know?"* prompts in the *Relationships* section remain unanswered. In particular, there is no reference to any data or information about *religious, racial, sexual or homophobic incidents*. The review team also found little evidence on these issues in their wider scrutiny of documents. **It is recommended that the College reviews its planning and provision for these aspects of pupils' personal development and welfare and the evidence it collects about them.** As noted in paragraph 3.4, 'outstanding' provision requires that; *"the ethos and culture of the whole school prevents any form of direct or indirect discriminatory behaviour"*.

5.3.10   Inspection criteria refer to schools having an *"open culture"* that helps them to *'actively promote all aspects of welfare"*. The second lowest parental survey response was to the question *"the school seeks the views of parents and takes account of their suggestions"*. The College JSED states that parental comments are always welcome and that there is an open door policy. The JSED adds, however, that *"Parental comments are invited in a formal way at every periodic. Comments made are passed to the relevant member of staff and followed up with a comment, if necessary, back to the parent."*   The intention of this comment may be to encourage dialogue. To the review team, however, it does not imply a commitment to seek the views of parents as part of an "*open culture*".

5.3.11   Schools may seek dialogue with parents, on an individual basis, about individual children or they may solicit opinion more widely across a range of issues. In relation to the College, responses to the question *"The school is responsive to any concerns I might raise"* achieved a relatively low score in the parental survey. Responses to the question *"The school seeks the views of parents and takes account of their suggestions"* achieved a lower score. The recommendation noted in paragraph 5.2.16 is applicable to this issue also.

5.3.12   As noted earlier in this report, safeguarding arrangements at the College are effective. Pupils referred under child protection arrangements are supported and monitored appropriately.   The teaching staff take their responsibilities seriously and the significant majority of the students leave the school as confident and successful young men. However the balance of evidence emerging from this review suggests that pastoral care in the College has not yet developed an ethos around a *culture of vigilance*. Many of the component elements of good pastoral provision are in place. Some provision is relatively recent and should improve further over time. Proof of their impact is lacking.

5.3.13   Heavy emphasis is given in this report to the evidence provided by three recent surveys. An extensive programme of interviews, observations and scrutiny of records has tested this evidence. For many areas there is a shortage of corroborative data, collected by the College.   Similarly there is lack of earlier survey evidence about the views of parents, pupils or staff. This obliges reviewers to work with the available information, some of which is negative. For this reason many of the recommendations in this report relate to the gathering, analysis and evaluation of evidence. In matters relating to pupil achievement, progress and attendance such data is readily available; comparisons within the school, with other schools and from year to year are easy to provide. This is not the case with data about the effectiveness of pastoral care.

5.3.14   The College is asked (paragraph 5.2.19) to identify and collect key management information to help it show the effectiveness of provision. The same paragraph suggests that greater use of survey data should be part of this process.   It is being asked (paragraph 5.2.21) to improve the rigour of development planning with clear success criteria, measurable targets and systematic monitoring arrangements. The area of pastoral provision with the greatest disparity between what the school believes and what pupils and parents say about it is bullying. Staff say, in interview, that they deal with every incident reported to them. Parents give a negative response to the question *"This school deals well with any cases of bullying"*. Parents give positive responses, however, to the questions *"My son is well looked after at school"* and *"My son is happy and feels safe at this school"*. On the other hand, the pastoral survey suggests that there is not yet a culture of reporting incidents.

5.3.15   This aspect of life, in any school, carries considerable implications not only for pupil welfare but also for reputation management. Clarifying the true position, targeting the right issues and adopting the most effective strategies are central to the improvement process. Bullying is an appropriate area, therefore, on which to focus new approaches to planning, information gathering and focused intervention. **The review recommends, therefore, that bullying be prioritised as a focus in the College's strategic plan and that improvements are monitored systematically using clear targets and success criteria.**

5.3.16   The criteria used throughout this final section of the report, relate exclusively to the grade of 'outstanding' in the inspection frameworks. They relate mainly to the *Personal Development Behaviour and Welfare* section of these frameworks. There is no implication that provision in this area is inadequate. Nor do these judgements imply inadequacy in other areas of the College's activities. The College's aspiration, however, is to be judged as 'outstanding' across all areas of its provision. For such a judgement to be attained the College will need to provide more evidence of pastoral effectiveness than at present. To be secure in its self-evaluation of this aspect it will need to compare, more systematically, its own views with those of other stakeholders.

Glossary of terms and acronyms

Ofsted   Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills

ISI   Independent Schools Inspectorate: Licensed by the UK Department for Education. Monitored by Ofsted

Quintile   UK comparative school data, such as found on the Ofsted Data Dashboard website, divides schools nationally into 5 x 20% blocks, known as 'quintiles'. The College would be in the 'upper quintile' for attendance if it were a UK school

LSU   Learning Support Unit. In the UK these units often support pupils who are out of class, usually for poor behaviour, on 'internal exclusions'. At the College, however it is used to support vulnerable pupils,

JSED   Jersey Self Evaluation Document: schools are invited to self-review against inspection criteria, quoting evidence for the judgements they make. Grades, self-awarded, range from dark green (= outstanding) through light green, amber and red (inadequate). The JSED is optional on Jersey. In the UK, although not statutory, schools are expected to share their self-evaluation grades with inspectors as part of the inspection.

An outline of the ISI Framework

ISI places safeguarding and welfare issues under the section: *"Quality of pupils' personal development".* 'Contributions' to this area are made by:
(a) The spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of the pupils
(b) The contribution of arrangements for pastoral care
(c) The contribution of arrangements for welfare, health and safety
(d) A separate section on boarding schools - not relevant here

The inspection of pastoral care uses the following criteria:
(i) The staff provide effective support and guidance for the pupils in accordance with the school's aims.
(ii) Relationships are positive between staff and pupils and among the pupils themselves.
(iii) Pupils are encouraged to be healthy through developing healthy eating habits and taking regular exercise.

(iv) The school is effective in promoting good behaviour and guarding against harassment and bullying, including cyber-bullying, and it deals constructively with any unacceptable behaviour, taking due account of any related difficulty or disability.
(v) The school has a suitable plan to improve educational access for pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities.
(vi) The school employs effective methods to seek the views of pupils.

The inspection of welfare, health and safety uses the following criteria:
(i) **The safeguarding arrangements have regard to official guidance (in *Keeping Children Safe in Education* and *Working Together to Safeguard Children,*** including measures to support the Prevent strategy*)* and in so doing take proper account of any particular circumstance or context of the school which may indicate a need for protocols greater than the minimum legal requirements.
(ii) All necessary measures are taken to reduce risk from fire and other hazards.
(iii) Arrangements to ensure health and safety are effective and include provision for pupils who are ill, injured or have special educational needs and/or disabilities.
(iv) The admission and attendance registers are properly maintained, and correctly stored for the previous three years.

ISI places leadership issues under the section: *"The effectiveness of leadership, governance and management".* 'Contributions' are made by:
(a) The quality of governance and
(b) The quality of leadership and management, including links with parents

Inspection criteria for governance are not relevant because, for independent schools, governors are often 'proprietors' and have a different relationship with the headteacher. Most maintained schools in Jersey do not have governors.

Inspection of leadership and management uses the following criteria:
(i) At all levels of responsibility, the leadership and management of the school are effective, in accordance with the aims of the school and in their discharge of their delegated responsibilities, particularly those for policy implementation and the safeguarding of pupils.
(ii) Leadership and management provide clear educational direction, as reflected in the quality of the pupils' education and the standard of their personal development.
(iii) Leadership and management are effective in self-evaluation, setting priorities and ensuring that they are achieved.
(iv) **Management at all levels is successful in securing, supporting, developing and motivating sufficient high quality staff and ensuring they are suitably trained for their roles in meeting the needs of all children, safeguarding, and welfare, health and safety.**

Note:
1. Criteria relating to safeguarding are in bold - the same statutory guidance document applies to both maintained and independent sectors.

Extracts from *"Inspecting safeguarding in early years, education and skills settings"* and *"signs of effective safeguarding"*

"Inspecting safeguarding ...." Is the key safeguarding reference document for ISI and Ofsted inspectors. *"Signs of effective safeguarding"* is the section of the guidance dealing with key indicators for inspectors to look for. The full text is longer than shown in the chart. Key words have been extracted so that text can fit in the chart. The right hand column shows those areas of the review's evidence base that addressed each criterion.

Note 1 *- in a full inspection of a large secondary school, one inspector might devote half a day to gathering the necessary evidence to make a judgement.*
Note 2 *- Regardless of documentation or teacher responses, if inspectors feel that the ambience and ethos of a school is hostile or unsafe this would take precedence over the more formal evidence. This might also happen if unsafe incidents were observed - fights, drug taking, drinking, bullying, unsafe playground behaviour, overt aggression etc. {NB: nothing of this nature was observed.)*

Criterion	Evidence from Review
The signs of successful safeguarding arrangements	
Leadership has put effective safeguarding in the setting	Summary judgement arising from overall evidence
A named and designated lead, in a position to pursue concerns	Staffing structure and responsibilities
Adults know and understand various abuse indicators	Interviews, training records
Staff are clear about procedures and expected behaviours if they need to refer	Interviews, training records, survey data
Staff make a robust and proactive response in the event of disclosure	Interviews and scrutiny of records
Written records made in a timely way	Scrutiny of records
Appropriate protocols for sharing information	Scrutiny of records
Relevant policies are in place	Scrutiny of policies and staff handbook
Records are shared appropriately	Scrutiny of records
Records of the referral are retained	Scrutiny of records
A written safeguarding plan is put in place	Scrutiny of records
Records are shared appropriately between agencies	Scrutiny of records
Children are protected and helped to keep themselves safe from harm	Scrutiny of records, pastoral structure, PSHE programme, outside speakers, House assemblies etc.
Children know a trusted adult	Interviews
Children feel safe	Interviews and surveys
Clear and effective staff development	Scrutiny of training records
Careful staff selection and recruitment**(a)	Single Central Record, Safer Recruitment
Physical environment is safe**(b)	Risk assessments, Health and safety arrangements and interviews with relevant staff

Note;
** this symbol denotes caution about two indicators. Both relate to aspects of the College's relationship with the Education Department. The implication is that the areas in question might be outside the College's ability to control:
a) Is the single central record statutory? If so, some key information is kept by the Department's HR section.
b) The public right of way through the College grounds has protected status. It is unclear whether safety aspects required in the UK apply in Jersey. These include, for example, security gates, disclosure and barring certification, the wearing of identity badges etc.

**Safeguarding and Welfare in Secondary Schools:
Practice Exemplified at Different Levels**

Delivering effective safeguarding in large organisations, such as secondary schools, is not always easy. However, in mainland UK, failure to safeguard effectively is an instant trigger for a judgement of Special Measures. More importantly, of course, serious failures in safeguarding can have distressing or traumatic consequences for pupils, families and the school community as a whole.

1.   The notes below explain why "getting safeguarding right" can be complex.

- The word, 'Safeguarding' is often used as an umbrella term covering a wide range of statutory requirements and duties.
- However, in Ofsted's **"Outcomes for Pupils"** section, the criterion "safeguarding is effective" is replicated, verbatim, in each of the descriptors for Outstanding, Good and Requires Improvement.
- This implies an absolute standard that must be met. There is no sliding scale of quality as in most other inspection grades. If it is not met then a judgement of 'Inadequate' follows automatically.
- At one level, therefore, it is important for schools to have a clear view of what "effective" safeguarding means, in practice, so that staff can make professional judgements accurately

2.   To complicate matters, however:

- Ofsted's guidance on this topic defines safeguarding in terms of 4 related duties: **'protecting'** children, **'preventing'** harm to children, **'ensuring'** a safe learning environment and **'taking action'** to enable the best outcomes
- It also gives a list of 19 areas including physical abuse, substance abuse, forced marriage, internet safety (etc.) where "safeguarding action may be needed"
- In addition to any responsive action, however, guidance requires that school leaders proactively "create a culture of vigilance" where "children's welfare is promoted"
- Inspectors must judge whether leaders "create a positive culture and ethos where safeguarding is an important part of every day life backed up by training at every level"

3.   In Ofsted reports, most of the above judgements appear in the section dealing with *"Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare"*. Nevertheless, they all contribute towards the overall judgement that "safeguarding is effective" in the "*Outcomes for Pupils"* section. This apparent separation between 'safeguarding' and 'personal development' is potentially confusing.

4.   In terms of school provision:

- Putting some component elements of safeguarding in place may not be very complex. All schools have a range of policies and PSHE programmes. Child protection coordinators will be in place. Some aspects of safety, such as managing behaviour or wearing goggles during science experiments will be seen as core parts of a teacher's professional role.
- Creating an effective culture of care and vigilance across a large organisation, however, is more challenging. In secondary schools pupils move between teachers who are employed principally for their subject expertise. Because some staff receive additional allowances for specialist roles (SENCO, Child Protection Coordinator etc.), there may be a tendency for leaders, or staff as a whole to assume that safeguarding is in safe hands and not their immediate concern.
- This last bullet point is, of course, an historical stereotype and not reflective of practice in a significant majority of secondary schools. Nevertheless it remains an appropriate starting point for the process of self-evaluation. The further a school moves away from this stereotype, in most cases, the better its safeguarding provision becomes.
- The following chart may help schools evaluate their own safeguarding provision. To aid the process of self-review it has been designed to be relatively free of jargon and Ofsted phraseology.

Hierarchy of Safeguarding Needs	What might we look for in order to make a judgement?
Having the expected Safeguarding basics in place and enabling them to be effective *Does the school have all the expected policies, posts and training arrangements in place? Their existence does not prove that safeguarding is effective but they are an essential prerequisite.*	• **As a minimum, it should be evident that:** • A full range of Safeguarding policies covering all related areas identified in the Ofsted / ISI Framework exists; • Designated safeguarding lead and Child Protection Coordinator, of sufficient seniority, are in place; • Clear and accurate guidance for staff is in place, including referral and information sharing protocols; • Staff have been trained / inducted as required (e.g. designated lead training is updated every 2 years); • Safer recruitment practices, including the Single Central record are in place. Job descriptions reflect safeguarding duties; • All relevant paperwork is maintained and stored appropriately; • Governing body / SLT / departmental minutes show that CP and safeguarding issues are discussed regularly.
Keeping evidence of effective safeguarding *A judgement that safeguarding is "effective" relies on historical evidence that shows appropriate referrals being made and handled effectively. It is much harder to prove that preventative methods are effective. A low incidence of referrals may merely mean that problems are not being notice or referred.*	• **The best evidence that safeguarding is "effective" is drawn from past successes or informed changes. For example:** • Case studies of effective in-house practice, where concerns were raised correctly, investigated thoroughly, with appropriate action taken and, where possible, resulting in improved outcomes; • Case studies of referrals where issues were raised by external agencies (e.g. police or social services) which resulted in appropriate interventions by the school; • Reviews of less successful cases where actions were reviewed and changes made as a result; • Evaluation of interventions for impact: e.g. which aspects of the support plan have been most / least effective? How effective have been any planned interventions by external agencies? • Have external agencies commented on or evaluated the effectiveness of the school's systems?
Building robust systems around the generation of evidence. *For issues that schools take seriously (e.g. tracking academic progress and securing high examination results) they create robust, regular, annual procedures. What robust data gathering and line management arrangements underpin safeguarding?*	• **What welfare and safeguarding data is collected annually? How does it impact on routine school systems? For example:** • Pupil, parent and staff surveys carried out annually, analysed and compared with previous years' data. If pupils say they feel safe, then they are. Results are published. Changes are made to PSHE, staff training (etc.) if appropriate; • Robust and regular analysis of behaviour data, attendance data, medical room data, used to identify sub-groups and trends; • Specific data on key areas of concern, such as incidents of bullying, e-safety, homophobic comments, participation rates in House activities (etc.) logged and analysed annually. Changes made to PSHE or staff training programmes in response; • Regular line management discussions with (e.g.) Child Protection Coordinator, Housemasters, IT Manager, Health and Safety Coordinator (etc.) require them to present trend data. If changes are required, data to show evidence of any impact. Performance management targets (if appropriate) to reflect findings; • Annual reports presented to Governors showing the impact of improved safeguarding and wellbeing measures year on year; • Collecting and sharing data and holding staff accountable for change will ensure that they give these issues higher priority.
A culture of vigilance, care and an ethos built around safeguarding. *A culture and ethos around safeguarding is an <u>outcome</u> that reflects the quality and consistency of the <u>inputs</u>. The school delivers what its policy, line management and staff training frameworks intend. There is a virtuous circle between what a school says it does and what pupils and parents report their experiences to be.*	**What kind of observable outcomes might indicate an ethos of care and concern for pupils' wellbeing? For example:** • Pupils and parents give uniformly positive responses to the regular and well-constructed wellbeing questions in surveys; • Pupils can explain accurately and concisely 'how things work here' and the systems in place to keep them safe; • Observable pupil behaviour reflects mature self control or cheerful compliance rather than fear of punishment; • Assemblies, tutor periods and public events celebrate successes in all areas: academic, cultural, creative, sporting, or communal; • Pupils with learning, emotional or behavioural problems are treated inclusively; provision adapts to their needs, not vice versa • Pupils are supportive of one another, whether in class or communal areas. Bullying is rare, as are racist or homophobic comments. Where they occur, the pupils feel confident enough to challenge them. • Attendance is high. Any anomalous absence patterns are picked up quickly and their causes identified and addressed • Interactions between adults and pupils are invariably positive and reflect a high degree of mutual respect. Etc.

Appendix V

Working Definitions of Ethos and Culture

The origins of the term ethos go back as far as Aristotle, and definitions belong in the field of philosophy. Common usage is less precise, however. Inspection frameworks use these terms without defining them. If schools are self-reviewing and using inspection criteria some agreed working definitions may be helpful. All examples are illustrative:

Term	Working Definition	Illustrative Examples	Where we might see evidence
Ethos	**What we stand for - our core principles** *Shared vision* *Shared values* *Shared sense of purpose*	"This is a school where we want every pupil to achieve at the highest level possible"	• Honours boards for Oxbridge successes • Speech day programmes and key speakers - what message • Prize giving - what can pupils win prizes for? • Exam results - staff carry this information in their heads • Governor reports - what are governors being informed about? • Department and SLT minutes - what is being discussed?
Culture	**How we do it here** - How, in practice, we show our ethos. How the pupils respond to us *Our actions embody our aspirations*	Teaching comes first The flight path to A level starts in Y7 We challenge every pupil to do their best Our job is to get you through the exam If you fall behind we help you catch up. Etc. *Most of the staff act like this, it is embedded behaviour*	• Book scrutiny - marking to exam Board criteria • Book scrutiny - no gaps, corrections required • Wall displays - subject rules, techniques and conventions • Lessons - pupils retain information, can work independently • Interviews - pupils say they are being pushed to do their best • Interviews - pupils have high aspirations • Documentation - reports are focused on how to improve • Documentation - progress data analysed in depth. Etc.
Actively Promote	**Our message.** How often and where we repeat it. The systems we build around it. *We don't just say it; we put things in place to make it happen. Then we say it again, and again (until you get it)*	We want you to do well and you can do well Your tutor knows your progress in all subjects We celebrate every success you achieve We have learning buddies and peer mentors We have effort badges We have revision classes We have catch up classes We leave no stone unturned in our quest to help you succeed Etc.	• Pictures and displays showing successful pupils • Motivational messages on the walls • Topics in assemblies • Messages and information that goes to parents • PSHE topics that deal with academic issues • Support packages in place, pupil take up, impact • What pupils say in interviews and surveys • The quality, pace, rigour and focus of lessons • Etc.

Appendix VI

Comparison between peer review model and Ofsted inspection

Adapted from *Challenge Partners* website

	Ofsted	**Quality Assurance Review**
1.	Provides summative judgements	Sits within an evaluation framework which includes the Ofsted summative judgement but is a formative assessment
2.	Commissioned as an independent external authorative audit	Bought into by schools as an external moderation and professional development opportunity. Does not carry the authority of Ofsted.
3.	Requires certain information from the school	Information provided by the school
4.	Provides a snapshot of where the school is now	Looks at where the school is now as part of its wider trajectory of improvement
5.	Report is public	Report is owned by the school
6.	Involves some professional development for the head teacher/senior leadership team	Provides time for professional development for all involved
7.	Is a one-off if the school receives a 'good' or 'outstanding' grade	Forms part of continuous cycle of school evaluation for all schools
8.	Timing is controlled by Ofsted	Timing is directed to ensure that schools do not have to adapt their routine
9.	Sometimes has a serving a head on the team (usually to allow Ofsted to check his / her judgements - especially on teaching grades)	Review team includes headteacher or senior leader(s) for professional development
10.	Shares best practice through the publication of a report	Embeds best practice through peer observation and dialogue - but a report is still written
11.	Provides a judgement on a school	Reviews a school's self-evaluation when coming to a judgement and comments on trajectory
12.	Has pre-defined criteria	The scope is whole school but the focus is flexible
13.	Data driven and produces formulaic reports, mainly judgements - written to the Ofsted house style	Uses professional judgement to reach a rounded picture of the school and its culture. Reports are more discursive and evaluative