

School Improvement Action Plan 2016 - 2017

Key Priority 1:



Key Priority 1 draft

Effectiveness of Leadership and Management

1. In the light of challenging financial climate, to ensure there is a sound financial 3-year plan.
2. To maintain and improve our effective partnerships with other schools to share and develop outstanding practice across our school and beyond.
3. To actively promote the school and Nursery with the aim to increase numbers (July 2016: school = 80; Nursery = 11. September 2016: School = 76; Nursery 5)
4. To research and consider whether the FSU will open to 2 year olds when funding is available to vulnerable families in Sept 2017.
5. To develop an effective devolved leadership across 3 areas of learning to improve 'subject leadership' across the school, which impacts significantly to improve standards and outcomes for children
6. To develop more robust evidence of the existing high quality impact of the Governing Body in securing strong strategic leadership and improvement in standards and outcomes for children.

Final Governor Evaluation, July 2017

Overarching success criteria – Term Three – End of Summer Term, July 2017

Success criteria	Evaluation questions	Monitoring tasks and responsibilities, and reporting arrangements.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 3 Year Budget Plan is balanced and meets the educational needs of the children – including staffing structure to meet the needs of children in the best possible way. 2. There is evidence of the positive impact on children's learning and SMSC development from Offwell's collaboration and sharing best practice with other schools/organisations. 3. Numbers in school and Nursery have continued to rise. School has been actively promoted and is well thought of in the local community/ies. 4. Governors made and active decision about whether to accept children from the age of 2 years old into Nursery ; if appropriate, changes are in place for a successful start to 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the budget sustainable over 3 years? Where there has been change, how will standards and outcomes be maintained and improved? Is further support or training needed for staff where there has been change. 2. Has impact of collaboration benefitted all areas of school/all children? Can impact of collaboration be improved? 3. What are the most reasonable projections for future pupil 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finance Governor report to Resources. Monitor impact of changed way of reporting budgeting to GB (so County and Gov documents are more clearly linked) 2. Resources to monitor collaboration and impact. 3. Pupil No.s in HT reports to Govs. 4. To be defined during year 5. Gov join Curriculum Leadership Team meetings

School Improvement Action Plan 2016 - 2017

Key Priority 1

<p>the FSU to offer high quality provision from September 2017.</p> <p>5. There is evidence of successful devolved leadership within the 3 Curriculum Leadership Teams and evidence of their impact to raise standards and outcomes for children. (T&L Action Plan 2). Staff feel they have made a valuable and valued contribution and can define the impact for children.</p> <p>6. Governors and SLT are able to readily demonstrate the impact of the FGB's strong strategic leadership; triangulation of SIP, monitoring, SEF identifies Governor impact.</p>	<p>numbers? What risks/benefits does this present?</p> <p>4. If Governors have decided not to change age-range of Nursery, will this decision be reviewed? If change has taken place, how will the impact be monitored?</p> <p>5. What has been the most significant impact of changing Subject Leadership responsibilities? Do staff feel some areas have 'suffered' from the changes?</p> <p>6. Can Governors more easily demonstrate the impact of the FGB?</p>	<p>on invitation. Gobs to discuss with teachers when on school visits. Possible invitation to report to GB.</p> <p>6. Governors completing records and documentation, according to plans.</p>
--	--	---

Term One – End of Autumn Term 2016

Success criteria	Evaluation questions	Monitoring tasks and responsibilities, reporting arrangements
<p>1.</p> <p>2. Governors are kept up to date re MAT national and local picture. In-school collaboration has impacted to improve on quality of teaching and learning, learning environments and teacher moderation. Next steps are identified. Headteacher has given and received peer support which impacts on her leadership and management, further developing best practice.</p> <p>3. –</p> <p>4. EYFS Advisor visit and advice, requirements for 2 year olds,</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>2. Is it appropriate for Governors to actively investigate MAT? Have governors identified the impact of collaboration within monitoring visits? Are plans to support Senior Teacher identifying L&M support?</p> <p>3. –</p> <p>4. What are the legal requirements and how does this compare to our</p>	<p>1. Chair & HT within policy until further notice.</p> <p>2. Chair & HT attendance at DAPH MAT information update event 4.10.16 and Small school's Diocesan meeting 11.11.16. Report to FGB</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4. Receive reports from HT / FSU leader.</p>

School Improvement Action Plan 2016 - 2017

Key Priority 1

<p>feedback from EYFS leader courses reported to Govs. SLT, EYFS Leader and Governors feel informed as to the requirements. Prepared to discuss impacts of potential change next term.</p> <p>5. Teams set up and have met (by Oct half term). (see also Action Plan 2: aims identified and shared; initial research/observations shared.)</p> <p>6. Governor visit report formats reviewed and agreed; are used constructively to demonstrate the links to SIP and provide evidence of next Gov step and evidence towards SEF. Governors who make monitoring visits are able to demonstrate clearly the origin of the monitoring plan, the impact of the area being monitored and how their recommend next steps will support further improvement.</p>	<p>current set up for EYFS?</p> <p>5. Have staff managed to meet in teams without impacting negatively on Teaching and learning for children?</p> <p>6. Does Gov monitoring documentation clearly explain to other governors? Is there a plan to clearly triangulate between minutes, visits, SIP and SEF?</p>	<p>5. Curriculum to consider opportunities to join Subject Leadership Team monitoring/meetings.</p> <p>6. Governors to review documentation and evidencing. Present and agree plan.</p>
---	--	---

Term Two – End of Spring Term 2017

Success criteria	Evaluation questions	Monitoring tasks and responsibilities, reporting arrangements
<p>1. A</p> <p>2.</p>	<p>1. A</p>	<p>1. A</p>

Tasks	Person	Cost	Start date	Resources	Support	Completion date
2 HT meet local HTs to discuss SIP and plan collaborative working / sharing best practice	AB	HT time	26.9.16	SIP,		26.9.16
2 HT attends HLC Heads meetings	AB	£150	28.9.16 meeting 1			7.12.16 meeting 2
2 HT & Chair attend DAPH MAT update	AB PA	£	4.10.16		DAPH invited speakers	4.10.16
2 Chair & HT attend Diocesan Small Schools Conference	AB PA	£	11.11.16		Diocese / Small Schools Network	11.11.16

School Improvement Action Plan 2016 - 2017

Key Priority 1

2 – see also T&L Action Plan 2						
4 EYFS Advisor Kerry Thorne visiting Offwell (See also EYFS plan)						
4 see also EYFS Action Plan 5 . Courses attended						

BUDGET SUMMARY

Key Priority	Cost of each priority
2. Collaborative Working, HT attend HLC meetings x2. £75 x2 supply.	£150