

Evaluation of Quality Assurance Visits

School: Confidential

Date: January 2003

Please indicate your schools based on the following:
4 – very good, 3 – good, 2 – fair, 1 – unsatisfactory

Pre-Visit

1. Were arrangements clear in terms of:

- The Purpose of the visit; 4
- The Scope; 4
- The structure (discussion with HT, Classroom Visits, interviews, debriefing) 4
- The follow up report; 4
- How any follow-up action is to be addressed? 3
- Usually 3 weeks notice of the visit is given. Is this sufficient notice? 4

Once the actual date of the visit has been agreed, the EDO cussed confirmation by letter or e-mail.

2. How useful is this in terms of outlining the purpose, scope and structure of the intended visit?

4 3 2 1

4

3. How might such confirmation be improved? Please comment below

I really don't know what else could have been done

4. Is the information given to Head Teachers sufficient to brief staff?

4

5. If not how might this be improved (e.g specially prepared handout for staff)? Please comment below

** 6 I think the run up to the visit is stressful enough. Agonising over who will visit whom wouldn't help. It doesn't reflect what would happen in an HMI visit . As members of the team gain reputations for being "tough" "fair" etc (whether justified or not) how would staff perceive decisions of the HT

6. Should Head Teachers continue to allocate the members of the visiting team to particular classrooms / staff, rather that the visiting team making the choice?

No **

Evaluation of Quality Assurance Visits

The Visit

The visit began with a presentation from the Head Teacher / management teams, was followed by interviews staff, pupils and school based. Then it concluded with a reporting back session with the Head Teacher / management team.

7. Was this a satisfactory way to structure the visit? Yes 4
8. **How useful / effective did you and your staff find the various aspects of the visit?**
- | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|-----|---|---|---|
| • The presentation; | 4 | | | |
| • The discussion with the management teams; | N/a | | | |
| • Classroom visits; | 4 | | | |
| • Discussions with teachers; | N/a | | | |
| • Reporting back session? I would have liked this to be longer and have involved the whole team, so that points could | 3 | | | |

Comment be clarified with the individual who addressed that area.

(Among other things you may wish to comment on: how members of the team conducted themselves and how they related to staff and pupils; the number in the visiting team – too few, too many.)

I had expected 4 extra adults in school to be overwhelming – but it just wasn't so. I wasn't aware of it changing the pupils' behaviour. The school board/parents felt quite comfortable (in retrospect) with their role.

9. **How useful was this visit overall for you and your staff?**
- | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | 4 | | | |

Comment

It really was very useful. We already believed we were some things well and we knew our shortfalls on some of the action points raised, but most useful were the things we thought we had right but now know we have to look at again – like the Standards and Quality Report and the evidence of pupils' work.

Written Report

10. The report was issued within 21 days after the visit. How happy were you with its:

- | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|
| | 4 3 2 1 |
| • Structure; | <input type="text" value="4"/> |
| • Clarity; | <input type="text" value="4"/> |
| • Tone; | <input type="text" value="4"/> |

11. How fair and balanced a report was it in your view?

12. Were you satisfied with the opportunities and arrangements for commenting on the report?

13. How helpful was the port in informing your development planning process

14. Was the time-gap between the visit and the report acceptable/reasonable in your view?

15. Was there consistency between the agreed structure of the visit (purpose, scope, outcomes) and the actual visit?
Yes

If no, comment here

** Question 12 Following the e-mail of the draft report, we were invited to comment, but we didn't get feedback on our comments. In our case they only referred to how we felt we could best be helped to address the action points, but perhaps in a more contentious report where staff were challenging the findings, it could be more of an issue

16. Any other comments, including how the process could be improved. Write here and if necessary, attach any additional sheets.

I was grateful for the opportunity to show the team around the school prior to the presentation. I hope the team would find that useful too and might keep that element in smaller school visits.
The process was wholly positive and was a useful preparation for the inevitable HMI version. Even if a subsequent HMI visit throws up a much longer list of urgent development priorities these visits give schools a degree of protection by establishing an independent, but shared, view of what will be targeted

Signature

signed and dated by the Head Teacher Date