

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ‘SIGNATURES OF RISK’ EVALUATION

	Signature of risk	RAG
SAFEGUARDING COMPLIANCE		
1	The school is not <u>compliant</u> with Keeping Children Safe in Education - systems for recording compliance are weak; governors fail to seek assurance regarding compliance	
LEADING THROUGH CHANGE AND ADVERSITY		
2	Significant building programme planned, on-going or newly completed	
3	Governors have not set a strategic direction to ensure that the school can be strong and sustainable into the long term	
4	Succession management is weak – consequently, the school becomes immediately vulnerable when long standing leaders or key governors leave or retire	
5	Lack of support provided for new leaders, including Headteachers, Principals and Chairs of Governors	
6	Unresolved medium and long term gaps in staffing	
PERFORMANCE CULTURE		
7	Stagnation in governance – the governing body lacks renewal in capacity, methodologies or thinking	
8	Governors/trustees do not effectively and systematically hold school leaders <u>at all levels</u> to account for standards of performance – scrutiny and challenge may be directed only at the headteacher	
9	The leadership scheme of delegation does not clarify roles, responsibility and accountability, and support the headteacher to effectively delegate responsibilities	
10	Governors/trustees do not have sufficiently effective assurance processes to ensure that leaders at all levels are held to account for the pace and impact of their actions to bring about measurable improvement	
11	Minutes of Board of Governors meetings do not <u>evidence</u> sufficient challenge or consideration of strategic issues	
12	Financial oversight is weak – it is unclear how the use of resources is driving the pace of improvement in standards of learning outcomes	
13	School leaders use excuses (e.g. levels of deprivation) to reinforce a culture of low standards and expectations	
14	School does not seek or sustain effective external validation of its performance	
15	Self-evaluation is largely descriptive and lacks analysis and evaluation – evidence and benchmarking lacks rigour	
16	The School Improvement Plan is insufficiently detailed, lacking specific success criteria and milestones by which governors can hold leaders to account for implementing the intended actions	
17	Weaknesses in staffing are tolerated too long without <u>formal</u> action	
18	There is an over-reliance on intervention activities to compensate for deficiencies in quality first teaching - the effectiveness of specific intervention activities is not well evidenced and understood	
19	Outcomes for vulnerable and disadvantaged children are not improving swiftly enough	
ENGAGEMENT		
20	Insularity or isolation – the school does not participate in <u>effective</u> collaborations or partnerships	

21	Persistent or concerning levels of parent dissatisfaction with the school – which may be evident in complaints, Parent View, community feedback and other sources	
22	Pupil transfers out of the school are high overall, or, for specific groups of children	

ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS

School:		
Date:		
Assessment overseen by:	Name:	
	Position:	
Analysis of key risks:		

GUIDANCE NOTES

The Signatures of Risk Evaluation is based on the learning from the first five years of the North Lincolnshire Education Standards Board. These are the recurrent issues and risks found when calling school leaders and governors to account for the weak performance of their school.

Unaddressed, these risks will contribute to poorer performance.

The Signatures of Risk are not intended to be an exhaustive list of risks against which schools can assess their performance. Governors and school leaders need to also be familiar with the detail of the Ofsted School Inspection Handbook which can be found at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-eif>

The Signatures of Risk approach requires a high level consideration of the prevailing culture and leadership practices of the school.

The assessment of risk and how well it is being managed and mitigated needs to be supported by evidence. As an assessment of risk, borderline decisions should normally fall to the lower category. E.g. a borderline decision between GA and AR is likely to be evaluated AR.

Enter the relevant RAG code (G, GA, RA, R) in the boxes.

Green (G)	Green/Amber (GA)	Amber/Red (AR)	Red (R)
No evidence of this risk	Risk is evident – management and mitigation is timely and effective	Risk is evident – management and mitigation is timely and partially effective	Risk is evident – management and mitigation lacks pace or is not effective enough

NOTE: this information is strictly confidential and remains the property of the person or organisation undertaking the assessment