

UPDATED TO TAKE
ACCOUNT OF THE
NOVEMBER 2014
OFSTED
DOCUMENTS

THE ROLE OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY
IN SCHOOL QUALITY ASSURANCE

PREPARING FOR INSPECTION



John Freeman
Consulting

The Local Authority Role in School Quality Assurance

Preparing for Inspection – Second Edition

Overview

'The Local Authority Role in School Quality Assurance' set out the statutory framework for the engagement of local authorities in educational quality assurance. In so doing, the paper drew a distinction between local authority 'school improvement' functions which relate only to maintained schools, and 'school quality assurance' functions which relate to all state-funded education provision, including, explicitly, academies.

This paper considers how best local authorities might carry out their school quality assurance functions for maintained schools and academies with a view to meeting Ofsted expectations. The paper does not deal directly with school improvement, on which there is an extensive literature, and for which local authorities have adopted a wide variety of structural arrangements. Ofsted documents unhelpfully conflate 'school improvement' with 'school quality assurance' – this paper maintains the distinction.

This second, extended, edition covers the changes made in the revised '*Local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement*' ('LASI') Framework and Handbook published by Ofsted on 11 November 2014, and includes a full analysis of Focused School Inspection ('FSI') letters, an extended section on the selection of local authorities for inspection, and an analysis of references to the use of data in the inspection letters issued. Also included for reference are the old and new Frameworks and Handbooks highlighted to indicate the changes.

The analysis is drawn very largely from the evidence of the LASI Frameworks and Handbooks (both the old and new versions), the text of Sir Michael Wilshaw's speech to the Association of Directors of Children's Services on 11 July 2014, and Ofsted LASI and FSI inspection letters.

There are two key themes – first, the evidence of local policies and practice that inspectors will be seeking, and second, the performance and other data that local authorities are able to use to make judgments about schools and academies. The aim is to support local authorities in ensuring that their local arrangements are both fit for purpose and will meet the requirements of inspection.

With respect to academies, the current Framework and Handbook state that while local authorities have no statutory intervention role with academies on school quality issues, it is nevertheless important that local authorities work to develop good relationships with academies on these and other matters. This topic is covered in detail at 'Academies' on page 22.

Comments are welcome to: john@johnfreemanconsulting.co.uk

John Freeman CBE
25 November 2014

The Local Authority Role in School Quality Assurance

Preparing for Inspection – Second Edition

Contents

Overview	2
Contents	3
Introduction and context	4
Changes between LASI 1 and LASI 2	7
The selection of local authorities for inspection	8
Pre-inspection evidence	11
The first week of the LASI 2 inspection	13
The second week of the LASI 2 inspection	17
The use of data	20
Lessons to be learned from LASI 1 inspections	21
Academies	22
Appendix 1 – LASI and FSI report dates for local authorities inspected to 16 September 2014	25
Appendix 2 – Suggested outline contents of a Local Authority School Quality Assurance Policy	26
Appendix 3 – Suggested outline contents of a Local Authority Self-Evaluation	27
Appendix 4 – Possible escalation procedure – maintained schools	28
Appendix 5 – Possible escalation procedure – academies	29
Appendix 6 – Data available to local authorities	30
Appendix 7 – Checklist for local authorities	34
References	35
Annexes (published as separate documents)	36

The Local Authority Role in School Quality Assurance

Preparing for Inspection - Second Edition

Introduction and context

In May 2013, Ofsted published the '*Framework for the inspection of local authority arrangements for school improvement*' ('the LASI Framework') alongside the associated '*Handbook for the inspection of local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement*' ('the LASI Handbook'). The LASI Handbook was updated in May 2014. On 11 November 2014, revised versions of the LASI Framework and Handbook were published by Ofsted [References 2 and 3].

This paper brings together the evidence that inspectors will be seeking during LASI inspections so that they can make judgments about a local authority's arrangements for supporting school improvement. The paper assumes familiarity with the earlier paper, '**The Local Authority Role in School Quality Assurance**' [Reference 1], which laid out the general statutory framework and made proposals for the way in which the statutory duties might be met.

Throughout this paper, 'LASI 1' and 'LASI 2' are used as shorthand. Text in *coloured italic* indicates a direct quotation from Ofsted documentation. Where there is a direct quotation from LASI 2 documentation and there has been a change from the LASI 1 version, this is indicated by the use of *coloured italic bold* text. **Black bold** text indicates specific advice to local authorities.

This second edition of 'Preparing for Inspection' includes a detailed analysis of the changes made in the November 2014 versions of the documents. The earlier versions of the LASI documentation have been withdrawn but highlighted versions are available as Annex 1 to enable comparison and analysis (see page 36).

The analysis is drawn very largely from the evidence of the LASI 2 Framework, the LASI 2 Handbook, the changes from the LASI 1 versions of the Framework and Handbook, the text of Sir Michael Wilshaw's speech to the Association of Directors of Children's Services on 11 July 2014, and Ofsted LASI 1 and FSI inspection letters to local authorities. [References 2 to 4 and Annexes 2, 3 and 4]

A total of 13 inspections were undertaken, and inspection letters published, using the LASI 1 Framework and Handbook. In each case inspectors made the overall judgment that local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement were either '*effective*' or '*ineffective*'. Appendix 1 gives the full list of LASI 1 inspections and the judgments – the inspection letters themselves are on the Ofsted website. In two cases LASI 1 re-inspections were undertaken where arrangements were found to be '*ineffective*'. Appendix 1 also includes details of 'Focused School Inspections' ('FSI') where a number of schools in an area were inspected as a group. Annex 3 and Annex 4 (see page 36) set out a detailed analysis of the outcomes of FSI inspections.

As with the previous papers, this paper focuses on '*school quality assurance*' and not '*school improvement*', on which there is already an extensive literature, and for which local

authorities have adopted a wide variety of structural arrangements. For the purposes of this and the previous paper, '*school quality assurance*' is taken as shorthand for the activities necessary to enable the local authority to judge the performance of all state-funded schools, including maintained schools and academies, and to ensure that any necessary '*school improvement*' action is undertaken in a timely and effective way. This '*school improvement*' action might be remedial where standards are too low or support for the dissemination of educational excellence.

Inevitably, the processes and model set out in the first paper were developed without consideration for the local arrangements presently in place for school improvement and school quality assurance, and would need to be customised to meet local needs.

The aim of this paper is to support local authorities in developing local arrangements for school quality assurance that are both effective and will meet Ofsted expectations. There are two themes that run through the paper:

- the nature of the evidence of local policy and practice that inspectors will be seeking; and
- the data and other information that local authorities use to make judgments about schools and academies.

With respect to academies, the LASI 2 Framework and Handbook state that while local authorities have no statutory intervention role with academies on school quality issues, it is nevertheless important that local authorities work to develop good relationships with academies on these and other matters. In fact, many local authorities have worked to develop and maintain good working relationships with academies on school improvement, as well as other matters where there is a statutory role for local authorities, such as school admissions, special educational needs, and safeguarding. This topic is covered in detail at 'Academies' on page 22. In summary, the LASI 2 Handbook states that where local authority have concerns about academies, they should refer them directly to the relevant Regional Schools Commissioner on behalf of the Department for Education. At best, this is a blunt tool, as concerns can vary from the minor to the catastrophic, and this one-size-fits-all single-step approach is unlikely to result in the positive relationships that would benefit both academies and local authorities.

Three specific areas of focus are emphasised at several points throughout the LASI 2 documentation:

- the effective and targeted use of local authority resources;
- the quality of relationships between the local authority and schools and academies; and
- the effective use of education data by local authorities to support and challenge schools.

Ofsted '*has no fixed view on the configuration of [local authority school improvement] functions but will focus on their impact, strengths and weaknesses.*' (LASI 2 Framework – paragraph 29) However, LASI 2 inspections will now be '*taking account of the way in*

which arrangements to deliver statutory responsibilities are exercised'. (LASI 2 Framework – paragraph 5)

It is therefore important that local policies are clearly referenced against the statutory framework, and particularly Section 13A of the Education Act 1996 (as amended) which sets out the general duty to promote high standards of education.

Section 13A is quoted in full in the LASI 2 Framework, although Section 13 (relating to the duty to contribute to the spiritual, moral, mental and physical development of the community through education) and Section 14 (relating to the duty to provide sufficient schools for an area) also have some relevance. There are also important statutory duties relating to school admissions, to special educational needs, to home-to-school transport, and to safeguarding, for example.

A useful review of local authority activity in this area was commissioned by the Department for Education from the ISOS Partnership carried out during 2013 and early 2014. [Reference 5]. This 'temperature check' was an in-depth review of a sample of 10 local authorities and gives a rich analysis of effective practice. The review gives significant coverage to school-led school improvement, the importance of the effective use of data, and the nature of effective relationships between local authorities, schools, and academies.

In October 2014, the National Audit Office published 'Academies and maintained schools: oversight and intervention', which provides a good overview of the challenges facing the Department for Education, Ofsted and local authorities in monitoring and improving school performance. [Reference 6] Finally, the 'Schools Causing Concern' Statutory Guidance issued in May 2014 is relevant to the work of local authorities with maintained schools. This Guidance is presently being updated. [Reference 7]

I must declare a personal interest in that I have had for many years a particular concern with the strategic use of education data by local authorities to inform school quality assurance and school improvement. As such, I am an adviser to the National Consortium for Examination Results ('NCER'), a community interest company co-owned by local authorities. The NCER operates at scale to make value-for-money data analyses available to local authorities and individual schools. NCER also provides systems for statutory data returns to the DFE.

I have discussed this paper and the thinking behind it with a number of colleagues in different agencies – I am grateful to them all, and I hope they can see their contribution reflected. But the analysis is my own, as are any errors.

John Freeman CBE
25 November 2014

Changes between LASI 1 and LASI 2

The LASI 2 documentation incorporates two fundamental changes from LASI 1:

1. LASI Inspections and Focused School Inspections have been brought together within the LASI 2 Framework and Handbook. The first week of all inspections will involve a number of school inspections, and a telephone survey. The outcomes of these inspections and the survey are part of the evidence for the second week of the inspection, which will be on-site with the local authority.
2. The one word ('*effective*' / '*ineffective*') judgment is being replaced by a narrative judgment setting out strengths and areas for improvement.

There is an apparently-minor but significant change to the criteria used to select local authorities for inspection, in that '**achievement by pupils eligible for the pupil premium**' has been added. A parliamentary answer has emphasised that this is seen as important for the government. [LASI 2 Framework – paragraph 13, page 8, and Reference 8]

Beyond these major changes, there are a series of more minor changes which reflect current organisational arrangements, and a number of drafting changes:

- Regional Schools Commissioners are referred to as being the route through which to communicate any concerns about academies to the Department for Education.
- There are two new mentions of local authorities '*championing educational excellence*'.
- References to '*effectiveness*' have largely been changed to '*quality*', often with a reference to '*strengths and weaknesses*'.
- References to '*judging*' have largely been changed to '*assessing*' or sometimes '*evaluating*'.
- References to '*judgments*' have largely been changed to '*findings*' or '*inspection findings*'.
- References to '*making judgments*' have been changed to '*reaching conclusions*'.

There are also a number of inconsequential changes including changing the order of paragraphs and restructuring, and some minor redrafting. There are a few minor oddities and ambiguities in the drafting, but unless these are germane, they are ignored here. (But see particularly the last bullet point in the LASI Handbook on page 10, which appears to have an unnecessary '*not*'.)

The selection of local authorities for inspection

HMCI may cause a local authority to be inspected, in relation to its support and challenge for schools and other providers, so that they improve, including where one or more of the following apply:

- *where the proportion of children who attend a good or better school, pupil referral unit and/or alternative provision is lower than that found nationally*
- *where there is a higher than average number of schools in an Ofsted formal category of concern and/or there are indicators that progress of such schools is not improving rapidly enough*
- *where there is a higher than average proportion of schools that have not been judged to be good by Ofsted*
- *where attainment levels across the local authority are lower than that found nationally and/or where the trend of improvement is weak*
- *where rates of progress, relative to starting points, are lower than that found nationally and/or where the trend of improvement is weak*
- ***where pupils eligible for the pupil premium achieve less well than pupils not eligible for the pupil premium nationally*** [nb: This is the text as published but it is assumed that the word 'not' is a drafting error.]
- *where the volume of qualifying complaints to Ofsted about schools in a local authority area is a matter of concern*
- *where the Secretary of State requires an inspection of local authority school improvement functions.*

LASI 2 Framework – paragraph 13

With regard to the newly-introduced metric relating to the pupil premium, in a parliamentary answer, the Schools Minister, Lord Nash, made it clear that the government placed a high priority on disadvantaged pupils. He said “*The Minister of State for Schools has met leaders from the nine local authorities that have failed these [LASI] inspections to date. These discussions focused on the attainment of disadvantaged pupils.*”

[Reference 8]

A recent Ofsted email to LGA, ADCS and Solace (17 October 2014) set out the metrics that were used in selecting local authorities for LASI 1 inspections:

1a	<i>Percentage of pupils in primary schools judged good or better</i>
1b	<i>Percentage of pupils in secondary schools judged good or better</i>
2	<i>Percentage of schools judged inadequate at most recent inspection (England average = 3%)</i>
3	<i>Percentage of schools in LA judged 'requires improvement' and inadequate (England average = 20%)</i>
4	<i>Percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above in reading test, writing teacher assessment, and mathematics, KS2 2012/13 (England average 75%)</i>
5	<i>Percentage of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 achieving 5A*-Cs including English and mathematics at GCSE 2012/13 (England average 59%)</i>
6a	<i>Percentage of pupils making at least two levels of progress in reading at KS2, 2013 (England average 88%)</i>
6b	<i>Percentage of pupils making at least two levels of progress in writing at KS2, 2013 (England average 92%)</i>
6c	<i>Percentage of pupils making at least 2 levels of progress in mathematics KS2, 2013 (England average = 88%)</i>
7a	<i>Percentage of pupils at the end of KS4 achieving expected level of progress between KS2 and KS4 English, state funded mainstream schools, 2012/13 (England average = 72%)</i>
7b	<i>Percentage of pupils at the end of KS4 achieving expected level of progress between KS2 and KS4 Maths, state funded mainstream schools, 2012/13 (England average 72%)</i>
8	<i>Estimated percentage of 16-18 year olds NEET 2013</i>
9	<i>Average point score per student achieving all Level 3 qualifications, state funded sector, KS5, 2012/13 (England average 706)</i>

It may be confidently assumed that Ofsted will continue to use these metrics for LASI 2, **with the significant addition of pupil premium metrics for both primary and secondary.**

Inspections may be undertaken where Ofsted has any of the concerns about any of the issues or metrics listed above. It would therefore be prudent for local authorities, as part of their self-evaluation, to maintain a view as to their comparative position with respect to these issues. The proportion of children in an area being educated in a good or better school is published by Ofsted on a quarterly basis, for example, and comparative

performance data are published by Ofsted and the DFE in RAISEonline as well as NCER analyses.

Tables based on all published school inspection reports are published daily for primary and secondary schools at www.watchsted.com. The Watchsted tables include the proportion of schools that are good or better, and the percentage of children attending a school that is good or better. The tables are segmented for primary or secondary, or all schools and pupils.

Information on school performance is published by the Department for Education and Ofsted. The National Consortium for Examination Results (NCER) also provides access to early comparative information on examination and assessment results. These sources of information are outlined at Appendix 6. These data sources can both provide early warning about vulnerability to selection for inspection, and valuable up-to-date information to support school quality assurance and school improvement more generally.

It would also be prudent to assume that Ofsted might '*become aware of other concerns*' [LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 2] through anything from concerted parental complaints, to national media attention over governance issues (such as 'the Trojan Horse'), to large-scale concerns over safeguarding.

Ofsted has previously inspected education functions through 'Focused School Inspections' where there is a concern about a number of schools in an area which are then inspected together. Inspection letters are then sent to the relevant local authority. Some of these inspections gave rise to more general concerns about the local authority and triggered a LASI 1 inspection. The dates of Focused School Inspections are given alongside LASI 1 inspection dates and outcomes at Appendix 1. The outcomes of Focused School Inspections are analysed at Annex 3 and Annex 4.

Pre-inspection evidence

By this point in the process, it is not a matter of persuading Ofsted that an inspection is not needed, as the local authority has already been selected, but rather of ensuring that inspectors arrive on site already knowing the local authority's key positions on education:

The lead inspector must prepare for the inspection by gaining a broad overview of the local authority's recent performance.

Inspectors must use all available evidence to develop an initial overview of the local authority's performance as reflected in the local authority dashboard and local authority RAISEonline. Planning for the inspection should be informed by analysis of:

- *data from the local authority RAISEonline*
- *the previous inspection report (where LAs have been subject to a previous inspection)*
- *issues raised about, or the findings from, the investigation of any qualifying complaints about schools within the local authority catchment area*
- *information from [HMI] monitoring visits of schools that are in a formal Ofsted category of concern or those schools judged to be requiring improvement*
- *information available on the local authority website.*

LASI 2 Handbook – paragraphs 5 and 6

As a matter of general good practice, therefore, local authorities ought to keep under regular review the externally-published information set out above in the form of a self-evaluation, so that when the inspectors arrive the local authority is not surprised by what inspectors already know.

The LASI 2 framework has deleted the reference to '*taking account of any self-evaluation by the local authority*' (LASI 1 Framework – paragraph 4). However, there is a reference to '*a summary of any self-evaluation*' (LASI 2 handbook – paragraph 16)

By far the simplest and most effective way to demonstrate that a local authority knows and understands its schools and academies is through a systematic and transparent process of self-evaluation. A self-evaluation document is therefore useful both to schools and academies, and to Ofsted, in answering the question '*How do you know how well you are doing?*'.

The main datasets listed above are all in the public domain and local authorities should be fully familiar with them, and also with further information about school performance from other sources. Trends over time should also be well understood – for example, trends in

the proportion of pupils attending good or outstanding schools available from www.watchsted.com .

The metrics used by Ofsted to select local authorities for inspection (set out above) should also be well-known to the local authority.

The local authority website is, of course, an important source of information about education and education standards for parents and others in the local community. **For the purposes of inspection, however, the website also enables the local authority to 'set out its stall' for Ofsted and local stakeholders, including schools and academies. The website should be reviewed on a regular basis, perhaps termly or even monthly, and certainly whenever there is a significant change.**

Since both schools and academies will be used by Ofsted to triangulate findings from the local authority, through school inspections and a telephone survey, it would be sensible to ensure that schools and academies are enabled and encouraged to use the local authority website as a matter of routine. Where NCER data products are made available at school level (which NCER recommends), their consistent use should be encouraged as part of the overall framework of school quality assurance and school self-evaluation.

The local authority website should include details of both the school quality assurance and school improvement policy frameworks, the up-to-date local authority self-evaluation, and the most up-to-date performance information from Ofsted, RAISEonline, NCER and elsewhere.

The intention should be to ensure that the website displays a coherent narrative about education in the area, consistent with published performance information, and the policies and activities of the local authority.

An example of the headings that might be used in a school (and academy) quality assurance policy was given in the previous paper and is repeated here (with minor updating) at Appendix 2.

It is important to help inspectors by providing information and evidence in a form that does not require major analysis and which is compatible with the headings in the LASI 2 Framework and Handbook.

The first week of the LASI 2 inspection

LASI 2 inspections now include the previously-separate Focused School Inspections.

The first week of a LASI 2 inspection will include both school inspections and a telephone survey of schools and academies.

School inspections with extra elements

The school inspections will be standard school inspections with the addition of extra elements, not reported as part of the school inspections, relating to '*the quality and impact of the local authority's school improvement arrangements*'. This will involve inspectors asking '*additional questions of headteachers, governors, and local authority officers*' separately to meetings relating to the school inspection. (LASI 2 Framework – paragraph 20)

The schools to be inspected will be notified in the usual way, at around midday on the day before the inspection. Once all the schools have been contacted, the local authority will be notified, up to five days before the start of the main inspection. (LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 13)

Local authority officers supporting Ofsted school inspections should already be well-aware of relevant local authority policies and practice, but once it has become clear that school inspections are part of a LASI 2 inspection, the local authority would be well advised both to brief officers and to collate feedback from each of the school inspections in order to ensure that later discussions with Ofsted inspectors are well-informed.

Telephone survey

The telephone survey will cover a sample of good or outstanding schools '*to ascertain the extent to which they support other schools to improve and the extent to which the local authority facilitates or supports this*', and a sample of 'requires improvement or inadequate' schools '*to explore the extent to which they recognised that their performance was not good or outstanding before they were inspected and how they receive support from the local authority in order to improve*'. A sample of academies will be contacted '*to explore the nature and quality of the local authority's engagement and relationships with them*.' (LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 18)

This provides a clear steer as to the expected contents of local authority school improvement policies and also on relationships with academies.

Local authority notification

The notification of the LASI 2 inspection to the local authority will be by telephone to the DCS or '*the most senior officer available with responsibility for the improvement of schools*'. (LASI 2 Handbook – paragraphs 13 and 14). **This is a very important telephone call in several respects and the DCS or whoever is deputising for this**

purpose should be fully briefed and prepared in advance with a written note as an *aide memoire*.

The conversation is '*an important opportunity to initiate a professional relationship between the lead inspector and the local authority*'. The conversation will focus on practical issues (see below) and should not be used 'to probe ... the local authority's performance'. '*However, inspectors should make clear the reasons why the local authority was selected for inspection*'. (LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 15)

The [practical] purpose of the lead inspector's notification call is to:

- *inform the local authority of the inspection*
- *inform the local authority of the focused inspection activity and the telephone survey of a wider group of schools*
- *make arrangements for the inspection; this includes an invitation to the DCS or their equivalent and/or nominee to participate in main inspection team meetings*
- *make arrangements for discussions with key elected members, senior officers and other staff/partners*
- *make arrangements for a meeting with the lead elected member for education (or similar) and other officials and/or councillors*
- *invite the local authority to share a summary of any self-evaluation, if available, and contextual background on day one of the inspection fieldwork*
- *request that relevant documents [see below] from the local authority are made available as soon as possible from the start of the inspection*
- *provide an opportunity for the local authority to raise any initial questions.*

LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 15

It can be seen from this that it is important that a clear note is kept of the contents of the notification telephone call, as both practical and strategic issues will be covered. The DCS should also immediately ensure that their nominee to participate in main inspection team meetings is identified and fully briefed.

During the notification telephone call, the lead inspector will also ask for standard information to be made available at the start of the on-site inspection in the second week:

[In the course of the notification telephone call] *inspectors should also request that the following information is made available at the start of the on-site inspection of the local authority in week 2:*

- *if available, a summary of any self-evaluation (if not already shared with the lead inspector) regarding arrangements for supporting school improvement and their impact, the current local authority strategic plan for education, including details of partnership arrangements, commissioning, brokerage and any evaluation reports and/or reports to elected members*
- *documentation about how arrangements for monitoring, challenge, intervention and support are provided to maintained schools, including details of the application of statutory obligations and powers*
- *the local authority data sets about school performance and any analysis of it*
- *case study material regarding targeted school improvement work and its impact on maintained schools*
- *school improvement or similar staff list, where relevant, with roles and responsibilities*
- *information regarding strategies used to improve leadership and management in schools and evidence of its impact*
- *information regarding strategies used to improve the standards of governance in maintained schools*
- *evidence to demonstrate how the local authority uses any available funding to effect improvement, particularly how it is focused on areas of greatest need*
- *information about how the local authority seeks to work constructively with academies, and any action taken to alert the Department for Education (DfE) through the Regional School Commissioner where there are concerns about standards or leadership in academies.*

LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 16

All of this evidence should be kept up-to-date and most of it made available on the local authority website as a matter of routine, and where not made public, the schools or academies concerned should be aware of information relating to them. So, for example, if it happens that a local authority has expressed formal concerns about an academy to the Regional Schools Commissioner, the academy should have been informed that this is happening. (See ‘Academies’, page 22)

The policy framework, including the local authority’s strategic plan for education, and the local authority’s school improvement policy, should have been consulted upon with schools and academies. Headteachers, governors and all relevant local authority staff

should be fully familiar with the policy documents, with the general self-evaluation, and, where appropriate, the information about their institution.

The policy framework should include a formal process for informing schools and academies about issues, both positive and negative, with appropriate record keeping, as it is not unknown for headteachers and governors to mis-remember the content of previous conversations during either school inspections or telephone surveys.

Potential escalation procedures for maintained schools set out at Appendix 4 and for academies at Appendix 5. (Again, see 'Academies' at page 22)

The second week of the LASI 2 inspection

[At the start of the on-site inspection] *the lead inspector should meet briefly with the Chief Executive and/or DCS or their equivalents or representatives at the beginning of the inspection to:*

- *introduce team inspectors and other attendees*
- *make arrangements for a longer meeting on day 1 to receive the local authority's contextual briefing and any other relevant matters*
- *confirm arrangements for meetings with representatives of the local authority and schools*
- *confirm arrangements for providing feedback at the end of each day and at the end of the inspection*
- *request information about staff absence and other practical issues*
- *share the outcomes of the focused inspection activity and telephone survey conducted the previous week.*

LASI Handbook – paragraph 21

Clearly the contextual briefing will include key elements of the self-evaluation and policy framework, but it will be broader than this. Again it is important that the whole briefing is internally consistent. There seems little reason not to make this a pre-prepared public document published on the local authority website, though there may be some areas that need to be confidential for several reasons, for example ongoing human resources cases or safeguarding investigations.

As a matter of both courtesy and common sense, it would be wise to ensure that both the Chief Executive and the DCS were present together at the initial meeting and the longer meeting on day 1.

Inspectors must spend as much time as possible gathering and triangulating evidence that will ensure a robust first-hand evidence base against the scope of the inspection in order to arrive at a fair conclusion about the strengths and weaknesses of the local authority's arrangements for supporting school improvement.

LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 23

Inspectors are likely to conduct meetings with a range of people to evaluate the impact of school improvement services on raising the quality of provision within the local authority. These may include:

- *elected Members of the Council, particularly those responsible for education*
- *the Chief Executive*
- *the DCS or their equivalent*
- *the head of school improvement or their equivalent*
- *local authority staff or contracted staff who support school improvement*
- *school improvement data manager(s)*
- *chair/vice chair of the schools' forum*
- *other agencies involved in school improvement, such as National/Local Leaders of Education/training schools and/or other contracted partners*
- *post-16 strategic planning representative*
- *headteachers of maintained schools subject to intervention or intensive support*
- *headteachers of maintained schools subject to local authority monitoring*
- *the headteacher of the virtual school and/or others responsible for this provision*
- *headteachers of academies, including, where applicable, university technical colleges, studio schools and 16-19 academies to determine the effectiveness of relationships, where established*
- *governors*
- *governor support services (or their equivalent) staff*
- *other stakeholders as appropriate.*

LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 30

Inspectors will be seeking explicitly to triangulate evidence gathered from different sources, and will, inevitably, focus on areas of inconsistency, as this is primary evidence of ineffective practice. Therefore every effort should be made, routinely as a matter of course, and in the run-up to and during the inspection itself, to ensure that inconsistency is minimised. This is facilitated by the use of a well-constructed policy framework that is well known to, and understood by, all stakeholders.

It might well be helpful for all potential interviewees to have a pre-briefing, or to be provided with an *aide memoire* of key policies and data, though clearly it would be unhelpful if inspectors came to the view that interviewees were speaking to a pre-prepared script.

Effective communication with schools, academies and colleges (where 16-19 year olds are being educated) is critically important. There should be explicit evidence of consultation with and engagement of schools, academies and colleges as to how the policy is implemented, and how the local authority and schools, academies and colleges are performing. If all this is routine and standard practice, it is much more likely that schools, academies and colleges will give consistent responses.

With regard to how local authorities organise their services and work with schools, the LASI 2 Framework makes a number of important statements that will be tested with schools and academies:

Inspectors are likely to encounter many different ways in which local authorities conduct their statutory functions, including formal contractual partnerships for the delivery of school improvement services. Lead inspectors must gain an overview of how arrangements are made as early as possible and work with the approach that the local authority is taking. Inspectors should evaluate the quality of the arrangements and their impact on improving school performance. Lead inspectors must recognise that local authorities discharge their statutory duties within a context of increasing autonomy of schools.

LASI 2 Handbook – paragraph 5

The use of data

Inspectors should use a range of data to inform the evaluation of a local authority's performance, including that found in the local authority RAISEonline, and examination of the local authority's own data sets where available. No single measure or indicator necessarily determines findings.

The data, including that provided by the local authority, should be used to check the accuracy of the local authority's assessment of school performance, pupils' progress and attainment levels (and to) check the robustness and accuracy of any local authority self-evaluation.

LASI 2 Handbook – paragraphs 27 and 28

The local authority overall data sets, including both national 'official' data sets and datasets derived from NCER and other data, should already have been constructed and checked, and should be fully consistent with the local authority's self-evaluation.

Where there are inconsistencies between 'official' and other datasets, these should be capable of being explained clearly and simply. For example, Watchsted data on the proportion of children attending a good or better school is updated daily while Ofsted data is updated quarterly.

The datasets available through Ofsted, the DFE and NCER systems are outlined at Appendix 6.

The use made of educational performance data features heavily in the LASI 1 letters. A full analysis of these letters has been carried out and is published as Annex 2.

Lessons to be learned from LASI 1 inspections and Focused School Inspections

The single word judgments for all the LASI 1 inspections are given at Appendix 1. A detailed analysis of the published LASI 1 inspection letters reveals a number of common strengths and weaknesses. However, it should be noted that LASI inspections are risk-based and the strengths and weaknesses may not be typical of all local authorities. However, each of the points noted below is evidenced in several LASI 1 inspection letters:

Positive features reported by Ofsted

Every local authority inspected was found to have a clear ambition for its schools to be good and outstanding. However, there was not always a clear alignment of policy and practice with this ambition.

The impact of effective local authority school improvement practice on school Section 5 inspections and school outcomes is starting to emerge but with significant delay.

Negative features reported by Ofsted

There are diverse and inconsistent relationships between local authorities and academies. These relationships are often judged as not productive.

The role of commissioning and the dissemination of good practice, through school networks or otherwise, is not well developed.

Consistency of support and challenge by local authorities is not always effective and the use of formal powers of intervention, and the effectiveness of informal pre-intervention activities, are not consistently well developed

The quality and sufficiency of data and data analysis is generally not well developed.
(See Annex 2)

An analysis of all the Focused School Inspection letters is set out at Annexes 3 and 4 (see page 36).

Academies

Academies are state-funded schools directly contracted to the Secretary of State and local authorities have no statutory intervention role on educational standards. The LASI 2 Framework refers to schools and other providers:

What is the purpose of inspection?

The inspection of a local authority's arrangements for supporting school improvement provides an independent external evaluation of how well it carries out its statutory duties in relation to promoting high standards in schools and among other providers so that children and young people achieve well and fulfil their potential as defined by section 13A of the Education Act 1996. This includes support for schools causing concern as set out in Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006.

LASI 2 Framework – paragraph 1

The LASI 2 Handbook sets out Ofsted's position in more detail:

Local authorities' statutory responsibilities for educational excellence are set out in section 13A of the Education Act 1996. That duty states that a local authority must exercise its education functions with a view to promoting high standards. Local authorities are discharging this duty within the context of increasing autonomy and changing accountability for schools, alongside an expectation that improvement should be led by schools themselves.

*Inspectors should note that local authorities have no specific powers of intervention in relation to academy schools. Local authority powers of intervention as set out under part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 **do not** apply to academy schools, which are state-funded independent schools. In terms of standards in academies, and holding sponsors to account for this, the lead responsibility lies with the Department for Education and the Regional Schools Commissioner.*

Inspectors will evaluate the ways in which the local authority seeks to form relationships and work constructively with academies. However, the form of relationship between academies and local authorities is ultimately for the academies to determine.

Where the local authority has concerns about the performance of an academy, inspectors should explore whether the local authority has, within the confines of its responsibilities, raised these concerns directly with the Department for Education, through the Regional Schools Commissioner.

LASI 2 Handbook – paragraphs 53 to 56

There are internal contradictions, particularly in the third paragraph above, where the local authority is expected to seek to develop productive and positive relationship with academies, but academies can determine the actual form of relationship. It is not clear how Ofsted would judge a poor relationship where there is evidence that local authority approaches to an academy have been rebuffed.

It is widely accepted (see the case studies in Reference 5, for example) that it is desirable to develop an effective working relationship between academies and local authorities that respects their respective roles, and in particular the fact that local authorities do not have statutory intervention powers on educational standards with academies. Such a relationship would encompass educational excellence, as well as other areas where local authorities have statutory duties with respect to academies and *vice versa*, including school admissions, special educational needs, place planning, and home-to-school transport.

It is therefore in the interests of both academies and local authorities to work to develop such an effective relationship. In this context, the actions set out in the fourth paragraph (a direct reference to the Regional Schools Commissioner and, through them, the Department for Education where a local authority has '*concerns about academy performance*') are unlikely to promote a positive relationship. It is for this reason that the possible escalation procedure set out at Appendix 5 is being proposed. The details are less important than the proposition that the starting point should be a professional discussion between the relevant senior officer of the local authority and the academy headteacher, building on an effective working relationship and founded in an agreed framework of policy and practice. It should only be if or when such an approach is rebuffed, or fails to have the desired effect, that the Regional Schools Commissioner and the Department need to be involved. However, it would be sensible to ensure that the policy is the subject of full and open consultation and its implementation is properly and transparently recorded in order to provide evidence of appropriate engagement to LASI inspectors.

Sir Michael Wilshaw touched on these issues in his speech to the Association of Directors of Children's Services in July 2014:

... local authorities can already take action if you're worried about a non-maintained school in your patch. As I reminded MPs this week, you can write to the Department or to the sponsor or, indeed, to me as Chief Inspector. The problem is, far too few of you are doing this. My postbag is not exactly bulging with letters from concerned DCSs, imploring Ofsted to go in and inspect a poorly performing school within their boundaries.

While I'm persuaded that you still have a role to play, I'm less certain that enough local authorities have come to terms with just how fundamentally the nature of their relationship with schools has changed.

There is absolutely no point in councils yearning for a return to some all-controlling relationship with schools – that has already been consigned to history.

But you do have a role. You are still responsible for safeguarding, for special needs

and for school places. You may no longer deliver education directly in many of your local schools but you certainly have an obligation to know how well children are being educated in all of them. As far as child well-being is concerned, the buck stops with you. You hardly need me to remind you of that.

Sir Michael Wilshaw HMCI, to the Association of Directors of Children's Services Conference, 14 July 2014

Sir Michael Wilshaw says that '*his postbag is not exactly bulging with letters from concerned DCSs ...*', but this is **exactly** what would be expected where local relationships are effective and challenging; there is only a need to escalate to the Regional Schools Commissioner, the Department or Ofsted where nothing else proves effective.

However, Sir Michael seems to have an alternative interpretation, that is, the fact that there are few complaints to him about academy performance is evidence of local complacency about poor standards, ignorance of poor academy outcomes, or a lack of willingness to engage with academies on standards issues.

There is even a third possible interpretation, that is, that there are few academies causing concern.

In light of these varied possible interpretations, it is clearly important that local authority quality assurance and school improvement policies deal explicitly with these issues. Local authority self-evaluations should record, academy by academy as well as school by school, what the local authority knows about the academy or school, and what action is being taken, if any, in line with locally-agreed policies.

Appendix 1 – LASI 1 and FSI report dates for local authorities inspected to 16 September 2014

		<u>Focused School Inspections</u>	<u>LASI 1A</u>	<u>LASI 1B</u>
Ineffective				
Effective				
Blackpool Council			7 January 2014	
Bournemouth Borough Council			31 January 2014	
Bristol City Council	6 September 2013			
Coventry City Council	10 April 2013			
Cumbria County Council	10 February 2014			
Derby City Council	19 February 2013			
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council			30 May 2014	
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	27 July 2013			
East Sussex County Council			3 August 2014	
Isle of Wight Council			24 July 2013	8 August 2014
Medway Council	12 September 2013			
Middlesbrough Council			7 March 2014	
Norfolk County Council	13 May 2013		24 July 2013	13 August 2014
North East Lincolnshire Council	12 June 2014			
North Somerset Council	6 June 2014			
Northumberland County Council	26 November 2013			
Peterborough City Council			18 March 2014	
Portsmouth City Council	25 March 2013			
Salford City Council	16 September 2014			
Staffordshire County Council	2 June 2014			
Suffolk County Council	7 November 2013		4 March 2014	
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	10 July 2014			
Thurrock Council	8 April 2014			
Wakefield Metropolitan District Council			6 January 2014	
Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council			8 August 2014	
Wolverhampton City Council	11 September 2014			

Appendix 2

Suggested outline contents of a Local Authority School Quality Assurance Policy

A school quality assurance policy will generally need to include the following elements, each of which will need to be determined locally.

1. Statement of purpose, including the statutory basis
2. Statement of the approach taken by the local authority
This statement should include explicit reference to :
 - the role of schools in leading improvement within a framework of accountability, and
 - how the local authority allocates and uses resources to effect improvement and in particular how resources are focused on areas of greatest need.
3. Details of consultation on the Policy
4. The agreed evidence base, including sources of data
5. The agreed process for reaching an agreement with schools, including timescales
6. The agreed process for escalation where agreement cannot be reached, including timescales, and including statutory escalation procedures such as Warning Notices.
7. Complaints and dispute resolution procedure
8. The agreed basis for publishing quality assurance information
9. The agreed process for local authority scrutiny of quality assurance information
10. The links between the school quality assurance process and the school improvement process
11. Quality assurance procedures for the overall process, involving both internal moderation and validation, and external stakeholder review

Appendix 3

Suggested outline contents of a Local Authority Self-Evaluation

The Local Authority Self-Evaluation should include:

1. An overview of the quality of the educational provision in the area
2. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the local authority's school quality assurance policy (for all schools, including academies)
3. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the local authority's school improvement policy (for maintained schools)
4. An assessment of the use of resources, both personnel and financial, and the extent to which the focus on areas of greatest need is carried through in practice and is proving effective
5. A school-by-school and academy-by-academy assessment of the quality of educational provision, including:
 - an assessment of the capacity of the school or academy both to improve itself and to support others in improvement
 - a summary of any actions taken by the local authority including those set out in the local escalation procedure

The evidence used in the local authority self-evaluation should be drawn from records of formal communications with schools, and up-to-date performance information from Ofsted (inspection reports and the Ofsted Data Dashboard), RAISEonline, the NCER and elsewhere (see Appendix 6).

Appendix 4

Possible escalation procedure – maintained schools

Serious concerns about a maintained school

1. Informal discussion with the headteacher, seeking a rapid response and appropriate action
2. Informal discussion with the governing body, seeking a rapid response and appropriate action
3. Formal written communication with the headteacher, seeking a rapid response and appropriate action
4. Formal written communication with the governing body, seeking a rapid response and appropriate action including information on the next steps of escalation
5. If the headteacher's performance is under question, meetings between the senior responsible local authority officer and the chair of the governing body and then the headteacher to spell out the concerns and to decide any necessary action.
6. Formal warning notice under provisions of the Section 60 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 instructing the school to take the necessary action.
7. Appointment of additional governors, replacement of the governing body by an Interim Executive Board, requiring the governing body to take specified actions, or removal of a delegated budget under Sections 63 to 66 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006. Whichever of these powers is used, the intention must be to ensure that the governing body or Interim Executive Board is able and willing to take the necessary actions with the support of the local authority, including where necessary taking capability proceedings against the headteacher.

Appendix 5

Possible escalation procedure – academies

Serious concerns about an academy

1. Informal discussion with the headteacher, seeking a rapid response and appropriate action
2. Informal discussion with the governing body, and, where appropriate, the sponsor or multi-academy trust, seeking a rapid response and appropriate action
3. Formal written communication with the headteacher, seeking a rapid response and appropriate action
4. Formal written communication with the governing body, and, where appropriate, the sponsor or multi-academy trust seeking a rapid response and appropriate action, including information on the next steps of escalation
5. Formal written communication with the Regional Schools Commissioner, and through them, the Department for Education, as the academy funder, informing the Department of the issues and seeking a response (copied to the academy)
6. Formal written communication with Ofsted, as the regulator, informing them of the issues and seeking a response (copied to the academy)

In the event of an academy not engaging with the local authority's school quality assurance process, steps 1 and 2 may not be practicable, in which case the local authority would need to move directly to the formal steps from step 3 onwards. (While there is no statutory provision for local authorities to intervene in the work of an academy, there is no reason why a local authority should not communicate formally with an academy where the local authority has concerns. Such communications are fully in line with the duty of the local authority under Section 13A of the Education Act 1996, as amended and referenced in the LASI 2 Framework and Handbook (see 'Academies' on page 22 for details).

Appendix 6

Data available to local authorities

Inspectors will consider carefully the way in which the local authority uses data of all sorts to quality assure schools and to provide support and challenge to maintained schools.

Local authorities should know schools serving their area better than Ofsted does, and should be able to provide inspectors with robust evidence for this.

There are several reliable data sources available to local authorities, including commercial offerings. This section covers only those data sources available free and through local authority membership of the National Consortium for Examination Results. The descriptions of each data source are indicative only, and changes to the national curriculum and the examination system will lead to changes in all these systems.

1. Ofsted Data Dashboard

It should be noted that information used in the Ofsted Data Dashboard can be significantly dated. So, for example, the final data for 2013 assessments and examinations was added in April 2014. Local authorities have more up-to-date information available through NCER systems.

The Ofsted Data Dashboard includes the following information at present.

Primary

Percentage of pupils who attained Level 4 or above in the **Key Stage 2 grammar, punctuation and spelling test**, compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Percentage of pupils who attained Level 4 or above in the **Key Stage 2 writing test**, compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Percentage of pupils who attained Level 4 or above in the **Key Stage 2 reading test**, compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Percentage of pupils who attained Level 4 or above in the **Key Stage 2 mathematics test**, compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Percentage of pupils making expected **progress** in **reading** with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average, and with separate information for **disadvantaged pupils**

Percentage of pupils making expected **progress** in **writing** with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average, and with separate information for **disadvantaged pupils**

Percentage of pupils making expected **progress** in **mathematics** with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average, and with separate information for **disadvantaged pupils**

Attendance rate at the school with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Contextual data for the school – size, gender balance, free school meal entitlement, and special needs

Secondary

Percentage of pupils **achieving 5+ A*-C GCSEs including English and mathematics** with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Percentage of pupils **achieving mathematics GCSE A*-C** with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Percentage of pupils **achieving English GCSE A*-C** with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Percentage of pupils making expected **progress** in **English** with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average, and with separate information for **disadvantaged pupils**

Percentage of pupils making expected **progress** in **mathematics GCSE A*-C** with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average, and with separate information for **disadvantaged pupils**

Attendance rate at the school with the trend over three years, and compared by quintile to all schools and similar schools, and the national average

Contextual data for the school – size, gender balance, free school meal entitlement, and special needs

Department for Education RAISEonline

The Department for Education RAISEonline system provides public domain access to a wide range of information about every school, including outcome and contextual data, financial and staffing data, and contextual data. As with the Ofsted Data Dashboard, it must be noted that information can be significantly dated. So the most recent outcome data available in October 2014 was posted in March 2014 from the assessments carried out in the summer of 2013. The workforce data is based on the November 2012 workforce census.

The National Consortium for Examination Results (NCER)

The NCER is a local authority co-owned community interest company with a long history of providing local authorities with performance information and analysis, and of enabling local authorities to make statutory data returns to the Department for Education. NCER is able to operate at national scale, enabling cost-efficient solutions for individual local authorities, as well as highly-secure and reliable online data systems. NCER also brings together a national 'community of interest' to develop expertise and best practice on data analysis.

Over the last year, NCER has been working with the Local Government Association and the Association of Directors of Children's Services to maximise the strategic effectiveness of the available analyses. NCER also invests significantly in developing analyses according to changing national policy imperatives. In order to secure best value for money and maximum flexibility, the NCER operates through contracting with Angel Solutions and RM Data Systems rather than setting up its own dedicated and resourced operation.

The NCER systems include EPAS, mainly for secondary schools, and NEXUS for primary schools. NEXUS includes Perspective Lite, a school-based improvement support tool. All NCER systems are updated in line with policy changes, and thus the description here is largely indicative. Local authority colleagues should approach their local authority NCER representative for more details on the available analyses.

NCER also supports Watchsted (www.watchsted.com) which produces comparative data on school inspections updated on a daily basis, including the proportion of schools or pupils attending a good or outstanding school, a key metric used by Ofsted when assessing the risks of local authority under-performance.

EPAS

The first release of EPAS Key Stage 4 and Key Stage 5 data releases from the July 2004 examinations was on 30 September 2014. On-line reporting and analysis has been enabled using the most up-to-date understanding of the Department for Education methodology. Each Key Stage report included data matched back to the previous Key Stage.

This year, analysis includes both 'best entry' or 'first entry' results taking account of recommendations from the Wolf Review. 'Attainment 8' and 'Progress 8' data will be published on-line as soon as there is sufficient information to support the analysis. The 2014 Key Stage 2, Key Stage 4, and Key Stage 5 EPAS downloadable database are made available from mid-October.

Schools and academies are able to interrogate their own performance data using an online interactive tool to support both their self-evaluation and improvement, and school-led school improvement.

NEXUS

NEXUS is a web-based portal available to all local authorities bringing attainment, census and Ofsted data together with local intelligence into real-time data dashboards using high-quality and easy-to-use infographics. NEXUS gives local authorities an early view of

provisional (but reliable) national and local figures across EYFS, Phonics and Key Stage 1. Local authorities are also able to assess school-level performance, giving much more rapid access to analysis than the Ofsted Data Dashboards.

Perspective Lite, part of NEXUS, provides schools with on-line access to NEXUS data and thus enables local authorities to support school-led school improvement.

Appendix 7

Checklist for local authorities

1. Do you know the proportion of children in your area in each phase attending a good or outstanding school? Do you know the trend of these metrics and the comparable metrics for other local authorities? Are these metrics reported to the Council?
2. Do you have a school quality assurance policy for all schools and academies, and has this been the subject of consultation and agreement, and evaluation? Does this policy give details of escalation of concerns and statutory intervention for maintained schools? Does this policy give escalation procedures for academies? Has this policy been published?
3. Do you have a published self-evaluation of education performance, covering both maintained schools and academies individually, and the local authority as a whole? Does this self-evaluation include an account of the actions you have taken to secure improvement where that is necessary, including action you have taken with academies?
4. Do you have a school improvement policy for maintained schools, and has this been the subject of consultation and agreement, and evaluation? Has this policy been published?
5. Do you regularly review the local authority website from the perspective of an Ofsted inspector, and ensure that it is updated?
6. Have you developed a professional relationship with academies such that there can be an effective professional dialogue on matters including education standards, admissions, special needs, place planning and safeguarding?
7. Have you agreed the datasets that you use to assess education performance, and are these datasets open to schools and academies online, so that they can take a full and informed part in school-led school improvement? Do you know your schools and academies better than Ofsted does?

References

1. John Freeman CBE, 2013
The local authority role in school quality assurance'
www.johnfreemanconsulting.co.uk
2. Ofsted, 2014
'The framework for the inspection of local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement'
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/framework-for-inspection-of-local-authority-arrangements-for-supporting-school-improvement>
3. Ofsted, 2014
'Handbook for the inspection of local authority arrangements for supporting school improvement'
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/handbook-for-inspection-of-local-authority-arrangements-for-supporting-school-improvement>
4. Ofsted, 2014
Association of Directors of Children's Services Annual Conference 2014: Speech by Sir Michael Wilshaw, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector, on 14 July 2014
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/association-of-directors-of-childrens-services-annual-conference-2014-sir-michael-wilshaw-her-majest>
5. ISOS Partnership for the DFE, 2014
The evolving education system in England: a "temperature check"
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/325816/DFE-RR359.pdf
6. The National Audit Office, 2014
Academies and maintained schools: oversight and intervention
<http://www.nao.org.uk/report/academies-and-maintained-schools-oversight-and-intervention/>
7. The Department for Education, 2014
Schools Causing Concern – Statutory Guidance
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/306946/SCC_guidance_May2014_FINAL.pdf
8. Lords' Written Questions, 2014
Disadvantaged Pupils – HL2113
<http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Lords/2014-10-15/HL2113/>

Annexes

Documents available at www.johnfreemanconsulting.co.uk

Annex 1A	May 2013 LASI Framework with changes highlighted
1B	May 2014 LASI Handbook with changes highlighted
1C	November 2014 LASI Framework with changes highlighted
1D	November 2014 LASI Handbook with changes highlighted
Annex 2	Analysis of LASI Inspection Letters – The Use of Data
Annex 3	Analysis of FSI letters by local authority (suitable for printing)
Annex 4	Analysis of FSI letters (suitable for on-screen analysis)