



Arolygiaeth Ei Mawrhydi dros Addysg a Hyfforddiant yng Nghymru
Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales

**Report following monitoring
Level of follow-up: Estyn monitoring**

**The Greenhill School
Heywood Lane
Tenby
Pembrokeshire
SA70 8BN**

Date of visit: January 2017

by

**Estyn, Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and
Training in Wales**

© Crown Copyright 2017: This report may be re-used free of charge in any format or medium provided that it is re-used accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the report specified.

The monitoring team

Rob Davies	Reporting Inspector
Lowri Jones	Team Inspector
Alan Edwards	Local authority representative

Outcome of monitoring

The Greenhill School is judged to have made insufficient progress in relation to the recommendations following the core inspection in May 2014.

As a result, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education and Training in Wales is increasing the level of follow-up activity.

In accordance with the Education Act 2005, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector is of the opinion that this school is in need of significant improvement. The school will draw up an action plan which shows how it is going to address the recommendations.

Under the provisions of Section 39 (9) of the Education Act 2005, every annual report to parents prepared by the governing body under Section 30 of the Education Act 2002 must include a statement on the progress made in implementing the action plan.

Estyn inspectors will re-visit the school in about 12 months' time to inspect progress against the recommendations.

Progress since the last inspection

Recommendation 1: Improve standards of pupils' work in lessons

Limited progress in addressing the recommendation

Since the core inspection, new processes have been introduced to focus on monitoring the quality of pupils' work in lessons. Regular reviews of pupils' books take place and these are used to identify shortcomings in pupils' work. However, these book reviews focus too heavily on aspects of assessment, such as whether or not peer or self-assessment is evident. Importantly, they do not evaluate the standards of pupils' work and teachers' planning well enough.

In the sample of books viewed during the monitoring visit there were fewer gaps or evidence of incomplete work noted than at the time of the core inspection. However, the overall the standard of work completed by pupils in the sample is, at best, adequate. In a few subjects, notably in Year 10, standards are weak.

In 2014, performance at key stage 4 in the level 2 threshold including English and mathematics declined noticeably. Subsequently there has been an upward trend of improvement and in 2016 outcomes in this measure are just below the median when compared with those of similar schools. However, overall, too many pupils make less than expected progress in the level 2 threshold including English and mathematics and the average capped point score. This weak progress from key stage 2 is particularly evident for boys and high attaining pupils. Furthermore, in a majority of subjects at GCSE, pupils make poor progress.

Recommendation 2: Improve attendance and reduce exclusions

Limited progress in addressing the recommendation

Since the core inspection the school has focused on improving attendance and reducing exclusions. However, overall these initiatives have not had enough impact in these areas.

The school has implemented a range of appropriate strategies to improve attendance. These include positive rewards, letters to parents and interviews with pupils. These interventions have begun to improve attendance and reduce the number of pupils who are persistently absent. Since the core inspection attendance figures have improved by 1.5 percentage points. However, the school's attendance for 2015-2016 is 1.7 percentage points below modelled outcomes and the school has remained in the bottom 25% of similar schools for the last three years. The school has started to identify and track groups of learners' attendance. However, this work has not impacted sufficiently on the attendance rates of pupils eligible for free school meals, for example.

The school has appropriate processes for recording lateness to lessons and subsequent follow up. As a result, punctuality has generally improved.

Staff and leaders have recently responded well to refining the whole-school behaviour policy. This has resulted in most staff having an improved understanding of procedures and has brought about a more consistent approach to dealing with incidents of poor behaviour. However, it is too early to judge the impact of this development. Pupils spoken to during the visit report that, in a minority of lessons and around the school, a few pupils continue to cause disruption and this hampers the learning of others. The development of the 'behaviour and wellbeing Hub' has suitably reduced the number of recorded behaviour incidents.

The rate of exclusions has reduced since the core inspection. However, it remains high and above the national average.

Recommendation 3: Improve the quality of teaching

Satisfactory progress in addressing the recommendation

Since the core inspection, leaders have introduced a range of strategies to improve the quality of teaching across the school. As a result, teachers observe each other's lessons and discuss the features of good practice more often. However, despite these strategies, the quality of teaching across the school has not impacted sufficiently on pupils' standards in a majority of subjects. In addition, leaders have only recently improved the school's tracking system to identify weak aspects in teaching and learning, such as the quality and completion of pupils' coursework.

In the sample of work seen during the monitoring visit, a majority of teachers plan lessons appropriately, which helps pupils to acquire subject specific knowledge, understanding and skills. However, overall, the work seen in the sample lacks sufficient challenge. This is notable in around half of the books reviewed from key stage 4. In these instances, work planned by teachers does not build sufficiently on pupils' experiences in key stage 3.

A majority of pupils spoken to during the visit noted improvements in the quality of teaching since the core inspection.

Recommendation 4: Reduce the inconsistency in middle leadership across the school to ensure that all middle leaders lead their departments effectively

Satisfactory progress in addressing the recommendation

The school has set out more clearly its expectations of middle leaders since the core inspection. As a result, many middle leaders' ability to lead their departments is developing appropriately. The introduction of faculty and revised line management arrangements provide middle leaders with beneficial support and opportunities to share good practice in aspects of their leadership.

Many middle leaders gather a suitable range of first hand evidence. This includes lesson observation and scrutiny of pupils' work to identify strengths and areas for development appropriately in teaching and learning. However, a minority of middle leaders do not focus well enough on the standards of pupils' work or the progress that pupils make in lessons.

Departmental self-evaluation reports follow a common format and appropriately identify the main strengths and areas for development. However, many departmental self-evaluation reports do not evaluate a suitable range of data and other evidence well enough. For example, they do not make use of findings from lessons and books to evaluate the standards achieved by pupils, or they do not analyse the performance of pupils in different components of qualifications.

Departmental improvement plans link clearly with many of the findings in the departmental self-evaluation reports and reflect the whole-school priorities. However, a minority of department development plans do not identify appropriate actions to improve the quality of teaching and standards. In addition, a minority of improvement targets are not precise enough.

Regular meetings with common agendas and action points enable middle leaders to communicate improvement priorities with the colleagues they line manage. However, in a few cases, actions from line management meetings do not focus sufficiently on raising the standards of teaching and learning across the department.

Recommendation 5: Improve processes to strengthen the accountability of senior and middle leaders

Satisfactory progress in addressing the recommendation

Since the core inspection, the school has strengthened its processes for ensuring that leaders are fully accountable for their work. For example, revised job descriptions now clearly set out the roles and responsibilities of senior and middle leaders. As a result, leaders have an increasingly sound understanding of what is expected of them. In addition, through involving staff in developing new policies and procedures, the school has fostered a culture that is more open and accepting of accountability.

The school has suitable line management arrangements and regular line management meetings provide helpful opportunities to review progress. Senior leaders set common agendas for these meetings and these are appropriately linked to the school's priorities. In many cases, these meetings lead to the identification of agreed actions, which are followed up in subsequent meetings. In a few cases, planned actions are not specific enough and do not have clear criteria or timescales for completion.

Line management meetings enable middle leaders to reflect on many aspects of their roles and responsibilities. However, there is too much variability in the attention given to important areas such as pupil progress and teaching. As a result, senior and middle leaders do not plan strategies early enough to address weak teaching or underperformance by groups of pupils.

The performance management system takes suitable account of findings from lesson observations and pupil voice activities. However, most performance management objectives are too broad or not measurable, or focus too much on the completion of tasks. Consequently, it is not possible to measure progress appropriately against these targets and therefore the system does not hold staff to account effectively enough.

The school has appropriate processes to quality assure the work of senior and middle leaders in holding others to account. These include evaluations by senior leaders of all book scrutiny and lesson observation reports and a recently developing system of paired lesson observations.

The school is beginning to challenge underperformance more robustly.

Recommendation 6: Improve the quality of self-evaluation and improvement planning processes to impact on the standards of pupils' work in class

Limited progress in addressing the recommendation

Since the core inspection, the school has developed consistent processes of self-evaluation. However, overall, the pace of change has been too slow and has had limited impact on key performance indicators at key stage 4.

The whole-school self-evaluation report is a reflective appraisal of current standards. The school's self-evaluation processes include department reviews, lesson observations, thorough reviews of pupils' work, accurate reporting of pupil outcomes and a common format for self-evaluation across the school. These processes are helping to develop greater consistency across the school and are beginning to add greater rigour to the self-evaluation cycle. However, the findings from lesson observations, department reviews and peer reviews of teaching are not drawn together well enough. As a result, the school does not have a clear enough overview of the common features of teaching and learning across the whole school. This limits leaders' ability to plan strategically for improvement. In addition, the school has not appraised the new processes to ensure that there is consistency in applying judgements. As a result, in a few instances, the outcomes of self-evaluation processes vary in quality.

The improvements identified in the school development plan link appropriately to the outcomes of self-evaluation. However, the plan does not prioritise the required improvements well enough. A few of the targets are too general, or lack clear actions and measurable outcomes.

Many departments use a common framework to produce a comprehensive evaluation of annual performance and detailed development plans. In the majority of cases, development plans identify clear targets that link suitable provision to improving pupil outcomes. However, in a minority of important areas, department analysis does not evaluate clearly enough the causes for underperformance. A minority of department development plans do not clearly identify appropriate actions to improve the quality of teaching and standards and a few improvement targets are not sufficiently precise.

Meetings to discuss progress are regular and have common agendas that have a more precise focus on key areas for development. However, in a minority of cases, action points following meetings are either not specific enough or are not revisited and do not result in improvements.

Recommendations

In order to maintain and improve on this progress, the school should continue to sustain the level of progress it has already made, and continue to address all the aspects identified in this report where further progress is required.