**Chalk Ridge Primary School**

**Governor Evaluation – Record of Visit**

|  |
| --- |
| **Time and date:**  12th December 2019 |
| **People involved:** |
| Staff group consisting of:  1 member of SLT/teacher, 1 Teacher, 1 LSA and 1 Office/Admin  Ian Ross (Governor) |
| **Purpose of visit:** |
| To carry out staff interviews as part of the annual Performance Management (PM) audit. In particular to enable governors to check/validate that the Performance Management process is being correctly, robustly and fairly operated.  In addition it will provide an opportunity to better understand the impact of the process on staff and outcomes, and to identify potential improvements. |
| **Summary of visit:** |
| I met with 4 members of staff as outlined above. This represented a broader cross section than the 2018 audit, including one member of staff with limited service at Chalk Ridge.  The following questions were posed/areas discussed. These are reflected in the summary below, but not necessarily mapped on a one-one basis:   1. Was the process clear and understood? Has it been explained to them? 2. What was their experience of the process? 3. Did they believe that the process was fair and equitable? 4. How did they feel about the targets/objectives set. How has the ability to set their own objectives been received/what has been the impact of this move? 5. What opportunities for CPD were discussed / included and how did the actual development activities match this? 6. What opportunities were provided for regular feedback, review and refinement? 7. To what degree did they consider the process had an impact on their performance and ultimately pupil outcomes? 8. What went well/no so well – what opportunities exist for us to improve the PM process.   Summary of Review Outcomes:   * The 3 staff who had been at school for the whole of the past period felt that the process was clear / understood by them. The new member of staff felt that whilst her objectives and associated performance measures were clear, and the initial objective setting was transparent and fair, with hindsight the whole annual process could have been explained more fully. There was a lot going on during this period however. * For the past period just completed, the objective setting/review processes (termly and annual) were described as a “Professional Discussion” leading to agreement on objectives / targets, with plenty of opportunity for open dialogue. * The objectives covered a range of areas, including targets linked to the School Development Plan, curriculum/subject plans, and pupil/class data. * The targets were generally considered aspirational, but achievable, although one member of staff felt that their targets were very high, not necessarily SMART, and they didn’t meet as many as they had hoped, leading to elements of demotivation. It was not possible to identify that this was a broader issue. * The setting of targets for the 2019-20 academic year was felt to be a step forward, reflecting the fact that staff were able to propose/set their own objectives, reflecting areas of the curriculum, skills and their own class/role needs. This was very well received by teachers and LSA alike. It was felt that this would lead to improved levels of commitment. It was further felt that the revised approach had still resulted in challenging objectives being set. * Teachers and LSA confirmed that they are increasingly aware of the need to be able to demonstrate the link between their performance (generally and for their PM objectives) and outcomes for children. In particular, they believed that the fact that they have been able to set their own objectives would heighten the focus on delivering against them. * The impact on objective setting of INSET visits to other schools was discussed. There were some mixed views on the degree to which the visits and practice discussed/observed had impacted objective setting. This could reflect the nature of the visits to different settings. * Changes to the timing of LSA processes were considered to be positive. It had previously felt somewhat random, with the new approach enabling closure on one year before getting into the next. * The on-going review processes were considered very helpful and supportive, with teachers in particular seeing this as an opportunity to reflect more on their own practice and the impact of their actions. * Discussion regarding CPD concluded that there were sufficient opportunities to discuss and agree CPD requirements, and that there was a good level of support within the school for the needs of individuals, of which internal training, peer reviews and knowledge sharing formed a significant part. One issue raised here was in relation to staff being able to identify additional, individual training requirements/opportunities. The Learning Zone (provided by Hampshire LA I believe) was cited as being the first port of call, and as being poor. All agreed that their PM manager/colleagues could be consulted if/as required should staff identify additional training and/or development needs. * Overall, the performance management process was considered a good experience, having a positive effect on performance, and one that has been further enhanced by the ability of staff to identify their own objectives. It appears to be a robust, well managed, challenging and motivating process. |
| **Student observation points:** |
| N/A |
| **Staff observation points:** |
| N/A |
| **Key points arising:** |
| See above |
| **Questions arising from activities/observation:** |
| There are 2 small items arising for consideration by the Head Teacher as follows:   1. Clarity of annual process in induction/initial PM process 2. Access to information for staff in relation to training opportunities |
| **Possible governor actions arising from visit (include names of relevant governors):** |
| None |
| **Any long term action/evaluation required as a follow up to this visit:** |
| No long term action needed, just annual reviews and items above |
| **IMPACT OF GOVERNORS VISIT** |
| This visit has helped to give the Governing body confidence that the PM policy & process have been implemented in a fair and equitable way, whilst also giving staff the opportunity to express any concerns directly to the Governors. |