



Quality in Study Support and Extended Services

CHAIR'S PACK

Procedure and Documentation for **QiSS** and **QES** Recognitions

September 2011





Preparation for Quality in Study Support (QiSS) and Quality in Extended Schools (QES) Recognition

Contents

	Page No
Guidance for Chairs:	
A Summary of the Role and its Responsibilities	1
EmergEd Recognition	4
Established Recognition	7
Advanced Recognition	11
Structure and Guidelines for Recognition	15
Rules of Behaviour for scrutiny group	17
Chair's Evaluation Report	18
Chair's Advanced Report	19
Revalidation	
Guidelines for Chairing Revalidations	21
EmergEd Revalidation	22
Established Revalidation	23
Advanced Revalidation	24
APPENDIX A - Guidelines for Chairing Advanced Recognition	25

Note: Organisers must ensure that all relevant documents are available for participants at the Recognitions



Guidance for Chairs

A Summary of the Role and its Responsibilities

Purposes

The rationale for Recognitions is to facilitate the claim(s) for quality recognition through focussed reflection on practice, based on a system of peer scrutiny. The guidelines and structure are intended to ensure this happens to best effect and with an emphasis on all participants' learning. The schools/centres/consortia presenting are submitting the results of their own thorough, criteria based self-evaluation to scrutiny by a group of their peers.

It is the Chair's role to ensure that the guidelines and structure are adhered to and the ethos of the Recognition scheme is maintained, that boundaries are observed and that the process is a purposeful, supportive and professional one. The Chair uses the skills of a good Critical Friend in managing the Recognition.

Being eligible to Chair QiSS and QES Recognitions

Recognitions may only be chaired by someone who has successfully completed the QiSS Critical Friend training (currently run as an MA level course through Canterbury Christ Church University) or completed the QiSS Chair's Course.

In addition, before chairing, the following is required:

- Experience of working with schools, centres or consortia as a Critical Friend (CF) and using the appropriate quality assurance framework (*Extending Learning Opportunities: a framework for self evaluation in study support (ELO)* or *Quality Development Framework for Extended Services (QDF)*)
- Having previously acted as a shadow chair at the appropriate level (an opportunity to discuss the role and the process with the Chair of the Recognition should be built into the day)
- Familiarity with the requirements of the recognition process and any current updates

NB: The requirements for QiSS and QES differ, therefore experience of chairing QiSS does not qualify a person to chair QES and vice versa. Experience must be gained for each scheme at each level.

The first time a new QiSS nationally trained Critical Friend chairs a Recognition at each level, another experienced QiSS National Critical Friend is present if at all possible to support the new chair and provide supportive feedback.

The Role and Responsibilities of the Chair

Prior to the Recognition – all levels

Recognitions may now be run either as a visit to the school/centre/consortium or as a meeting, the latter being more likely where more than one school/centre/consortium is submitting for Recognition. There are slight differences in process and procedure when conducting a visit or a meeting (see section on relevant level).

Having agreed to chair a Recognition, the Chair also becomes a Scrutineer and either reads the full Portfolio of Evidence as part of a Recognition visit **or** in advance in the case of a Recognition meeting. In liaison with the school/centre/consortium and/or local organiser, they should ensure that:

1. The chair has received a copy of the CF Endorsement Sheet. This will indicate that:
 - The CF is satisfied that the key indicators at the appropriate level have been addressed
 - The school/centre/consortium is not ready for recognition
 - Additional evidence is required to be submitted at the recognition

If the CF indicates that the school/centre/consortium is not ready for recognition, the chair needs to ensure that the CF has communicated this to the school/centre/consortium. If the CF indicates that additional evidence is required, the Chair needs to ensure that the school/centre/consortium is aware of this.

2. At least 10 days prior to the visit or meeting, the chair receives the appropriate paperwork for the school/centre/consortium and completes clarification sheet(s).

Note: the paperwork and evidence required varies depending on level of **QiSS/QES** sought (see following sections for more detail starting on page 4).

3. If the Chair has any concerns that the evidence may not meet the necessary criteria for the level being sought, they should **immediately contact** the Critical Friend who will feedback to the school/centre/consortium and outline the additional evidence which may be required or points that should be addressed as part of the Professional Discussion at the Recognition. If the Chair's concerns are such that they do not believe the school/centre/consortium to be at the necessary stage of development or in a strong enough position to submit at that level, they may advise that it should not go forward at that time. The Chair should inform the CF, the local organiser and the QiSS office of this decision and the reasons behind it. If this does not resolve the chair's concerns, QiSS should be contacted for further advice.

At the Recognition – all levels

At all recognitions the chair will need to ensure that:

- The programme for the visit or meeting runs to time (please see **QiSS** or **QES** pack for organisers of recognition for details)
- The questions asked are appropriate and linked to the criteria at the level of Recognition sought, based on outstanding points for clarification and phrased as questions rather than anecdotes, interpretations or advice. Questions should be directed through the Chair and led by the group that scrutinised the portfolio
- For each level recommendations can only be made by suitably experienced scrutineers *

* Only the required number of recommendations should be completed for each level (see page 4 onwards). Additional scrutineers are welcome to participate and make suggestions for future development but will not be asked to make a recommendation.

Participants and Necessary Experience

Role	Qualification/Experience
Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successfully completed the CCCU Module 1 Critical Friend PG Cert or the QiSS Chair's Course. • Has shadow chaired/chaired at the level being sought for the appropriate scheme (QiSS/QES) • Familiarity with the Recognition process and appropriate quality framework (ELO/QDF)
Peer Scrutineer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has scrutinised/observed at the level sought for the appropriate scheme (QiSS/QES) • Familiarity with the Recognition process and appropriate quality framework (ELO/QDF)
Observer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anyone with an interest in the process ie schools working towards recognition, Local Authority Officers/Educational Professionals who wish to learn more about the process
Critical Friend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A colleague who has worked with a school/centre/consortium seeking recognition and completed a CF Endorsement <p>Note: the CF is welcome to attend the recognition in a supportive capacity but do not take an active part in the Professional Discussion or complete a recommendation in addition to the CF Endorsement</p>

After the Recognition – all levels

The chair will need to ensure that:

- Recommendation Sheets, Suggestions for Future Development Sheets and Clarification Sheets are collected and edited as appropriate, before sending to the QiSS Office along with an attendance list for the day (amended as appropriate) and the Chairs' Evaluation Report
- The school/centre/consortium, the QiSS office and the organiser are informed of the outcome of the Recognition on the next working day following the Recognition

EMERGED RECOGNITION

Prior to the Recognition

At least 2 weeks prior to the visit or meeting, the Chair receives:

- Self-evaluation Document (**QiSS**) or Summary of Evidence (**QES**)
- File of Evidence (meeting only)
- CF Endorsement sheet
- Programme
- Participants list
- Venue details
- Blank clarification sheet

NB: For **visits** the File of Evidence will not be sent to the Chair prior to recognition

During Recognition

The Chair will:

- Introduce themselves and all participants
- Outline the process to be followed including how decisions will be arrived at and communicated
- Scrutinise the evidence, together with observers if applicable.
- Ensure that they and any observers have formulated questions appropriate to the level sought and in line with the ethos of critical friendship
- Conduct a Professional Discussion impartially giving all participants the opportunity to contribute within the time allowed
- Make a recommendation and suggestions for future development, taking into account all the available information (Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence, File of Evidence and Professional Discussion)
- Collect all paperwork including:
 - Clarification Sheets
 - Chair's Recommendations Sheet
 - Suggestions for Future Development (all participants)
 - Participant list amended as appropriate

Required Recommendations

That there is a minimum of **two** Recommendations made per school/centre/consortium. The CF Endorsement will already have been completed in advance, which counts as one of the required recommendations. Observers are welcome to participate in the Professional Discussion and are only expected to make suggestions for future development if they wish.

EmergEd Recommendations

Participants

CF Endorsement (in advance)	=	1
Chair Recommendation	=	1
Total	=	2

Chair
Critical Friend (if present)
Additional Participants/including Observers (if present)

EmergEd Meetings

Where all schools/centres/consortia are seeking recognition at EmergEd level, each recognition needs to be conducted in sequence rather than concurrently as the Chair is the only participant who makes the recommendation for each centre (see organiser's pack for suggested timetable). Critical Friends and Observers from other centres are welcome to participate in each recognition, contribute to the Professional Discussion and complete suggestions for future development.

If during the meeting some schools/centres/consortia are seeking recognition at Established level, a scrutiny group needs to be convened (see Established section) and can be led by an experienced scrutineer at the Chair's discretion.

EmergEd Visit

Critical Friends and Observers from other centres are welcome to participate in the recognition, contribute to the Professional Discussion and complete suggestions for future development.

Structure and Timings for EmergEd Recognition

10 mins	Arrival, registration
10 mins	Chair/organiser welcomes participants, introductions are made and the purpose and structure of the Recognition explained. Chair explains participant's roles and Chair checks Clarification Sheets have been completed.
30 mins	Self-evaluation Document(s) and supporting evidence examined by the Chair and participants group. The group is made up of the Chair plus any additional participants. The school/centre/organisation may have their Critical Friend present to support them through the process.
30 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• School/centre/organisation has a professional discussion about their practice with the participants group• Questions and clarification
10 mins	Chair completes the Recommendation Sheet and the Chair and additional participants complete Suggestions for Future Development. Chair collects all completed paperwork
Process is then repeated for other schools/centres/organisations if they are seeking Recognition at the same meeting	

Notes:

- ***In a meeting involving multiple Recognitions, these should be run consecutively, with a suitable break in between.***
- ***Recognitions can be incorporated into wider training sessions e.g. an ELO workshop, Practice-Focused Workshops***

After the Recognition

There are four possible outcomes to the Recognition:

Scrutineers decide either:

	Decision	Action
1.	<p>QiSS and QES</p> <p>The criteria have been met Emerged status and the award should be granted.</p>	<p>The Award is granted and collated examples of good practice and suggestions for future development are forwarded by the QiSS office along with a congratulatory letter and certificate.</p>
2.	<p>QiSS</p> <p>There is an insufficiency of evidence in one or more of the Emerged areas that require evidence (themes 1, 4, 8, 12) (please specify) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional evidence.</p>	<p>Suggestions and comments will be collated and the QiSS office will inform the school/centre/consortium what types of additional evidence/information are required. The school/centre/consortium should then submit the additional evidence/information to the QiSS office within 3 months of the Recognition date. It is read by the chair who is asked to complete a new Recommendation sheet.</p> <p>QiSS - Additional evidence cannot be asked for in themes 2, 3, 6, 7, 9 since evidence is not required for these themes at Emerged level.</p> <p>QES - Additional evidence cannot be asked for in themes 2,3,4,6,7,8 since evidence is not required for these themes at Emerged level.</p>
	<p>QES</p> <p>There is an insufficiency of evidence in one or more of the Emerged areas that require evidence (themes 1, 5, 9, 10) (please specify) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional evidence</p>	
3.	<p>QiSS</p> <p>There is insufficient information in the Self-evaluation Document (themes 1-4, 6-9 or 12) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional information.</p>	<p>QiSS - Additional evidence cannot be asked for in themes 2, 3, 6, 7, 9 since evidence is not required for these themes at Emerged level.</p> <p>QES - Additional evidence cannot be asked for in themes 2,3,4,6,7,8 since evidence is not required for these themes at Emerged level.</p>
	<p>QES</p> <p>There is insufficient information in the Summary of Evidence (themes 1 - 10) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional information.</p>	
4.	<p>QiSS and QES</p> <p>The evidence or information submitted, following opportunities for clarification and discussion, indicates that further development is needed in some Emerged areas (please specify) before Emerged status may be granted.</p>	<p>The school/centre/consortium may resubmit within 6 – 12 months of the Recognition date without re-attending formal Recognition. They should continue to work with a Critical Friend and collect key evidence to demonstrate development over this time. A QiSS Chair will then visit the school/centre/consortium to look at the key evidence, discuss progress and either make a Recommendation that status now be awarded or suggest next steps if the criteria are still not being adequately addressed.</p>

ESTABLISHED RECOGNITION

Prior to the Recognition

At least 2 weeks prior to the visit or meeting, the chair receives:

- Self-evaluation Document (**QiSS**) or Summary of Evidence (**QES**)
- Portfolio (meeting only)
- CF Endorsement sheet
- Programme
- Participant list
- Venue details
- Blank clarification sheet

NB: For **visits** the Portfolio will not be sent to the Chair prior to recognition.

During Recognition

The Chair will:

- Introduce themselves and all participants
- Ask the participants to make a declaration of interest in the school/centre/consortium. If they have a declared interest (eg are a school governor, parent, employee etc) they are not entitled to act as Peer Scrutineers for their own school/centre consortium*
- Outline the process to be followed including how decisions will be arrived at and communicated
- Scrutinise Portfolio together with all participants (Peer Scrutineer and Observers)
- Ensure that participants have formulated questions appropriate to the level sought and in line with the ethos of critical friendship
- Conduct a Professional Discussion impartially giving all participants the opportunity to contribute within the time allowed
- Ensure they and the Peer Scrutineer independently make a recommendation and suggestions for future development, taking into account all the available information (Self-evaluation/Summary of Evidence, Portfolio and Profession Discussion)
- Collect all paperwork including:
 - Clarification Sheets
 - Recommendations Sheets (Chair and Peer Scrutineers)
 - Suggestions for Future Development (all participants)
 - Participant list amended as appropriate

*If this occurs at a meeting, the Chair will need to nominate someone to act as a Peer Scrutineer.

If this occurs at a visit, the Chair should first enquire if any Observers are suitably experienced and willing to take on the role. If no Observers are suitably qualified to act as Peer Scrutineer, the Chair will need to retain the Portfolio, Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence and clarification sheets. The scrutinising of the evidence and Professional Discussion will continue as planned. The Chair will then meet with a member of the QiSS team who will act as the Peer Scrutineer to support them in making a recommendation.

Required Recommendations

The Chair will ensure that there is a minimum of **three** Recommendations made per school/centre/consortium. The CF Endorsement will already have been completed in advance. Observers are welcome to participate in the Professional Discussion and are only expected to make suggestions for future development if they wish.

Established Recommendations

CF Endorsement (in advance)	=	1
Chair Recommendation	=	1
1 Peer Scrutineer Recommendation	=	1
Total	=	3

Participants

Chair
Critical Friend (if present)
1 x Peer Scrutineer
Additional Participants/including Observers (if present)
<i>Meeting only: (Group leader - if Chair in a different group)</i>

After the Recognition

There are four possible outcomes to the Recognition:

Scrutineers decide either:

	Decision	Action
1.	QiSS and QES The criteria have been met Established status and the award should be granted.	The Award is granted and collated examples of good practice and suggestions for future development are forwarded by the QiSS office along with a congratulatory letter and certificate.
2.	QiSS There is an insufficiency of evidence in one or more of the Established areas that require evidence (themes 1 - 13) (please specify) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional evidence.	Suggestions and comments will be collated and the QiSS office will inform the school/centre/consortium what types of additional evidence/information are required. The school/centre/consortium should then submit the additional evidence/information to the QiSS office within 3 months of the Recognition date. The scrutineers are then asked to make a decision as to whether the school/centre/consortium has now met the Established criteria.*
	QES There is an insufficiency of evidence in one or more of the Established areas that require evidence (themes 1 - 12) (please specify) does not need the required standard. The award should be deferred pending the submission of additional evidence.	
3.	QiSS There is insufficient information in the Self-evaluation Document (themes 1 – 13) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional information.	
	QES There is insufficient information in the Summary of Evidence (themes 1 - 12) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional information.	
4.	QiSS and QES The evidence or information submitted, following opportunities for clarification and discussion, indicates that further development is needed in some Established areas (please specify) before Established status may be granted.	The school/centre/consortium may resubmit within 6 – 12 months of the Recognition date without re-attending formal Recognition. They should continue to work with a Critical Friend and collect key evidence to demonstrate development over this time. A QiSS Chair will then visit the school/centre/consortium to look at the key evidence, discuss progress and either make a Recommendation that status now be awarded or suggest next steps if the criteria are still not being adequately addressed.*

***NB:** For schools/centres/consortia submitting at Established level without holding Emerged status, and which are not successful at Recognition, Emerged status may be awarded at the discretion of the Chair, taking into the consideration the views of the scrutiny team. This does not preclude them from also following routes 2, 3, 4 (as appropriate) above, in order to seek Established status.

Established Meetings

Where all schools/centres/consortia are seeking recognition at Established level, the scrutiny group sessions may be run in parallel. If this model is used, the organiser will need to ensure that there is an additional, experienced Peer Scrutineer who can lead one of the groups on behalf of the Chair.

If there is a mix of levels sought during a meeting, the Chair will need to ensure that they scrutinise all the Emerged recognitions.

Critical Friends and Observers from other centres are welcome to participate in each recognition group, contribute to the Professional Discussion and complete suggestions for future development.

Established Visit

A visit will also require a scrutiny group, consisting of a Chair and 1 Peer Scrutineer. Critical Friends and Observers are welcome to participate in the recognition, contribute to the Professional Discussion and complete suggestions for future development.

Structure and Timings for Established Recognition

10 mins	Arrival, registration
10 mins	Chair/organiser welcomes participants, introductions are made and the purpose and structure of the Recognition explained. Completed Clarification Sheets are collected for redistribution to scrutiny groups.
1 hr 30 mins (visit) 1 hr (meeting)	Portfolio(s) of Evidence examined by scrutiny group – the scrutiny group is made up of the Chair and a minimum of one Peer Scrutineer plus observers *. The school/centre/organisation may have their Critical Friend present to support them through the process.
45 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• School/centre/organisation has a professional discussion about their Study Support practice with the scrutiny group• Questions and clarification
10 mins	Participants complete the Recommendation and Suggestions for Future Development Sheet, with Peer Scrutineers only making a Recommendation. All completed sheets are handed to the Chair.
	Process is then repeated for other schools/centres/organisations if they are seeking Recognition at the same time

Note:

Recognition meetings can be incorporated into wider training sessions e.g. an ELO workshop, Practice-Focused Workshops

ADVANCED RECOGNITION

Prior to the Recognition

At least 2 weeks prior to the visit or meeting, the Chair receives:

- Self-evaluation Document (QiSS) or Summary of Evidence (QES)
- Case Study
- CF Endorsement sheet
- Programme
- Participant list
- Venue details
- Blank clarification sheet

During Recognition

The chair will:

- Examine evidence prior to arrival of scrutiny group
- Introduce themselves and all participants
- Ask the participants to make a declaration of interest in the school/centre/consortium. If they have a declared interest (eg are a school governor, parent, employee etc) they are not entitled to act as Peer Scrutineers for their own school/centre consortium*
- Outline the process to be followed including how decisions will be arrived at and communicated
- Scrutinise Portfolio and case study together with all participants (Nominated and Peer Scrutineers and Observers)
- Ensure that participants have formulated questions appropriate to the level sought and in line with the ethos of critical friendship
- Conduct a Professional Discussion impartially giving all participants the opportunity to contribute within the time allowed
- Ensure they and the Scrutineers independently make a recommendation and suggestions for future development, taking into account all the available information (Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence, Portfolio, Case Study and Profession Discussion)
- Collate recommendations and key suggestions for development, which are then fed back to the learning team in a hot de-brief before the close of the recognition
- Collect all paperwork including:
 - Clarification Sheets
 - Recommendations Sheets (Chair, Nominated and Peer Scrutineer)
 - Suggestions for Future Development (all participants)
 - Participant list amended as appropriate

*If this occurs, the Chair should first enquire if any Observers are suitably experienced and willing to take on the role.

If no Observers are suitably qualified to act as Peer Scrutineer, the Chair will need to retain the Portfolio, Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence (and Case Study) and clarification sheets. The scrutinising of the evidence and professional discussion will continue as planned. The Chair will then meet with a member of the QiSS team who will act as the Peer Scrutineer to support them in making a recommendation.

Required Recommendations

That there is a minimum of 4 Recommendations made per school/centre/consortium. The CF Endorsement will already have been completed in advance. Observers are welcome to participate in the Professional Discussion and are only expected to make suggestions for future development if they wish.

Advanced Recommendations

CF Endorsement (in advance)	=	1
Chair Recommendation	=	1
1 Peer Scrutineer	=	1
1 Nominated Scrutineer	=	1
Total	=	4

Participants

Chair
Critical Friend (if present)
1 Peer Scrutineer
1 Nominated Scrutineer
Additional participants including Observers (if present)

Critical Friends and Observers from other centres are welcome to participate in the recognition, contribute to the Professional Discussion and complete suggestions for future development.

After the Recognition

There are four possible outcomes to the Recognition:

Scrutineers decide either:

	Decision	Action
1.	QiSS and QES The criteria have been met Advanced status and the award should be granted.	The Award is granted and collated examples of good practice and suggestions for future development are forwarded by the QiSS office along with a congratulatory letter and certificate.
2.	QiSS There is an insufficiency of evidence in one or more of the Advanced areas that require evidence (themes 12 - 15) (please specify) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional evidence.	Suggestions and comments will be collated and the QiSS office will inform the school/centre/consortium what types of additional evidence/information are required. The school/centre/consortium should then submit the additional evidence/information to the QiSS office within 3 months of the Recognition date. The scrutineers are then asked to make a decision as to whether the school/centre/consortium has now met the Established criteria.*
	QES There is an insufficiency of evidence in one or more of the Established areas that require evidence (themes 13 - 15) (please specify) and/or the Case Study does not need the required standard. The award should be deferred pending the submission of additional evidence and/or development of the Case Study.	
3.	QiSS There is insufficient information in the Self-evaluation Document (themes 1 - 15) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional information.	
	QES There is insufficient information in the Summary of Evidence (themes 1 - 15) and the award should be deferred pending the submission of additional information.	
4.	QiSS and QES The evidence or information submitted, following opportunities for clarification and discussion, indicates that further development is needed in some Advanced areas (please specify) before the award may be granted at Advanced.	The school/centre/consortium may resubmit within 6 – 12 months of the Recognition date without re-attending formal Recognition. They should continue to work with a Critical Friend and collect key evidence to demonstrate development over this time. A QiSS Chair will then visit the school/centre/consortium to look at the key evidence, discuss progress and either make a Recommendation that status now be awarded or suggest next steps if the criteria are still not being adequately addressed.*

***NB:** For schools/centres/consortia submitting at Advanced level which are not successful at Advanced Recognition, Established status may be revalidated at the discretion of the Chair, taking into the consideration the views of the scrutiny team. This does not preclude them from also following routes 2, 3, 4 (as appropriate) above in order to seek Advanced status.

Advanced Recognitions

All Advanced Recognitions are conducted as a visit. This is to give the scrutiny group the opportunity to meet the staff and pupils see facilities including aspects of leading edge practice. Where consortia are seeking Advanced recognition, a decision will need to be made which member of the Consortia will host the Recognition. It may be possible for the scrutiny group to visit more than one site during the course of the Recognition within the time allowed.

Structure and Timings for Advanced Recognition

Chair examines evidence (may be undertaken the day before if more appropriate).	45 mins
Arrival, introductions, roles and responsibilities	15 mins
Scrutiny team examines evidence and identifies points for clarification or further exploration.	60 mins
'Seeing is believing' tour of the school/centre/organisation in small groups accompanied by young people/community members.	30 mins
Input from the school/centre/consortium learning team who will provide exemplars of how the criteria at Advanced level are being met.	45 mins
Questions and clarifications.	20 mins
Final questions/clarification by scrutiny team to nominated staff and the Study Support co-ordinator if appropriate.	10 mins
Scrutiny team withdraws to make decision.	20 mins
Verbal feedback from Chair to learning team.	10 mins
Total time (including Chair's scrutiny)	4 hours 15 mins

Advanced Recognition Chair's Report

In addition to sending the collated paperwork to the QiSS office, the Chair completes a report for QiSS outlining the Aspects of Leading Edge Practice, other strengths and areas for development. This is fed back to the school/centre/consortium and also forms part of a growing record of leading edge practice (see Page 19 for Chair's Report proforma).

NB: for further guidelines for chairing Advanced Recognitions see [Appendix A](#).

For further details and useful paperwork for all levels, including essential paperwork for Recognition please see the [QiSS](#) and/or [QES](#) Recognition Packs. These are available on the QiSS website: www.canterbury.ac.uk/qiss

Structure and Guidelines For Recognition Visits or Meetings

RATIONALE

The structure and guidelines presented here will facilitate the scrutiny of claims for Recognition through focused reflection on practice via peer scrutiny. Peer Scrutineers perform the role of Critical Friends, using the information provided in the Self-evaluation Document (QISS) or Summary of Evidence (QES), Portfolio and Professional Discussion to clarify, question and consider the school/centre/consortium's claim for Recognised status, recording points using the Clarification Sheet.

Each Peer Scrutineer completes a Recommendation Sheet in respect of each school/centre/consortium's claim for Recognition and makes written suggestions for future development. They are also invited to highlight up to 2 examples of good practice. These are passed to the Chair after each question and answer session, which forms part of the professional discussion. The guidelines and structure are intended to inform the process of gaining Recognition for all participants in addition to enabling them to reflect on their own practice. Observers may complete suggestions for future development but are not to make a recommendation.

THE PURPOSE AND THE STRUCTURE

The common task in which participants are engaged is to scrutinise the claim for Recognition at Emerged, Established or Advanced status. The visit or meeting is chaired by a QiSS nationally trained Critical Friend who is not linked to the schools/centres/consortia submitting. Peer Scrutineers are drawn from schools/centres/consortia which have already gained recognised status at the appropriate level or are presenting at the same level at the Recognition or LA officers.

The visit or meeting, following introductions, begins with a scrutiny session.

At a meeting where more than one school/centre/consortium is submitting for Emerged, the recognitions will run consecutively but may involve different observers and critical friends for each recognition conducted during the day. For Established level, recognitions are often held in parallel groups, in which case participants initially divide into groups. Each group scrutinises the Portfolio of Evidence, or part of the Portfolio of Evidence, provided by a school/centre/consortium claiming status at the session.

For a visit at Emerged the Chair and observers scrutinise the evidence but only the Chair makes a recommendation. For Established and Advanced the scrutiny group examines the evidence and the Chair and Scrutineers make recommendations.

Each school/centre/consortium then engages in a Professional Discussion facilitated by the Chair and responds to the clarification questions put forward by the group, which have been collated by the Chair and which will be linked to the criteria in the relevant quality framework (ELO or QDF).

PROFESSIONAL DISCUSSIONS and Question & Answer Sessions

The representative(s) of the school/centre/consortium need to offer aspects of provision and practice for examination and assessment by the members of the group in an open and honest way and be prepared to accept constructive challenge, as part of the process. The group must agree to maintain professional confidentiality about the issues raised during the discussion.

It is the Chair's role to facilitate the discussion which falls into two main sections, the first a general discussion highlighting aspects of practice and the second an opportunity for the scrutiny group to ask outstanding questions. As the school/centre/consortium's representatives talk about their practice some of the Peer Scrutineers and Observers questions are likely to be answered. It is the chair's responsibility to ensure the questions are appropriate and all participants are given the opportunity to ask questions in

the time allowed. The Chair may need to rephrase or withdraw the question if it is not phrased in the appropriate manner or relevant to the level sought. The Chair may also wish to bring in an observer/scrutineer with a particular question at an appropriate point in the conversation. The discussion should be fluid and partly spontaneous but structured around issues and questions raised in the scrutiny session and linked to the Key Indicators for the level of Recognition sought. The following elements should be included:

- An opportunity for representatives to talk about their school/centre/consortium's work and highlight examples of good practice, reflect on developments (and difficulties) and planned future developments. This should be invited by the Chair and supported by appropriate comments and questions.
- An opportunity for members of the scrutiny group to pose any outstanding questions for clarification.

It is the Chair's responsibility to ensure that scrutineers and observers wherever possible are given the opportunity to ask all the questions they wish and that the school/centre/consortium are given the opportunity to fully respond. It is important however that all recognitions are conducted consistently and that the Professional Discussion is completed within the allotted time. It may be necessary for the Chair to move the discussion along to give everyone an equal opportunity.

While schools/centres/consortia are no longer required to give a presentation, some participants may wish to provide handouts or refer to slides or materials as an aide memoire or to provide an additional element of evidence. This should be discussed in advance with the CF and agreed with the Chair. If a school/centre/consortium wishes to give a presentation, the Chair will curtail the discussion to allow for this. They would then facilitate questions after the presentation within the allotted timeframe.

The focus, however, should be on the conversation. Representatives need to have a clear idea of which aspects of the school/centre/consortium's practice best demonstrate that the criteria of the **ELO** or **QDF** are being met. Links with school/centre/consortium purposes and priorities and young people's and/or community learning need to be clearly articulated. A full picture of the work of a school/cluster/centre and its context will not be possible in the allotted time, and therefore the representative(s) need(s) to be selective, getting to the key issues in relation to the school/centre/consortium's stage of development and status being sought.

It is important that professional discussions are kept to time and the Chair should ensure all outstanding questions are asked and draw the discussion to an appropriate close. If the Peer Scrutineers/Observers do not feel comfortable asking questions, the chair should ask them on their behalf.

Finally, the school/centre/consortium's representative is asked to leave the room while the paperwork is completed. For Emerged only the Chair completes a recommendation, for Established and Advanced the Chair and Peer Scrutineers complete Recommendation(s). For all levels all participants may complete Suggestions for Future Development.

It is important that this is undertaken independently and is not a group discussion, however after the scrutineers have made their decision, the Chair may wish to briefly allow discussion of their decisions to assist their development and that of any Observers.

All sheets, including Clarification Sheets are passed to the Chair. For Emerged and Established, the Chair informs the school/centre/consortium of the outcome the next working day unless the recognition takes place on a Friday, in which case the Chair may inform the school/centre/consortium on the day. For Advanced the Chair informs the school/centre/consortium of the outcome on the day and provides a more detailed report which will be forwarded to the school/centre/consortium by QiSS.

*For more information for each level of **QiSS** and **QES** Recognitions, please see previous sections.*

Rules of Behaviour for Members of the Scrutiny Group

- Keep to time boundaries
- No anecdotes:
Focus on the key issues which are not clearly substantiated by evidence in the portfolio.
Points should be constructively critical.
- No chasing of needless details:
that is, you mustn't ask 'Do you open at 3.30 or 3.35?'. The point of this rule is to ensure that the group doesn't fall into the trap of failing to see the wood for the trees. There may well be interesting operational details which can be discussed outside the Peer Scrutiny Session.
- No telling the presenter what they ought to be doing:
The purpose of the Recognition is to scrutinise claims for Recognition through focused reflection on practice.
- Complete forms independently
Recommendations are made by an individual and is not a group discussion (the exception to this is that there is a scrutiny team discussion at Advanced level).

The Chair

Must ensure that

- Clarification Sheets have been completed and participants have read the Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence.
- The guidelines and structure are adhered to according to **QiSS/QES** level sought.
- The composition of the group that examines a portfolio of evidence is made up of participants who are not directly linked to the centre presenting and are suitably experienced
- The Recognition is kept to time
- Recommendation and Suggestions for Future Development sheets are completed and collected at the end of each Recognition
- **The suggestions must be checked and edited appropriately to ensure that they reflect key development priorities and to avoid duplication before sending to the QiSS office**

Group Members Learn

- From hearing the practice of schools/centres/consortia being described in detail
- By taking part in the process of focused reflection on practice, using the appropriate framework (**ELO/QDF**) and Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence
- By examining the evidence provided by a school/cluster/centre to support its claim
- From considering and acting on suggestions for future development.
- By asking clarification questions

CHAIRS' EVALUATION REPORT

For QiSS/QES Recognitions

(To be completed by the Chair and returned to the QiSS Office)

This form will not be forwarded to the school/centre/consortium but will be retained by QiSS for quality assurance purposes.

Name of Chair			
Venue of Recognition		Date of Recognition	
Local Authority			
Moderated by: (if applicable)			

Prior to the Recognition:

Please include comments on adequacy of timescales (for reading evidence etc.), receipt of appropriate paperwork and organisational details.

Critical Friendship

If you have any concerns about the support given by the Critical Friend, please provide details

Recognition Visit or Meeting

Please include comments on the organisation of the visit or meeting, adequacy and comfort of space, the programme, how well scrutiny groups worked and the appropriateness of scrutiny and questioning for the level.

If for any reason procedures were not adhered to, please comment on the circumstances and if, in your opinion, they had any effect on the recognition

Please return completed form to:
Sue Vardy, Quality in Study Support and Extended Services, Hall Place Enterprise Centre
Harbledown, Canterbury, Kent CT2 9AG
email: sue.vardy@canterbury.ac.uk Fax: 01227 863030



Quality in Study Support and Extended Services
ADVANCED CHAIR'S REPORT

Advanced		Advanced Revalidation	
QISS		QES	

Please ✓ as appropriate

Name of School/centre/consortium:	
School/centre/consortium Presenter(s):	
Date of Meeting:	
Venue:	
Chair:	Organisation:
Shadow Chair:	Organisation:
Scrutiny Team:	
Observers:	
Learning Team: *	

* Not required for Revalidation

The following aspects of leading edge practice, other areas of strength and recommendations for development have been identified through the scrutiny process:

ASPECTS OF LEADING EDGE PRACTICE:

(State what these are and how they are exemplified)

OTHER AREAS OF STRENGTH

(Key elements of particular leading aspects and how they are exemplified)

AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT/SUGGESTIONS

Signed: _____

Dated: _____

Name: _____

***Please return to Sue Vardy
Quality in Study Support and Extended Services, Canterbury Christ Church University
Hall Place Enterprise Centre,
Harbledown, Canterbury, Kent CT2 9AG
Fax: 01227 863030***

GUIDELINES FOR CHAIRING REVALIDATIONS

THE REVALIDATION PROCESS

Schools/centres/consortia are awarded **QiSS/QES** at all levels for three years. If, at the end of that time, they have not moved to the next level, they may seek to retain their status for a further three years through Revalidation. At Emerged level, schools/centres/consortia may only revalidate once as it is expected that there will be ongoing development towards Established level.

DIFFERENCES IN CHAIRING APPROACH AND STYLE

There are certain aspects of the Chair's role that are the same as with first time Recognition. For example, the Chair should still ensure that the Recognition requirements are being met, that the appropriate paperwork has been sent out in accordance with the requirements and that the participants understand their roles and the importance of reading the Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence and completing Clarification Sheets. Likewise, at the visit or meeting, it is the Chair who keeps the Recognition to time and ensures the boundaries of the Recognition are kept.

In terms of style, however, the Chair's role is more informal, i.e. engaging in a Critical Friend style conversation with the school/centre/consortium representative/s and encouraging the participation of other scrutineers and observers at appropriate points. The aim of the Revalidation is to ensure the criteria are still being met, to explore how practice has grown and developed, what issues and barriers remain and to help the school/centre/consortium representative consider future developments and next steps, through offering support with challenge.

REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGED AND ESTABLISHED REVALIDATION

Schools/centres/consortia work with a Critical Friend to identify how they still meet the criteria at the respective level, how practice has been maintained and developed and what evidence there is to support this. They complete Revalidation Self-evaluation Documents or Summary of Evidence Document (see Emerged/Established Revalidation Pack), reviewing practice against the sections of the **ELO** Framework or **QDF**. It is recommended that the Critical Friend reads these **four weeks** before the Revalidation and completes an Endorsement Sheet which is copied to the Chair and to the QiSS Office.

A file of evidence demonstrating key updates and areas of development is put together and brought to the Revalidation by the school/centre/consortium. The file should contain only key documentation which demonstrates development (i.e. latest policy/business plan, programme of activities, evaluations and reports etc. to back up the Self-evaluation Documents/Summaries of Evidence). It is only read in advance by the Critical Friend when they complete their Endorsement.

The Self-evaluation Documents/Summaries of Evidence are sent out to participants **10 working days** before the visit/meeting along with the usual paperwork (i.e. programme, list of participants, venue details and Clarification Sheets.)

ORGANISATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE RECOGNITION

Depending on circumstances, the Revalidation may be organised in a number of different ways eg:

- A visit to the school/centre/consortium
- A meeting at an appropriate venue (for example when more than one school/centre/consortium is revalidating)
- As part of the programme of a Recognition day for other schools/centres/consortia submitting for status at a level for the first time

EMERGED REVALIDATION:

Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence

Schools/centres/consortia are required to complete review statements reflecting on their development over the preceding three years and identify key priorities for future development. They are required to reflect on those themes of the quality assurance framework in the original validation.

File of Evidence

Schools/centres/consortia are required to submit **1 piece** (wherever possible) of supporting evidence for those themes of the quality assurance framework in the original validation.

Requirements for QiSS and QES Emerged Revalidation

Process	Review statement	Supporting Evidence
QiSS Themes (ELO)	1-4, 6-9 and 12	1, 4, 8, 12
QES Themes (QDF)	1 – 10	1, 5, 9, 10

The participants at the visit/meeting are:

- The Chair
- The school/centre/consortium's Critical Friend if desired (the CF's attendance is not a requirement)
- Maximum of 2 observers (eg a colleague from another school/centre/consortium revalidating at the same time or wishing to revalidate in the near future) plus the moderator if applicable.

Structure and Timings for Emerged Revalidation

Welcome and introductions	(10 mins)
Participants look through the key evidence, while the school/centre/organisation representative leaves the room and consider what questions they have and points they wish to clarify.	(30 Mins)
The school/centre/organisation representative talks about how practice has developed since QiSS/QES status was first gained (this does not need to be a formal presentation) and all participants ask questions and raise points for clarification. This is built into a structured Professional Discussion, building on questions and responses, around relevant elements of practice.	(up to 40 mins)
The Chair completes their Recommendation and Suggestions for Future Development sheet and observers may complete Suggestions for Future Development Sheet and feedback is given i.e. the school/centre/organisation is told of the outcome and areas of good practice are identified along with possible areas for future development.	(10 mins)
Total time	1 hour 30mins

ESTABLISHED REVALIDATION:

Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence

Schools/centres/consortia are required to complete review statements reflecting on their development over the preceding three years and identify key priorities for future development. They are required to reflect on those themes of the quality assurance framework in the original validation.

File of Evidence

Schools/centres/consortia are required to submit supporting evidence for those themes of the quality assurance framework in the original validation. There should be a **maximum of 3 pieces of evidence per theme** (where possible), cross-referenced as appropriate.

Requirements for QiSS and QES Established Revalidation

Process	Review statement	Supporting Evidence
QiSS Themes (ELO)	1- 13	1 - 13
QES Themes (QDF)	1 – 12	1 - 12

The participants at the visit/meeting are:

- The Chair
- The school/centre/consortium's Critical Friend if desired (the CF's attendance is not a requirement)
- Maximum of 2 observers (e.g. colleagues from schools/centres/consortia wishing to revalidate in the near future) plus the moderator if applicable.

Structure and Timings for Established Revalidation

Welcome and introductions	(10 mins)
Participants look through the key evidence, while the school/centre/organisation representative leaves the room and consider what points of clarification and questions they have	(30 Mins)
The school/centre/organisation representative talks about how practice has developed since QiSS/QES status was first gained (this does not need to be a formal presentation) and all participants ask questions and raise points for clarification. This is built into a structured professional discussion, building on questions and responses, around relevant elements of practice	(up to 40 mins)
The Chair completes their Recommendation and Suggestions for Future Development sheets and observers just fill in Suggestions for Future Development Sheet and feedback is given i.e. the school/centre/organisation is told of the outcome and areas of good practice are identified along with possible areas for future development	(10 mins)
Total time	1 hour 30 mins

ADVANCED REVALIDATION:

Self-evaluation Document/Summary of Evidence

Schools/centres/consortia are required to complete review statements reflecting on their development over the preceding three years and identify key priorities for future development. They are required to reflect on those themes of the quality assurance framework in the original validation.

In addition Schools/centres/consortia are required to complete a Reflection on Advanced Activities Record. For revalidation Schools/centres/consortia are expected to evidence some of the activities they have engaged in as an advanced centre and to reflect on what lessons they have learned and been able to share with others. (Please note from September 2010, this has taken the place of a case study).

Please see Advanced Revalidation Packs for more details.

File of Evidence

Schools/centres/consortia are required to submit supporting evidence for those themes of the quality assurance framework in the original validation. There should be a **maximum of 3 pieces of evidence per theme** (where possible), cross-referenced as appropriate.

Requirements for QiSS and QES Advanced Revalidation

Process	Developmental Review	Supporting Evidence
QiSS Themes (ELO)	1-15	12 - 15
QES Themes (QDF)	1-15	13 - 15

The participants at the visit/meeting are:

- The Chair identified by QiSS
- Peer Scrutineer identified by QiSS
- The Critical Friend (attendance is not a requirement but is usual. Whether attending or not the Endorsement Sheet counts as one of the required Recommendations)
- A maximum of two observers who are preparing for Advanced status or Advanced Revalidation

The above will be agreed in consultation with the QiSS Office.

Structure and Timings for Advanced Revalidation

Arrival, introductions, scrutiny team examine recent evidence and complete clarification sheets	45 mins
Questions and points of clarification from Chair and participants	45 mins
Final questions/points of clarification to Extended Services co-ordinator (if required)	15 mins
Chair, Peer Scrutineer and Observers withdraw to discuss decision	15 mins
Verbal feedback from Chair to representative/learning team	15 mins
Total time (including Chair's scrutiny)	2 hours 15 mins

NB: Observers - the Chair, Peer Scrutineer and Critical Friend will need to arrive at a consensus about whether criteria at Advanced level continue to be met. Observers take a full part in the process but do not make a recommendation.

GUIDELINES FOR CHAIRING ADVANCED RECOGNITION

PRE-CONDITIONS TO CHAIRING AT ADVANCED

When a school/centre/consortium seeks Advanced status, QiSS appoints an appropriate Chair. This will be someone who:

- Is a QiSS trained Critical Friend
- Has had extensive experience of Chairing at Emerged and Established levels
- Has had experience of working with schools/centres/consortia at Advanced level (e.g. as a Critical Friend or as a lead co-ordinator taking a school/centre/consortium through Advanced)
- Has Shadow-Chaired an Advanced Recognition visit

NB: The first time a new QiSS nationally trained Critical Friend chairs Advanced, another QiSS nationally trained Critical Friend who has already done so, moderates the process and is present to support and provide feedback to the new Chair.

The Chair will need to check that the requirement for scrutineers on the day is being met. The Chair should also ensure that the programme for the day is workable and provides adequate time for the essential components of the visit. (Please see the Advanced Pack for further details)

THE RECOGNITION VISIT AND SCRUTINY TEAM

Advanced Recognitions are different in several respects to Emerged and Established. They are organised as a site visit and the visiting scrutiny team have an opportunity to see aspects of practice across the site (or sites), talk to a selected learning team and to young people and other stakeholders and consider a range of documentary evidence (please see Advanced Recognition Guidelines in the Advanced pack).

Another key difference is in the make-up of the scrutiny team. This consists of:

- The Chair
- A Peer Scrutineer from another Advanced school/centre/consortium

These two scrutineers complete the Recommendation Sheets at the Recognition. The third recommendation will come from the Critical Friend who has completed an Endorsement Sheet upon visiting the site, meeting with key personnel and reading the evidence base (approximately a month prior to the Recognition visit). The Critical Friend will copy this to the Chair and to the QiSS office. Critical Friends are not required to attend the Recognition visit but they may do so by arrangement with the school/centre/consortium and the Chair (many schools/centres/consortia welcome their Critical Friend's presence on the day).

Up to two observers may attend the Recognition and another QiSS trained Critical Friend may also attend as Shadow Chair in preparation for Chairing at Advanced level themselves.

DIFFERENCES IN CHAIRING APPROACH AND STYLE

In some ways, Chairing at Advanced needs a more flexible approach and therefore relies on the Chair's experience and being confident about what constitutes Advanced practice and about managing a more complex set of evidence.

There is no portfolio reading prior to the day although the Chair has up to an hour to scrutinise the evidence before the rest of the scrutiny team arrive to enable them to direct the attention of the scrutiny team to any aspects of note and if necessary to support a shadow chair. The school/centre/consortium will have sent a Self-evaluation Document (QiSS) or Summary of Evidence (QES) plus a Case Study, along with a Prospectus or Business Plan (or similar document) and the programme and participants' list two weeks prior to the visit to all attendees.

Because the range of evidence is potentially so wide at Advanced and includes the site itself and because there is an opportunity to ask questions of a range of people including senior management staff, the co-ordinator, the learning team, young people, stakeholders and partners, it is not possible to define and allocate specific questions in the same way as in scrutiny sessions at Emerged and Established. Scrutineers should have questions for clarification from their reading of the Self-evaluation Documents or the Summary of Evidence and the documentary evidence displayed on the day but the opportunities to clarify these points will be varied and will occur throughout the day. The Chair therefore needs to ensure there are adequate opportunities for points and questions to be raised and addressed whilst also assuring that the Critical Friend approach to scrutiny is maintained ie support with challenge.

At the end of the Recognition visit, the scrutiny team retires to consider its decision. Each scrutineer makes a Recommendation and both scrutineers and observers offer Suggestions for Further Development. The Chair collates the comments and recommendations and feedback is given to the presentation team immediately following the decision. The Chair informs the school/centre/consortium of the decision and outlines aspects of Advanced Practice as well as suggestions for further development. (If the scrutineers fail to reach a consensus that all of the Advanced Criteria have been met, the Chair should explain clearly what additional evidence or further development is required and what the next steps are. Aspects of Advanced practice should still be highlighted. Please see page 4 for guidance on outcomes)

In addition to sending the collated paperwork to the QiSS office, the Chair completes a report for QiSS outlining the Aspects of Leading Edge Practice, other strengths and areas for development. This is fed back to the school/centre/consortium and also forms part of a growing record of leading edge practice (see Page 18 for Chair's Report Proforma).

ADVANCED REVALIDATION

The standard expected and the process is the same however for revalidation only two recommendations are required (CF in advance and the Chair and Peer Scrutineer on the day). There is no need for a Nominated Scrutineer but Observers are welcome. The CF, Chair and Peer Scrutineer need to satisfy themselves that the school/centre/consortium has maintained provision at advanced levels for all the themes in the ELO or QDF.

In addition there should be evidence of dissemination of advanced practice through the Reflection on Advanced Activities Record undertaken over the last 3 years since their last Advanced validation.

As with Advanced the CF, Chair and Peer Scrutineer scrutinise the available evidence and engage in a professional discussion with representatives of the school/centre/consortium. A tour of the site is not a requirement but may be carried out if time allows.

The QiSS office may be contacted should the Chair have any concerns or queries as to their role or the procedures that should be followed.

Quality in Study Support and Extended Services, Canterbury Christ Church University
Hall Place Enterprise Centre, Harbledown, Canterbury, Kent CT2 9AG
sue.vardy@canterbury.ac.uk Tel No: 01227 863656 Fax: 01227 863030