



Jan Taylor
Head Teacher
Scotts Primary School
Bonington Road
Hornhurch
RM12 6TH

Trevor Cook
Assistant Director, Education

Children, Adults and Housing
London Borough of Havering
Mercury House, 9th Floor
Mercury Gardens
Romford, Essex
RM1 3DW

Telephone: 01708 433808
e-mail: trevor.cook@havering.gov.uk

Date: 23rd May, 2018

LA SCHOOL CATEGORISATION, 2017-18

Dear Jan,

In accordance with Havering's "Provider Quality Assurance Framework," (which I attach and can be found on the portal), the LA has undertaken a review of all schools and academies following an analysis of their provisional examination results and an assessment of the likely timing of their next Ofsted inspection.

As you will be aware, the LA is committed to working with schools in order to deliver the best education for the young people of Havering. Our categorisation system, as outlined in full in the Framework document (October 2015), is summarised in the appendix attached to this letter.

Considering your most recent Ofsted inspection and on-going discussions with Jacqueline Treacy, your Strategic Lead, we have placed your school in Category 1 ↑ subject to further discussions and evidence from QA Meetings. The Quality Assurance Framework details the levels and nature of support available for each category of provider.

The reasons for this assessment are:

- *the judgements made during the LA Review in January 2018, which noted all sections as outstanding;*
- *leadership at all levels is highly effective as demonstrated by the exceptional achievement of all pupils from their starting points;*
- *the high quality of provision to support pupils' personal development, behaviour and welfare including safeguarding;*
- *the role played by the school in supporting system leadership including providing school to school support for a school requiring improvement.*

May I take this opportunity to thank you for your continued commitment to improving education in Havering and assure you of my commitment to working in partnership with all of Havering's schools and academies and settings, in an open and honest relationship, in order to achieve our joint objective of ensuring that all our children and young people reach their potential and that all of our schools are rated as Good or better by Ofsted.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in grey ink, appearing to read 'T. Cook', written in a cursive style.

Trevor Cook
Assistant Director, Education

cc Susan Sutton, Education Quality and Effectiveness Manager
Grahame Smith, School Improvement Manager
Jacqueline Treacy, Strategic Lead
Chair of Governors

Quality Assurance Framework Summary

Category	Description – if inspected now	Designation	QA Support
1 ↑	The provider would be solidly Outstanding. A system leader, the provider shares its very strong practice and provides significant partnership support to providers that are not yet good or better.	System Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x Quality Assurance Visits
1 =	The provider would be likely to remain Outstanding.	(Potential) System Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x Quality Assurance Visits
1 ↓	The current Outstanding grade would be unlikely to be retained. The provider would be likely to be Good (or lower if specified).	(Possible) Priority Provider (PP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x Quality Assurance Visits Possible Mid-Term Review
2 ↑	The provider would be likely to be Outstanding.	(Potential) System Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x Quality Assurance Visits
2 =	The provider would be likely to remain Good.	Standard Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x Quality Assurance Visits
2 ↓	The current Good grade would be unlikely to be retained. The provider would be likely to be Requires Improvement (or lower if specified).	Priority Provider (PP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality Assurance Visits (as necessary) Action Plan Progress Review Meetings (PRMs) Possible Mid-Term Review
3 ↑	The provider would be likely to be Good or better	Standard Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x Quality Assurance Visits Action Plan Progress Review Meetings (PRMs) Possible Mid-Term Review
3 =	The provider would be likely to remain Requires Improvement, but is taking timely necessary actions.	Priority Provider (PP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality Assurance Visits (as necessary) Action Plan Progress Review Meetings (PRMs) Mid-Term Review
3 ↓	The provider has just been inspected and is beginning its improvement - or the current RI grade would be unlikely to be retained. The provider is not taking timely necessary actions - likely to be SW or SM	Provider Causing Concern (PCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality Assurance Visits (as necessary) Action Plan Progress Review Meetings (PRMs) Urgent Review if not improving
4 ↑	The provider would be likely to be Requires Improvement or better	Provider Causing Concern (PCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality Assurance Visits (as necessary) Action Plan Monitoring Board (MB) Possible Mid-Term Review
4 =	The provider is newly categorised as Serious weaknesses and is taking necessary early steps, or is in Special Measures but is taking necessary steps.	Provider Causing Concern (PCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality Assurance Visits (as necessary) Action Plan Monitoring Board (MB) Possible Mid-Term Review
4 ↓	The provider is newly categorised as Special Measures or the provider would be likely to be Serious Weakness or Special Measures and is not taking the necessary steps.	Provider Causing Concern (PCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality Assurance Visits (as necessary) Action Plan Monitoring Board (MB) Urgent Review if not improving