

Considering a UCL Centre for Holocaust Education Beacon School Quality Mark / re-designation visit?

Step 1: Prior to contacting the Centre to request a Quality Mark /re-designation visit use the checklist below to consider if you are Quality Mark /re-designation ready. If you answer YES to all, then book your Quality Mark visit with n.wetherall@ucl.ac.uk

- Has the Lead Teacher attended 1 day UCL CPD course?
- Has school hosted 1 day UCL CPD course for network/local/regional schools?
- Has the school identified a named member of SLT to support Beacon School Status?
- Did Lead Teacher and member of SLT attend UCL residential?
- Did school submit initial scheme of work?
- Has scheme of work been refined/edited in light of UCL mentor feedback?
- Did school send representative on Poland trip?
- Has scheme of work been shared with at least 5 partner schools?
- Has Beacon School Status been prominently included in the SIP plan and acted upon?
- Has teaching and learning about the Holocaust been observed by UCL?
- Has a SWOT analysis been provided by either Lead Teacher, SLT or both?

Step 2: a) If you answered YES to everything then Lead Teacher and nominated SLT should contact n.wetherall@ucl.ac.uk to express interest in the process and to schedule a visit.

b) If you have answered NO to some of the requirements then these need addressing or clarifying before contacting the Centre for a visit to be scheduled.

Schools will be asked to secure a date that is suitable for the Lead Teacher and their SLT and the UCL reviewer. The date of the visit **must** coincide with the teaching of the Holocaust, to allow a lesson from the scheme of work and it's learning to be seen.

Step 3: Once a visit Quality Mark /re-designation visit has been agreed by Lead Teacher and nominated SLT and a visit scheduled, then collation of necessary documentation should be undertaken.

The school may already have, or will receive a folder prior to the visit – this will include a copy of all documentation, but also allow slots for the Lead Teacher and SLT to insert key documents; like the School Improvement Plan (a prerequisite of Beacon School application), the Scheme of Work plus, any other relevant materials, for example any mapping document of Holocaust Education provision in the school, a few examples of students work, relevant data (*see below 3b*. It would be useful the reviewer to have access to this data prior to the visit, but is not essential).

3a: Electronic copies of the following **MUST** be submitted to the UCL reviewer (***at least a week prior to the visit***)

1. A link to, or copy of your most recent Ofsted reports
2. A link to, or copy of your school improvement plan (SIP) or SEF
3. A link to, or copy of your original Beacon School application
4. A plan of the schedule for the day
5. A link to, or copy of the Holocaust SoW developed, amended as part of your UCL Beacon School year
6. A copy of the SWOT analysis completed by either the Lead Teacher, SLT contact, or both*

* The 1-side A4 SWOT analysis (template available within the Quality Mark /re-designation pack for schools) provides the reviewer with key information regards the schools context and self-evaluation regards UCL Beacon School status and its impact on their school. In addition, the reverse of the SWOT analysis allows for listing of any Holocaust education achievements, events etc. that the school has organised – and opportunity for Lead Teachers to note and identify areas of success, pride and achievement that would be useful in advance for the reviewer to be aware of. The SWOT and listing document can feature in the folder of documents mentioned above. This is the opportunity for Lead Teacher and SLT to reflect on the progress to date and the impact Holocaust Education has made. It is also the chance to champion success, identify strengths and emerging best practice, whilst also acknowledging areas for further development.

3b: Other documentation **MAY** be offered as supporting evidence to the reviewer (either in advance of the visit or available to be seen and discussed during the visit). Such documents may include:

1. Any curriculum mapping document of Holocaust education provision across the school
2. Data analysis: It is essential that some level of objective data is collected and evaluated. Each school will use/present its own pre-determined data in advance of the Quality Mark /re-designation visit for this purpose, but examples may be;
 - Responses / scores from tests or assessment
 - Attitudinal questionnaire responses
 - Pre-post analysis
 - Motivational / attitude to learning / effort scores or grades
 - Student voice responses
 - UCL research contribution to survey /research data (pre and post-tests)
3. Small sample of students work – across range of ability; photocopy for reviewer to take away with them to support and evidence the report. This work will provide evidence of student progression, knowledge and understanding, possibly assessment opportunities, feedback, strategies and pedagogy.

Other forms of documentation may be submitted by the school for consideration in support of the Quality Mark /re-designation. These may be include in the file/folder along with the required documents, or be presented separately.

Step 4: Planning the programme for the 1 day Quality Mark /re-designation visit

A programme for the visit should be put together by the Lead Teacher/SLT and sent to the reviewer at least a week in advance. That programme MUST include the following elements:

1. **Welcome & tour of the school:** At the start of the visit it would be advantageous to briefly meet with both/either Lead Teacher and SLT by way of welcome; a chance for the reviewer and school colleagues to introduce themselves, to be welcomed to the school and a confirmation of the days programme. It would also be advised that the reviewer has a tour of the school – accompanied either by staff or students, to get a feel for the school and its context.
2. **Lesson Observation/Walk:** Some form of learning/lesson observation is also required. The preferred model would be for the reviewer to observe a teacher delivering a part of the scheme of work that had been developed in Holocaust education or inspired by UCL Centre for Holocaust Education, materials, pedagogy or association. The intention is that this is a purely developmental observation (not for the use of Appraisal or Performance Management against the wishes of either the teacher or UCL), and as such the feedback would be based on the observer generating feedback in 3 key areas:
 - A. **Learning** – what key learning could be shared with other schools?
 - B. **Question** – what questions could be asked that may enhance the learning opportunities within the specific context?
 - C. **Feeling** – what were the underpinning feelings of the observers, teachers and students?

(LQF feedback is based on model developed by OLEVI International as part of their Outstanding Teacher Programme)

It would be advantageous in advance of the lesson that the reviewer is given a seating plan with details regards PP, SEND, EAL or other relevant information included. This would provide useful content and context when considering engagement, differentiation, behaviour for learning etc. It would also be useful, though not essential, for the reviewer to be provided a brief lesson plan (no more than an A4 page!) This would be a useful point of reference, but the format of any such lesson plan is not prescribed; the schools usual template would be fine is submitted. Clearly the lesson will be discussed with the Lead Teacher, or colleague observed, and so such a lesson plan is just a guide and supplement to that discussion.

Please note: It may be that in some circumstances observation is not be possible or suitable – this may be discussed in advanced with n.wetherall@ucl.ac.uk in the planning stage.

3. **Meetings:** Conversations and questioning, listening and sharing are key to the review process and thus the following opportunities for discussion or meetings are required within the review schedule –
 - a) A 1:1 meeting with the Lead Teacher (this could be linked to feedback from the lesson observation or be separate, and should include a work scrutiny element of that work collated prior to the visit)
 - b) A 1:1 meeting with the nominated SLT
 - c) A meeting with 6-10 students – mixed ability to discuss their reflections, experiences and insights regards Holocaust education
 - d) Feedback meeting to the colleague observed (if this was not the Lead Teacher)
 - e) A meeting with a small number of teacher colleagues who have undertaken any UCL CPD, or collaborate with the Lead Teacher to embed Holocaust education in other subjects or parts of the curriculum.

The format of the meetings will be very discursive and will primarily focus on identifying to what extent students have been informed, inspired, immersed, compelled, challenged, captivated, engaged, empowered and encouraged, and made more independent, curious and empathetic (see 'ICE' feedback sheet).

A discussion around the scheme of work developed, and the quality of teaching and learning about the Holocaust can also be expected, along with mention of Holocaust educations' contribution to a broad and balanced curriculum, SMSC, innovation pedagogy and practice. Conversations might also reflect on Holocaust Educations contribution to improving behaviour for learning (engaging all learners, effort and active participation), raising attainment, independent and critical thinking. The work scrutiny sample, may illustrate and help inform some of these discussions.

4. **Initial review feedback:** A short meeting should be scheduled for the end of the review visit to debrief the Lead Teacher, nominated SLT and Headteacher/Principal

and offer initial feedback. This is an opportunity to raise any final questions, clarify and emerging issues and the formal feedback report logistics and the reviewer to reflect on their visit and thank the schools for their time and commitment.

**Lunch should be provided by the school and appropriate tea break and review reflection and notes time identified within the day's schedule.*

Step 5: After the visit

Following the Quality Mark /re-designation visit, the school being reviewed will receive a written report. This report will be completed by the reviewer and will report back on the non-negotiables, areas of best practice that could be shared and suggested actions to improve provision and/or outcomes.