

1. Check the front page:

- is a summary of the school strengths and AfD
- is unequivocal in explaining judgements, including any J2 statements
- is accurate
- is not contradictory

School strengths:

- identify most significant school strengths
- evaluate the impact of the vision
- are all relevant to church school status
- embrace the school's context and story.

Areas for development:

- link to the IQs
- are strategic, substantial, long-term targets as a Church school
- are listed in order of priority
- cite the J2 criteria where appropriate
- indicate what must improve and why (but not how)
- ensure intended benefit is valid consequence of improvement point
- avoid unreasonable workload on any staff groups.

2. Check the inspection findings:

- tell the evaluative story of the school, fluidly incorporating *all* IQs
- focus on impact with pertinent illustrations as necessary
- keep flourishing and inclusion at the forefront of thinking
- affirm and celebrate a school for its work even where there are shortcomings
- demonstrate that the judgement emerges naturally from the inspection findings
- enable the school to recognise itself and know it has been understood.

Evaluation of the IQs:

- writing addresses and responds to all the questions
- addresses IQs in different degrees of detail according to context and outcomes
- reports on RE in *all* schools under IQ6
- in VA schools, addresses IQ7 in the inspection findings.

Text is well-crafted:

- builds a coherent and substantial argument for the judgement in the context of the school
- balances positive evidence with shortcomings in practice
- expands upon and is consistent with the front page
- captures both the essence and the big picture of the school.

3. Check the writing style

Meets house style requirements:

- ✓ complies with guidance on the template
- ✓ follows the house style
- ✓ adheres to word limits
- ✓ makes minimum use of capitals.

Is structured so that:

- ✓ each paragraph opens with a bold, evaluative statement that gives the reader a clear steer for what is to come
- ✓ each paragraph follows one train of thought e.g. spirituality
- ✓ writing consistently evaluates impact, using description solely for brief and telling illustrations
- ✓ emphasis is on what pupils regularly experience
- ✓ connections between cause and effect are logical and valid.

Uses language that is:

- ✓ straightforward
- ✓ inclusive
- ✓ succinct
- ✓ unambiguous
- ✓ in the present tense
- ✓ in active voice (not passive)
- ✓ in sentences *generally* no more than 20 words.

Avoid:

- ✗ lifting passages from previous reports, always start anew
- ✗ unnecessary words
- ✗ abbreviations.

Avoid:

- ✗ quoting the views of stakeholders, it is the inspector's view that counts
- ✗ speculating and advising

Danger signs:

- ✗ could /would /should /needs to
- ✗ xxx say...

Avoid:

- ✗ masking negatives in advisory language
- ✗ multi-clause sentences
- ✗ jargon

Danger signs:

- ✗ has yet to /is planning to.

4...and finally, check the report before sending it for QAR. It should already read well and reflect all of the above expectations.