



Making Social Care
Better for People

inspection report

Boarding School

Summerhill School

Westward Ho

Leiston

Suffolk

IP16 4HY

25th January 2005

Commission for Social Care Inspection

Launched in April 2004, the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) is the single inspectorate for social care in England.

The Commission combines the work formerly done by the Social Services Inspectorate (SSI), the SSI/Audit Commission Joint Review Team and the National Care Standards Commission.

The role of CSCI is to:

- Promote improvement in social care
- Inspect all social care - for adults and children - in the public, private and voluntary sectors
- Publish annual reports to Parliament on the performance of social care and on the state of the social care market
- Inspect and assess 'Value for Money' of council social services
- Hold performance statistics on social care
- Publish the 'star ratings' for council social services
- Register and inspect services against national standards
- Host the Children's Rights Director role.

Inspection Methods & Findings

SECTION B of this report summarises key findings and evidence from this inspection. The following 4-point scale is used to indicate the extent to which standards have been met or not met by placing the assessed level alongside the phrase "Standard met?"

The 4-point scale ranges from:

- 4 - Standard Exceeded (Commendable)
- 3 - Standard Met (No Shortfalls)
- 2 - Standard Almost Met (Minor Shortfalls)
- 1 - Standard Not Met (Major Shortfalls)

'O' or blank in the 'Standard met?' box denotes standard not assessed on this occasion.

'9' in the 'Standard met?' box denotes standard not applicable.

'X' is used where a percentage value or numerical value is not applicable.

SCHOOL INFORMATION

Name of School

Summerhill School

Address

Westward Ho, Leiston, Suffolk, IP16 4HY

Tel No:

01728 830540

Fax No:

01728 830540

Email Address

Name of Governing body, Person or Authority responsible for the school

Summerhill School

Name of Head

Zoe Readhead

CSCI Classification

Boarding School

Type of school

Boarding School

Date of last boarding welfare inspection

24/05/01

Date of Inspection Visit		25th January 2004	ID Code
Time of Inspection Visit		02:00 pm	
Name of CSCI Inspector	1	Joe Staines	077511
Name of CSCI Inspector	2	Anna Rogers	
Name of CSCI Inspector	3		
Name of CSCI Inspector	4		
Name of Boarding Sector Specialist Inspector (if applicable):			
Name of Lay Assessor (if applicable) Lay assessors are members of the public independent of the CSCI. They accompany inspectors on some inspections and bring a different perspective to the inspection process.			
Was this inspection conducted alongside an ISI or OfSTED inspection as part of a Joint Whole School Inspection?			NO
Name of Establishment Representative at the time of inspection		Zoe Readhead (Principal)	

CONTENTS

Introduction to Report and Inspection

Inspection visits

Brief Description of the school and Boarding Provision

Part A: Summary of Inspection Findings

What the school does well in Boarding Welfare

What the school should do better in Boarding Welfare

Conclusions and overview of findings on Boarding Welfare

Notifications to Local Education Authority or Secretary of State

Implementation of Recommended Actions from last inspection

Recommended Actions from this inspection

Advisory Recommendations from this inspection

Part B: Inspection Methods Used & Findings

Inspection Methods Used

- 1. Welfare Policies and Procedures**
- 2. Organisation and Management**
- 3. Welfare Support to Boarders**
- 4. Staffing**
- 5. Premises**

Part C: Lay Assessor's Summary (where applicable)

Part D: Head's Response

D.1. Comments

D.2. Action Plan Status

D.3. Agreement

INTRODUCTION TO REPORT AND INSPECTION

Boarding schools are subject to inspection by the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) to determine whether the welfare of children (ie those aged under 18) is adequately safeguarded and promoted while they are accommodated by the school.

Inspections assess the extent to which the school is meeting the National Minimum Standards for Boarding Schools, published by the Secretary of State under Section 87C of the Children Act 1989, and other relevant requirements of the Children Act 1989 as amended.

Inspections are carried out by the CSCI, and in most cases the inspection team includes a specialist in boarding provision working, or with experience of working, in the boarding sector. Boarding welfare inspections by CSCI may also be carried out in conjunction with a full inspection of the school by the Independent Schools Inspectorate or OfSTED, so that the two inspections together constitute a Joint Whole School Inspection of the school. In such cases, a joint summary of main findings and recommendations from both inspections will also be available.

This document summarises the inspection findings of the CSCI in respect of Summerhill School.

The report follows the format of the National Minimum Standards and the numbering shown in the report corresponds to that of the standards.

The report will show the following:

- Inspection methods used
- Key findings and evidence
- Overall ratings in relation to the standards
- Recommended Action by the school
- Advisory recommendations on boarding welfare
- Summary of the findings
- Report of the lay assessor (where relevant)
- The Head's response and proposed action plan to address findings

INSPECTION VISITS

Inspections are undertaken in line with the agreed regulatory framework under the Care Standards Act 2000 and the Children Act 1989 as amended, with additional visits as required.

The report represents the inspector's findings from the evidence found at the specified inspection dates.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICES PROVIDED.

Summerhill is an independent school providing boarding and day facilities for pupils between the ages of about 7 and 17 years. It is situated in the small market town of Leiston within walking distance of the town centre. The site extends to about 12 acres and consists of a main house and a number of permanent outbuildings. There are also a number of mobile homes scattered around the campus in which some staff have their quarters. The school has a playing field, a camping area, a small wood and a garden area. The school has its own swimming pool. The driveways are tarmaced throughout the campus and provide smooth, level areas for moving around the campus. The boarding accommodation was provided in 5 areas, separated by age and/or gender, with a houseparent allocated to each, except that for the oldest boarders, who are supported by two identified houseparents, who undertake this role in addition to their other duties in relation to their house.

At the time of the inspection a total of 81 children were on roll, 74 boarders and 7 day children. The school's policy is to resist admitting any child after 12 years old. The school does not cater for 'weekly boarders'. The school makes no guardian arrangements and no lodgings are arranged. Mrs Readhead confirmed that every child goes home during the longer holidays. The school does not close during half term breaks.

The school is now 80 years old and has been in its present position for the majority of that time. The school has an 'alternative' stance to children's education. Founded by A.S.Neill, it strongly adheres to the principle that children should be given the opportunity to decide for themselves how to spend their time at the school. Mrs Readhead, Neill's daughter and the school's current Principal, fiercely guards her father's philosophy. The school has produced a general policy statement, identifying 5 key principles underlying the philosophy of the school. They are:

- 1) To provide choices and opportunities that allow children to develop at their own pace and to follow their own interests.
- 2) To allow children to be free from compulsory or imposed assessment, allowing them to develop their own goals and sense of achievement.
- 3) To allow children to be completely free to play as much as they like.
- 4) To allow children to experience the full range of feelings free from the judgement and intervention of an adult.
- 5) To allow children to live in a community that supports them and that they are responsible for; in which they have the freedom to be themselves, and have the power to change community life, through the democratic process.

The school meetings are used to create, confirm and amend all of the school 'laws', which form the structure of expectations the community has of itself, including all members of the school, regardless of age or position.

PART A SUMMARY OF INSPECTION FINDINGS

WHAT THE SCHOOL DOES WELL IN BOARDING WELFARE

Feedback from older boarders clearly indicated that, whilst the freedom afforded them by the ethos of the school was not always easy, the overall view was that their experiences at Summerhill were helping them to develop into mature, responsible young adults. All of the boarders spoken to stated that they felt happy and safe. The overall reported levels of satisfaction from boarders about life at Summerhill were very high. Examples were seen of genuine involvement by boarders in the day to day life at the school. There was no doubt in the inspector's minds that the boarders were able to contribute fully to all matters affecting them. There were a number of different ways that boarders could be involved in committees and areas of responsibility, the evidence of observations throughout the inspection was that the boarders undertook their tasks with a sense of responsibility, and ensured that younger boarders were supported and involved in the school. The feedback from boarders about bullying was consistently positive, both in terms of the results of the boarders' survey, and in the verbal comments made to inspectors during the inspection. The evidence obtained during the inspection confirmed that bullying levels were low, and boarders of all ages were equally involved with each other in recreational activities. Feedback from parents was generally positive, including comments such as "we would not send our children to any other boarding school in Great-Britain", even if we would get paid for doing so" and, "Both boys are extremely happy at Summerhill and would not even countenance the idea of attending any other boarding school". One negative comment was made, and is referred to below.

WHAT THE SCHOOL SHOULD DO BETTER IN BOARDING WELFARE

The school accepted that it was run in a different way to most schools, and as a result, found alternative ways of achieving some of the outcomes identified in the National Minimum Standards than those used at other schools. Whilst the inspection did confirm that the majority of outcomes were being achieved, and the National Minimum Standards met, there was a need for the school to evidence the ways in which the school addresses areas where it's philosophy does not, or cannot enable it to meet the standards in the way usually expected. The main example of this is in relation to internet access. The principal clearly stated that the measures, restricting access to unsuitable material, used in many schools, would not be accepted by the school through it's democratic process. The principal was of the view that the school's system of self determination and encouraging all children to feel safe enough to speak out about any concerns, offered adequate protection from unsuitable material on the internet, and indeed, there were several laws relating to accessing adult or pornographic material. This is in conjunction with a clear statement in the parents handbook, explaining the school's policy on internet usage, which all parents of boarders have access to. The inspectors were of the view that the school should produce a written risk assessment regarding this issue, determining the potential risks, the measures needed to ensure the risk was minimised, and putting into practice, any resultant safeguards. The inspectors made the school aware that the issues of concern were not wholly centred on access to adult material, but from the potential harm of unregulated access to internet "chatrooms".

Other minor shortfalls identified in this inspection related to the school's written policies which in some cases needed expanding upon, risk assessments in relation to school trips, the recruitment records held by the school, training in food hygiene and health & safety, and some environmental issues. These issues were not felt to be difficult to rectify.

Of the responses received from parents, one particular concern was made, and passed on to the school during the inspection. One parent made it clear that they felt they should be more involved in the school, and were of the view that the school marginalised the views of parents.

CONCLUSIONS AND OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS ON BOARDING WELFARE

The staff and boarders of Summerhill were helpful and open with the inspectors throughout the three days of the inspection. There was clear evidence that the welfare of boarders was being promoted. The philosophy of the school enabled a number of pupils to experience the pressure of responsibility, both in terms of decision making, through the school meetings, and in the undertaking of roles with a variety of responsibilities attached. Older boarders were seen helping, supporting and engaging with younger boarders, and visa versa. The feedback from staff was that the care provided to pupils was good, that communication between the staff team was effective, and that the pupil's needs in terms of welfare were being met. There was no evidence of boarders rejecting, or finding it difficult to adhere to the expectations of the school in terms of behaviour, as they had been involved in deciding upon those expectations. The staff team were well supported by the principal and senior staff, who all had a very "hands on" approach to working at the school. The principal and other members of senior staff were frequently seen engaging in activities and discussions with boarders, and fellow members of staff on a variety of subjects.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS IDENTIFIED FROM THIS INSPECTION

Action Plan: The Head is requested to provide the Commission with an Action Plan, which indicates how Recommended Action are to be addressed. This action plan will be made available on request to the Area Office.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Identified below are the actions recommended on issues addressed in the main body of the report in order to safeguard and promote the welfare of boarders adequately in accordance with the National Minimum Standards for Boarding Schools. The references below are to the relevant Standards. Non-implementation of recommended action can lead to future statutory notification of failure to safeguard and promote welfare.

No	Standard*	Recommended Action	
1	BS5	The school should amend the complaints information provided to parents and boarders, to include the details of the Commission for Social Care Inspection.	July 1 st 2005
2	BS5	The school should produce a means of recording any serious complaints made about the school.	July 1 st 2005
3	BS11	The school should produce a written risk assessment for the use of the internet, and produce a protocol, enabling the school to monitor the sites accessed by pupils via the schools computers.	May 1 st 2005
4	BS15	The school should ensure that records are maintained in boarder's files, of written parental permission for the administration of first aid and appropriate non-prescription medication, or to seek medical, dental or optical treatment when required.	July 1 st 2005
5	BS24	The school should ensure that all staff involved in the preparation of food undertake food hygiene training every 3 years	July 1 st 2005
6	BS29	The school should produce a written risk assessment form, for completion in respect of school trips.	July 1 st 2005
7	BS34	The school should ensure that staff attend ongoing training in areas such as health & safety, to keep up to date with current guidance in this area.	July 1 st 2005
8	BS35	The school should produce guidance for staff who may be suspended, pending investigation of allegations of abuse, detailing the support the school would offer in such a case.	July 1 st 2005

9	BS38	The school should ensure that satisfactory enhanced CRB certificates, are obtained in respect of all staff. Where staff have come directly from abroad, the equivalent clearance should also be sought, or whatever alternative that country can supply, in addition to the UK CRB certificate,	July 1 st 2005
10	BS41	The school should ensure that suitable security measures are in place to prevent unauthorised access by the public to boarding houses.	July 1 st 2005
11	BS44	The school should ensure that toilet doors are fitted with locks which are openable from the outside in an emergency.	July 1 st 2005

ADVISORY RECOMMENDATIONS

Identified below are advisory recommendations on welfare matters addressed in the main body of the report and based on the National Minimum Standards, made for consideration by the school.

No	Refer to Standard*	Recommendation
		None

*Note: You may refer to the relevant standard in the remainder of the report by omitting the 2-letter prefix. E.g. BS10 refers to Standard 10.

PART B**INSPECTION METHODS & FINDINGS**

The following Inspection Methods have been used in the production of this report.

Direct Observation	YES
Pupil guided tour of accommodation	YES
Pupil guided tour of Recreational Areas	YES
Checks with other Organisations and Individuals	
• Social Services	YES
• Fire Service	YES
• Environmental Health	YES
• DfES	YES
• School Doctor	NA
• Independent Person or Counsellor	YES
• Chair of Governors	NA
'Tracking' individual welfare arrangements	YES
Group discussion with boarders	YES
Group interviews with House staff teams	YES
Group discussion with ancillary staff	YES
Group discussion with Gap students	NA
Individual interviews with key staff	YES
Boarders' survey	YES
Meals taken with pupils	YES
Early morning and late evening visits	YES
Invitation to parents to comment	YES
Inspection of policy / practice documents	YES
Inspection of Records	YES
Visit to Sanatorium	YES
Visits to lodgings	NO
Individual interviews with pupil(s)	YES
Date of Inspection	25/01/05
Time of Inspection	14:00
Duration of Inspection (hrs.)	70
Number of Inspector Days spent on site	6

Pre-inspection information and the Head's evaluative statement, provided by the school, have also been taken into account in preparing this report.

SCHOOL INFORMATION:

AGE RANGE OF BOARDING PUPILS FROM

7

 TO

17

NUMBER OF BOARDERS (FULL TIME + WEEKLY) AT TIME OF INSPECTION:

Boys	<table border="1" data-bbox="842 362 938 443"><tr><td>35</td></tr></table>	35
35		
Girls	<table border="1" data-bbox="842 443 938 524"><tr><td>39</td></tr></table>	39
39		
Total	<table border="1" data-bbox="842 546 938 627"><tr><td>74</td></tr></table>	74
74		
Number of separate Boarding Houses	<table border="1" data-bbox="842 627 938 707"><tr><td>4</td></tr></table>	4
4		

The following pages summarise the key findings and evidence from this inspection, together with the CSCI assessment of the extent to which standards have been met. The following 4-point scale is used to indicate the extent to which standards have been met or not met by placing the assessed level alongside the phrase "Standard met?"

The 4-point scale ranges from:

- 4 - Standard Exceeded (Commendable)
- 3 - Standard Met (No Shortfalls)
- 2 - Standard Almost Met (Minor Shortfalls)
- 1 - Standard Not Met (Major Shortfalls)

"0" in the "Standard met" box denotes standard not assessed on this occasion.

"9" in the "Standard met" box denotes standard not applicable.

"X" is used where a percentage value or numerical value is not applicable.

WELFARE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The intended outcomes for the following set of standards are:

- A suitable statement of the school's boarding principles and practice should be available to parents, boarders and staff.
- Boarders are protected from bullying.
- Boarders are protected from abuse.
- Use of discipline with boarders is fair and appropriate.
- Boarders' complaints are appropriately responded to.
- Boarders' health is promoted.
- Safeguarding and promoting boarders' health and welfare are supported by appropriate records.

Standard 1 (1.1 – 1.4)

A suitable statement of the school's boarding principles and practice should be available to parents, boarders and staff.

Key Findings and Evidence

Standard met?

3

This standard was assessed as met. The school have produced a coloured and illustrated brochure entitled "Imagine a School", containing a clear description of the school's philosophy and facilities. The document contains a number of quotes from pupils, describing life at the school. There were also a number of associated documents available to parents, staff and boarders, giving detailed information as set down in 1.2 of this standard.

Standard 2 (2.1 – 2.6)

The school should have an effective policy on countering bullying, which is known to parents, boarders and staff and which is implemented successfully in practice.

Key Findings and Evidence

Standard met?

3

This standard was assessed as met. The school had a clear statement as to how bullying would be responded to, which included being investigated by elected ombudsman, or by the whole community in it's community meetings.

The inspectors observed one of the school meetings, where an issue of potential bullying was raised. The boarders were clearly able to speak freely about what had happened, with no fear of reprisals, and a decision reached by the whole community, as to what the consequences should be.

During boarder discussions, both in formal and informal settings, Boarders stated clearly that they were not bullied, and that all episodes of bullying were dealt with in a much better way than they had experienced previously. One boarder stated that they had been bullied in a previous school, but were not at Summerhill.

Of the boarders surveyed, bullying was not identified as an issue.

PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS REPORTING NEVER OR HARDLY EVER BEING BULLIED

95

%

Standard 3 (3.1 – 3.9)

The school should have, and follow, an appropriate policy on child protection and response to allegations or suspicions of abuse, which is consistent with local Area Child Protection Committee procedures, and is known to staff and, as appropriate, to older boarders in positions of responsibility.

Key Findings and Evidence**Standard met?**

3

This standard was assessed as met. The school had arranged for formal child protection training to take place for all staff in November 2004, provided by local authority child protection training officers. The inspectors spoke with staff that attended. The responses given were consistently positive about the training.

The school has a clear child protection policy, which included all the information identified in the National Minimum Standards, and a copy of the local Area Child Protection Committee procedures. The principal, Zoe Readhead, was the school's nominated child protection liaison officer, and staff were aware of this.

No allegations of abuse had been received by the local authority or the Commission for Social Care Inspection since the last inspection.

Standard 4 (4.1 - 4.7)

The school should have, and follow, a fair and appropriate policy on behaviour, discipline and use of punishments, known to boarders, staff and parents.

Key Findings and Evidence**Standard met?**

3

This standard was assessed as met. The school had a number of opportunities for pupils to take on posts of responsibility, including ombudsman (responsible for acting as advocate in disputes, bringing issues to the community meeting to avoid acting in isolation), beddies officer (responsible for enforcing the "bedtime laws", which had been previously agreed by the whole community at a meeting). During the inspection, inspectors observed the bedtime routine in the younger boarders house, and noted that the beddies officers appeared to take their responsibilities seriously, and positively, ensuring that all the children were accounted for by the agreed time.

The school have a written list of the school "laws" voted on and agreed by the whole community at one of the regular meetings. At the time of the inspection, the laws covered 36 general areas, with detailed specific rules under a variety of themes. The consequences to breaches of the rules were clear, with a clear fining system, and other agreed responses to misdemeanours. All of the fines given were recorded in the minutes of community meetings. All of the boarders spoken to during the inspection stated that they felt the rules were fair. This was backed up by the results of the pupil survey, in which 100% of responses said that punishments were given out fairly.

Standard 5 (5.1 - 5.7) The school should have, and follow, an appropriate policy on responding to complaints from boarders and parents.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	2
This standard was assessed as not fully met. A minor shortfall was identified with the school's complaints procedure. There was a need for the information provided to parents and boarders, to include the details of the Commission for Social Care Inspection, should any complainant wish to access this organisation. There was information available to boarders in the telephone booth about a variety of external agencies, including childline, whom boarders could access if they felt they needed to. However, this needed to be updated to include reference to the Commission for Social Care Inspection, and not the previous welfare inspection agency. There was also a need for the school to develop a means of maintaining a written record, of serious complaints received by the school.		
Number of complaints, if any, received by CSCI about the school during last 12 months:		0

Standard 6 (6.1 - 6.3) The school should have, and follow, an appropriate policy on countering major risks to health, including substance abuse.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The school had clear guidance in the school laws about smoking tobacco. Boarders confirmed in discussion groups, that the science teacher had covered health and sex education, and the issue of alcohol and drug misuse, within the curriculum. The inspectors saw evidence of literature being available in classrooms and recreational areas.		

Standard 7 (7.1 - 7.5) Adequate records should be kept in relation to individual boarders' health and welfare needs and issues.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The files of boarders examined contained information on health and welfare issues.		

ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT

The intended outcomes for the following set of standards are:

- There is clear leadership of boarding in the school.
- Crises affecting boarders' welfare are effectively managed.
- The school's organisation of boarding contributes to boarders' welfare.
- Boarders have access to a range and choice of activities.
- Boarders are enabled to contribute to the operation of boarding in the school.
- The operation of any prefect system safeguards and promotes boarders' welfare.
- Boarders receive personal support from staff.

Standard 8 (8.1 - 8.3)

There should be clear management and leadership of the practice and development of boarding in the school.

Key Findings and Evidence

Standard met?

3

This standard was assessed as met. The school was privately owned, and therefore did not have a board of governors. There was a senior management team, consisting of the principal and senior members of staff. The principal, and some senior members of staff, had been boarders at the school themselves and as such, had immense experience of how the school operated. They were strong defenders of the school's philosophy and culture.

Standard 9 (9.1 - 9.3)

The school should be capable of satisfactorily managing crises affecting boarders' welfare

Key Findings and Evidence

Standard met?

3

This standard was assessed as met. Discussion with the principal confirmed that the school had a clear set of planned responses in the event of a crises affecting boarders welfare. Advice was given that putting the putting the plans down on paper would enhance the system.

Standard 10 (10.1 - 10.5)

The organisation of boarding houses or units should operate satisfactorily and provide appropriate protection and separation of boarders by age and gender.

Key Findings and Evidence

Standard met?

3

This standard was assessed as met. There were individual accommodation areas, separated by the ages of those boarding in them. The quality of the boarding houses was found to be of a similar standard throughout. No adverse comments were made in relation to this standard.

Standard 11 (11.1 - 11.6)

There should be an appropriate range and choice of activities for boarders outside teaching time.

Key Findings and Evidence**Standard met?****2**

This standard was assessed as not fully met. Boarders had responsibility for organising their own free time. There were a number of facilities available to pupils to facilitate undertaking activities. During the inspection, boarders were observed engaging in an activity, pre-arranged and organised by pupils, such as a drawing game, which included participants from a wide age range. All those partaking were equally involved. Older boarders had also arranged their own board game in the “Jazz Café”. A number of other boarders were seen participating in discussions with each other and staff in the staff room. There was a swimming pool at the school, which could only be used in accordance with the rules about supervision, agreed by the whole school at one of the community meetings.

The school had some rules about internet use, regarding the issue of viewing and making screen savers of adult material. However the school had not responded to the issue raised at the last inspection regarding the lack of safeguards for young people using the internet. It was noted by the inspectors that the school had made a clear statement in the information provided to parents of boarders that access to the internet is not restricted at the school. The principal reported that the school had been advised that protective software was easily overridden, and that the system the school had in place, of supervision by each other, and the promotion of individual responsibility was sufficient. Due to the potentially serious nature of this issue, further recommendations have been made that the school produce a written risk assessment for the use of the internet, and a protocol be produced enabling the school to monitor the sites accessed by pupils via the schools computers.

Standard 12 (12.1 - 12.2)

Boarders have opportunity to contribute views to the operation of boarding provision.

Key Findings and Evidence**Standard met?****4**

This standard was assessed as met. The school’s system of community meetings and equal involvement ensured that all boarders, of all ages, had their views listened to and fully respected. There were a number of committees and roles that anyone could be elected to by the whole school, such as end of term committee, health & safety committee, ombudsman, beddies officer, social committee, visitors committee, work fines supervisor, investigation committee, room committee and library committee. The fact that they were listened to, and were able to contribute equally to all aspects of the school was identified as one of the best things about Summerhill by a number of boarders spoken to during the inspection.

Standard 13 (13.1 - 13.7)		
Any prefect system (or equivalent) should give prefects (or equivalent) appropriate specific duties and responsibilities, with adequate staff supervision and measures to counter possible abuses of the role.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	4
This standard was assessed as exceeded. As stated previously in this report, a number of areas of responsibility were available for boarders to undertake, if they chose to. The responses from boarders about these roles was unanimously positive, both from those who undertook the tasks involved, who stated that it was rewarding and a useful part of their own development, and from other boarders, who confirmed that officers did not abuse their position.		

Standard 14 (14.1 - 14.6)		
Each boarder should have one or more members of staff to whom he or she can turn for personal guidance or with a personal problem.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. All boarders who spoke to the inspectors confirmed that every member of staff at the school could be approached equally, if the boarder had a problem they wished to discuss. The school also had an independent person, external to the school, who could be contacted if boarders chose to contact them.		

WELFARE SUPPORT TO BOARDERS

The intended outcomes for the following set of standards are:

- Boarders receive first aid and health care as necessary.
- Boarders are adequately supervised and looked after when ill.
- Boarders are supported in relation to any health or personal problems.
- Boarders do not experience inappropriate discrimination.
- Boarders can maintain private contact with their parents and families.
- Boarders' possessions and money are protected.
- New boarders are introduced to the school's procedures and operation, and are enabled to settle in.
- Boarders' welfare is protected in any appointment of educational guardians by the school.
- Risk assessment and school record keeping contribute to boarders' welfare.
- Boarders receive good quality catering provision.
- Boarders have access to food and drinking water in addition to main meals.
- Boarders are protected from the risk of fire.
- Boarders' welfare is not compromised by unusual or onerous demands.
- The welfare of any children other than the school's pupils is safeguarded and promoted while accommodated by the school.
- Boarders' safety and welfare are protected during high-risk activities.
- Boarders have appropriate access to information and facilities outside the school.

Standard 15 (15.1 - 15.14)

Appropriate first aid and minor illness treatment are available to boarders at all times, with access to medical, dental and optical services as required.

Key Findings and Evidence

Standard met?

2

This standard was assessed as not fully met. The school had access to local GP's of both genders via the local surgery, which was situated close to the school, in Leiston. Detailed records were maintained in individual boarder's files regarding complementary medicines. The school had maintained at least two members of staff on duty who held 1st aid certificates. Discussion with staff and records confirmed that the school had a strict policy of refusing to accept medications brought back by boarders from home, without clear descriptions and records of prescription. No records were present in files of written parental permission for the administration of first aid and appropriate non-prescription medication to boarders, or to seek medical, dental or optical treatment when required, and a recommendation was made in respect of this. The National Minimum Standards also state that the school should secure, and follow, qualified medical or nursing advice in a written protocol on the provision of non-prescription 'household' medicines to boarders. A recommendation was made in respect of this.

Standard 16 (16.1 - 16.3) Boarders who are ill should be regularly checked and adequately looked after by a member of staff, and be able to summon staff assistance readily and rapidly when necessary.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The staff handbook contained a detailed policy on the monitoring of boarders who were unwell. Boarders confirmed that staff were readily available should they need to summon assistance when ill.		

Standard 17 (17.1 - 17.8) Significant health and personal problems of individual boarders should be identified and managed appropriately.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The boarders' files examined contained information about the health and personal problems, where present, of individuals. The staff guidance included protocols for support to sick boarders, the administration of medicines, dealing with cuts and wounds, injuries, personal hygiene problems and infectious diseases.		

Standard 18 (18.1 - 18.6) Within the school, there is no inappropriate discrimination on grounds of gender, disability, race, religion, cultural background, linguistic background, sexual orientation, or academic or sporting ability. These factors are taken into account in the care of boarders, so that care is sensitive to different needs.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The feedback from boarders confirmed that there was no discrimination of any sort at the school. Boarders reported that the variety of cultures represented by the boarder population at the school were all integrated and that the culture of the community was one of acceptance and equality, regardless of cultural background. The boarders who spoke to the inspectors were firm in their belief that any form of discrimination, or bullying, on the grounds of race or culture would not be tolerated, and would almost certainly result in the issue being brought up at one of the community meetings, with strong condemnation and possible sanction for anyone found guilty of perpetrating any such action, be they another boarder or a member of staff.		

Standard 19 (19.1 - 19.6) Boarders are enabled to contact their parents and families in private.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. Boarders had unlimited access to e-mail, and the principal confirmed that a fax was available for use if needed by boarders. The school telephone box is situated in the dining room. The box is reasonably private, and a poster was present, with numbers provided with numbers boarders could phone if they wished to discuss a personal problem with someone from outside the school, including childline. Advice was given that the notice had out of date information on it regarding the inspection body, and needed to be updated to provide the appropriate number for the Commission for Social Care Inspection.		

Standard 20 (20.1 - 20.3) Reasonable protection is provided for boarders' personal possessions and for any boarders' money or valuables looked after by the school.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The tour of boarding houses confirmed there were appropriate lockable spaces for boarders to securely store possessions. Appropriate pocket money records were held in the main school office.		

Standard 21 (21.1 - 21.3) There is an appropriate process of induction and guidance for new boarders.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. Feedback from boarders confirmed that the school had an effective buddy system where established boarders ensured new boarders were supported whilst they adjusted to life as a boarder at the school. The beddies officers were seen paying attention to new boarders as part of their overall responsibility. Ombudsmen also played a significant role in ensuring new, or vulnerable boarders were supported in expressing their opinions at community meetings.		

Standard 22 (22.1 - 22.4) Any guardians appointed by the school should be subject to the same recruitment checks as staff, and their care of pupils should be monitored.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	9
This standard did not apply to this school, as the school appointed no guardians.		

Standard 23 (23.1 - 23.4) The Head, or a senior member of the school's staff, regularly monitors the school's records of risk assessments, punishments, complaints and accidents, to identify any issues requiring action.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The principal, and senior members of staff all lived on or near the school and played a very "hands on" role within the schools day-to-day events. Monitoring of the school records was undertaken on a regular basis.		

Standard 24 (24.1 - 24.8) Meals should be provided to boarders, which are adequate in quantity, quality and choice, and provision is made for special dietary, medical or religious needs.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	2
This standard was assessed as not fully met. All the meals taken by the inspectors with boarders were appealing, nutritious and well received by the pupils. A small minority made negative comments regarding the quantities available at the evening meals, however, other boarders confirmed that additional helpings were available to those who wanted them. The shortfall identified during the inspection related to food hygiene certificates. These needed updating, as some kitchen staff had not undertaken this training for over three years.		

Standard 25 (25.1 - 25.5) Boarders have access to drinking water in both boarding and teaching areas, and to food or the means of preparing food at reasonable times in addition to main meals.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. There were a number of different areas where boarders could prepare snacks and drinks. Drinking water was available in several areas, although the school has identified the provision of a drinking fountain as an area for development.		

Standard 26 (26.1 - 26.5) Boarders and boarding staff should be aware of emergency evacuation procedures from boarding accommodation. The school should comply with recommendations of the Fire Service, and should regularly carry out and record risk assessments in relation to fire, together with fire drills and any routine tests recommended by the Fire Service.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The inspectors discussed fire evacuation procedures with boarders during the tours of the accommodation. On each occasion boarders demonstrated that they were aware of what to do in the event of the fire alarms sounding. Boarders also confirmed that fire drills took place regularly. Records maintained at the school confirmed that drills took place regularly and routine tests took place on all fire safety equipment. A fire had occurred at the school since the last inspection. The principal reported that the fire service had been pleased with the way the school reacted to the incident, where no one had been injured, and evacuation procedures worked well.		

Standard 27 (27.1 - 27.3) Schools where there are unusual or especially onerous demands on boarders ensure that these are appropriate to the boarders concerned and do not unacceptably affect boarders' welfare.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. There was no evidence of any onerous demands or activities undertaken at the school, and boarders confirmed that they were able to choose what activities they take part in.		

Standard 28 (28.1 - 28.2) The welfare of any children accommodated at the school, other than pupils, is protected.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	9
This standard did not apply. The school does not offer any accommodation to any children who are not boarders.		

Standard 29 (29.1 - 29.6)		
Identifiably high-risk activities provided for boarders should be competently supervised and accompanied by adequate and appropriate safety measures.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	2
<p>This standard was assessed as not fully met. The records of risk assessments seen by the inspectors confirmed that the school had risk assessed major outings and trips, and consent forms were seen for pupils undertaking activities and large trips, such as abroad. However, there was a need for regular risk assessments to be made in relation to more routine trips, such as to London on theatre trips. Advice was given to the school to seek guidance from the DfES, or LEA regarding possible standard forms for such trips, ensuring information such as staff ratios, emergency telephone numbers and procedures in the event of someone going missing were consistently recorded, or the school would have to devise their own. A recommendation was made in respect of this.</p>		

Standard 30 (30.1 - 30.5)		
Boarders have access to information about events in the world outside the school, and access to local facilities, which is appropriate to their age.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
<p>This standard was assessed as met. Newspapers were delivered to the school, and all boarders had access to news information, via the internet, on events relating to them individually.</p>		

STAFFING

The intended outcomes for the following set of standards are:

- Boarders are adequately supervised by staff.
- Staff exercise appropriate supervision of boarders leaving the school site.
- Boarders are adequately supervised at night.
- Boarders are looked after by staff with specific boarding duties, with adequate induction and continued training.
- Boarders are looked after by staff following clear boarding policies and practice.
- There are sound relationships between staff and boarders.
- Boarders' personal privacy is respected.
- There is vigorous selection and vetting of all staff and volunteers working with boarders.
- Boarders are protected from unsupervised contact at school with adults who have not been subject to the school's complete recruitment checking procedures and there is supervision of all unchecked visitors to the boarding premises.

Standard 31 (31.1 - 31.7)

The staff supervising boarders outside teaching time should be sufficient in number and deployment for the age, number and needs of boarders, and the locations and activities involved.

Key Findings and Evidence

Standard met?

3

This standard was assessed as met. Duty rota's seen by the inspectors confirmed that there always a minimum of 4 members of staff on duty at any one time. As the majority of boarding staff lived on the site, the reality for boarders was that there were frequently more than this number. Procedures were in place for staff to cover in the event of sickness. Boarders and staff both reported that there were sufficient numbers of staff on duty.

Standard 32 (32.1 - 32.5)

Boarders temporarily away from the school site remain under the overall responsibility of a duty member of staff, and are able to contact a member of staff in an emergency.

Key Findings and Evidence

Standard met?

3

This standard was assessed as met. The laws of the school included strict procedures for boarders of different ages leaving the school site. Normally, this involved at least one older boarder being present, or a member of staff in respect of younger boarders.

Standard 33 (33.1 - 33.5) Staff should be present, and accessible to boarders as necessary, in each boarding house at night.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. Four members of staff slept in boarding houses each night. The only house where staff did not sleep in was restricted to boarders aged over 15 boarders, and two specific members of staff, who slept in buildings adjacent, or close to the accommodation for senior boarders had been identified to boarders as the people to go to if an adult was needed. Boarders reported that this system worked in practice, and any closer level of supervision would not be welcomed.		

Standard 34 (34.1 - 34.7) All staff with boarding duties have job descriptions reflecting those duties, receive induction training in boarding when newly appointed, and receive regular review of their boarding practice, with opportunities for continuing training in boarding.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	2
This standard was assessed as not fully met. It was noted by the inspectors that the unique nature of Summerhill made it difficult for the school to access relevant training in boarding practices, however, there were a number of areas identified by the inspectors, which were common to all boarding provision, such as health & safety, risk assessing, recording and communication issues, which could benefit staff. A recommendation was made that a member of staff should attend ongoing training in areas such as health & safety, to keep up to date with current guidance in this area.		

Standard 35 (35.1 - 35.4) All staff with boarding duties are provided with up to date written guidance on the school's boarding policies and practice.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	2
This standard was assessed as not fully met. The school had a clear set of policies and procedures in the event of a member of staff having to be suspended as a result of an allegation. It was clear through discussion with the principal that the school a positive approach to supporting staff, however this needed to be confirmed in writing. Additional guidance should be provided for staff who were suspended, pending investigation of allegations of abuse, detailing the support the school would offer in such a case.		

Standard 36 (36.1 - 36.4) There are sound staff/boarder relationships.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	4
This standard was assessed as exceeded. The democratic nature of the school was evidenced by the records of school meetings, which confirmed that members of staff were as liable as boarders, to being brought up at the meeting, if others found their behaviour unreasonable or unfair, including pupils. This had happened and was evidence that disagreements between boarders and staff were dealt with reasonably. Boarders who spoke to the inspectors clearly stated that they were treated as complete equals by all of the staff at the school. The feedback from boarders, both in the pre inspection survey, and comments made to the inspectors, was also consistently positive regarding their relationships with staff.		

Standard 37 (37.1 - 37.2) Staff supervision of boarders should avoid intruding unnecessarily on boarders' privacy.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. Boarders confirmed that staff were available to boarders, but did not intrude upon their privacy. As members of staff were subject to the laws of the community in the same way as everyone else, intrusion of privacy would be seen as reason to be brought up at a school meeting, where the community could discuss the incident in detail if necessary.		

Standard 38 (38.1 - 38.10) Recruitment of all staff (including ancillary staff and those on a contractual/sessional basis) and volunteers who work with boarders (as defined in the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000) includes checks through the Criminal Records Bureau checking system (enhanced as appropriate), with a satisfactory outcome. There is a satisfactory recruitment process recorded in writing.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	2
This standard was assessed as not fully met. The inspectors examined the files of six employees. One had no reference. 1 no ref request letter on file, one had a "to whom it may concern" letter as a reference. The records seen confirmed that the school had produced reference request letters that related to last employer where applicable, and included reference as to any reason whether there was any known reason why the applicant might not be suitable to work with children. Some of the files could not evidence that explanations had been sought regarding gaps in employment. Criminal Records Bureau certificates were in place, but not for staff from abroad. A recommendation was made in respect of this shortfall. Inspectors gave a copy of a checklist the school may wish to use regarding recruitment.		

Standard 39 (39.1 - 39.4) The school does not allow any member of staff (including ancillary staff, sessional/contract staff and volunteers) to work unsupervised with boarders unless that member of staff has been satisfactorily checked with the Criminal Records Bureau.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. Peripatetic staff, and ancillary staff were subject to the same level of checks as other staff.		

PREMISES

The intended outcomes for the following set of standards are:

- Boarders are provided with satisfactory accommodation.
- Boarders have their own accommodation, secure from public intrusion.
- Boarders have satisfactory sleeping accommodation.
- Boarders have satisfactory provision to study.
- Boarders have adequate private toilet and washing facilities.
- Boarders have satisfactory provision for changing by day.
- Boarders have access to a range of safe recreational areas.
- Boarders are protected from safety hazards.
- Boarders are suitably accommodated when ill.
- Boarders' clothing and bedding are adequately laundered.
- Boarders can obtain personal requisites while accommodated at school.
- The welfare of boarders placed in lodgings is safeguarded and promoted.
- The welfare of boarders is safeguarded and promoted while accommodated away from the school site on short-term visits.

Standard 40 (40.1 - 40.8)

Boarding Houses (including dormitories and living areas) and other accommodation provided for boarders should be appropriately lit, heated and ventilated, suitably furnished, accessible to any boarders with disabilities, and adequately maintained.

Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
---------------------------	---------------	---

This standard was assessed as met. During the environmental tour, one boarder highlighted the cold temperature of one area. This was dealt with by the boarder by themselves, who reported it to a senior member of staff. Remedial action was taken within 24 hrs, to adjust the timing of the heating system. Other boarders reported later in the inspection, that they had to open windows to keep cool when the heating was on, and it was clear that the school had an effective heating system when in use. All of the boarding areas were adequately furnished. Some of the areas, such as the area known as the "Jazz Café" had been tastefully furnished and appeared comfortable and relaxing. None of the boarding areas were unnecessarily noisy.

Standard 41 (41.1 - 41.8) Boarding accommodation is reserved for the use of those boarders designated to use it, and protected by access by the public.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	2
<p>This standard was assessed as not fully met. Some of the houses did not have their own locking system. The school had fitted key pad locks to all houses, but were reviewing their use as some had broken, a recommendation was made in respect of this. No adverse comments were received regarding the issue of personal safety at night by any of the boarders.</p> <p>Since the last inspection, a gate had been put up, signs had been put up directing all visitors to the office. Barriers had been put up in both entrances, one permanent, one that is closed at night.</p> <p>The school had a written policy on challenging visitors, which was reported by staff and boarders alike to be effective.</p>		

Standard 42 (42.1 - 42.14) Sleeping accommodation is suitably furnished and of sufficient size for the number, needs and ages of boarders accommodated, with appropriate separation between genders, age groups and from accommodation for adults.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
<p>This standard was assessed as met. Beds were of sound construction. Ample space was available in bedrooms. There was no evidence of any cramping. Boarders all stated that said they liked their rooms. All boarding accommodation for boarders aged 10 and over was fully separated by gender. Only the youngest share dorms. Advice was given that placing information in the school prospectus and parents handbook about the way boarding is separated throughout the school would enhance the system.</p>		

Standard 43 (43.1 - 43.2) Suitable facilities for both organised and private study are available to boarders.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
<p>This standard was assessed as met. The school has a flexible approach to lessons, but the facilities are available for boarders to use at any reasonable time. Computers are freely available and there were a number of areas where boarders could study quietly if they wanted to.</p>		

Standard 44 (44.1 - 44.10) Adequate toilet and washing facilities are readily accessible to boarders, with appropriate privacy.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	2
<p>This standard was assessed as not fully met. There were a suitable number of toilet and bathing facilities available to boarders. However, the environmental tour identified that some of the locks used could not be opened in the case of an emergency. A recommendation was made in respect of this.</p>		

Standard 45 (45.1 - 45.3) Suitable changing provision is provided for use by day.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. All of the boarders could use their own dormitories or bedrooms to change in.		

Standard 46 (46.1 - 46.6) Boarders have access to a range and choice of safe recreational areas, both indoors and outdoors.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The school has a number of external recreational areas, including a skateboard 'half pipe', climbing areas, and a swing attached to a large beech tree. Risk assessments were seen in relation to this activity, and other recreational areas, such as the swimming pool.		

Standard 47 (47.1 - 47.9) Indoor and outdoor areas used by, or accessible to, boarders should be free from reasonably avoidable safety hazards.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The school had a health and safety committee, with responsibility for undertaking regular walkabouts, with a view to identifying any hazards. Risk assessments were seen in relation to all areas of the school. The feedback from boarders confirmed that they were unaware of any serious injuries suffered by staff or boarders, in relation to any of the indoor or outdoor areas of the school.		

Standard 48 (48.1 - 48.4) Suitable accommodation should be available for the separate care of boarders who are ill.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. Separate accommodation was available within the school grounds for the purpose of accommodating children who were sick. This accommodation was viewed by the inspector, and found to be comfortable, and supplied with toilet and washing facilities.		

Standard 49 (49.1 - 49.3) Adequate laundry provision is made for boarders' clothing and bedding.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. The school had it's own laundry, where boarders can do their own washing, with the younger boarders having their laundry done for them by domestic and housekeeping staff.		

Standard 50 (50.1 - 50.2) Boarders are able to obtain minor necessary personal and stationery items while accommodated at school.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	3
This standard was assessed as met. During the inspection, boarders were seen obtaining stationery items from the school office. The school housekeeper also had a wide variety of toiletry and other personal items available to boarders if required.		

Standard 51 (51.1 - 51.11) Any lodgings arranged by the school to accommodate pupils provide satisfactory accommodation and supervision, are checked by the school before use, and are monitored by the school during use.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	9
This standard does not apply to this school. No lodgings are arranged by the school.		

Standard 52 (52.1 - 52.8) Any off-site short-stay accommodation arranged by the school for any of its boarders provides satisfactory accommodation and supervision, is checked by the school before use (although this may not be feasible when accommodation is in private households), and is monitored by the school during use.		
Key Findings and Evidence	Standard met?	9
This standard does not apply to this school. The school does not provide any off site accommodation for boarders.		

PART C

LAY ASSESSOR'S SUMMARY

(where applicable)

[Empty box for Lay Assessor's Summary]

Lay Assessor _____ **Signature** _____

Date _____

PART D**HEAD'S RESPONSE****D.1 Head's comments/confirmation relating to the content and accuracy of the report for the above inspection.**

We would welcome comments on the content of this report relating to the Inspection conducted on a 25th January 2005 and any factual inaccuracies:

Please limit your comments to one side of A4 if possible

Action taken by the CSCI in response to Head's comments:

Amendments to the report were necessary	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments were received from the Head	<input type="checkbox"/>
Head's comments/factual amendments were incorporated into the final inspection report	<input type="checkbox"/>
Head's comments are available on file at the Area Office but have not been incorporated into the final inspection report. The inspector believes the report to be factually accurate	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note:

In instances where there is a major difference of view between the Inspector and the Head both views will be made available on request to the Area Office.

D.2 Please provide the Commission with a written Action Plan by , which indicates how recommended actions and advisory recommendations are to be addressed and stating a clear timescale for completion. This will be kept on file and made available on request.

Status of the Head's Action Plan at time of publication of the final inspection report:

Action plan was required	<input type="checkbox"/>
Action plan was received at the point of publication	<input type="checkbox"/>
Action plan covers all the recommended actions in a timely fashion	<input type="checkbox"/>
Action plan did not cover all the recommended actions and required further discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>
Head has declined to provide an action plan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: <enter details here>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D.3 HEAD'S AGREEMENT

Head's statement of agreement/comments: Please complete the relevant section that applies.

D.3.1 I **Zoe Readhead** of **Summerhill School** confirm that the contents of this report are a fair and accurate representation of the facts relating to the inspection conducted on the above date(s) and that I agree with the recommended actions made and will seek to comply with these.

Print Name	<u>ZOE READHEAD</u>
Signature	<u>Z Readhead</u>
Designation	<u>Principal</u>
Date	<u>11/4/05</u>

Note: In instance where there is a profound difference of view between the Inspector and the Head both views will be reported. Please attach any extra pages, as applicable.

Commission for Social Care Inspection
33 Greycoat Street
London
SW1P 2QF

Telephone: 020 7979 2000
Fax: 020 7979 2111

National Enquiry Line: 0845 015 0120
www.csci.org.uk

S0000024584.V196423.R01

© This report may only be used in its entirety. Extracts may not be used or reproduced without the express permission of the Commission for Social Care Inspection



The paper used in this document is supplied from a sustainable source