



*Making Social Care
Better for People*

inspection report

RESIDENTIAL SPECIAL SCHOOL

Limpsfield Grange School

**89 Bluehouse Lane
Oxted
Surrey
RH8 0RZ**

Lead Inspector
Kerry Fell

Announced Inspection
27th June 2006 02:30

The Commission for Social Care Inspection aims to:

- Put the people who use social care first
- Improve services and stamp out bad practice
- Be an expert voice on social care
- Practise what we preach in our own organisation

| Reader Information | |
|---------------------|---|
| Document Purpose | Inspection Report |
| Author | CSCI |
| Audience | General Public |
| Further copies from | 0870 240 7535 (telephone order line) |
| Copyright | This report is copyright Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) and may only be used in its entirety. Extracts may not be used or reproduced without the express permission of CSCI |
| Internet address | www.csci.org.uk |

This is a report of an inspection to assess whether services are meeting the needs of people who use them. The legal basis for conducting inspections is the Care Standards Act 2000 and the relevant National Minimum Standards for this establishment are those for *Residential Special Schools*. They can be found at www.dh.gov.uk or obtained from The Stationery Office (TSO) PO Box 29, St Crispins, Duke Street, Norwich, NR3 1GN. Tel: 0870 600 5522. Online ordering: www.tso.co.uk/bookshop

Every Child Matters, outlined the government's vision for children's services and formed the basis of the Children Act 2004. It provides a framework for inspection so that children's services should be judged on their contribution to the outcomes considered essential to wellbeing in childhood and later life.

Those outcomes are:

- Being healthy
- Staying safe
- Enjoying and achieving
- Making a contribution; and
- Achieving economic wellbeing.

In response, the Commission for Social Care Inspection has re-ordered the national minimum standards for children's services under the five outcomes, for reporting purposes. A further section has been created under 'Management' to cover those issues that will potentially impact on all the outcomes above.

Copies of *Every Child Matters* and *The Children Act 2004* are available from The Stationery Office as above.

SERVICE INFORMATION

Name of school Limpsfield Grange School

Address 89 Bluehouse Lane
Oxted
Surrey
RH8 0RZ

Telephone number 01883 713928

Fax number

Email address

Provider Web address

**Name of Governing body,
Person or Authority
responsible for the
school** Surrey Childrens Service

Name of Head Mrs Jane Humphreys

Name of Head of Care Miss Spinks

**Age range of residential
pupils**

**Date of last welfare
inspection** 21/11/05

Brief Description of the School:

The school is in the residential area of Limpsfield in Oxted, Surrey. It is a small Residential Special School catering for girls between the ages of eleven and sixteen with emotional and learning difficulties, with a small number of sixth form students.

The school was built in the 1880's as a family home and still retains many of its original features. The boarding facilities within the school are situated on the first floor, which provides a homely and relaxing atmosphere.

The grounds surrounding the school are well maintained. In addition, the school has a tennis court, gymnasium and swimming pool, and an award winning smallholding and gardens that are available to all the pupils.

SUMMARY

This is an overview of what the inspector found during the inspection.

This was the key inspection for the inspection year 2006/2007.

Mrs Kerry Fell and Mr Joe Croft undertook the inspection. The inspection was an announced inspection, which means that the school was given short notice that the inspection was going to take place. The inspection commenced on 27th June 2006, and took a day and a half to complete.

The inspectors reviewed policies and procedures, sanction, restraint and incident logs, pupils' records, and the management of medication. The inspectors spoke to pupils during the inspection and met with the Head teacher, the Head of Care, and the staff team. A tour of the school was also undertaken on the first day of the inspection.

The inspectors stayed to observe evening activities on 27th June 2006, and an inspector joined pupils for their evening activities in gardening and animal care.

Questionnaires were sent to the parents of the boarding pupils, and questionnaires were left with the pupils. Four questionnaires were received from parents. All stated that they felt that the staff were great. 75% stated that they had been told about the schools punishments and rules, and although the general feeling was that these were fair, 25% felt that there were inconsistencies in how they were applied, and 25% stated that they felt punishments should be used more often. The overarching feeling from parents questionnaires was that the school did a good job, and that the care and support provided was "excellent", or a "shining example to other school's in Surrey". Six questionnaires were received from the pupils. All were positive about the support that they received from the school, especially in relation to healthy eating, homework and future plans.

What the school does well:

The school promotes the pupils' medical and health needs, and kept detailed health plans.

Staff promote privacy and confidentiality, and pupils confirmed that staff knock on their bedroom doors before entering their bedrooms, and that they could make telephone calls in private.

Policies, procedures and practice with regard to complaints, absence of a child, behaviour management, countering bullying, health and safety and staff recruitment safeguard the pupils.

The school actively promotes education and offers individualised support, and targets are implemented within the twenty-four hour curriculum.

Pupils' have access to a range of health professionals as required, and specialist behavioural programmes were introduced where necessary. All decisions were observed to be made in a multi-agency manner and with the pupil's involvement where possible. Pupils are supported to attend mainstream schools to complete academic courses not offered by Limpsfield Grange School.

The ethos of the school promotes and encourages children to make decisions and choices about their lives and the way the school is run, and contact with parents and carers is promoted.

The school's care planning exceeds the standards, in that care plans were observed to be detailed and bright. Care plans were written from the pupil's perspective, and comments were included in each section from the pupil. Forms used within the care plans were child-friendly and included pictures and photographs.

The school has a clear statement of care principles and practice. The pupils are looked after by competent staff who understand their needs. Pupils were observed to have a good rapport with the care staff, and relationships and activities observed positively promoted and supported the pupils' skills and interests.

What has improved since the last inspection?

Recommendations made at the last inspection were met.

What they could do better:

Recommendations were made with regard to ensuring that accurate medication administration records are maintained, and that only the prescribing medical practitioner is to make written changes to the pharmacy labels on pupils' medication.

Pupils met during the inspection raised concerns about the quality of meals provided, however this was not supported by questionnaires received from pupils. It was not clear whether the pupils could use the menus displayed, therefore the school would be advised to review the style of menu displayed. Records of meals given did not always reflect changes made when ingredients were unavailable. A recommendation has been made.

Practice with regard to child protection was sound, and staff had received training in and had an understanding of the Area Child Protection Procedures, however areas for improvement were identified within the school's detailed child protection policy to ensure that it fully met the National Minimum Standards for Residential Special Schools.

Although monthly visits were completed as detailed under standard 33 of the National Minimum Standards for Residential Special Schools, further improvements were identified with regard to the monitoring undertaken by the management team.

Please contact the Head for advice of actions taken in response to this inspection.

The report of this inspection is available from enquiries@csci.gsi.gov.uk or by contacting your local CSCI office.

DETAILS OF INSPECTOR FINDINGS

CONTENTS

Being Healthy

Staying Safe

Enjoying and Achieving

Making a Positive Contribution

Achieving Economic Wellbeing

Management

Scoring of Outcomes

Recommended Actions identified during the inspection

Being Healthy

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- Children live in a healthy environment and the health and intimate care needs of each child are identified and promoted.(NMS 14)
- Children are provided with healthy, nutritious meals that meet their dietary needs.(NMS 15)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

14,15

Quality in this outcome area is **adequate**. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

The school promotes the health and medical needs of pupils; however, further work is required in regard to maintaining accurate records of medicines dispensed. Although menus are displayed, the style and accuracy needs reviewing.

EVIDENCE:

The school had a Medical Policy and Procedure that provided the appropriate information with regard to meeting the care needs of the students, and safe administration procedures in regard to medication.

The school provides guidance, advice and support in regard to health and social issues through Personal, Health and Sex Education during the school day. The head of care stated care staff attend these lessons to offer support. Further issues could be discussed with the students' key worker, if they wished to.

Files sampled during the inspection, evidenced that students had health care plans, which included a medical history, dental and optical needs and any known allergies. Parent/carers provided this information to the school, and also signed written consent for their child to receive emergency treatment and homely remedies whilst attending the school. Parents/carers were allowed to choose for their child to be registered with the school's GP and dentist, or to remain with their own at home.

Care staff were responsible for the administering of medication. Certificates and evidence of training with regard to medication and first aid undertaken by care staff were viewed during the inspection.

The head of care stated that the school followed medical guidance from the school's GP.

The school used medication administration records for the recording of prescribed medication. These records were sampled during the inspection; however, the recording of one prescribed medication was found to be inaccurate and the amount prescribed did not tally with the record of medication accepted into the school. It is strongly recommended that the school identifies the error with regard to this, and to ensure safe administration of medication is accurately accounted at all times.

It was also noted that the dose with regard to a prescribed medication had been changed in ink on the original pharmacy labelled container. The school must ensure that only the prescribing medical practitioner completes any change to prescribed medication.

The head of care maintained written records of homely remedies, including a monthly stock check.

Although pupils met during the inspection raised concerns about the quality of the food, the inspector were advised that there were channels available for feedback and that this feedback would be heard. This was not reflected in the questionnaires received from pupils. 100% stated that salad and fruit was always available and that healthy meal options were promoted.

The inspectors met with the Chef and reviewed the menus available. Menus appeared varied, and seasonal. Cooked meals were available during lunchtimes and on alternate evenings for boarding pupils. The inspectors were advised that if pupils did not like the choice of meal on the menu, they could approach staff the day before to arrange an alternative.

It was not clear whether pupils could actually understand the menus displayed. Discussions took place during the inspection about the appropriateness of the menus for the pupils at Limpsfield Grange, and whether a clearer menu could assist the pupils make choices at mealtimes, and therefore reduce confusion or dissatisfaction. The school would be advised to review the style of menu displayed.

Menus were being kept as a record of meals taken by the pupils, however these menus were not always changed to reflect last minute adjustments to menus if ingredients were unavailable. The school should ensure that the menus held accurately detail meals given.

Staying Safe

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- Children's privacy is respected and information about them is confidentially handled.(NMS 3)
- Children's complaints are addressed without delay and children are kept informed of progress in their consideration.(NMS 4)
- The welfare of children is promoted, children are protected from abuse, and an appropriate response is made to any allegation or suspicion of abuse.(NMS 5)
- Children are protected from bullying by others.(NMS 6)
- All significant events relating to the protection of children in the school are notified by the Head of the school or designated person to the appropriate authorities.(NMS 7)
- Children who are absent without authority are protected in accordance with written guidance and responded to positively on return.(NMS 8)
- Children are assisted to develop appropriate behaviour through the encouragement of acceptable behaviour and constructive staff responses to inappropriate behaviour.(NMS 10)
- Children live in schools that provide physical safety and security.(NMS 26)
- There is careful selection and vetting of all staff, volunteers, and monitoring of visitors to the school to prevent children being exposed to potential abusers.(NMS 27)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

3,4,5,6,8,10,26,27

Quality in this outcome area is **good**. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

Staff promote privacy and confidentiality. Policies, procedures and practice with regard to complaints, absence of a child, behaviour management, countering bullying, health and safety and staff recruitment safeguard the pupils, although further work is required on the child protection policy.

EVIDENCE:

The school did not have a specific policy with regard to privacy and confidentiality; however, this is addressed through other school policies, for example, the Child Protection Policy.

During discussions, staff stated that they respected all students' privacy; that they always knocked on bedroom doors before entering, and that they encouraged students to respect each other's privacy. The head of care stated that staff receive training with regard to privacy during their induction training.

The head of care stated parents could visit during the week, and would be able to meet with their child in private.

Students confirmed that staff respected their privacy. They also confirmed that they could make and receive telephone calls as long as it is not during the school day or homework time. Students stated they can have their own mobile telephones, and there is a pay telephone on the first floor for all students to use. The pay telephone is enclosed in a red telephone kiosk, in the style of an old-fashioned telephone box. Telephone help line numbers were displayed in the kiosk.

Students stated if letters were to be sent to the school, they would be able to read them in private.

The school had a written Complaints Policy and procedure that was available to staff, students and parents/carers. This policy provided accurate information on how the school would respond to complaints. This document also included the contact details of the Commission for Social Care Inspection Surrey Local Office.

The complaints book was viewed during the inspection, and evidenced. The last recorded complaint was on the 5th May 2006. The complaints book accurately recorded the name of the person making the complaint, date received, the nature of the complaint, action taken and the outcome of the complaint.

The school held a countering bullying policy that defined what bullying was and detailed that in any incidences of bullying both the victim and the bully would be supported. Pupils confirmed that there were few incidents of bullying, although they could identify pupils who had been bullied. On these occasions the pupils confirmed that staff had been told about the incident and the believed it had been dealt with. Pupils confirmed that all parties were offered support. 100% of the questionnaires received from the pupils stated that they were not being bullied. One questionnaire received stated that the school should change how they respond to bullying.

The school held a very detailed policy with regard to child protection that was dated October 2004. The policy stated that the school would complete a review of this policy each autumn term. The head of care confirmed that although it was not detailed on the policy that it had been reviewed, it would have been reviewed at the start of the autumn term, and was due to be

reviewed again shortly. Although the policy was detailed, there were elements missing from the school's policy as would be expected by the National Minimum Standards for Residential Special Schools. The school should therefore review the child protection policy in line with appendix one of the National Minimum Standards for Residential Special Schools.

Staff met during the inspection confirmed that they had attended training in child protection and that this had formed part of their induction programme. Child protection arrangements were also detailed within the staff handbook and the school guide.

The school has a written policy and procedure about how to respond in the event that a student was absent without authority. This policy gave clear guidance on the procedures to be followed, and the people to be contacted. The policy clearly stated that the student's parents/carer and the police would be informed within twenty minutes if the student could not be accounted for. The policy also stated that upon the student's return to school, they would be provided with the opportunity to discuss the reasons why they absconded. If this had been in regard to a Child Protection issue, it would be referred to the Child Protection Liaison Officer.

There had been no incidents of a child being absent without permission since the last inspection.

The school's behaviour policy was under review at the time of the inspection. At the time of the inspection the school used a positive approach to behaviour management with the use of rewards for good behaviour, with the use of verbal praise, house points and tangible rewards. The school's behaviour policy clearly identified the hierarchy of rewards and how these could be achieved. The school's policy also included a hierarchy of permissible sanctions that ranged from contact with parents and verbal warnings to removal of privileges and exclusion. The policy was again clear about when sanctions would be applied.

75% of questionnaires received from parents stated that they had been advised about the school's rules and punishments. 25% stated that they felt that the rules and punishments were not applied consistently, and 25% stated that they wanted the school to apply punishments more often. The school's sanction book was observed during the inspection. The sanction log had clear guidance attached, as to how it should be completed. It was observed to be neat and completed well. Very few sanctions were applied during boarding time, and had been applied appropriately.

The school currently does not have a policy with regard to physical restraint. Where a pupil's behaviour was of concern, and a specific response was required, the school would liaise with staff and parents in order to develop a

specific strategy to respond to the behaviour of concern, and to support the pupil. Examples of these programmes were observed on pupil's records.

The school held sanction, physical restraint and incident logs, and all were observed to have been fully completed in a neat and detailed manner.

The school had a written Health and Safety Policy and Procedure in place.

Certified evidence of the annual servicing for the gas supply and boilers were viewed. The gas was serviced on the 15/08/05; the boilers were last serviced on the 16/02/06. Legionella testing had been undertaken on the 16/12/05.

The school had a fire inspection by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Team on the 28th October 2004. Fire risk assessments were viewed during the inspection. The head of care stated these were to be reviewed in September 2006. Evidence for the testing of all fire protection systems were viewed, which included the emergency lighting system, fire extinguishers, fire alarm system and fire alarm sounders.

Staff were aware of the fire evacuation procedures, and posters detailing the evacuation procedure were displayed throughout the school. The head of care stated care staff had received training from the Surrey Fire and Rescue Team. The last recorded fire drill was held on the 5th June 2006.

The health and safety officer for the school stated the hot water outlets are checked on a monthly basis, evidence of these records were viewed during the inspection.

Risk assessments for the whole school were viewed; these included the residential area, kitchen, classrooms, water hygiene, and activities on and off site.

The school had a small animal holding which students take responsibility for. Risk assessments with regard to this were viewed.

The school had a swimming pool, which was let to outside agencies. Strict guidance on the use of the swimming pool, access to the school site and conduct by visitors were issued to leaders of groups using the swimming pool. The school had a 'Normal Operating Procedure' and an 'Emergency Evacuation Procedure' for the swimming pool. The health and safety officer stated that the school followed the guidelines as set by the Health and Safety Executive for the safe use of swimming pools.

The last health and safety inspection undertaken by the school was conducted on the 16th May 2006.

Files for two new members of staff were sampled during the inspection. Evidence was available to demonstrate that CRB checks had been completed, that two written references had been requested, and were followed up by telephone, and that evidence of identity and qualifications were obtained. Personnel files were neat and orderly, and CRB checks were held separately. CRB disclosure certificates were not sampled during this inspection.

A discussion took place with regard to the use of agency staffing, and the Bursar was very clear about ensuring that the agency the school used had completed the relevant recruitment checks, and that consistent members of agency staff would be available.

Enjoying and Achieving

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- The school's residential provision actively supports children's educational progress at the school.(NMS 12)
- Children have ample opportunity to engage in purposeful and enjoyable activities both within the school and in the local community.(NMS 13)
- Children receive individual support when they need it.(NMS 22)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

12,22

Quality in this outcome area is **excellent**. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

The school actively promotes education and offers individualised support through the schools 24-hour curriculum.

EVIDENCE:

During discussions, the head of care and care staff stated that the students received support during homework from the care staff, and this was confirmed by the pupil's responses in questionnaires. Students had access to the new school library and the ICT suite where they could complete their homework.

The head of care stated a member of the care team attended the daily handover from teachers in the morning, where information in regard to the previous evening would be discussed. At the end of the school day care staff read the duty book in the staff room. There was no formal handover from teachers at the end of the school day.

Care staff attend 'Tutor' meetings with teachers and classroom assistants, where individual educational targets for the students are discussed. These targets were implemented within the twenty-four hour curriculum. The head of care stated that key workers consulted students and their parents/carers in regard to setting educational targets. This was confirmed during discussions with students.

As stated under Standard 2, students write reports and attend their annual reviews.

Pupils' files evidenced that the school offered individualised support. Pupils had access to a range of health professionals as required, and specialist behavioural programmes were introduced where necessary. All decisions were observed to be made in a multi-agency manner and with the pupil's involvement where possible. Specialist provision was observed on the pupil's files, for example speech and language therapy support was provided to the pupils who required it. The school had also been seeking support from Surrey with regard to behaviour management.

Pupils were supported to attend mainstream schools to complete academic courses not offered by Limpsfield Grange School, and evidence of attendance at taster days and at Connexions were observed. The school also supports pupils to complete work experience, and one pupil had been involved in work experience activities around the school grounds and in the kitchens. One pupil told the inspector about how they were supported to attend classes in animal care because that was their specific interest.

Pupils also felt supported to make decisions about their future. Group based activities were arranged in the evening, mainly in year groups. At the time of the inspection this included watching films, gardening and animal care.

Pupils confirmed that they were able to speak to any member of staff, but they stated that they would often take advantage of key worker sessions to raise concerns. 100% of the questionnaires received stated that pupils felt that they had someone to talk too, although in some cases this included school friends and family, and pupils stated that staff did listen to them.

Pupils had an identified independent listener.

It was not evident from pupil's records that any specific therapeutic techniques were being used to support pupils.

Making a Positive Contribution

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- Children are encouraged and supported to make decisions about their lives and to influence the way the school is run. No child should be assumed to be unable to communicate their views.(NMS 2)
- Children have sound relationships with staff based on honesty and mutual respect.(NMS 9)
- Children experience planned and sensitively handled admission and leaving processes.(NMS 11)
- Children have their needs assessed and written plans outline how these needs will be met while at school.(NMS 17)
- In accordance with their wishes children are able and encouraged to maintain contact with their parents and families while living away from home at school.(NMS 20)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

2,17,20

Quality in this outcome area is **excellent**. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

The ethos of the school promotes and encourages children to make decisions and choices about their lives and the way the school is run. The school's care planning exceeds the standards. Contact with parents and carers is promoted.

EVIDENCE:

The school sought the views and opinions of students through the school council and boarder meetings. During discussions, students stated that they were asked for their opinions in regard to their care whilst boarding at the school. Students stated that they wrote reports for their annual reviews as well as attending these meetings. This was confirmed during discussions with staff.

Students also stated that they were able to make daily choices whilst at the school, which included putting forward ideas and suggestions for consideration during the school council meetings. The inspector viewed minutes of the council meeting, however, it was noted that these meetings had not taken place during the autumn term 2005. Students could also put forward their ideas through the use of the school's 'can I help you' forms, which could be posted into a post box in the hall. This is monitored by the senior care staff who would provide a written response. Students also stated they would talk to

their key workers to raise concerns or put forward their views about the school.

Evidence was viewed that the school had consulted with students and their parents/carers in regard to bullying, awareness of healthy food and the layout of the school dining room.

Each young person had a review of Special Educational Needs. In addition to this document each child had a detailed care plan file that was kept up to date. The care plan file used bright pupil-friendly forms to identify the pupil's specific needs in relation to personal care, socialisation and behaviour. The format used ensured that the care plans were written from the child's perspective, and pupils' made statements in each section. Only one pupil's file identified any specific religious or cultural needs, and how these would be met. Files included photographs and pictures to illustrate important people, activities and things to the pupil.

There was evidence of the school being involved in statutory reviews. Pupils had been supported to complete questionnaires given to them by Surrey CC specifically for their reviews.

The school exceeds this standard.

The school encouraged students, if they wished, to maintain contact with their parents/carers throughout the week. The head of care stated parents/carers were contacted if there had been any concerns in regard to their child's welfare. Care staff stated they have regular contact with parents/carers.

Achieving Economic Wellbeing

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- Children can wear their own clothing outside school time, can secure personal requisites and stationery while at school, and are helped to look after their own money.(NMS 16)
- Children about to leave care are prepared for the transition into independent living.(NMS 21)
- Children live in well designed and pleasant premises, providing sufficient space and facilities to meet their needs.(NMS 23)
- Children live in accommodation which is appropriately decorated, furnished and maintained to a high standard, providing adequate facilities for their use.(NMS 24)
- Children are able to carry out their personal care in privacy and with dignity.(NMS 25)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

None of these standards were assessed.

EVIDENCE:

Management

The intended outcomes for these standards are:

- Children, parents, staff and placing authorities have access to a clear statement of the school's care principles and practice for boarding pupils.(NMS 1)
- Children's needs, development and progress is recorded to reflect their individuality and their group interactions.(NMS 18)
- There are adequate records of both the staff and child groups of the school.(NMS 19)
- Children are looked after by staff who understand their needs and are able to meet them consistently.(NMS 28)
- Children are looked after by staff who are trained to meet their needs.(NMS 29)
- Children are looked after by staff who are themselves supported and guided in safeguarding and promoting the children's welfare.(NMS 30)
- Children receive the care and services they need from competent staff.(NMS 31)
- Children and staff enjoy the stability of efficiently run schools.(NMS 32)
- The governing body, trustees, local authority, proprietor or other responsible body monitors the welfare of the children in the school.(NMS 33)

JUDGEMENT – we looked at outcomes for the following standard(s):

1,28,31,32

Quality in this outcome area is **adequate**. This judgement has been made using available evidence including a visit to this service.

The school has a clear statement of care principles and practice. The pupils are looked after by competent staff who understand their needs. Although monthly visits are completed further work was identified with regard to termly monitoring.

EVIDENCE:

The school had a brochure for 2005 – 2006, which accurately described the school's statement of purpose. This document provided information on the admission criteria for the school, the age range and needs of students attending the school, staff roles and their qualifications, and a copy of the school's complaints procedure.

At the time of the inspection the school accommodated twenty boarders from Monday to Friday.

The care team consisted of the head of care, two senior care officers, two full time care officers and two part time care officers. Teaching staff undertook extraneous duties each evening. The head of care stated that one care officer had recently left the school, and the recruitment process had commenced.

The head of care stated staff shortages were covered through the use of teaching assistants and the consistent use of agency members of staff.

The duty rota was viewed, this provided evidence there were sufficient staff on duty during the morning and evening shifts, including two senior staff at all times. Two members of staff undertake sleep-in duties each evening. Written records of each student and member of staff sleeping on the premises were maintained.

The head of care stated that a member of the senior management team was on call each evening to provide support and advice when required.

The head of care held the Certificate in Social Services (CSS), the A1 and A2 Assessors Award, and has been working at the school since 1992. The two senior carers had recently completed the NVQ Level 3 in children and young people and were awaiting their certificates. One member of staff was due to have a final meeting with her assessor to sign off her NVQ award. The head of care stated that the two part time members of staff were due to commence NVQ level 3 training in September 2006.

Records of supervision for staff were viewed. The head of care stated that the aim was to provide nine supervision sessions to each member of staff per year. Time for supervision and attendance to other meetings was built in to the duty rota, however, the head of care stated staff attending annual reviews were allowed to take time back as these could not be accommodated in the duty rota.

During discussions, the head of care stated there were no formal plans written in regard to foreseeable crisis, however, there were emergency contact details kept of students and staff. The head of care stated planned responses to crisis needed to be further developed, and would be done in line with Surrey's guidance.

Pupils were observed to have a good rapport with the care staff, and relationships and activities observed positively promoted and supported the pupils' skills and interests.

Although monthly visits were taking place; it was not evident that senior staff were undertaking the termly and half-termly checks as detailed under standard

33 of the National Minimum Standards for Residential Special Schools. These must be completed. However it was noted that handover and duty and logs had been signed every day.

SCORING OF OUTCOMES

This page summarises the assessment of the extent to which the National Minimum Standards for Residential Special Schools have been met and uses the following scale.

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

"X" in the standard met box denotes standard not assessed on this occasion

"N/A" in the standard met box denotes standard not applicable

| BEING HEALTHY | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>Standard No</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| 14 | 3 |
| 15 | 2 |

| STAYING SAFE | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>Standard No</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 2 |
| 6 | 3 |
| 7 | X |
| 8 | 3 |
| 10 | X |
| 26 | 3 |
| 27 | 3 |

| ENJOYING AND ACHIEVING | |
|------------------------|--------------|
| <i>Standard No</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| 12 | 3 |
| 13 | X |
| 22 | 3 |

| MAKING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|
| <i>Standard No</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| 2 | 3 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 11 | X |
| 17 | 4 |
| 20 | X |

| ACHIEVING ECONOMIC WELLBEING | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| <i>Standard No</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| 16 | X |
| 21 | X |
| 23 | X |
| 24 | X |
| 25 | X |

| MANAGEMENT | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>Standard No</i> | <i>Score</i> |
| 1 | 3 |
| 18 | X |
| 19 | X |
| 28 | 3 |
| 29 | X |
| 30 | 3 |
| 31 | X |
| 32 | 2 |
| 33 | X |

No

Are there any outstanding recommendations from the last inspection?

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

This section sets out the actions that must be taken so that the proprietor meets the Children Act 1989, Inspection of Schools and Colleges Regulations 2002 and the National Minimum Standards.

| No. | Standard | Recommendation | Timescale for action (Serious welfare concerns only) |
|-----|----------|--|--|
| 1. | RS14 | It is strongly recommended that the school identifies the error with regard to this, and to ensure safe administration of medication is accurately accounted at all times. | 27/07/06 |
| 2. | RS14 | The school must ensure that only the prescribing medical practitioner completes any change to prescribed medication. | 27/06/06 |
| 3. | RS15 | The school should ensure that the menus held accurately detail meals given. | 27/08/06 |
| 4. | RS5 | The school should therefore review the child protection policy in line with appendix one of the National Minimum Standards for Residential Special Schools. | 27/09/06 |
| 5. | RS32 | Senior staff must undertake the termly and half-termly checks as detailed under standard 32 of the National Minimum Standards for Residential Special Schools. | 27/09/06 |

Commission for Social Care Inspection

Surrey Area Office

The Wharf

Abbey Mill Business Park

Eashing

Surrey

GU7 2QN

National Enquiry Line: 0845 015 0120

Email: enquiries@csci.gsi.gov.uk

Web: www.csci.org.uk

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