

Serco Inspections  
Colmore Plaza  
20 Colmore Circus Queensway  
Birmingham  
B4 6AT

T 0300 123 1231  
Text Phone: 0161 6188524  
enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk  
[www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk)

**Direct T:** 0121 6799169  
**Direct email:** [matthew.mitchell@serco.com](mailto:matthew.mitchell@serco.com)



31 January 2014

James Simon  
Trinity School  
8 Station Road  
Foxton  
CB22 6SA

Dear Mr Simon,

### **Requires improvement: monitoring inspection visit to Trinity School**

Following my visit to your school on 27 January 2014, I write on behalf of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services and Skills to report the findings. Thank you for the help you gave me and for the time you made available to discuss the actions you are taking to improve the school since the most recent section 5 inspection.

The visit was the first monitoring inspection since the school was judged to require improvement following the section 5 inspection in October 2013. It was carried out under section 8 of the Education Act 2005.

*Senior leaders and governors are not taking effective action to tackle the areas requiring improvement identified at the last section 5 inspection and plans are not sharply focused on rapidly bringing about improvement.*

### **Evidence**

During the visit, meetings were held with the executive headteacher, the chair and vice-chair of the Governing Body and a representative of the local authority. A range of information was reviewed, including the school's improvement plan and pupil progress tracking records. The local authority's review reports and action plan were also considered.

### **Context**

There have been no significant changes to the school since the inspection in October 2013.

## **Main findings**

The school improvement plan is not adequate as a means of monitoring effectively if the weaknesses found at the last inspection are being tackled. The plan describes a wide range of actions to be taken and includes milestones towards their completion. Without prioritisation, however, there are too many actions in the plan to ensure the most important areas are tackled first. Very few of the actions, and none of the milestones, provide end-dates by which time they should have been completed. Furthermore the plan fails to identify the intended impact of the actions taken, particularly regarding improvements in pupils' progress and behaviour.

A new system has been introduced for tracking pupils' progress. Pupils' attainments in each subject are assessed at the end of each half term. The resulting data are entered on a spreadsheet that includes pupils in all of the school's three centres. These data allow easy analysis of how well pupils are doing and whether there are variations between different groups or subjects. The first set of data from October 2013 showed that pupils were on-track to achieve their attainment targets. However the second set of data, from December 2013, showed a substantial proportion of pupils were below target in each subject. School leaders had not identified this apparent decline in progress. The data, however, is not moderated adequately and therefore its accuracy cannot be assured. Intended actions to work with a secondary school to improve the moderation of assessment have not been implemented.

There are significant weaknesses in communication within the governing body. For example, the full governing body did not have the opportunity to contribute to the school improvement plan and a pre-inspection audit report undertaken by the local authority was not shared with all governors. The full governing body has not seen the post-inspection support plan from the local authority. Furthermore discussion with the chair of governors did not assure that staff are held sufficiently to account for their performance in carrying out agreed actions in an effective and timely manner. A review of governance recommended by the previous inspection is scheduled to take place in the near future. Some governance training was provided by the local authority during the week prior to this monitoring inspection visit.

Senior leaders and governors are not taking effective action to tackle the areas requiring improvement identified at the recent section 5 inspection.

Ofsted may carry out further visits and, where necessary, provide further support and challenge to the school until its next section 5 inspection.

## **External support**

The local authority rightly continues to consider that this school as one that is 'at risk' and that it is not making sufficient progress. This level of risk has not changed since the school opened in 2012. The post-inspection support plan identifies appropriate actions and specifies improvement targets, for example in pupils'

progress. However the support provided to date has not resulted in sufficient improvement. Reports of visits by the local authority do not adequately evaluate the progress the school has made.

I am copying this letter to the Chair of the Governing Body and the Director of Children's Services for Cambridgeshire.

Yours sincerely

Charlie Henry  
**Her Majesty's Inspector**