

Tribal  
Kings Orchard  
One Queen Street  
Bristol  
BS2 0HQ

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

**Direct T** 0117 311 5359  
**Email:** christina.bannerman@tribalgroup.com

16 January 2015

Mr S Morris  
The Principal  
Callington Community College  
Launceston Road  
Callington  
PL17 7DR

Dear Mr Morris

### **No formal designation monitoring inspection of Callington Community College**

Following my visit with Richard Light and Emmy Tomsett, Her Majesty's Inspectors, to your academy on 14 and 15 January 2015, I write on behalf of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services and Skills to confirm the inspection findings.

This monitoring inspection was conducted under section 8 of the Education Act 2005 and in accordance with Ofsted's published procedures for no formal designation inspection of schools. The inspection was carried out because the Chief Inspector was concerned about the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements at the academy.

### **Evidence**

Inspectors scrutinised the single central record and other documents and policies relating to safeguarding and child protection arrangements. Meetings were held with the Executive Principal, Principal, senior leaders, the designated safeguarding leader, safeguarding leaders, the site manager, the Director of Sixth Form, pastoral and subject leaders, a group of teaching staff and two teaching assistants. A telephone conversation with the local authority designated child protection officer took place on the 13 January 2015. A recent local authority audit of safeguarding arrangements, the academy's school self-evaluation and development plan, governors' minutes, 2013 and 2014 achievement data, attendance records and exclusions data, together with behaviour and conduct logs were also scrutinised. Inspectors met with three groups of students and observed behaviour at the start of the day, break and lunchtimes. Inspectors spoke informally to a number of students to gather their views of behaviour at the academy during different parts of the school day.

Inspectors met with two members of the governing body and three parents. By the end of the monitoring inspection visit there were too few responses to the online questionnaire (Parent View) to gain a representative sample of parents' views. A sample of lessons was observed.

Having considered all the evidence I am of the opinion that at this time:

The academy's safeguarding arrangements do not meet requirements.

## **Context**

Callington Community College is a larger-than-average-sized comprehensive college, with a large sixth form. It converted to an academy in April 2011. There are 1,402 students on roll, 250 are in the sixth form. The proportion of students known to be eligible for free school meals is below average. Almost all students are White British and very few speak English as an additional language. The proportion of disabled students and those with special educational needs is below average; the largest groups in this category have specific or moderate learning difficulties. The academy meets the current floor standard. The Learning Institute South West, which provides Initial Teacher Education, is based on the site. This provision was not inspected as part of this inspection. The proportion of students joining or leaving the academy at times other than the start of secondary education or post-16 education is typical to that found nationally. There is a vacancy for a leader of personal, social, health, and economic education and citizenship education. The academy is currently recruiting to this post.

## **The effectiveness of leadership and management in ensuring that safeguarding and child protection arrangements keep pupils safe**

There is a poor culture of safeguarding at Callington Community College. Leaders and managers have not kept abreast of statutory guidance as set out in *Keeping Children Safe in Education* published by the Department of Education in April 2014. Leaders and governors lack an overarching strategy for monitoring and evaluating the academy's safeguarding arrangements. They do not use the tools for evaluating the impact of the safeguarding processes strategically to drive a clear improvement strategy that addresses specific safeguarding, behaviour and attendance issues. There is some effective intervention with individual students based on information, but the use of such information to target improvements in safeguarding practice more widely is lacking.

There has been a lack of external validation of procedures and practices to keep students safe and, as a consequence, the key documents are out of date. Leaders' knowledge of the *Keeping Children safe in Education* statutory guidance to safeguard children is not being used to influence the improvement of safeguarding at the academy on a day-to-day basis.

Governors have an inaccurate view of safeguarding because they are not rigorously monitoring or auditing the academy's provision. At present, governors are totally reliant on information passed up from the academy safeguarding team. They are not undertaking first hand monitoring activities to check on the effectiveness of the safeguarding arrangements in the school. Despite basic training for a few governors, their lack of knowledge and understanding of safeguarding places them at a disadvantage when reviewing and challenging the academy's view of its effectiveness. Governors are advised by academy leaders of what improvements are required and this re-enforces their reliance. They do not share routinely the data that inform these priorities to ensure they are the right ones. They are unaware that important documents such as the child protection policy are out of date and lack essential information. For example, the policy does not set out the timescales for referrals to social services, contact details for the local social care offices, how staff are to respond immediately to a child making a disclosure and how the policy is to be checked for its impact. The policy has not yet been approved by the local safeguarding children's board (LSCB) although the school maintains it was submitted to the LSCB in July 2014.

There is an appropriate level of training for all staff, which is updated at the required intervals. It is complemented by a rolling programme of training sessions to induct staff who join after the start of the year, as well as to provide refresher training for other staff. Leaders do not evaluate the impact of this training to ensure that practice is improving.

Staff involved in recruitment are appropriately trained. However, leaders and governors do not follow the guidance on the safer recruitment of staff with respect to maintaining a record of the evidence that the questions required of all candidates at interview were asked. This is a significant omission in procedures.

The checks conducted to ensure the suitability of adults to work with children are recorded systematically. Checks on casual workers in the sports academy and others who support the Friday afternoon sports programme meet the minimum requirements, but do not reflect the additional risk to students posed by these arrangements. There are no checks to ensure that these staff are appropriately trained in basic safeguarding awareness. Leaders and governors do not routinely monitor or sample the single central record to ensure its accuracy.

The four leaders who constitute the safeguarding team are clear about their responsibilities within the academy. They work well together as a team and are tenacious in following through all safeguarding concerns as they arise. They react well when concerns are presented to them, but do not analyse the types and frequency of child protection incidents arising in school. They are not systematically using resources to prevent issues arising in the future.

The implementation of the child protection on-line management system ensures students subject to concern are effectively tracked. However, staff who work with

students on a daily basis do not have access to the information. This hampers their ability to check effectively the key risks associated with particular students. This places students' welfare at risk.

Academy staff react well when child protection issues arise. There are well established systems for ensuring that relevant information is shared amongst academy staff. However, staff are not taking the initiative in looking for the more subtle signs of safeguarding concerns, such as those associated with child sexual exploitation, cyber bullying and racism. Staff are not consistent in applying their knowledge derived from training to recognise potential safeguarding issues during lessons.

The Rights Respecting Schools agenda is a core part of the tutor programme. Students are taught to practise, respect, protect and promote the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. However, these principles are not yet embedded in the school culture or practice. Teachers are not responding assertively to incidents of disrespectful language and immature attitudes towards homosexuality and race, in lessons and day-to-day interaction with students. The personal, social, health and economic education curriculum lacks on overall structure and clear development of core ideas and concepts such as identity or what it means to say you feel safe. The lack of training on these issues for staff means that they do not recognise prejudice to groups of varied sexual orientation or intolerance to race and different cultures when they are displayed by students. At present, students have a weak understanding of British values and are poorly prepared for life in modern democratic Britain.

Attendance is below the national average. Overall absence rates are decreasing, but persistent absence is increasing. The procedures for following up individual students' absence are thorough. Parents are informed quickly and academy staff are welcoming when students return after being away. The reason behind the rise in persistent absence is not looked into in sufficient detail. Leaders are not pooling this information to identify trends or patterns. They do not use the patterns of attendance to target specific groups to reduce the numbers who are persistently absent. The information about student absence is not compared to national data and is not shared with governors.

Leaders undertake good analysis of poor and disruptive behaviour and bullying incidents but are not doing enough with the information at an academy-wide level. There have been incidents of verbal abuse to staff. Students report that the use of foul language out of the earshot of staff is common. Older students state that 'sexting' is prevalent and intrusive and that these behaviours are accepted as typical. There is little indication that any analysis is done to address these issues by school leaders.

The restructuring of the student support team, combined with early intervention, has proved effective in reducing the number of exclusions to below the national average.

There is well informed and regular collaboration between staff, parents and carers to make sure all avenues have been utilised before reaching a decision to take a student off roll.

Students report that they know whom to turn to and where to go in the academy when they have concerns arising from either home or at school. They would welcome more explicit guidance during lessons on where they can seek further guidance and support on aspects relating to safety.

Appropriate systems are in place to manage e-communications. Staff have received relevant training. There is a growing awareness of issues around e-safety. However, e-safety awareness has only recently been audited across the curriculum and remains ad hoc in the academy.

Risk assessment of educational visits is thorough. Site risk assessments are carried out diligently and acted upon. The identification of risks during physical education lessons is similarly strong and action taken to remedy issues is quick. The academy's policy and procedures for ensuring that visitors to the academy are suitable, checked and monitored are appropriate, for example those undertaken for external speakers.

### **External support**

The local authority and local safeguarding children board have been slow to respond to their concerns about safer recruitment at the academy.

The academy works well with social care, police and health partners. The academy safeguarding team contributes effectively to the individual plans for young people at all levels of child protection. The quality of the information provided by the academy is clear and comprehensive and well evidenced. Personal plans and health plans are up to date and effective as they are well documented and shared between relevant staff.

There are effective arrangements to monitor the provision and welfare for students educated off site. The school receives appropriate specific advice and support from social care professionals at case conference meetings to enable pupils to overcome personal difficulties. Close working relationships have been established with the school nurse to share relevant medical information. This has been successful in improving these students' attendance.

### **Priorities for further improvement**

- The headteacher and senior leaders should urgently develop a strong culture of safeguarding, tolerance and respect by:
  - ensuring there is systematic and robust monitoring of safeguarding across the academy

- setting activities that help students to recognise and manage risk
  - systematically planning to teach students key concepts, themes and ideas that progress each year in depth and content, including that 'sexting', homophobia and verbal abuse are not acceptable in any context
  - providing training for staff on how to ensure students are well prepared for life in modern democratic Britain
  - ensuring that staff records of safer recruitment practice include a record of the evidence that the questions required of all candidates at interview were asked.
- Urgently improve the role of governors in safeguarding at the academy by:
- updating relevant policies in accordance with safeguarding guidance from the Department for Education and taking into account procedures and practice set up by the local safeguarding children board
  - establishing an annual cycle of first hand monitoring activities to check rigorously on the effectiveness of the academy's safeguarding arrangements
  - ensuring the information from external evaluations of safeguarding arrangements is used to plan future improvements
  - attending relevant up-to-date training to ensure academy leaders can be held robustly to account.

After the on-site inspection had ended, the local authority designated officer for Cornwall contacted HMI to bring a further safeguarding matter to their attention. This matter was not revealed to inspectors at the time of the inspection and is now being investigated by the appropriate authorities.

I am copying this letter to the Director of Children's Services, to the Secretary of State for Education, the Chair of the Governing Body, the Regional Schools Commissioner and the Academies Advisers Unit at the Department for Education. This letter will be published on the Ofsted website.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Palk  
**Her Majesty's Inspector**