

David Young Community Academy

Bishop's Way, Off North Parkway, Seacroft, Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS14 6NU

Inspection dates 29–30 October 2015

Overall effectiveness **Inadequate**

Effectiveness of leadership and management	Inadequate
Quality of teaching, learning and assessment	Inadequate
Personal development, behaviour and welfare	Inadequate
Outcomes for pupils	Inadequate
Overall effectiveness at previous inspection	Good

Summary of key findings for parents and pupils

This is an inadequate school

- Leaders of the school and the academy trust have failed to fulfil legislative requirements relating to safeguarding and to health and safety.
- Leaders have not brought about the essential improvements identified at the last inspection.
- A breakdown in relationships between the academy trust and the local governing body, school leaders and staff has delayed essential academy improvements.
- Until recently, governors have not challenged school leaders effectively and have been too reliant on senior leaders for information on how well the academy is doing.
- Pupils' achievement, including in the sixth form, is inadequate and standards are too low.
- Since the previous inspection, leaders have not focused their efforts on improving the quality of teaching in order to raise pupils' achievement. Performance management arrangements have too little impact.
- Expectations of what pupils can achieve are too low. The academy's targets are not challenging enough.
- Leaders have not ensured that assessments of pupils' work are accurate. Until recently, procedures for tracking pupils' progress and providing additional support for those who need it have been ineffective.
- Teachers do not demand enough of pupils and too readily accept work that is of poor quality or is incomplete. Marking is infrequent and, at times, inaccurate in many subjects.
- Groups of pupils, including disabled pupils, those with special educational needs and those eligible for pupil premium funding, are poorly supported and do not make enough progress.
- The curriculum, including in the sixth form, does not meet the needs of pupils.
- The behaviour of pupils is inadequate because of their poor attitudes to learning and their lack of self-discipline.
- Attendance is well below the national average. The achievement of many pupils is held back because they do not attend the academy regularly.

The school has the following strengths

- The new Principal has quickly established an accurate picture of the academy's position and has gained the confidence of governors, senior leaders and staff. He has begun to tackle long-term weaknesses in the academy's effectiveness.

Full report

In accordance with the Education Act 2005, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector is of the opinion that this school requires special measures because it is failing to give its pupils an acceptable standard of education and the persons responsible for leading, managing or governing the school are not demonstrating the capacity to secure the necessary improvement in the school.

What does the school need to do to improve further?

- Ensure, as a matter of urgency, that:
 - an external review of site security, including that of the alternative provision, is carried out and academy leaders respond rapidly and in full to its findings
 - gaps in the academy's recruitment checks are corrected.

- Improve the strategic leadership of the academy by ensuring that:
 - members of the academy trust, the local governing body, the Principal and the academy leaders, as a matter of urgency, resolve the current breakdown in relationships
 - academy improvement plans are based on a thorough and accurate evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the academy's performance, and that these plans are regularly reviewed and updated in the light of progress
 - leaders at all levels understand their roles and responsibilities and are held accountable for their actions
 - accurate information about pupils' progress, attendance and behaviour is used to anticipate underachievement and respond more effectively and swiftly to concerns
 - leaders' checks on the quality of teaching are closely linked to detailed analysis of the progress that pupils make in each subject
 - performance management procedures provide a close link between challenging targets for staff and decisions about pay and salary progression
 - pupil premium funding and Year 7 catch-up funding is used effectively to improve the achievement of those pupils it is intended to support
 - more effective procedures are put in place to identify and support pupils with disabilities or special educational needs
 - the academy curriculum is fit for purpose so that all pupils can achieve well, including those in the sixth form.

- Improve the quality of teaching, including in the sixth form, so that pupils make at least good progress by:
 - developing and implementing an academy-wide strategy for improving teaching, monitoring its impact and holding staff closely to account
 - ensuring that accurate assessment information is used across all year groups to plan work that matches the learning needs of different groups of pupils
 - ensuring that teachers have high expectations of all pupils and insist that pupils' work is completed and presented to a high standard
 - managing behaviour more effectively so that pupils are focused on their learning and no one is able to interrupt or disrupt a lesson.

- Improve behaviour and safety by:
 - developing an academy behaviour management policy which sets out clear expectations for pupils' behaviour and conduct and ensuring that all staff and pupils follow it
 - investigating why bullying occurs so regularly and taking decisive action to stop it
 - improving the attendance of all groups of pupils and reducing the proportion of pupils who are persistently absent from the academy.

- Raise achievement across the academy, particularly in English, mathematics and science, by:
 - rigorously checking that all pupils and groups of pupils are making at least expected rates of progress
 - improving equality of opportunity and the impact of support for disabled pupils and those with special educational needs
 - reducing the time lost through fixed-term exclusions from the academy.

An external review of governance should be undertaken in order to assess how this aspect of leadership and management may be improved.

An external review of the academy's use of pupil premium funding should be undertaken in order to assess how this aspect of leadership and management may be improved.

Inspection judgements

Effectiveness of leadership and management is inadequate

- Inspectors found leadership of the academy to be dysfunctional. There is a failure in effective communication between the academy trust and the group of other key stakeholders, including the recently appointed Principal, the local governing body, other senior academy leaders and teachers.
- The trust has an unrealistic view of the academy's effectiveness, which has been in decline for some time.
- The new Principal has rapidly established an accurate picture of the academy's position and has gained the confidence of governors, senior leaders and staff, but has not been in post long enough to make significant improvements. The local governing body, senior leaders and staff have confidence in the new Principal and the changes he has proposed but this is not acknowledged by the academy trust.
- The academy's self-evaluation now accurately assesses that all areas of academic and safeguarding provision and outcomes for pupils are inadequate. Until the Principal's re-evaluation, leaders viewed the performance of the academy as good in all areas. The Principal has begun to initiate sensible and workable actions to tackle long-term weaknesses, but this work is being impeded by a lack of support from the academy trust.
- Systemic and long-standing weaknesses in leadership across the academy meant that leaders' actions to raise achievement and improve teaching were unclear and lacked urgency. None of the areas for improvement set out in the previous inspection report were tackled successfully. Leadership roles and responsibilities were not clearly understood, resulting in a lack of accountability.
- Leaders' understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the academy's performance were not accurate or insightful enough. For example, the evaluation of teaching was not linked to an analysis of the progress of pupils. Weaknesses in the way checks were carried out meant that staff were not properly or consistently held to account for their responsibilities in bringing about improvement.
- Systems for managing the performance of teachers are inadequate. Targets are not precise enough to hold staff to account for pupils' performance and there is currently no link between salary progression and pupils' achievement.
- Although academy leaders are developing better systems for collecting and analysing assessment information, they have yet to demonstrate high levels of confidence in the reliability of the data collected. As a result, staff are unable to use this data effectively to anticipate and tackle underachievement. In addition, pastoral and support staff do not use a range of information, including attendance and behaviour data, well enough to detect and respond to the early signs of pupils who may be falling behind.
- Over time, some decisions taken by leaders are difficult to understand and patently are not supporting the progress of pupils into the sixth form. The entry requirement for admission to the sixth form means that two thirds of the Year 11 pupils cannot continue their education at the academy. The sixth form curriculum now has an expectation that all learners will learn a second language just as the number of pupils following a second language in Year 11 has declined to below 5%.
- Following a significant decline in outcomes for pupils in science in 2014, leaders carried out a series of initiatives to support and improve teaching in the department. These were ineffective. Despite leaders confidently believing these would lead to improved outcomes, pupils' progress in science declined still further in 2015.
- Expectations of what pupils can achieve are too low. The academy's academic targets are too modest and more-able pupils in particular are not challenged enough to make faster progress. As a result, few pupils make the progress expected of them across a range of subjects, including in mathematics, English and in science.
- Academy leaders have used the pupil premium money to provide a range of activities for particular groups of pupils. However, they have not checked on the difference this funding is making, nor do they know which strategies are making the most or least difference. The academy trust and the local governing body have not challenged academy leaders robustly enough about how this money is spent.
- Evidence from observations in lessons, a scrutiny of pupils' work, the views of parents and discussions with senior leaders show that there is no systematic identification, assessment or specialist provision for young people with disabilities or special educational needs. This means that some pupils have been denied the targeted support required to improve their progress across all areas of the curriculum.
- For a number of years, the funding provided specifically to support pupils in Year 7 who did not achieve well at the end of Key Stage 2 was spent in other areas of the academy. This meant that these pupils fell further behind in literacy and mathematics.
- The academy's current curriculum is not fit for purpose, is not appropriately matched to the needs and

aspirations of pupils, and does not provide suitably for pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development. The academy website describes a daily 90-minute timetabled session for intervention, enrichment and extra-curricular activities but staff and pupils confirm that this is rarely used. Pupils are not sufficiently prepared for the opportunities and experiences of life in modern Britain.

- Leaders have not ensured that information on attendance, persistent absence and exclusions is accurate and monitored.
- There are significant concerns about the security of the academy site and of the Limewood Centre alternative provision site.
- Leaders, governors and the trust do not fulfil legislative requirements relating to safeguarding and health and safety. The academy safeguarding policy has not been approved by governors. Safeguarding training delivered to staff has been ineffective. There are significant gaps in the academy's recruitment checks and records do not include some recent appointments and members of the academy trust.
- Inspectors strongly recommend that the academy should not seek to appoint newly qualified teachers.
- **The governance of the school**
 - Governance at the academy is inadequate. Until recently governors have been over-reliant on inaccurate and over-generous information from senior leaders and did not have an accurate view of the significant weaknesses of the academy. They have been too slow in reacting to declining examination results and have not held leaders to account for the performance of the academy.
 - Governors' oversight of the management of teachers' performance is inadequate. Despite the significant underachievement of pupils in most subjects over the past two years, all teachers have progressed up the salary scale with the approval of governors.
 - Governors have not ensured that procedures to safeguard pupils, including checks on recruitment, are accurate, secure and up to date.
- The academy's arrangements for safeguarding are not effective.

Quality of teaching, learning and assessment is inadequate

- As a result of weak teaching over time, pupils, including those in the sixth form, make inadequate progress.
- Teachers' expectations of what pupils are able to achieve are too low. Historically, teachers have had little confidence in the targets set for pupils. The majority of teaching is not adapted well enough to suit the needs and abilities of pupils as teachers do not use their knowledge of pupils' prior learning to make sure work is set at the right level. As a result, many lessons are based on all pupils completing the same activities rather than making sure that pupils are sufficiently challenged with the work they are given.
- In almost all lessons, low-level disruption hampers learning and slows progress. Too many pupils do not engage productively with their learning and instead engage in off-task behaviour such as rocking back and forth on chairs, tapping rulers and pens and talking across the teacher and the pupils who are trying to respond to the teacher's questions. Teachers and pupils have suffered from not having a consistently applied whole-academy system of behaviour management, with effective sanctions and rewards, and consequently poor behaviour has become the norm.
- Teachers' questioning in lessons is ineffective and lacks precision. There are too few opportunities for pupils to provide anything but brief responses or to engage in more in-depth discussion with the teacher and each other. This limits the learning that takes place and also contributes to the pervading sense of passivity and boredom amongst those pupils who are not misbehaving but display a quiet sense of 'putting up' with the circumstances created by poor behaviour. Teachers too often aim to get through tasks without much regard for how well pupils acquire knowledge and understand important ideas and concepts.
- Pupils take little pride in their work. Presentation is poor and many books and planners contain graffiti. Where pupils have clearly tried hard they receive little positive reinforcement because work is not marked regularly and feedback is too often superficial.
- The Learning Resource Centre based within the academy is a bright and well-resourced area which is staffed by a team of dedicated tutors. However, the lack of effective assessment, monitoring and specialist support for pupils who need help with literacy, numeracy and other specific learning needs has contributed significantly to the gaps seen in pupil progress.
- The provision for pupils attending alternative provision at the Limewood Centre is inadequate. Pupils are not receiving the education and curriculum hours to which they are entitled. Staff support the vulnerable and often challenging pupils who attend the centre with care and sensitivity and have had some success at returning these pupils to mainstream education.

Personal development, behaviour and welfare is inadequate

Personal development and welfare

- The school's work to promote pupils' personal development and welfare is inadequate.
- Incidents of bullying, including the use of discriminatory and derogatory language, are common. Leaders and managers do not tackle bullying effectively and pupils report that they accept bullying as a feature of everyday life at the academy. The academy does not have a clear or effective policy in this area and systems to tackle bullying are ineffective.
- Some pupils say that they do not feel safe and that adults do not always listen when they report issues and concerns. Academy leaders confirm that some adults do not know how to respond to concerns expressed by pupils and do not always take concerns seriously.
- The safety and welfare of pupils attending the Limewood Centre alternative provision is compromised by ineffective monitoring of their attendance and concerns with the security of the site.

Behaviour

- The behaviour of pupils is inadequate.
- The low-level disruptive behaviour observed by inspectors in lessons was confirmed as being typical through discussions with pupils. Pupils are often uninterested in lessons because teaching is poorly matched to their levels of ability, and behaviour is not managed well. Discussions with teachers and responses to the inspection questionnaire confirmed significant staff concerns with poor pupil behaviour throughout the academy.
- Too often, pupils do not listen to adults and ignore their directions. Pupils' conduct at the start and end of the day, at breaks and lunchtimes is, at times, poor. Some pupils are disrespectful and occasionally aggressive towards adults and each other.
- Absence has been well above the national average for several years and continues to increase. The proportion of pupils who are persistently absent from the academy is well above the national average. Levels of fixed-term exclusion and repeated fixed-term exclusion are very high. Records of absence, persistent absence and exclusions kept by the academy are inconsistent and have not been routinely checked and it is possible that actual levels may be even higher than those reported.

Outcomes for pupils are inadequate

- Overall, pupils have not made enough progress in their time at the school since the last inspection. Examination results in 2015 indicate that their progress has declined over the last three years and is now inadequate. The current progress of pupils, evident in work in books and in the academy's assessment information, shows that there is little sign of improvement. The academy is unlikely to meet the government's floor standards for 2015 when they are published. These are the minimum expectations for pupils' attainment at GCSE and their progress in English and mathematics.
- In GCSE examinations in 2014, attainment was significantly lower than in the previous year. Provisional information indicates that the proportion of pupils gaining five good GCSEs including English and mathematics in 2015 has declined further and is once again well below the national average.
- In 2014, the average point score reached by disadvantaged pupils in English and in mathematics was equivalent to around one GCSE grade lower in each subject. Provisional GCSE scores for 2015 show the gap between disadvantaged pupils and other pupils has widened further. This is despite the school receiving significant extra funding from the pupil premium to boost their achievement.
- Many pupils underachieve because expectations of them are too low and leaders and teachers have not supported or challenged them well enough to succeed. The proportion of more-able pupils attaining high GCSE grades is low in most subjects and in several subjects no pupils achieve higher grades. In too many lessons, higher-ability pupils are insufficiently challenged by their teachers or the curriculum provided for them.
- Current pupils with disabilities and special educational needs are making inadequate progress. The academy has been reluctant to recognise and understand the differing needs of these pupils. As a result, the approaches taken to help them to learn, and the nature of the work they are set, are not appropriate in too many lessons. A number of parents complained to inspectors that they were unaware whether or not their children had received additional support since leaving primary school.

- Pupils aged 16 and learners in the sixth form are inadequately prepared for the next stage of their education, training, or employment.
- Pupils who attend the Limewood Centre alternative provision receive only three hours of teaching per day and little targeted support and so make inadequate progress.

16 to 19 study programmes are inadequate

- Academy leaders have not secured effective provision for learners in the sixth form. The curriculum currently offered is not appropriate for the majority of pupils at the academy and the advice and guidance pupils receive before entering the sixth form is poor. Too many pupils are on courses that are not matched to their skills or interests. This limits their opportunities to succeed.
- Too much teaching fails to promote the required level of depth and insight into the subject studied. In some lessons there are high expectations of what pupils can achieve, work is presented well and pupils are engaged in their learning. In too many lessons, however, pupils are taken step-by-step through their work which limits pupils' ability to develop the skills and independence they will need in higher education or in work.
- Leadership of the sixth form is weak. Attendance, punctuality, behaviour and safeguarding are poorly monitored and the impact of provision in the sixth form is not clearly understood.
- There is no coherent programme to enable pupils to develop their knowledge and understanding of issues including online safety, sexual health, and alcohol and drug misuse. Pupils say that sexist and homophobic language, along with swearing, are common in the academy. Pupils do not always use their free time to good effect.
- Too many learners drop out of the sixth form at the end of Year 12 and during Year 13. In 2015 almost half of learners failed to complete their courses.
- The academy does not meet the requirements of the 16–19 study programmes. Until this year learners were not offered work experience, and opportunities to develop their character, skills, attitudes and confidence are still very limited. The small number of pupils who enter the sixth form without a good GCSE grade in English or mathematics are supported well and the majority passed their examinations last year.

School details

Unique reference number	131898
Local authority	Leeds
Inspection number	10008539

This inspection was carried out under section 8 of the Education Act 2005. The inspection was also deemed a section 5 inspection under the same Act.

Type of school	Secondary comprehensive
School category	Academy sponsor-led
Age range of pupils	11–18
Gender of pupils	Mixed
Gender of pupils in 16 to 19 study programmes	Mixed
Number of pupils on the school roll	995
Of which, number on roll in 16 to 19 study programmes	102
Appropriate authority	The governing body
Chair	Karen Osborne
Principal	Jeremy Richardson
Telephone number	0113 273 9100
Website	www.dyca.org.uk
Email address	dyca.info@leafacademytrust.org.uk
Date of previous inspection	9 May 2012

Information about this school

- The academy is similar in size to the average secondary school. It is one of three academies in the LEAF Academy Trust, along with Manston St James and Rothwell Church of England Primary Academies. Each of the academies in the trust has a local governing body.
- The Principal has been in post since August 2015.
- The proportion of disadvantaged pupils eligible for support through the pupil premium funding is well above the national average. (The pupil premium is additional funding for those pupils who are known to be eligible for free school meals and those children who are looked after by the local authority.)
- The proportions of pupils from minority ethnic groups, and those whose first language is not believed to be English, are close to the national average.
- The proportion of disabled pupils and those who have special educational needs is well below the national average.
- A small number of pupils attend the Limewood Centre alternative provision run by the academy.
- In 2014, the academy met the government's floor standard for the minimum expectations of attainment and progress at GCSE.

Information about this inspection

- This inspection was initially conducted under section 8 of the Education Act 2005 in accordance with Ofsted’s published procedures for inspecting schools with no formal designation. The monitoring inspection was carried out because Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector was concerned about the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements, the effectiveness of leadership and management (including governance) and the personal development, behaviour and welfare of pupils in the academy. The monitoring visit was subsequently converted into a full section 5 inspection.
- Inspectors observed teaching in 48 part-lessons in a range of subjects taught by teachers across the age range of the academy. Inspectors looked at the work pupils were doing in lessons and over time in their books.
- Meetings were held with the Principal, members of the leadership team, middle leaders, and a group of classroom teachers. In addition inspectors met with the Chair and three other members of the Local Governing Body, the Chief Executive Officer and three other members of the LEAF Academy Trust, the Deputy Director of Children’s Services and the Safeguarding Lead for Leeds local authority and the Director of Education for the Diocese of West Yorkshire and the Dales.
- Inspectors observed the academy’s work and scrutinised a wide range of documentation including the academy’s view of its own performance, monitoring records, information about pupils’ progress, improvement planning, minutes of meetings of the local governing body and the academy trust, records of behaviour and attendance, and records relating to safeguarding and child protection. Inspectors took note of recent external reviews of the quality of teaching, learning and assessment and of attendance.
- Discussions were held with groups of pupils about the quality of their educational experience and the standard of behaviour in the academy. Inspectors also spoke with pupils in lessons and at various times during both days of the inspection.
- There were insufficient responses to the online Parent View questionnaire to provide evidence for the inspection, although inspectors were able to take note of a small number of comments made by parents. A very high proportion of staff contributed their views in a questionnaire; 107 responses were received.

Inspection team

David Brown, lead inspector	Her Majesty’s Inspector
Nick Whittaker	Her Majesty’s Inspector
Tanya Stuart	Her Majesty’s Inspector
Wendy Ripley	Ofsted Inspector
Mary Lanovy-Taylor	Ofsted Inspector

Any complaints about the inspection or the report should be made following the procedures set out in the guidance 'Raising concerns and making a complaint about Ofsted', which is available from Ofsted's website: www.gov.uk/government/publications/complaints-about-ofsted. If you would like Ofsted to send you a copy of the guidance, please telephone 0300 123 4234, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.



You can use Parent View to give Ofsted your opinion on your child's school. Ofsted will use the information parents and carers provide when deciding which schools to inspect and when and as part of the inspection.

You can also use Parent View to find out what other parents and carers think about schools in England. You can visit www.parentview.ofsted.gov.uk, or look for the link on the main Ofsted website: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, further education and skills, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may reuse this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted.

Interested in our work? You can subscribe to our monthly newsletter for more information and updates: <http://eepurl.com/iTrDn>.

Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 4234
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.ofsted.gov.uk

© Crown copyright 2015

