

Noel-Baker School

Bracknell Drive, Alvaston, Derby, Derbyshire DE24 0BR

Inspection dates

4–5 October 2016

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
16 to 19 study programmes	Inadequate
Overall effectiveness at previous inspection	Requires improvement

Summary of key findings for parents and pupils

This is an inadequate school

- Leadership and management are inadequate in many respects. The headteacher, senior leaders and governors have not ensured that pupils attend school regularly, achieve well or that staff apply policies consistently.
- Safeguarding is ineffective. The systems for managing attendance and following up pupils' absences are weak. Leaders could not tell inspectors where some absent pupils were.
- Outcomes for pupils have been unacceptably low for far too long and show little sign of improving. In 2015, almost every pupil group underachieved significantly in most subject areas and 2016 outcomes are similar. This applies to the main school and the sixth form.
- The curriculum is unsuitable for some pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities. Pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development is not well promoted.
- Leaders' oversight of extra funding for disadvantaged pupils is inadequate.
- The school's engagement with parents is poor.
- Protracted and messy negotiations over the school's potential academy status have had a negative impact on vital school improvement work.
- The school's self-evaluation is inaccurate and pupils' progress data is unreliable.
- Governance is inadequate. Governors have too readily accepted the word of the headteacher and senior leaders and have not challenged enough. They have not managed the performance of the headteacher robustly.
- Pupils' personal development, behaviour and welfare are inadequate. Leaders have not fully understood that poor attendance could link to safeguarding concerns. When they have, appropriate action is not always taken. Teachers do not use rewards as willingly as sanctions. Lunchtime arrangements for pupils are poor.
- Leaders have not fulfilled their duty to provide pupils with independent, impartial careers advice in the main school or the sixth form.
- The requirements of the 16–19 study programmes are not met.

The school has the following strengths

- The quality of teaching, though inadequate over time, is improving slowly due to leaders' actions.
- Outcomes for pupils are good in dance, art, childcare and religious education (RE).
- Behaviour in classrooms and around the school site, while not yet consistently good, has improved very recently.

Full report

In accordance with section 44(1) of 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?

- Make safeguarding effective through ensuring that there is an appropriate system for monitoring pupils' attendance, which includes rigorous checks on absences.
- Increase the impact of leadership and management, in both the main school and the sixth form, by:
 - resolving the academy status of the school as soon as is practicable so that it no longer distracts all involved from vital work to improve the life chances of pupils
 - ensuring that governors have the skills to be able to hold school leaders to better account
 - creating an effective strategy for the use and evaluation of the extra funding the school receives to improve the outcomes of disadvantaged pupils of all abilities
 - ensuring the accuracy of pupils' progress data so that leaders, governors and teachers are better informed about what they need to improve
 - making sure that all members of staff are consistent in their application of school policies about expectations of pupils, including the appropriate use of rewards as well as sanctions
 - introducing an effective programme of independent, impartial careers advice, making sure that pupils consider their future steps from Year 8 onwards
 - reviewing the curriculum, including the subject choices pupils make, so that it is fit for all pupils, particularly those with special educational needs and/or disabilities
 - ensuring that the curriculum better supports pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development
 - reviewing the school's lunchtime arrangements to promote a calmer environment, which is more efficient and equitable for pupils
 - developing closer relationships with parents so they are better informed about the school's work.
- Improve teaching and learning more quickly through bespoke professional development for members of staff, including the sharing of best practice, so that teachers can increase rates of achievement for all pupils across the curriculum.
- Increase the effectiveness of the sixth form by:
 - ensuring that the requirements of the 16–19 study programmes are met, particularly in terms of increasing opportunities for students to experience the world of work

- supporting students in making the most appropriate choices of courses so that retention rates increase
- supporting students better in taking their next steps
- making sure that leaders have a full and accurate understanding of students' destinations and analyse this to improve the provision offered
- increasing the range and opportunities of non-qualification activities available to students.

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 school's use of the pupil premium should be undertaken in order to assess how this aspect of leadership and management may be improved.

Inspection judgements

Effectiveness of leadership and management

Inadequate

- The headteacher and governors have overseen poor outcomes for pupils for too long and they have not demonstrated the capacity to improve them.
- The school had an academy order approved in January 2015. Since then, protracted negotiations have taken place between the local authority, a prospective sponsor of the school (L.E.A.D. Academy Trust), the headteacher and the governing body. Most, though not all, of the wrangling has been about money, specifically the financial implications and complexities associated with a school that was recently built through a private finance initiative. Almost two years later, the academy status of the school has still not been resolved. While the stakeholders involved have differing opinions on many matters, all representatives interviewed by the lead inspector readily agreed on one thing: the situation has been a complete mess. There was unanimous agreement that this has distracted the local authority, the prospective sponsor and the governing body from the vital school improvement work they could have been doing. Those who care least about these matters are those who have been affected most: the pupils of Noel-Baker School.
- Leaders have not ensured that pupils attend school regularly. The attendance of all pupils is well below that seen nationally but the attendance of some pupil groups, including those who are disadvantaged or have special educational needs and/or disabilities, is alarmingly low and not improving. This has been the case for some time. This does not convey an ethos of care or ambition for pupils.
- Between April 2015 and March 2016, Noel-Baker School received £423,555 in pupil premium funding. The school received a similar amount in the year before that. This considerable sum has had little impact on improving either the attendance of or the outcomes for the disadvantaged pupils for whom it is intended. The management of this funding, and of the further Year 7 literacy and numeracy catch-up funding, has been inadequate. There is no evaluation of the funded actions that take place to see what works or what does not work.
- The curriculum is unsuitable for pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities. The choice of subjects on offer has been too limited and has not allowed these pupils to flourish. The information, advice and guidance given to them has not enabled them to make the progress of which they are capable; too many have been ill-advised, for example in making options choices following which they have subsequently underachieved.
- The curriculum contains an appropriate range of subjects for most key stage 3 and 4 pupils. However, very few take or succeed in the suite of qualifications that constitutes the English Baccalaureate. Pupils' curriculum choices are very much their own. While this has merit, some pupils would achieve more if they received clearer guidance on course suitability.
- There is no whole-school strategy in place for the promotion of pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development. While leaders of individual subject areas have begun to think about how their subject can contribute to aspects of pupils' development, this work is at an early stage of development.

- The school encourages respect for other cultures and traditions, for example through displays and positive messages that are displayed around school that provoke reflection on what it is like to live in different parts of the world. However, opportunities to learn about other faiths and cultures are currently limited to subjects such as religious education (RE).
- Not all pupils have a secure understanding of British values. The programme of personal, social, health and economic education (PSHE) provides pupils with opportunities to learn about democracy and the rule of law, and pupils were eager participants in the discussions about the vote on the EU referendum. There are plans to redevelop the school council, but this has only taken place in the sixth form thus far. Consequently, pupils are not routinely consulted on what they think and feel about their school and they have few opportunities to influence their school's development.
- School data on the progress made by pupils is at best inconsistent and at worst wildly inaccurate. Data provided from the end of May predicted a healthy and positive Progress 8 score for the Year 11 students who have just left the school. In fact, the outcome was a negative one and only just above the government's new minimum expectations.
- Leaders' self-evaluation of the school is inaccurate and depicts a place that is much better than the current reality.
- The headteacher and other senior leaders have not helped the governing body become effective in their duties.
- Leaders have not ensured that teachers consistently follow their policy on expectations of students or the behaviour policy. Application of the latter is improving and behaviour has improved very recently.
- There is little evidence of successful engagement with parents. A small amount of correspondence to inspectors revealed that some parents do not feel listened to. At the time of the inspection, less than 1% of parents had given their views on the school via Ofsted's online questionnaire, Parent View.
- The leader with responsibility for the quality of teaching, learning and assessment has developed an effective system to manage the performance of teachers. This has led to some recent improvements in teaching, particularly in key stage 3. It has also led to some teachers choosing to leave. In some of these instances, it has not been possible for senior leaders to recruit staff of the quality they would like. Too often, pupils have been left to endure poor-quality teaching. This has compromised the senior leader's efforts to improve the quality of teaching in the school as a whole, but its quality is still moving in the right direction.
- The school provides a wide range of extra-curricular clubs and activities for those who are interested in sport. The most popular are football and basketball. The school's sporting facilities are a strength. There are links to local engineering companies and some pupils have benefited from related projects.
- The nurture group and those who attend the before-school and lunchtime provision for vulnerable pupils have good opportunities to develop their social skills. Those who spoke with inspectors talked of the impact these sessions had on improving their confidence and ability to join in with whole-class activities.
- Newly qualified teachers may be appointed on the condition that their progress and support is overseen by the senior leader with responsibility for improving the quality of teaching.

Governance of the school

- The governance of the school is inadequate.
- The governing body has too willingly and readily accepted the word of the headteacher and other senior leaders about the performance of the school. It was a great surprise to the governors when the lead inspector revealed the accurate picture of outcomes for Year 11 and the sixth form students over the last two years. The governors are committed and well-meaning individuals. However, they have failed to ensure that they were trained to enable themselves to adequately challenge senior leaders, or to take another informed, independent view to satisfy themselves that the governing body was being presented with an accurate view of the school.
- A notable exception to this is the link governor for pupil premium funding, who was rightly concerned about how little impact there has been. Partly as a result of this challenge, the school now has a teacher specifically overseeing this area.
- Governors have not managed the performance of the headteacher rigorously enough.
- The governors are not satisfied that they have a full understanding of the school's current finances. As a result, they are in the process of arranging an independent financial audit.
- Governors have not ensured that they have members who have been trained in safer recruitment procedures.
- Governors understand how the school makes decisions about teachers' salary progression and performance.

Safeguarding

- The arrangements for safeguarding are not effective.
- The current arrangements to monitor pupils' attendance are not adequate. This applies to the sixth form as well as the main school. Leaders do not follow up absences with sufficient rigour. This places pupils at unnecessary risk. Leaders do not always make the connections between pupils' attendance and potential safeguarding issues, and put in place appropriate support.
- Leaders have taken action in response to concerns raised previously and have improved many aspects of safeguarding within the school following a helpful review by the local authority. They have put in place effective safeguarding and staff behaviour policies, and have much improved the systems for making checks on the suitability of staff. Training for staff has covered issues such as domestic violence, child sexual exploitation, peer-on-peer abuse and female genital mutilation. Staff know the signs of potential abuse and the procedures to follow when they have concerns about the welfare of a pupil. Much-improved recording systems mean that written records are now produced in a timely way and are stored securely.
- Leaders have a better understanding of how they can work with other agencies to support parents and families and prevent problems from escalating. They support staff to carry out early-help assessments and ensure that there is now better attendance at multi-agency meetings. This work is beginning to have an impact in ensuring that the most vulnerable pupils receive the help they need, but it is not consistently effective.
- Pupils are taught how to keep safe from the dangers of radicalisation and extremism through the school's programme of PSHE and assemblies. Leaders have a good understanding of what the risks are in the local community and all staff have undergone 'Prevent' training. Pupils who spoke with inspectors knew what the systems

were for ensuring their safe use of the internet in school. Staff are alert to the possible signs that pupils may be at risk.

Quality of teaching, learning and assessment

Inadequate

- Teaching is inadequate because it has failed to meet the needs of pupils. As a result, pupils of all ability levels are underachieving across many subject areas.
- The needs of disadvantaged pupils, those who have special educational needs and/or disabilities, and the most able pupils, have not been addressed. The pupil premium funding has not been used well to improve the teaching of those pupils for whom it is intended.
- With regard to those pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities, teachers do not routinely make best use of the expertise within the school or local area. In some cases, too little is expected of these pupils, while at other times they are not able to access the work they are given because they do not have the right support.
- There are too many occasions when too little is expected of pupils of all abilities. This is demonstrated through basic activities such as copying, cutting out or repeating work from earlier years. This disproportionately affects the achievement of the most able pupils, who do not routinely have the opportunities they should.
- Too little teaching encourages a sense of wonder and awe. There are occasions when this happens, for example in a Year 7 science lesson on magnetism and electricity, when pupils were eager and excited to create their own motors and work out how to make them go faster. However, such moments are too infrequent.
- On occasion, teachers successfully link the learning to important moral and social issues. This was evident in a Year 12 English classroom, where students offered thoughtful and sensitive views on society's changing attitudes to domestic violence.
- Pupils, both those who have left the school recently and those who are currently in the school, cannot apply their mathematics skills as well as they should.
- The quality of homework varies considerably between subjects.
- Historic systems to manage the performance of teachers proved ineffective, which allowed a legacy of inadequate teaching to go unaddressed for some time. Leaders did not have the information to tackle poor performance or identify best practice.
- The arrangements for managing the performance of teachers have improved greatly. This has led to poor practice being challenged, with the result that many members of staff have left, while others have improved their practice. Some new members of staff displayed potential to secure better outcomes for pupils. Teaching is improving, and pupils' response to this is seen more readily at key stage 3.
- Where teaching is most effective, it is characterised by good subject knowledge, helpful feedback that is developmental, and positive, respectful relationships between teachers and pupils.
- Teachers' development needs are beginning to be addressed through effective training. Newly qualified and trainee teachers said that they are supported well.

Personal development and welfare

- The school's work to promote pupils' personal development and welfare is inadequate.
- Arrangements for pupils' welfare are not effective because leaders do not make sufficient checks on the whereabouts and welfare of pupils who are not in school. Ad hoc arrangements for pupils to remain at home are not challenged and checked with sufficient rigour.
- Leaders' monitoring of pupils whose welfare has been a cause for concern is not rigorous enough. There is insufficient oversight of the work that is done by different members of staff who are concerned with pupils' welfare. Consequently, key information is sometimes missed. This places pupils at unnecessary risk.
- The current arrangements for serving lunch are not sufficient to ensure pupils' safety and welfare. This is because too many pupils queue for lunch at the same time. While the vast majority cope well with this situation, it leaves some pupils feeling vulnerable, unsafe and resentful when older pupils push in.
- Pupils who spoke with inspectors had no concerns about bullying in the school, and this was confirmed by the school's own records which show such incidents to be low. Pupils are confident that teachers would listen to their concerns and take appropriate action. They know who they should approach if they have any concerns about their own or others' safety. However, school leaders have not successfully resolved all of the small number of parental concerns expressed.
- Teaching is not consistently effective in supporting pupils to become successful, resilient learners. This is especially true for the least able pupils. In some cases, pupils are over-reliant on teachers and support staff and do not know how to get help or find out the answers for themselves.
- In assemblies and tutor time, pupils learn how to stay safe in a range of situations. For example, in an assembly observed by inspectors, pupils learned about the dangers of sexting and cyber bullying. Pupils listened intently and with interest, and gained a good understanding of the seriousness of these issues.
- The programme of PSHE education takes places in tutor time and assemblies. Some pupils who spoke with inspectors would like more opportunities to learn about these topics. As one said, 'Our mental health is as important as our physical health'.
- The school does not meet its statutory duty to provide impartial advice and guidance to pupils. Pupils who are getting ready to move on to the next stage of their education, employment or training are not all clear about what their next steps are, or how to seek advice.

Behaviour

- The behaviour of pupils is inadequate.
- The reason for this judgement is because of very low attendance levels rather than the behaviour of pupils as seen in the school.
- For too long, too many pupils have been disadvantaged by chronically poor attendance. The attendance of all pupils remains well below national averages. The attendance of pupils who are eligible for pupil premium funding, and those with special educational needs and/or disabilities, is even worse than for others and shows little sign of improvement. In the last academic year, for example, one in five pupils entitled to

support through the pupil premium funding was frequently absent from school. This rose to one in four for Year 10 pupils, leaving them under-prepared for their final year of GCSEs. At the time of inspection, the attendance of Year 11 pupils for this academic year was 75%. It is almost impossible for pupils to achieve good outcomes in these circumstances.

- Incidents of poor behaviour and of low-level disruption have reduced considerably since the school was visited by Ofsted in May 2016. However, pupils who spoke with inspectors confirmed that not all teachers apply the behaviour policy consistently. In a few instances, teachers do not challenge instances of poor language and behaviour in class. Teachers do not use the rewards system consistently.
- Around the school and in their unstructured time, most pupils behave well. There is good adult supervision to ensure that pupils are safe.
- The majority of pupils show self-discipline in ensuring that they get to lessons on time. Some of the older pupils have developed a more casual attitude. Not all teachers challenge those pupils who arrive late to class.

Outcomes for pupils

Inadequate

- The Year 11 pupils who left Noel-Baker School in the summer of 2015 underachieved significantly. This was the case for pupils in all ability groups. Achievement which was already previously poor in humanities and science declined further in 2015.
- Achievement in mathematics has been an area of concern in this school for many years. In 2015, achievement declined further still. The progress made by low-ability pupils in this subject was appalling, with only one pupil of 34 making the progress expected of them.
- The only major subject area in which pupils did not underachieve in 2015 was English. Pupils' achievement was also relatively good in dance, music and computer science.
- Despite predictions to the contrary, early 2016 data shows that little improvement has been made. Performance in English language declined significantly, though several remarks of examination papers have improved the initial picture. Attainment and progress in mathematics has declined further still. School data shows that 60% of last year's Year 11 pupils underachieved. In 17 of the 30 courses available in 2016, more than half of the pupils underachieved. Only one in three pupils, approximately, achieved good GCSEs in both English and mathematics.
- Information provided by the school shows that pupils performed particularly poorly in all science courses, history, geography, Spanish, computer science, drama, citizenship, health and social care, music, product design and sport. Data shows that all but two of the 22 students who took business studies underachieved.
- In both 2015 and 2016, the worst-performing ability group across subjects was the most able pupils. A legacy of inadequate teaching over time has affected this group most; a key factor in the poor teaching has been teachers' low expectations of what some pupils can achieve.
- The significant sums of pupil premium funding are having little discernible effect on improving the outcomes of disadvantaged students. In 2015, this group did very well indeed in English and performed almost in line with non-disadvantaged pupils nationally. That was not the case in mathematics, with only a third making the

progress expected of them. As a result, only 18% of disadvantaged pupils achieved five or more good GCSE grades, including English and mathematics. Early 2016 data and information provided by the school shows that the necessary improvements for this group have not materialised. Differences between this group of pupils and their non-disadvantaged peers nationally, which were already very wide, have not diminished. There are too few most-able disadvantaged pupils to be able to report on their progress as a whole.

- Pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities generally make less progress than others in most subjects. The exception to this is in science, where this group of pupils is now making progress in line with their peers, and in some cases doing better than them. On the whole, however, the achievement of pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities continues to be hampered by dire attendance and by teaching that does not always meet their needs effectively in class.
- There are some subject areas in which Year 11 pupils did well in 2016. School data shows that pupils did exceptionally well in dance, childcare, art and RE. Pupils also achieved some good outcomes in English, food technology and media studies.
- The system for managing pupils' progress information has improved of late. However, the figures which go into the system still lack reliability. School information shows that key stage 4 pupils are performing better than those in key stage 3. Inspection evidence contradicted this; key stage 3 pupils, particularly the younger ones, have not necessarily been exposed to a legacy of inadequate teaching and have benefited from some improvements in the classroom. Evidence from observations and the scrutiny of books supported the view that these pupils are making better progress than older pupils, although this is not consistent across subjects. Even here though, the poor attendance of pupils severely compromises outcomes.

16 to 19 study programmes

Inadequate

- The flaws in the attendance management systems in the main school are also prevalent in the sixth form. School data shows that attendance across Years 12 and 13 is below 70%. The new, biometric system for students' signing in is not used properly. Not having an accurate picture of which students are in the building and which are not is a safeguarding concern.
- This has also contributed to creating a culture where some students feel that punctuality to lessons is optional. Teachers do not challenge this enough.
- Outcomes for students who left the sixth form in 2015 were inadequate in both academic and vocational courses. They were particularly poor for boys studying vocational courses.
- Outcomes for students studying academic courses in 2016 declined further, particularly for girls. Seven of 12 courses showed a decline in students' progress. The school's website and a prominent banner in front of the school proudly displays the message: '100% pass rate at A level!' This, as accepted by senior leaders and governors during the inspection, is misleading. It implies that everyone who took an A level passed it. This is far from the case – it actually means that each student achieved at least one A-level pass, which is something quite different. Only 42% of students achieved passes in three A levels, which is well below the national average of 77%. Weaker subjects at A level were history, art and design, and further mathematics. Students achieved

relatively well in drama, media and sociology.

- Some general improvements were evident at AS level; those studying religious education and media studies achieved well. Improvements were also seen in vocational courses, although this was partly due to the removal of two of the worst-performing courses in 2016. Students performed well in childcare.
- When it is effective, teaching is characterised by supportive environments, small class sizes, and staff with good subject knowledge who provide effective feedback. Relationships are good, as is students' behaviour. However, expectations of and challenge to students is not sufficient to ensure good progress. Students are sometimes over-reliant on their teachers rather than developing independence.
- Overall retention rates are low, particularly for girls.
- The requirements of the 16–19 study programmes are not met. Not all students have work experience opportunities. Only three of the 28 students on vocational courses in Year 13 have benefited from this. Work experience is not in place for all students in Year 12. Core mathematics is not offered to students.
- Students do not have access to independent, impartial careers guidance. This, along with a lack of sufficiently formalised individual support for completing applications, means that they are not well prepared for their next steps in education or employment.
- There is limited coordination of meaningful participation in non-qualification activity.
- There is no coordinated, effective tutor programme.
- Leaders do not have a complete picture of former students' destinations. There has been no rigorous analysis of the information they do have.
- Sixth form students have their own dedicated and separate building, but there are no catering facilities there. This means that they have to either bring their own lunch, go off-site or join the already overcrowded canteen in the main school.
- GCSE English and mathematics lessons are appropriately coordinated into students' timetables, where appropriate, and students achieve reasonably well on these courses.
- Students who spoke with inspectors were thankful of the availability and support of teaching staff to assist them when they have questions.

School details

Unique reference number	112992
Local authority	Derby
Inspection number	10022993

This inspection of the school was carried out under section 5 of the Education Act 2005.

Type of school	Secondary comprehensive
School category	Maintained
Age range of pupils	11 to 18
Gender of pupils	Mixed
Gender of pupils in 16 to 19 study programmes	Mixed
Number of pupils on the school roll	1,242
Of which, number on roll in 16 to 19 study programmes	100
Appropriate authority	The governing body
Chair	Alan Larkins
Headteacher	Mal Kerr
Telephone number	01332 572 026
Website	http://www.noel-baker.derby.sch.uk
Email address	enquiries@noel-baker.derby.sch.uk
Date of previous inspection	19–20 February 2015

Information about this school

- Noel-Baker School is an above average-sized secondary school with a sixth form.
- There is a higher proportion of disadvantaged pupils than that seen nationally. Most pupils are of White British heritage.
- The school does not meet requirements on the publication of information about: exam and assessment results at key stages 4 and 5; details of courses in key stage 3; how parents or members of the public can find out more about the school's curriculum; pupil premium funding; Year 7 literacy and catch-up premium funding and special

educational needs and/or disabilities information on its website.

- The school meets the government's floor standards, which set out the minimum expectations for attainment and progress of pupils.
- The school uses alternative provision at Derby Pride Academy.

Information about this inspection

- The headteacher was absent due to illness during this inspection.
- Inspectors observed learning in 37 lessons. Some observations were carried out jointly with school leaders. Inspectors visited an assembly, a tutor period, the school canteen during two lunchtimes, and a seclusion room which is used as a behaviour management resource.
- Meetings were held with the two deputy headteachers, who are currently leading the school in the absence of the headteacher; various leaders with responsibilities for behaviour, safeguarding, the sixth form, the curriculum, pupil premium funding, careers guidance, and pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities; newly qualified and trainee teachers; and various subject and pastoral leaders.
- The lead inspector met four governors, including the chair of the governing body, three representatives of the local authority, and three representatives of L.E.A.D. Academy Trust.
- Inspectors met with groups of pupils from Years 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 13. They spoke informally with other pupils at break and lunchtimes, and in lessons.
- An inspector conducted a telephone interview with a representative of an alternative provider.
- Inspectors considered a range of documentation including the school's self-evaluation documents, quality assurance records, records of behaviour, bullying and attendance, safeguarding documentation, information about the progress of all pupils, and various reports compiled by representatives of the local authority and L.E.A.D. Academy Trust.
- There were too few responses to Parent View to take into account. The lead inspector took note of one piece of written parental correspondence through this route. There were no responses to the staff or pupils' surveys.

Inspection team

Ian McNeilly, lead inspector	Her Majesty's Inspector
Deirdre Duignan	Her Majesty's Inspector
Chris Stevens	Ofsted Inspector
Javier Sanchez-Garcia	Ofsted Inspector
Julie Griffiths	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.

In the report, 'disadvantaged pupils' refers to those pupils who attract government pupil premium funding: pupils claiming free school meals at any point in the last six years and pupils in care or who left care through adoption or another formal route. www.gov.uk/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings.

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 children looked after, 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/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.gov.uk/ofsted

© Crown copyright 2016