

# Wey House School

Horsham Road, Bramley, Guildford, Surrey GU5 0BJ

## Inspection dates

28–29 November 2018

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

## Summary of key findings for parents and pupils

### This is an inadequate school

- Pupils are at risk of harm. The school is out of leaders' control and is an unsafe place to be for staff and pupils. There is no capacity to improve.
- The school's designated safeguarding leads do not act on reported concerns, which are indicators of potential abuse. The help and support that some pupils may urgently need are not activated.
- Governors and leaders do not exercise their safeguarding responsibilities competently. Safer recruitment procedures are neither observed nor understood.
- Responsible stakeholders have not reviewed many of the school's policies and procedures for some time. As a result, leaders and staff do not follow due process for many aspects of provision.
- The school is in disarray. Staff absence is too high, and many are leaving or have left. The staffing level is too low to meet pupils' needs safely or capably. Many staff are disheartened.
- Some pupils are not in receipt of their entitlement to a full-time education. For others, the school's curriculum does not meet their individual needs well enough. Pupils, including those who are disadvantaged, are underachieving.
- Staff are exasperated that leaders have not prioritised their training needs for some time. Staff feel deskilled and say they cannot meet the increasingly complex needs of some pupils. As a result, teaching is inadequate.
- Governance is ineffective. Governors have not ensured that special educational needs funding is spent well. Other additional funding, such as the sport premium and pupil premium, is not monitored or evaluated for impact.
- Staff do not receive the support that they need to manage pupils' behaviour effectively. The number of incidents of physical restraint is too high and not reducing. Adults or pupils are sometimes unnecessarily injured.
- Transition arrangements are poor. Pupils are not supported well enough to access the right provision in a timely manner.

### The school has the following strengths

- Many staff share a deep moral purpose and want to meet pupils' needs well. Some staff demonstrate high levels of care for pupils. Staff are keen and willing to improve their skills.
- During the inspection, the local authority initiated robust and prompt action. Officers are determined to arrest the decline and urgently put in measures to ensure that all are safe.

## 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?

- Urgently review and sharpen safeguarding processes so that:
  - leaders and relevant staff fully understand safeguarding requirements and ensure that statutory processes are in place
  - all pupils receive their entitlement to a full-time, safe and appropriate education
  - staff's concerns, particularly those relating to child protection, are acted on promptly and appropriately
  - safer recruitment processes are observed
  - risk assessments are implemented with immediate effect, including those relating to pupils' safety
  - all staff receive an appropriate level of safeguarding training in a timely manner
  - the school's safeguarding policy meets requirements
  - staff receive sufficient training related to the behaviour management of pupils with the most complex needs, so that they can carry out their roles effectively and safely
  - inclusion is promoted strongly, and pupils are kept safe from bullying, racism and other forms of discrimination.
- Rapidly improve the quality of leadership and management and governance by making sure that:
  - a sustainable leadership, governance and teaching structure is in place
  - the school's registration status accurately reflects the provision it offers
  - pupils' education, health and care plans (EHC plans) are updated annually and the requirements of the code of practice are fully implemented
  - the school's finances are kept under watchful review and evaluated for value for money
  - the school's policies and processes are agreed, follow statutory guidance, and are kept under regular review
  - school performance information is used to inform school improvement planning more sharply
  - the curriculum meets the needs of pupils, including the targets in their EHC plans, more effectively
  - staff's training needs, attendance and job descriptions are kept under watchful

review

- the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 are fully considered and applied
- the school's website meets statutory requirements.
- Improve the quality of teaching and learning so that pupils, including those who are disadvantaged, make good progress in all aspects of learning.

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

- Pupils are not safe. Leaders and governors have not ensured that the school's policies and procedures comply with the government's latest guidance. Some staff have not received the required level of training, including those staff new to the school. Significant concerns about pupils' welfare are not reported to the relevant agencies.
- The school is in crisis. Staff are regularly hurt by pupils. So far this term, there have been 10 reported incidents of adults requiring medical attention. Some staff have left the school and others plan to leave, including some in leadership roles. Of those that remain, some are often absent, and others are sometimes unaccounted for. Currently, the working conditions for staff and pupils are stressful, untenable and unsafe.
- Staff are not confident in the school's leadership. They express the highest level of concern about information sharing, safeguarding practices and leaders' decision making. This has a negative impact on the morale, aspirations and job satisfaction of members of staff. Staff are demotivated.
- Leaders' school improvement planning is not fit for purpose. The school's plan takes a long-term view and only contains operational targets. It is unclear how leaders intend to deliver improvement or monitor and evaluate the impact of their work. Nevertheless, the plan identifies that leaders believe the school has significantly declined since last year. Those responsible do not yet have a strong enough sense of what needs to be achieved or how to go about it. Leaders do not demonstrate sufficient understanding and judgement to initiate improvement.
- The school's policies are not kept under regular review. For example, the exclusions policy has lapsed since it was due for review in September 2017. Other policies, including those relating to the school's approach to managing pupils' behaviour, are outdated. The school's website does not meet requirements as key information is either missing or outdated.
- Responsible stakeholders' oversight of the school's spending, including special educational needs funding and the sport premium, is inadequate. Furthermore, there are no plans in place, for this academic year, to show how leaders plan to spend the pupil premium. Leaders have not gauged what difference the use of this funding, including that from the preceding two years, has made. Leaders do not account for additional funding appropriately.
- There is no equalities plan in place. School leaders have not ensured that the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 are implemented. Some pupils are discriminated against as they do not have access to satisfactory educational provision. The special educational needs funding for these pupils is not used well. Inclusion is not promoted strongly enough and not all pupils have an equal opportunity to succeed.
- Staff are keen to improve and are highly committed to pupils in their care. However, this energy is not harnessed, managed or led effectively. Leaders have not ensured that teaching staff are well informed about pupils' needs. Many staff complained to inspectors, noting that they are restricted from having full access to essential information. One adult commented: 'There are inadequate opportunities to know about

pupils' EHC plan needs. We are kept out of the loop.'

- School leaders consulted to increase the school's planned admission number from 36 to 55 pupils, in 2018. However, the school has exceeded its admission number for some time. Particularly concerning is the expansion to an additional key stage, key stage 1. The school is not registered to admit younger pupils, although pupils in this age group have attended for several years.
- During the course of the inspection, the local authority acted promptly to address some of the emerging shortcomings. For example, plans to strengthen leadership arrangements were established and safeguarding support triggered. Although it is too soon to evaluate the effectiveness of these actions, it is reassuring that the very serious concerns about the school are fully understood.
- The school should not appoint newly qualified teachers.

### **Governance of the school**

- Governors have not ensured that the school's safeguarding policies and procedures meet requirements. Governors have poor oversight of this aspect and have not participated in sufficient training. As a result, leaders' unsafe practices remain unchallenged. An example is that governors have not assured themselves that volunteers are appropriately supervised.
- Governors do not carry out their statutory duties capably or competently. There is poor oversight of leaders' spending of additional funding. This is evident in governors not challenging leaders on the issue that some pupils in receipt of both special educational needs and pupil premium funding do not receive an education. A culture of inequality prevails.
- Governors do not hold leaders to account rigorously enough for the school's performance. Minutes of the governing body's meetings show that there is insufficient oversight and scrutiny of pupils' achievement. Governors do too little to challenge underperformance.
- Too few policies are discussed and revised appropriately. Governors do not ensure that the school's policies and processes are regularly refreshed and fit for purpose. For instance, governors have not ensured that the Department for Education's updated statutory exclusions guidance, introduced in September 2017, is implemented and understood. In this regard, governors are not meeting their legal responsibilities.
- During the summer term, the governing body was without a chair person. During this time, leaders were not held to account. Governance arrangements remain fragile and ineffective. The local authority is beginning to address this concern.

### **Safeguarding**

- The arrangements for safeguarding are not effective.
- Inspectors were not assured that the school's designated safeguarding leads (DSLs) have had sufficient training. Roles and responsibilities are not understood. Furthermore, there is a high level of uncertainty concerning how many DSLs there are. The number of staff holding this responsibility changed several times during the

inspection and differs from that reported in the school's policy.

- The school's DSLs do not act on reported concerns. Staff routinely describe their concerns, including those that could indicate pupils are at risk of physical harm. However, leaders do not take appropriate action. Delay or negligence in passing on concerns about pupils, who may be at risk of, or suffering, significant harm, mean that no further action is triggered. During the inspection, leaders were asked to act immediately to address the most serious unreported concerns that inspectors sampled.
- Other risks, that some pupils in vulnerable situations face, are not reported to the relevant agencies, including children's social care. Risks are not kept under review and liaison with external agencies is poor. Pupils are increasingly vulnerable to harm because of leaders' poor decision making.
- The school's safer recruitment policy is significantly outdated and relates to obsolete statutory guidance. School leaders neither follow nor understand the required processes. Pre-employment checks are misunderstood. For example, therapists and other adults are checked to ensure that they are not prohibited from teaching. This is unnecessary as many of these employees do not hold qualified teacher status. This illustrates leaders' dubious knowledge and expertise in this regard.
- The school's single central record is not compliant, and there are gaps and errors in the record. Additionally, some pre-employment checks are completed retrospectively, after employees have started working with pupils. This includes those checks that confirm an individual's identity. This is deeply concerning.
- Some adults, such as volunteers, are required to work in a supervised capacity. However, leaders have not ensured that this is the case and some adults regularly work with pupils without supervision. Furthermore, leaders have not ensured that appropriate risk assessments are in place. This puts pupils at risk. During the inspection, the lead inspector reported a serious incident that occurred because of such unsafe arrangements.
- Adults and pupils do not feel safe. During the inspection, employees reported a multitude of safeguarding concerns to inspectors. Some described the school's practices as 'dangerous'. Leaders have not created a positive ethos and culture where competent safeguarding practice is an integral part of everyday provision.

## Quality of teaching, learning and assessment

## Inadequate

- Staffing arrangements are unsatisfactory. High levels of staff absence and unfilled vacancies contribute to the day-to-day struggle to implement acceptable teaching arrangements. Support staff are uncertain about where they will be placed, or the duties required of them, on any given day. Pupils, many of whom have social, emotional and mental health needs or autism spectrum disorder (ASD), cannot cope with such changeable and inconsistent staffing provision.
- Despite the daily shortfall in staffing arrangements, leaders do not employ temporary staff. This means that staff who attend are spread too thinly. From the start of the day, adults incessantly call for assistance to arrange cover for a range of duties, such as registering pupils or leading a class. The first hour of most days is chaotic.
- The lack of consistency in pupils' learning contributes strongly to pupils' low

achievement. With ever-shifting staffing arrangements, there is very limited scope for good learning to be the norm, as the academic year proceeds.

- Staff have not had sufficient training. They say that that they cannot teach well as they are not trained to meet pupils' complex needs, including those of pupils with ASD. Also, teachers' subject knowledge is weak in some areas of the curriculum.
- Although staff do their best to contain pupils, too few pupils make gains in learning activities. Leaders do not share helpful information freely enough with staff. Staff do not always have sufficient oversight of pupils' EHC plans or contribute to planned reviews. As a result, teachers do not plan tasks that meet pupils' needs well enough and expectations are too low.
- During the inspection, many staff expressed their deep concern about the quality of the provision for pupils. One adult commented, 'We have lost sight of pupils' learning needs and it has become a pupil-management situation.' Staff are highly committed but are also frustrated. All those who spoke to inspectors concede that despite their best intentions they are not meeting pupils' needs capably.
- Where teaching arrangements are more secure, warm relationships between pupils and staff are highly evident. This contributes well to pupils feeling comfortable and ready to learn. During the inspection, an example of this was observed in a music session. Year 5 pupils responded well to the teacher and were able to describe how listening to music made them feel. One pupil, commenting on the activity, said gleefully, 'This is so good.'

## Personal development, behaviour and welfare

## Inadequate

### Personal development and welfare

- The school's work to promote pupils' personal development and welfare is inadequate.
- School leaders say that the school cannot meet some pupils' needs. Arrangements for such pupils are unacceptable. For example, the use of internal seclusion is unsatisfactory. In some cases, isolation from others extends for far too long, sometimes for weeks or months. Pupils' mental health suffers as a result and staff are unnecessarily put at risk.
- Alternative arrangements are not always well aligned to the objectives set in pupils' EHC plans. Planned opportunities do not meet pupils' best interests well enough.
- There is a lack of oversight as to who is teaching which pupils and when. Greater clarity is required to ensure that pupils are safe, and that staff are held to account for meeting their responsibilities and fulfilling their roles.
- Pupils' EHC plans are not updated annually and so do not reflect their needs accurately. As a result, pupils, particularly those in Year 6, are not supported well enough to move on to an appropriate setting that meets their specific needs. In some cases, this lack of oversight acts as a barrier which prevents some pupils accessing an appropriate education.
- Discriminatory behaviour goes unchallenged. Records show that staff turn a blind eye when pupils use derogatory language, including that which is racially abusive. Pupils

are not protected or helped to keep themselves safe from bullying, racism and other forms of discrimination.

- Staff are trying their best. During the inspection, there were compelling examples of high levels of care afforded to pupils. In some sessions, such as cookery, staff used praise and encouragement to good effect to get the best from pupils.

## Behaviour

- The behaviour of pupils is inadequate.
- Pupils' attendance is too low and unauthorised absence is too high and rising. Leaders neither monitor nor evaluate pupils' attendance closely enough. Some pupils have not attended for more than a year and are not receiving an education.
- The rate of exclusion is too high. Leaders use fixed-term exclusions to deal with both disruptive behaviour and more serious incidents, including physical assault. There is strong evidence of the use of 'unofficial' and, therefore, illegal exclusions that have not been properly recorded. Consequently, the logged historic exclusions statistics, although high, are untrustworthy and likely to be even higher in fact.
- The acting headteacher acknowledges that there is bullying in the school and that leaders are only just beginning to record incidents accurately. Action to tackle this issue is, so far, insufficient, and sometimes inappropriate. For example, pupils are 'moved down a class' to spend time with much younger pupils. One member of staff described this practice as 'dangerous'. Other, more suitable strategies, are not in place. Leaders have not reviewed the school's policy and approach for some time.
- The number of serious incidents recorded is too high and shows no signs of reducing. Staff are ill equipped to de-escalate and manage pupils' most volatile behaviour. Situations take hold and can escalate quickly. Leaders say that, 'No-one has the time to drill down to why behaviour incidents are so high.'
- Teaching and support staff are distressed by leaders' approach to managing the behaviour of some pupils. They do not believe that the school's use of internal seclusion is appropriate or effective. Staff do not feel safe.
- The number of incidents requiring physical intervention is too high. Some staff are not sufficiently skilled, and pupils and adults are sometimes hurt. There is no clear system in place and staff are frustrated at the lack of time afforded for reflective practice.

## Outcomes for pupils

### Inadequate

- Pupils are underachieving. Some are not in education as leaders have failed to establish an appropriate placement that meets pupils' needs or the objectives in their EHC plans.
- Pupils do not achieve well because staffing arrangements are continually fluctuating. Relationships suffer and pupils, including those with ASD, become anxious and unsettled. This is not conducive to promoting learning.
- Leaders do not track or analyse pupils' achievements sufficiently well. Although the school's teaching and learning leader provides some useful information, senior leaders



do not make use of the reports they receive. Information on how well pupils are learning is not shared widely enough nor understood at the highest level.

- Pupils underachieve in writing. Standards have declined and pupils' progress in this aspect is too slow. Leaders have accomplished too little in addressing this area for improvement set at the last inspection.
- The school's special educational needs coordinator routinely reviews pupils' EHC plan objectives. However, those responsible do not ensure that pupils' EHC plans are then updated annually to reflect the findings from each pupil's review. Pupils' EHC plans, therefore, do not reflect pupils' needs and learning objectives accurately. For example, some Year 6 pupils have not had their plans updated since they were in Year 3. Many pupils are underachieving and not in receipt of an education that meets their needs well enough.
- Disadvantaged pupils achieve less well than their peers. This group is underachieving. Leaders do not ensure that additional funding is targeted sufficiently well to make a positive difference.

## School details

Unique reference number	125466
Local authority	Surrey
Inspection number	10084611

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	Special
School category	Community special
Age range of pupils	5 to 11
Gender of pupils	Boys
Number of pupils on the school roll	54
Appropriate authority	The governing body
Chair	Vacancy
Acting Headteacher	Mr Alisdair Whitelaw
Telephone number	01483 898 130
Website	<a href="http://www.veyhouse.surrey.sch.uk">www.veyhouse.surrey.sch.uk</a>
Email address	<a href="mailto:info@veyhouse.surrey.sch.uk">info@veyhouse.surrey.sch.uk</a>
Date of previous inspection	3 May 2017

## Information about this school

- In November 2018, the governing body was issued with a warning notice on behalf of the local authority. The local authority expressed a range of concerns about the quality of leadership and governance, the effectiveness of safeguarding and the well-being of pupils.
- Also, in November 2018, the local authority began a full review of the school, which focused on safeguarding practices, the management of pupils' behaviour and financial accounting procedures.
- The headteacher is absent. The deputy headteacher, since November 2018, has stepped up to be acting headteacher. An assistant headteacher, with responsibility for teaching, learning and assessment, is leaving at the end of term. The other assistant headteacher is the school's special educational needs coordinator.
- The senior leadership team consists of the acting headteacher, both assistant

headteachers, the school business manager and the head of therapy.

- The previous chair of governors resigned in May 2018. During the summer term, the governing body did not have a chairperson. In September 2018, a new chair was elected. During this inspection, the chair of governors resigned their post. The governing body is currently without a chair.
- Since the previous inspection, there have been significant changes to the school's teaching arrangements. Many staff have left or are planning to leave. Several vacancies are unfilled.
- The acting headteacher is supported by a national leader of education (NLE), brokered by the local authority. This support started on the first day of the inspection.
- Wey House School provides for pupils who have social, emotional and mental health difficulties. Some pupils have other learning difficulties, including ASD.
- All pupils have an education, health and care plan (EHC plan). The proportion of pupils who are supported by the pupil premium is above that seen nationally.
- Last academic year, the school exceeded its planned admission number. A consultation to increase the number of pupils the school can admit took place in July 2018. However, the Department for Education has not been informed. Also, since the previous inspection, the school has extended to provide for younger pupils by adding an additional key stage, key stage 1. The Department for Education has not been informed.
- Some pupils attend alternative provision. Providers include Elysian at Westland Farm, riding for the disabled and sporting chances.
- The school does not meet requirements on the publication of information on its website because some of the necessary information about its spending of both pupil premium and sport premium, its governance information, and equalities objectives is missing.

## Information about this inspection

- This inspection was carried out as a direct result of two qualifying complaints made to Ofsted which raised serious concerns. Her Majesty's Chief Inspector decided that an inspection of the school should take place to follow up the whole-school issues that were identified. Inspectors sought to establish whether the quality of leadership was effective, pupils were safe, and pupils' well-being was promoted effectively.
- Inspectors met with the acting headteacher, both assistant headteachers, the school business manager and the head of therapy. An NLE, who is providing additional leadership support, also attended some meetings.
- The lead inspector met with three representatives from Babcock Education Services, who act on behalf of the local authority. Discussions were held with the senior lead for education safeguarding and the head of school effectiveness.
- The lead inspector also met with the chair of governors, who has subsequently resigned.
- Inspectors visited a variety of lessons in different year groups and subjects, all accompanied by the acting headteacher or another leader. Inspectors reviewed some work in pupils' books.
- Inspectors discussed pupils' progress and attainment with leaders.
- Inspectors spoke to pupils informally during the inspection.
- There were insufficient parental responses to Ofsted's online questionnaire, Parent View. An inspector spoke to a parent via telephone.
- Inspectors took account of staff's views, meeting with a variety of staff throughout the inspection.
- Inspectors scrutinised records and documentation relating to safeguarding, behaviour, attendance, pupils' individual records and school improvement planning.
- Inspectors reviewed the checks made on staff about their suitability to work with pupils.

## Inspection team

Elizabeth Farr, lead inspector

Her Majesty's Inspector

Catherine Davies

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](http://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](mailto: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](http://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](http://www.parentview.ofsted.gov.uk), or look for the link on the main Ofsted website: [www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted](http://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](mailto: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/](http://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](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This publication is available at [www.gov.uk/ofsted](http://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](mailto:enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk)  
W: [www.gov.uk/ofsted](http://www.gov.uk/ofsted)

© Crown copyright 2018