

# Liverpool Hope University

Hope Park, Liverpool, Merseyside L16 9JD

## Inspection dates

14–17 June 2021

## Inspection judgements

	Primary age-phase	Secondary age-phase	Further education age-phase
<b>Overall effectiveness</b>	Requires improvement	Requires improvement	Inadequate
The quality of education and training	Requires improvement	Requires improvement	Inadequate
Leadership and management	Requires improvement	Requires improvement	Inadequate
Overall effectiveness at previous inspection	Good	Good	N/A

## What is it like to be a trainee at this ITE partnership?

Liverpool Hope trainees are proud to be classed as a 'Hope teacher'. They have a strong sense of social justice. For example, trainees receive high-quality initial professional development in how to adapt the curriculum for pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND), or for those who speak English as an additional language (EAL). Trainees understand their role in improving achievement for the most vulnerable pupils in the north west of England.

Despite trainees' strong grounding in SEND and EAL, the initial teacher education (ITE) curriculums across this partnership do not place sufficient emphasis on what is unique about different subjects and/or phases. The ITE curriculums that trainees experience across the primary- and secondary-phase programmes are uneven in quality. In further education and skills (FES), the ITE curriculums are ineffective because they are not coherently planned or implemented. On secondary programmes, trainees' experience varies depending on the subject that they are preparing to teach. On primary programmes, trainees benefit from strong training in primary English and early reading. However, they do not receive a thorough grounding in all subjects that form the national curriculum.

Leaders know that the quality of mentoring is not as it should be on the primary and secondary programmes. Current trainees do not receive consistently strong mentoring in their subjects and phases. In the FES phase, trainees receive ineffective mentoring. On the primary- and secondary-phase programmes, there is an overemphasis on the teachers' standards as a tool for assessing trainees' ongoing development. On the FES programmes,

leaders' ineffective use of assessment impedes trainees' development. Across all ITE programmes, leaders have not established systems that enable mentors to assess how well trainees are learning the different elements of the ITE curriculums.

Some trainees do not benefit from well-thought-out targets for improvement. Trainees do not routinely know what they need to do to learn more of the ITE training programme in their subject and/or phase. Target-setting for trainees in the FES phase is poor.

Leaders' checks on the quality of the ITE training programmes do not focus on how effectively the ITE curriculums across subjects and phases are delivered. Checks do not provide leaders with the pertinent information that they need in order to improve the learning experience for trainees.

Trainees understand their professional responsibilities to safeguard pupils and learners. They are well supported to manage behaviour in their classrooms.

Leaders ensure that trainees know and understand how to manage their workload. All trainees benefit from strong pastoral support, including access to a 'resilience mentor' if needed. Trainees have access to a wide range of enrichment opportunities, such as international placements. They receive strong support from the partnership as they move into employment as early career teachers.

Trainees have a strong voice in this partnership and they are heard. Trainees said that the partnership communicates well with them.

## Information about this ITE partnership

- In 2020/21, the partnership had 1,033 trainees over three phases: primary, secondary and FES.
- There were 676 trainees in the primary age-phase, 318 trainees in the secondary age-phase and 39 trainees in the FES phase.
- In the primary phase, the following training routes are available: the undergraduate Bachelor of Arts with Qualified Teacher Status (BA QTS) route; the postgraduate Masters in Education QTS route (MEd QTS); the core Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) route; and the PGCE School Direct fee-paid route. Trainees opt for either the 3–7 primary age-phase or the 5–11 primary age-phase.
- In the secondary phase, the partnership offers the core PGCE route and the PGCE School Direct fee-paid route. In 2020/21, trainees were enrolled on the following secondary subject courses: art and design, business studies, classics, computing, design and technology, biology, chemistry, drama, English, geography, history, mathematics, modern foreign languages, music, physical education, physics, and religious education.
- In the FES phase, the partnership has trainees on the postgraduate diploma in education (PGDE) route. In 2020/21, FES trainees were studying for specialisms in English, mathematics, special educational needs, and sport, or they were on a generic subject programme.
- In the primary phase, the partnership works with approximately 416 schools in 23 local authorities.
- In the secondary phase, the partnership comprises approximately 152 schools in 23 local authorities.
- In the FES phase, the partnership includes 28 schools, colleges and other FES settings that span seven local authorities.

## Information about this inspection

- This inspection was carried out by 11 of Her Majesty's Inspectors and four Ofsted Inspectors.
- Inspectors spoke with a range of staff and partners, including: the head of the School of Education; the head of teacher education; the head of initial teacher education; other senior leaders and university-phase leaders; internal and external quality assurance partners; the university student well-being leader; the chairs of the phase steering committees; the head of professional partnership development; headteachers and senior leaders in schools and partnership alliances; employers; and School Direct representatives.
- Inspectors also held conversations with: early career teacher leaders; the head of legal services and the lead for admissions; the head of formation and placements; a data manager; representatives of the Centre for Education and Policy Analysis (CEPA); partnership mentors, lead mentors and professional mentors; professional tutors and senior professional tutors; and university link tutors.

- Inspectors sampled a wide range of documentation relating to the ITE training programmes. This included: subject and phase curriculum plans; trainees' assignments and their records of target-setting and mentoring; and information relating to Department for Education (DfE) ITE criteria and supporting advice.
- Inspectors also reviewed a wide range of information relating to the leadership and management of the partnership. These documents included leaders' self-evaluation and improvement planning documents.
- Inspectors considered the 281 responses to Ofsted's trainee online survey. This comprised 131 responses from primary-phase trainees, 139 responses from secondary-phase trainees and 11 responses from FES trainees. Inspectors also considered the 63 responses to Ofsted's staff survey.
- The inspection was carried out through face-to-face meetings, virtual meetings and on-site visits to partner schools.
- In the primary phase, inspectors spoke with 40 trainees and 14 newly qualified teachers (NQTs), either face to face or remotely.
- In the secondary phase, inspectors spoke with 42 trainees and 11 NQTs, either face to face or remotely.
- During the visit, primary-phase and secondary-phase inspectors visited 16 schools.
- In the FES phase, all trainees had finished their training programmes at the time of the inspection. Inspectors held remote interviews with 15 former trainees.
- In the primary phase, inspectors carried out focused reviews in: art and design, early reading, English, geography, history, languages, mathematics, music, physical education, and science.
- In the secondary phase, inspectors carried out focused reviews in: art and design, biology, English, geography, history, modern foreign languages, and religious education.
- In the FES phase, inspectors carried out focused reviews in: English, the generic route, mathematics, SEND, and sport.

# Primary phase report

## **What works well in the primary phase and what needs to be done better?**

In the primary phase, leaders have designed undergraduate and postgraduate ITE programmes that help trainees to develop a broad understanding of the primary national curriculum. However, leaders have not ensured that the primary ITE curriculums set out precisely the knowledge that trainees will learn in relation to how to teach different subjects. This hinders trainees' learning and progress because they miss the important knowledge that they need in order to teach all of the primary national curriculum subjects. This is especially the case for some of the foundation subjects, for example music.

Despite these weaknesses, leaders have taken effective steps to improve the design and ambition of the primary ITE curriculums in other ways. For example, through the initial professional studies programme, leaders ensure that trainees have a strong knowledge of how to adapt the primary national curriculum for pupils with SEND, and for pupils with EAL. Leaders also ensure that the primary ITE programmes enable trainees to know exactly what it means to be a 'Hope teacher'. Trainees understand their critical role as a teacher in improving education for disadvantaged and vulnerable pupils.

Across all primary training routes, trainees know and understand the key knowledge that they need in relation to how pupils learn to read. Leaders plan the training in primary English and early reading effectively. The curriculum for early reading is linked well across taught sessions and school placements. Leaders ensure that trainees are fully informed of how they can improve children's communication and language skills in early years. This is another example of being a 'Hope teacher'.

Leaders strive to ensure that the curriculum content they teach is equitable across the different primary ITE training programmes. This includes undergraduate, postgraduate and School Direct routes. Leaders also ensure that trainees have a secure knowledge of the key stages before and after the age-phase that they are training to teach. For example, leaders ensure that trainees on the 3–7 primary age-phase training route have a strong grounding in what, and how, children aged under three learn. Leaders work well with partner schools to shape all of the primary ITE programmes.

Leaders understand the role and purpose of the DfE's core content framework (CCF). They make sure that planned ITE training complies and sometimes exceeds the entitlement set out in the CCF, such as in relation to the management of pupils' behaviour. Leaders are beginning to help members of the ITE partnership to understand the connection between the CCF and the ITE training curriculums. However, leaders are in the early stages of moving school-based mentors away from using the teachers' standards to assess trainees' progress.

The quality of mentoring for trainees is inconsistent. Some trainees do not receive sufficient guidance through the target-setting and mentoring processes. Leaders have a wide range of procedures in place to review the quality of mentoring. Despite this, they do not capitalise on the information that they glean to improve the overall impact of mentoring on a trainee's learning and development. Trainees often receive feedback that does not focus on how to improve their subject-specific and pedagogical knowledge of how to teach the foundation subjects in the primary national curriculum.

Leaders and university tutors work successfully with local and national organisations to ensure that they have up-to-date knowledge of the primary national curriculum. In history, for instance, university tutors understand and share information about key debates in their subject with colleagues and trainees. As a result, trainees are becoming curriculum thinkers. They are able to debate and challenge educational research, such as about the importance of systematic synthetic phonics in teaching pupils to read. Trainees on the MEd QTS route also have the opportunity to carry out local school improvement initiatives and international research overseas. All trainees are encouraged to write research papers, for example on how to use planning, preparation and assessment time effectively on their school-based placements.

Leaders have systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the ITE training programmes. However, these arrangements do not focus sufficiently on the impact of mentoring or the content of the ITE curriculums in the primary phase. Leaders do not focus on the most pertinent actions that will improve trainees' understanding of the essential knowledge that they need to know and understand within the ITE curriculums. For example, leaders, including members of the primary steering committee, focus too heavily on evaluating trainees' progress against the teachers' standards as a way of improving the ITE curriculums.

Leaders support trainees well as they take up employment as early career teachers. Trainees also appreciate the support that they receive to manage their workloads. Trainees develop a strong understanding of how to safeguard pupils.

## **What does the ITE partnership need to do to improve the primary phase?**

### **(Information for the partnership and appropriate authority)**

- Leaders do not ensure that the primary ITE training curriculums identify some of the core knowledge that trainees will be taught about each subject in the primary curriculum. This means that leaders cannot be sure that all aspects of the ITE training curriculums link together to increase systematically trainees' understanding of how to teach different subjects. Leaders should improve the planning of the ITE curriculums, so that all subjects set out clearly the component knowledge that trainees must learn in order to become primary school teachers.

- Leaders and mentors do not assess effectively how much of the ITE training curriculums trainees are learning. Some mentors do not fully understand how to review and support trainees' progress, nor how to set effective targets. Some mentors rely on the teachers' standards to assess trainees' progress. This means that leaders cannot be sure that trainees remember what they should of the ITE curriculums. Leaders should improve their assessment of trainees, the guidance and support they offer to school-based mentors, and the quality assurance of mentoring.
- Leaders use many systems to check on the overall effectiveness of the primary ITE training programmes. However, leaders' quality assurance systems do not yield enough information about how well the different elements of the ITE curriculums are planned and delivered. As a result, leaders' priorities for improving the primary ITE curriculums are sometimes unclear and lack specificity. Leaders should sharpen their quality assurance systems to check that the content and delivery of the primary ITE curriculums are planned and taught effectively.

### **Does the ITE partnership primary phase comply with the ITE compliance criteria?**

- The partnership meets the DfE statutory compliance criteria.

# Secondary phase report

## **What works well in the secondary phase and what needs to be done better?**

Leaders have not ensured that trainees across all subjects in the secondary phase benefit from an ITE training curriculum that is consistently ambitious. In some subjects, such as modern foreign languages (MFL), trainees learn a curriculum that is rooted in up-to-date, subject-specific research. However, this is not the case universally. In some subjects, trainees learn a narrower and less research-informed secondary-phase ITE curriculum.

Leaders are in the early stages of enacting an ambitious strategy to thread research and debate throughout the secondary ITE programmes. Some aspects of trainees' learning are rooted in relevant research. For example, trainees have a reasonably strong understanding of recent influential research on generic approaches to teaching that are informed by developments in cognitive science. However, this is not yet the case consistently. Trainees' knowledge of the debates and research that are unique to their subjects is typically weaker than their awareness of more generic influences.

The initial professional studies (IPD) sessions introduce trainees to important knowledge that prepares them for the realities of teaching. The IPD programmes are fully compliant with the requirements of the CCF. They systematically build trainees' knowledge and understanding of areas such as safeguarding and how to support pupils to behave well. Trainees also benefit from some highly effective sessions on topics such as how to improve the learning of pupils with SEND. These sessions are thoughtfully sequenced throughout the year. This helps to secure incremental improvements in trainees' knowledge, understanding and skills. The sessions are delivered by experts who are credible within their respective fields.

Leaders work well with partner schools and colleges to design the ITE curriculums in the secondary phase. Despite these strengths, leaders have not outlined the specific components that they intend trainees to learn in different elements of the secondary-phase ITE programmes. This limits the extent to which mentors align their school-based support for trainees with the formal, taught, centre-based curriculum. It undermines mentors' ability to consolidate and build upon the knowledge that trainees acquire in taught sessions.

Leaders have not established appropriate systems for the ongoing assessment of trainees. Mentors' formative assessment of trainees does not assess how well trainees are learning the planned curriculum. Instead, mentors typically rely on the teachers' standards to judge trainees' ongoing progress. This is unhelpful and often limits the amount of subject-specific feedback trainees receive. It prevents mentors from consistently setting trainees targets that would make a more meaningful contribution to their development as subject teachers.



Leaders, including the steering committees, have many different systems for quality assuring the work of the partnership. When problems arise, they deal with issues sensitively and decisively. Despite this, leaders' systems do not focus sufficiently on the elements that would enable them to gain clearer insights into the quality of the training curriculum and mentoring. For example, they rely on historical information about trainees' attainment against the teachers' standards to inform planned changes to the programmes. In many respects, they support mentors well. However, they do not have effective systems for checking on the ongoing work of mentors. These weaknesses prevent leaders, including members of the secondary steering committee, from gaining an accurate view of the ITE provision and from formulating more precise and ambitious plans for improvement.

Staff from many schools are strategically involved in the partnership's work. For example, many teachers support the partnership with the recruitment and selection of trainees.

## **What does the ITE partnership need to do to improve the secondary phase?**

### **(Information for the partnership and appropriate authority)**

- There is significant variation in the scope and ambition of secondary-phase ITE subject curriculums. This has a negative impact on the relevance and breadth of trainees' learning in some subjects. Leaders have started to address this issue, but they need to do more. Leaders should ensure that trainees in all subjects benefit from subject curriculums that provide a thorough grounding in what is unique to their subjects.
- The different elements of the training curriculum do not outline the precise components that leaders intend trainees to learn. At times, this prevents mentors from aligning their mentoring with the formal, taught, centre-based curriculum. As a result, mentoring does not routinely consolidate and build upon what trainees learn in their subject and IPD sessions. Leaders must therefore ensure that the curriculum outlines the precise components that trainees are to learn. They should make sure that mentors receive the information and support that they need to align their mentoring with more consistency with other elements of the programmes.
- Leaders have started the process of making research and debate a more prominent feature of the secondary-phase ITE programmes. However, there remains considerable variation in the extent to which trainees engage meaningfully with relevant research. In some subjects, trainees are not introduced to the debates that influence current thinking within their subject communities. This impedes their development as research-informed and reflective practitioners. Leaders should ensure that trainees are able to relate theory to practice. They should also make sure that trainees know and understand up-to-date research and debates that influence current thinking and practice, particularly within their subjects.
- Leaders have not developed effective systems for the ongoing assessment of trainees. Mentors do not assess whether trainees know and understand the different components of the ITE curriculums. They rely on using the teachers' standards as a tool for the ongoing assessment of trainees. Leaders have not outlined precisely what they intend

trainees to learn. This impedes the progress that some trainees make towards becoming effective teachers. Leaders should introduce systems to ensure that mentors are able to assess how well trainees know and understand the taught ITE curriculums in each subject.

- Leaders' systems for quality assuring the work of the partnership are not sufficiently focused on the content and delivery of the training programmes. This prevents leaders from gaining clearer insights into the diet that trainees receive. It also impedes their ability to establish precise priorities for improvement. Leaders should therefore redefine their systems for quality assuring the work of the partnership to enable them to gain a clearer understanding of the strengths and weaknesses in mentoring and the taught curriculum.

### **Does the ITE partnership secondary phase comply with the ITE compliance criteria?**

- The partnership meets the DfE statutory compliance criteria.

# Further education and skills phase report

## **What works well in the further education and skills phase and what needs to be done better?**

Leaders have not ensured that trainees benefit from ambitious, coherent and well-planned FES ITE curriculums. Not all course tutors have the required expertise to deliver the subject-specific aspects of the FES programmes. The ITE curriculums in the FES phase fail to meet the needs of many trainees.

Leaders do not use the extensive knowledge and expertise of leaders and mentors in partnership placements to construct and evaluate their ITE curriculums. Added to this, leaders do not ensure that trainees have a full appreciation of the different types of provision in FES, such as adult learning and apprenticeship provision. These provision types are not sufficiently integrated into the ITE programmes.

Leaders have failed to ensure that their ITE curriculums include the most relevant research material to inform trainees' practice in further education. In one case, the reading list was over 30 years old and did not reflect the changes to further education in recent years.

Leaders and tutors place a disproportionate emphasis on generic approaches to teaching. This is at the expense of trainees gaining a secure knowledge of how to deliver the subject-specific content of their chosen programmes. This impedes trainees' understanding of how to better teach and train their learners. The lack of subject-specific content in the ITE curriculums hinders trainees from preparing effectively for their placements in colleges or other settings. Additionally, this lack of knowledge limits the progress that they make on their programmes.

In the sport programme, leaders have not incorporated the 'football professional' component. This is a key learning pathway of partner schools into the curriculum. In the English ITE programme, leaders have not included essential content to inform trainees of the strategies to engage GCSE resit learners in further education. This is a key requirement of this type of provision. Consequently, trainees are unable to reflect on the types of learning outcomes that their learners will be working towards. This deficit prevents trainees from considering the subject-specific teaching strategies that they could use with these learners prior to commencing their placements. It is often left to workforce mentors to use their professional judgement to determine what knowledge trainees need to learn. Centre-based university leaders and tutors provide limited guidance to mentors and trainees in this partnership. This slows trainees' learning and development further.

Trainees have not received sufficient training in the use of different types of assessment strategies in their subjects. In some cases, trainees are not taught any relevant and effective assessment strategies to assess their learners. For example, trainees on the SEND programme learn about academic-style assessments as a method for the ongoing

assessment of learners, rather than assessment strategies that are more suited to meet learners' individual needs.

The quality of mentoring across the phase is uneven and ineffective. Leaders and tutors do not inform mentors of the intended learning outcomes of the ITE curriculums. This considerably impedes mentors' ability to assess trainees' progress on their placements. Leaders described how they teach generic pedagogical theory at the university and that they expect mentors to support trainees with their subject specialism while on placement. This leads to a disjointed experience for trainees that stops them gaining the knowledge that they need to teach.

Leaders have not established effective systems for the ongoing formative assessment of trainees. They place a disproportionate emphasis on checking professional standards as a proxy for formative assessment. It is not clear how formative assessment informs the development of the skills and knowledge of trainees across placement- and centre-based training.

Leaders' arrangements and systems for the quality assurance of this phase are endemically weak. In 2020/21, quality assurance checks were not completed until trainees had completed almost two thirds of the programme. In the same year, leaders' quality assurance systems failed to identify many of the significant weaknesses that inspectors identified throughout the inspection. Furthermore, leaders and quality assurance partners were not aware that the CCF did not apply to the FES phase.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of the FES ITE programmes by leaders, including members of the FES steering group, is overly positive. Over time, they have not accurately identified where the ITE curriculums are failing. As a result, improvement plans place a disproportionate emphasis on compliance checks and audits. Weak self-evaluation is leading to weak improvement planning. This is at the expense of identifying what can be put in place to improve trainees' learning and experience of the ITE curriculums.

## **What does the ITE partnership need to do to improve the FES phase?**

### **(Information for the partnership and appropriate authority)**

- Leaders do not have effective curriculums and course tutors in place to deliver the breadth of FES programmes. As a result, leaders and tutors do not adequately prepare trainees to deliver their chosen subjects, for example in photography, film and media. Leaders need to ensure that they plan and implement coherent and ambitious subject- and phase-centric FES curriculums that prepare trainees sufficiently well for teaching in further education. This includes having a full appreciation of the different types of provision in FES, such as adult learning and apprenticeship provision.
- Mentoring is ineffective. Leaders have not ensured that trainees have access to consistently high-quality mentoring. This impedes trainees' progress on their chosen

ITE programme. Leaders should ensure that mentors have a full appreciation of the content of the course, and that the subject-specific learning outcomes for trainees are understood by mentors. This will ensure that mentors can support trainees' learning and development while they are on placement. It will also ensure that there is alignment between the centre- and placement-based training.

- Leaders' and mentors' ongoing assessment of trainees is flawed. Trainees do not have sufficient understanding of their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the ITE curriculums. Leaders should ensure that tutors and mentors provide accurate, timely and frequent feedback to trainees. This is to ensure that trainees learn more and remember more of the taught curriculums. It is also so that leaders can address any gaps in trainees' learning.
- Quality assurance processes are inadequate. Leaders do not have a secure understanding of the quality of the ITE programmes for which they are responsible. Trainees' learning and progress suffer as a result. Leaders should swiftly put in place robust quality assurance systems to ensure that they have a full and unequivocal view of the quality of the ITE programmes. They should also use this information to adapt and improve the ITE curriculums without delay.
- Leaders have an over-generous view of the ITE curriculums in the FES phase. Self-evaluation and improvement planning are weak. This means that trainees do not have access to a well-planned ITE curriculum. Leaders should ensure that they accurately evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculums by using an appropriate range of information to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the provision. They should use this information to set the partnership's improvement plans, so that the quality of training that trainees receive improves quickly.

## ITE partnership details

<b>Unique reference number</b>	70130
<b>Inspection number</b>	10180809

This inspection was carried out by Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) and Ofsted Inspectors (OI) in accordance with the 'Initial teacher education inspection framework and handbook'.

This handbook sets out the statutory basis and framework for initial teacher education (ITE) inspections in England from September 2020.

<b>Type of ITE partnership</b>	Higher education institution (HEI)
<b>Phases provided</b>	Primary Secondary Further education and skills
<b>Date of previous inspection</b>	20–23 January 2014

## Inspection team

Jonathan Smart, Overall lead inspector	Her Majesty's Inspector
Tim Vaughan, Phase lead inspector (primary)	Her Majesty's Inspector
Will Smith, Phase lead inspector (secondary)	Her Majesty's Inspector
Paul Cocker, Phase lead inspector (further education)	Her Majesty's Inspector
Alison Humphreys	Her Majesty's Inspector
Anne Seneviratne	Ofsted Inspector
John Nixon	Her Majesty's Inspector
Kathleen Harris	Ofsted Inspector
Michael Pennington	Her Majesty's Inspector
Ruth Stammers	Her Majesty's Inspector
Sheila Iwaskow	Her Majesty's Inspector
Simon Hunter	Her Majesty's Inspector
Sonja Oyen	Ofsted Inspector
Stephen Bentham	Her Majesty's Inspector
Vincent Ashworth	Ofsted Inspector

## Annex: Partnership schools

Inspectors contacted trainees and staff at the following settings, schools and colleges, as part of this inspection:

<b>Name</b>	<b>URN</b>	<b>ITE phase</b>	<b>Date joined partnership</b>	<b>Current Ofsted grade</b>
Childwall Church of England Primary School	104625	Primary	Unknown	Outstanding
Longmoor Community Primary School	133334	Primary	Unknown	Good
Malvern Primary School	104427	Primary	Unknown	Good
St Oswald's Catholic Primary School	142523	Primary	Unknown	Good
Trinity St Peter's Church of England Primary School	134988	Primary	Unknown	Good
St Bartholomew's Catholic Primary School	104815	Primary	Unknown	Good
Halewood Academy	139614	Secondary	Unknown	Good
Liverpool College	139686	Secondary	Unknown	Outstanding
Notre Dame Catholic College	104706	Secondary	Unknown	Requires improvement
Pensby High School	105101	Secondary	Unknown	Good
Rainhill High School	144326	Secondary	Unknown	Requires improvement
Saint John Bosco College	135762	Secondary	Unknown	Good
St John Plessington Catholic College	139031	Secondary	Unknown	Outstanding
St Julie's Catholic High School	104712	Secondary	Unknown	Good
Woodchurch High School	138853	Secondary	Unknown	Good

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 1231, or email [enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk).

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 education, 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/government/organisations/ofsted](http://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 1231  
Textphone: 0161 618 8524  
E: [enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk)  
W: [www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk)

© Crown copyright 2021