

Institutional Inspections and Frameworks Division  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Alexandra House  
33 Kingsway  
London  
WC2B 6SE

**Direct Tel** 020 7421 6594  
**Direct Fax** 020 7421 6855

[www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk)



6 May 2005

Mr S Canadine  
Headteacher  
St Peter and St Paul CE Primary School  
Wainfleet Road  
Burgh-le-March  
Skegness  
PE24 5ED

Dear Mr Canadine

### **Implementation of St Peter and St Paul CE Primary School's Action Plan**

Following the visit of Mr A Gray HMI and Ms L Murphy, Additional Inspector, to your school on 27 and 28 April 2005, I write on behalf of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector to confirm the inspection findings which are recorded in the attached note.

The visit was the fifth monitoring inspection since the school became subject to special measures. The focus of the inspection was to assess: the pupils' standards of attainment and their progress; the quality of education provided; the leadership and management of the school; the pupils' attitudes and behaviour; and the progress that has been made in implementing the action plan.

The school has made limited progress since the last monitoring inspection and limited progress overall since being subject to special measures.

I am copying this letter and the note of the inspection findings to the Secretary of State for Education, the chair of governors, the Director of Education for Lincolnshire and the Diocesan Director of Education for Lincoln. This letter will be posted on the Ofsted website

Yours sincerely

Andrew Reid  
Head of Institutional Inspections and Frameworks Division

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF ST PETER AND ST PAUL CE PRIMARY SCHOOL'S ACTION PLAN**

### Findings of the fifth monitoring inspection since the school became subject to special measures

During the visit 19 lessons or parts of lessons and two assemblies were inspected. Meetings were held with the headteacher, the chair of governors, one further governor, the assistant headteachers and subject co-ordinators, and a representative of the school improvement service. Informal discussions were held with other members of staff and with pupils and samples of work were examined. A range of documents was scrutinised. Using this evidence, HMI made the following observations to the headteacher, the chair of the governing body and a representative from the school improvement service.

Standards in lessons were variable. A scrutiny of work showed that in Year 2 standards are high in reading and mathematics. In writing they are at the expected level. By Year 6 standards are broadly at expected levels in English, below expectations in mathematics and low in science. The standards at Key Stage 1 are not being maintained at Key Stage 2.

In English at both key stages standards are stronger in reading than in writing. Priority has been given over time to reading and the school now has a good range of books and a library that is used regularly. Discrete time is set aside for the teaching of reading other than in the daily lesson in literacy. In writing many pupils lack fluency in their style of handwriting and too few pupils use a cursive script. The school's scrutiny of work shows that the pupils' attainment in handwriting has declined over the year in Key Stage 2. In a handwriting lesson the higher attainers were insufficiently challenged and marked time while those of a below average attainment lost concentration because work was not well matched to the pupils' differing needs. Moreover, the pupils' pencil grip went uncorrected and their posture for writing was unsatisfactory.

In mathematics the pupils often became confused with different methods of calculation. This was the case in Year 2 when pupils had difficulty in using addition and subtraction to check the accuracy of particular calculations, partly because they were given too few opportunities to explain their thinking. The pupils were insufficiently adept at identifying the methods required and applying them to solve mathematical problems, including those in Years 5 and 6. Presentation is often untidy and leads to mistakes being made in calculations.

The pupils' skills at scientific investigation are hindered by a lack of precise vocabulary to explain their thinking. They find it difficult to draw conclusions from their learning and to provide evidence of their experiments in a logical way. Past learning is not readily at their finger tips and so difficulties emerge in applying learning to new situations. Standards in the two information and communication technology (ICT) lessons seen were at the expected level. The pupils were able to

work independently to retrieve saved data and use it to analyse patterns of traffic flow from their previous survey.

The quality of learning was satisfactory or better in 15 of the 19 lessons including nine in which it was good. However, there was variation between the key stages. All three lessons in the Foundation Stage featured good progress; this was the case in one in five lessons in Key Stage 1 and five out of 11 lessons in Key Stage 2.

The quality of learning related very closely to the quality of teaching. A strength was in the way that the pupils applied themselves to the task in hand although their productivity became limited when time was not used well enough by the class teacher. The pupils were interested in their tasks and made best progress when they were involved in active and meaningful work. Where the pupils' progress did not match the quality of teaching it was the result of new class teachers lacking sufficient information about the pupils' prior learning. Higher attaining pupils were at times insufficiently challenged and marked time with their learning. This was a result of lesson planning that did not identify how learning was to be matched to the pupils' needs, but rather concentrated on the activities to be provided.

The quality of teaching was satisfactory or better in 14 of the 19 lessons, including seven in which it was good. The majority of the unsatisfactory teaching was in Key Stage 2. The characteristics of the good teaching included: well structured and lively approaches which provided a good rate of learning; thoughtful and probing questioning of pupils; effective deployment of teaching assistants to lead and manage group activities, enhancing the range of learning; good opportunities for pupils to work with partners, teasing out ideas and sharing responses to problems; and good relationships between adults and pupils, including the secure management of behaviour.

Weaker characteristics present in the teaching included: the lack of expectations high enough to challenge the most able pupils; questioning which centred only on pupils who volunteered to give answers, so that others became too passive; inefficient use of additional adults during whole-class teaching; the management of time, so that lessons lacked pace or that the time available for independent work or concluding plenary sessions was too short; a lack of thorough planning and preparation; and the unsatisfactory use of overhead projectors when other technologies were available.

The quality of planning varied from good to unsatisfactory. The best planning was carefully matched to the needs of the pupils and contained a variety of tasks, linked to appropriate progress steps for individuals or small groups. The weakest planning was often taken directly from nationally published schemes, without having been adapted to the individual class. Planning for learning outcomes was a consistent weakness. Target-setting varied across the school: some teachers have introduced group targets, but others used only whole-class targets which many pupils did not find especially helpful. Marking varied from excellent and

unsatisfactory, with evidence of some poor marking over the last few months; marking in the foundation subjects was often weak, because it generally did not relate to pupils' progress in the relevant subject skills.

The leadership of the headteacher is poor, and elements of his management are also unsatisfactory. He has not set out a clear or consistent vision for the improvement of the school and has provided insufficient support for the work of teachers and governors; this has contributed to a decline in morale. A number of useful initiatives, such as the introduction of individual pupil targets, have not been maintained. Important areas of the school's operations, such as monitoring and assessment, have made insufficient progress over the last five months and in some respects have regressed. Staff are confused about issues such as target-setting and planning because there has been no clear definition of expectations.

The contribution of other staff to leadership and management is unsatisfactory because their capabilities have not been strategically deployed for the maximum impact. The two new senior managers have not been adequately briefed about their roles, nor have they been allocated the time in which they could familiarise themselves with current conditions in the school; both of them teach all of the week. Other managers, while willing to learn, have lacked focused support and guidance.

The quality of the self-evaluation provided in advance of the inspection was unsatisfactory. It contained too little quantified evidence, for example in regard to pupils' standards, and was insufficiently evaluative. Judgements about standards and the quality of teaching were not consistent with what was seen during this inspection. Some of the headteacher's written reports to governors have been poor; they have not provided governors with sufficient information, and governors have rightly asked for greater clarity and analysis in future.

Some school policies are out of date. The person named in the child protection policy as responsible for handling issues left the school several years ago. The assessment policy does not reflect the school's current needs.

The work of the governing body contains many good elements. They have an effective committee system which is appropriate for the needs of the school, and they have a clear focus on the school's improvement. Minutes of meetings are detailed and provide a good record of their actions in holding the headteacher and others to account. The role of the curriculum committee in setting standards for the work of the headteacher and holding him to account is very clear. The recent presentation to the governing body by the science co-ordinator was a useful example of governors seeking to be better informed but only a small proportion of governors have been directly involved in visiting the school. Most governor visits over the year have had a functional rather than an evaluative purpose, although there have been some valuable monitoring visits to particular subject co-ordinators.

The pupils' attitudes and behaviour were satisfactory or better in all lessons and good in nearly half. They were weakest in Key Stage 2 where barely a third was good, a decline from the last monitoring visit. The pupils were patient and well behaved even when the teaching failed to fully engage them. When pupils encountered problems, some did not take responsibility for their own learning by asking for help. The pupils had a clear understanding of the difference between right and wrong and treated others with courtesy and respect; social and moral development is good. The pupils' behaviour at break time and around the school was good.

The rate of attendance over the last seven months was 94.35 per cent. However, it fell below this figure in Year 3, Year 5 and Year 6.

The school improvement service's science consultant visited the school in March and provided a valuable evaluation of provision, highlighting issues such as the lack of challenge for more able pupils and inconsistent practice. There has been some coaching of the headteacher in lesson observation skills, but this has not led to sufficient improvement in his practice. There has been no further support for the literacy co-ordinator. The service's strategy of stepping back from the school to enable it to become self-sustaining has been undermined by the school's lack of subsequent progress. The January review did not result in actions being taken to reinvigorate the school's progress towards improvement. In particular, the impact of the changes in leadership over the last year has not been closely monitored.

### **Action taken to address the key issues**

#### **Key Issue 1: raise standards in English, science, information and communication technology (ICT), religious education, geography and history particularly in Year 6**

Standards have been reported above. The Year 6 and Year 5 classes have each had three teachers this academic year; as a result of this and the school's lack of secure systems to ensure high quality teaching and learning, pupils' progress has slowed. Actions taken in the past, such as setting targets for the pupils in English and mathematics, have lost direction and the pupils lack a clear understanding of what they need to do to improve. Although the subject leaders for English and science have an understanding of what is required they have insufficient support from the leadership of the school to ensure that a consistent approach is taken and monitored. Too little time has been provided for the subject leaders to carry out their role. A new subject leader for mathematics has had little induction and has not received the information required to give continuity to the subject's development. Extra classes, much needed to boost the pupils' attainment in Year 6, started very late in the year.

Limited progress has been made on this key issue.

## **Key Issue 2: improve the leadership and management of the school, including that of the governing body**

The school now has a permanent senior management team consisting of the headteacher, two new assistant headteachers, and the assessment manager, who is also the Key Stage 1 leader. One member of this team has returned to work after a period of absence and a temporary member of the team has now left it; the school is therefore better positioned in terms of staff stability. Some work has taken place in considering the roles of the new team, and the headteacher has plans to make adjustments in the roles of individuals. At present, the job descriptions of the two assistant headteachers are identical and do not reflect their actual roles, while the third member of the team has two job descriptions.

Although some steps have been taken to improve monitoring and evaluation in the school, they are still inadequate. A new policy was first drafted in January but was referred back to the headteacher by a committee and has not yet been formally adopted by the governing body. A work scrutiny was conducted by the science and numeracy co-ordinators in March. The headteacher made 13 lesson observations during the spring term. At the start of the term, observation records were very brief and unstructured, but a better format was adopted after further training. All subsequent observations focused on the delivery of planned learning objectives. However, the quality of written records is still poor and does not provide an effective method of driving the further improvement of teaching and thus the raising of standards. There has been no attempt to provide a strategic analysis of strengths and weaknesses.

Progress has been limited on this key issue.

## **Key Issue 3: improve the quality of teaching to reduce the proportion of unsatisfactory teaching and raise the proportion of good teaching**

There have been a number of changes in teaching since the last inspection. Concerns about the teaching of Year 6 were expressed during the spring term. All classes are now taught by permanent staff.

Leadership on this key issue was previously shared by two staff, one of whom has now left the school and the other has relinquished the responsibility. The two new senior managers have only a very limited understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of teaching since they have not been adequately briefed, nor do they have any time available or planned for observations. The quality of monitoring work has been too low to generate an agenda for the improvement of teaching, although areas of continued good practice are still evident. The assessment system does not yet contribute to the evaluation of teaching, nor does it provide a basis for holding teachers to account.

There has been limited progress on this key issue.

**Key Issue 4: improve resources for ICT to support pupils' learning in all subjects and provide staff training necessary to equip teachers and support staff to develop this work**

Reasonable use is being made of the suite of computers but those in the classroom were underused during the monitoring inspection. The planning for ICT follows a national scheme and the school has most of the resources required to teach each aspect. The planning for the curriculum has yet to fully incorporate a cross-subject approach. The school is well equipped with digital projectors, but they are not always used at appropriate times.

Progress on this key issue has been reasonable.

**Key Issue 5: improve procedures for checking on pupils' attainment and progress and ensure that the information gathered is used to match work to the identified learning needs of different groups of pupils**

Responsibility for assessment and planning is divided between four staff with the result that there is a lack of clarity about who is responsible for the development of a strategic policy which would make effective links between assessment and planning. The situation is further complicated by the recent changes in staffing, with two new staff and one who has returned to work being involved. The school is also intending to use the principles of the Intensifying Support Programme to develop its target-setting practice, using the expertise of one of the assistant headteachers, while the headteacher manages the pupil achievement tracker software. Recent senior management team minutes indicate that the whole-school target-setting programme will start properly in September, which is unacceptably slow; some staff are keen that effective target-setting be introduced much quicker.

Some scrutinies of work have been conducted by some subject leaders over the last few months and a schedule exists for further scrutinies. These are not having sufficient influence on the school's agenda for improvement.

At present, the new and returning staff have barely an outline understanding of the issues facing the school and have been able to conduct only informal monitoring of the situation themselves. They are aware, for example, that practice in aspects such as target-setting and marking varies widely across the school and that there is no clear definition of what constitutes the expected standard of practice. This awareness is a sound basis for future progress.

The school does not have a clear analysis of pupils' standards and progress. Systems for assessing attainment in some of the foundation subjects are especially weak.

Progress is limited on this key issue.

**Key Issue 6: improve the availability and use of learning resources and learning experiences, including visits and visitors, which emphasise the cultural and ethnic diversity of British society**

The responsibility for cultural development has been given to a new member of staff without adequate notification, and there has been no induction process to enable a clear direction to be set. Some classrooms have appropriate displays to nurture cultural development. Progress on this key issue has been limited.