



“Aiming Higher”

**A SCRUTINY REVIEW OF SCHOOL
EFFECTIVENESS**

**FIRST REPORT OF THE
CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE
SCRUTINY PANEL**

March 2013

Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Chair's Foreword	3
Introduction and Working Party objectives	5
Background and evidence Sources	6
Key Findings	8
Concluding remarks	15
Recommendations	16
Acknowledgements (Appendices 1-4)	18

FOREWORD

Councillor Mrs Anne Collins

This first report presents the findings of a Working Party of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel which undertook a detailed scrutiny review on the topic of School Effectiveness.

As chair of the working party, I am pleased to present this first report. I am assured that the other members of the working party have found the exercise as interesting and informative as I have.

The Working Party has been unanimous in its ambition that all schools within Calderdale should be good or better. Anything less is letting down our children and young people. The School Effectiveness Service has an important role to play in this and should be supported to act with speed and rigour when they identify any concerns about school performance. Our recommendations will assist in this.

There are some aspects of school effectiveness that we wish to address further and we aim to produce a second report in summer 2013, which will cover:-

- How effective the school-to-school support systems put in place from September 2012 are proving to be in terms of raising standards and ensuring good quality leadership and governance across all Calderdale schools.
- How well the central school effectiveness team has developed its strategies for monitoring and intervening in schools causing concern.
- The outcomes of OFSTED inspections for the academic year 2012-2013.
- How are Governors contributing to school effectiveness through strong leadership? In particular, how effective is the new Governor training programme and the support Governors are being given to help them fulfil their duties?

Such a report could, in fact, be very timely when considered alongside the implications of OFSTED's recent announcement that it intends to inspect and report on how effectively local authorities are managing to secure school improvement in all local schools regardless of their status.

We have also listed (at Appendix 4 to this report), the current OFSTED ratings and dates of inspections for all schools in Calderdale. We hope this will help to focus minds on the journey for improvement we need to undertake, and we have also included a figure for the number of primary/secondary schools causing concern. It is our express aim for all schools to be achieving “good or better”.

I wish to thank all members of the working party and the scrutiny officers for the commitment and hard work they have put into this exercise. I would also like to send a big ‘thank you’ to other senior officers, cabinet members and particularly to staff and governors in our schools who gave their time so willingly and provided us with much useful evidence for this report.

Anne Collins



Calderdale Councillor and
Chair, School Effectiveness Working Party,
and Member of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel

Introduction and working party objectives

The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel agreed at its meeting in June 2012 to set up a working party to look at the local authority's effectiveness in securing improvement in all local schools but, particularly, in those schools identified as being in need of improvement or failing to provide a good standard of education for their pupils.

OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKING PARTY

The following objectives of the working party were agreed at the Panel meeting in July 2012:-

- To understand the implications of the new OFSTED inspection regime for schools and for the Council
- To examine the effectiveness of the 'school-to-school' initiative
- To consider what support can be offered to schools that are not performing well
- To monitor school improvement delivery across Calderdale with particular focus on OFSTED inspection outcomes and the effectiveness of the school-to-school support via the self-improving school system
- To look at best practice in those schools which are performing well
- To make recommendations to the Scrutiny Panel concerning:
 - Ways in which more schools can achieve OFSTED judgements of good or outstanding;
 - What difference the new OFSTED framework has made;
 - How successful schools can effectively support other schools.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WORKING PARTY

It was agreed by the scrutiny panel that the review would be undertaken by Councillors Baines, Ford, Raistrick, Wilkinson and Mrs A. Collins. Unfortunately due to work commitments Councillor Wilkinson had to withdraw from the working party and no substitute member was found. At its first meeting Councillor Anne Collins was elected as chair of the working party.

Background and Evidence Sources

BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW

The working party was set up at a time when the centralised role of local authorities in respect of school improvement was diminishing, when the OFSTED framework for school inspection was requiring higher standards of schools and when many schools were moving away from local authority control by opting or sometimes being compelled to become academies or trust schools.

As a result, the number of staff employed in the local authority's School Effectiveness Team was drastically cut and its capacity to intervene and support schools requiring improvement was much reduced. Most of the funding for school improvement was transported directly to schools with schools becoming responsible for their own improvement.

The key objective, when faced with this much changed regime, was to find out how the Council could best ensure that all children in Calderdale schools receive a good education and achieve well, regardless of the status of the school they attend or the nature of the community which the school serves.

Working party members were aware that before the above changes impacted on the School Effectiveness Service and schools there had been instances where senior leaders and staff in successful schools had worked with less successful schools with positive outcomes.

The working party examined some of these case studies in order to understand some of the necessary features of good schools and examine some of the models of school-to-school support which brought about improvement in the receiving school.

Our Evidence Sources

The working party has met formally to review progress and to plan activities at least monthly since September 2012. Agendas, detailed notes of the meetings and copies of any useful documentation were provided for each meeting.

The group was informed by the following:-

- OFSTED reports on schools
- Input from and discussion with Anthony Briggs, OFSTED inspector, about changes to the inspection regime and their likely impact on schools
- A members' briefing session on implications of the new OFSTED framework for school inspection
- Access to local authority documentation on schools causing concern.
- Discussions with heads and governors who had provided various models of school to school support and the impact on receiving and host schools
- Attendance at secondary and primary cluster meetings
- Discussion with the Head of Learning Services and members of the School Effectiveness Team
- Discussion with the cabinet members for Children and Young People's Services
- Meetings with staff and elected members from neighbouring local authorities

Key Findings

The key findings of the Working Party in producing this first report are summarised below:-

1. THE NEW OFSTED FRAMEWORK FOR SCHOOL INSPECTIONS

The OFSTED inspection framework was changed from September 2012. As a result, any school not judged to be good or outstanding is now deemed to be 'in need of improvement'. When making this announcement her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools, Sir Michael Wilshaw, was adamant that all schools should be good or better and that there were currently too many schools which could be described as 'coasting'.

Hence, the judgement that a school's performance is 'satisfactory' no longer exists. Like most other local authorities, Calderdale has several schools which had been judged 'satisfactory' under the previous OFSTED inspection framework. Consequently, when re-inspected, some of these could be deemed to be 'in need of improvement' and the local authority has a statutory duty to intervene and support where this is the case.

In order to keep itself informed of the position in all Calderdale schools the local authority has collated a significant amount of data, although it has proved more difficult to obtain data from some of the academies. Using OFSTED reports and performance data alongside evidence from School Effectiveness Officers' visits it has a list of schools 'causing concern' which is regularly reviewed and updated. In November 2012 the local authority had some concerns about a quarter of its maintained schools.

The big question facing the local authority is the strategies it can now use to ensure that such schools do improve, bearing in mind the loss of central funding and the responsibility placed on schools for self-improvement.

The new OFSTED framework also focuses more attention on the role of governors and makes judgements about their ability to challenge the management of the school and hold it to account. The change of emphasis places increased pressure on local authorities to try and ensure that governors are effectively prepared and trained to take on this crucial and demanding role.

Such a change coincided with the significant loss of funding previously available to the local authority to provide in-house training and support for governors from its own staff team. However, this aspect of training has been out-sourced since September 2012 and the quality and effectiveness of the new arrangement is yet to be assessed.

Summary of issues/comment

- The need for clearer strategies for local authority intervention prior to government involvement
- The evaluation of take-up and governors' feed-back on the quality of training provided

2. THE CHANGED ROLE OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

i) MONITORING THE PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOLS

Although the local authority has a much-reduced role in offering direct support to schools, it retains a statutory duty to ensure that its schools are offering a good standard of education and has powers of intervention if it judges this not to be the case.

In September 2012 the local authority had a much-reduced team responsible for monitoring standards and supporting school improvement. The School Effectiveness Team had been through a difficult period of staff reductions and redundancies.

This was not, therefore, an easy start to the school year. There was some lack of confidence in the service on the part of many of the schools as well as some confusion as to the changing nature and approaches to school improvement which government was demanding. The views of schools were paramount to the success of any change as the funding to support the small central team was subject to their agreement.

This was compounded by the difficulty encountered in making permanent appointments of the four school effectiveness officers which the central budget would fund. At the time of writing this report only one of these staff was in post and the role was being filled temporarily by 2 former headteachers, on a part-time basis, and 3 interim staff.

However, plans are being revised to clarify how the local authority will use its powers of support and intervention where schools fail to meet the necessary standards either in terms of pupils' achievement or good quality leadership and governance.

The working party accepted that there were occasions when a school might suffer an unexpected decline in standards which could be caused by the loss of an effective headteacher or key senior staff.

Currently, meetings are held between the Head of Learning Services and the Senior School Effectiveness Officer and the headteachers and chairs of governors of these schools. Such meetings are intended to ensure that schools are aware of the concerns of the local authority and of the expectation that they will be required to identify clearly what they intend to do to improve.

We heard that the view of the current School Improvement Team (SIT) was that the previous larger School Improvement Team provided consultants who were able to improve the quality of classroom teaching. However, it was not always sustained where leadership was weak and the consultant team withdrawn.

It was also said that in the past, some School Improvement Officers did not always sufficiently challenge the leadership of a school and that some relationships were described as “cosy”.

However we identified a lack of clarity about the triggers/criteria being used to challenge such schools and how rigorously their progress is monitored and by whom, especially when such schools could be academies or trust schools in which the local authority has fewer powers of intervention.

If this stage in the process is not working then the local authority does have statutory powers to issue ‘warning notices’ to schools who are failing to make sufficient improvement. Such a power has been invoked rarely in the past but has been used more frequently in the past year.

As a result, a few schools have had additional governors or an interim board of governors imposed to lead on school improvement and some headteachers have left their posts. Nevertheless, such powers take time to implement and, on its own admission, the local authority has not always responded quickly enough to invoke such powers.

Summary of issues/comment

- There is a need to make permanent appointments to the School Effectiveness Team as soon as possible and increase schools’ confidence in the system
- Increased clarity over when to intervene before formal notice to improve and how to ensure this is working. Is it enough to just ‘nudge’ them?
- Issue formal notices where necessary without delay.

ii) SCHOOL TO SCHOOL SUPPORT MODEL

Much of the above refers to measures to be taken by the local authority in those schools which are failing to give their pupils a good education. But our remit also focussed on looking at how, as a Council, we might best ensure that every child in every school receives the best education possible.

In order to meet the government's vision for school improvement, the local authority, with the agreement of headteachers, developed a model where schools use their own skills, expertise and experience to support each other. Most of the budget formerly retained centrally for school improvement was delegated to this model.

It involved establishing 7 primary cluster groups and 1 secondary cluster. The primary schools are clustered on a broad geographical basis and they vary in size. However, all schools are invited to be part of the cluster and most have taken up the opportunity.

Each group is serviced by a School Effectiveness Officer and meetings are chaired by a headteacher. The clusters hold the budgets for their own cluster and the intention is that schools share their data and together identify and agree the support that individual schools might require and who, within the cluster, or sometimes externally, might be able to offer the necessary support. At the moment, the attendance at Cluster meetings is predominantly by Headteachers and the Lead Officer. However, there are early examples where Governors have been elected to support their Clusters.

Obviously, the largest share of that budget will be allocated to those schools which are in a 'notice to improve' but the aim is that other schools offer support and receive payment for the support they might give.

In order that all schools should see some benefit from this model a small budget is set aside for whole cluster work and this can be used against agreed areas for development which are pertinent to each cluster.

The allocation of the budget is agreed and monitored by a central Improvement Board comprising officers and headteachers. They must agree the support requested by individual schools or clusters based on a submitted action plan and will eventually be charged with monitoring the effectiveness of such an action plan at the end of the period agreed.

It would seem that the decision on which schools need additional support is determined by the previous year's assessment data and the most recent OFSTED report. The cluster system is in its early days and, as yet, is not flexible enough to make changes mid-year when schools might move in or out of a category when re-inspected.

Reports from working party members attending the early cluster meetings suggest that there is a considerable variation in their current effectiveness. This appears to be caused by factors including a lack of clear leadership from the chair or cluster officer; a misunderstanding amongst some headteachers of the changed role of the school improvement team; and a reluctance to share or accept the data provided by the local authority.

Where clusters were beginning to work to plan support for each other based on individual schools' strengths the reverse was true and there was evidence of effective advance planning by the officer and headteacher responsible for leading the cluster, a willingness on the part of headteachers to share information and accept their strengths and weaknesses and an understanding of the changed role of the local authority.

Summary of issues/comment

- More effective monitoring of the success of all the clusters in school improvement
- More flexibility within the structure to allow schools falling into a category mid-cycle to receive support
- Greater clarity in terms of the role of the headteacher chair in leading the cluster
- Firm leadership from the permanent School Effectiveness Officers as soon as possible

3. FEATURES OF EFFECTIVE MODELS OF SCHOOL TO SCHOOL SUPPORT

Early in this review process, we felt it necessary to establish our view of the features of a good or outstanding school and how such features might be replicated in less successful schools through a school-to-school support system.

Research documents received by the group set out clearly the characteristics of successful schools: strong leadership, high pupil attendance, good pupil achievement and progress, low staff turn-over or absence, good behaviour and consistent discipline policies, effective governance and supportive parents.

We then took evidence from a range of headteachers and chairs of governors who were or had been part of successful school-to-school intervention models. These headteachers validated the features of successful schools as outlined above. The views of the schools in receipt of support were taken account of alongside those who had led it.

All parties concerned agreed that any action taken to support another school to improve had to be firm and decisive and included:-

- A strong and proven headteacher to lead the intervention who will be present in the receiving school for a significant part of each week;
- A determination to address weak leadership and teaching quickly and use capability procedures where necessary;
- A clear plan of action with a limited number of priorities and timescales which is shared, understood and applied consistently by all staff;
- The use of experienced staff from the intervening school to improve the delivery in classrooms;
- Clear strategies for monitoring and reviewing outcomes with all staff

The headteachers, however, did recognise how difficult and expensive this process could be and the possible vulnerability of their own schools caused by their absence. The working group heard significant evidence of the positive impact on staff in both schools such as:-

- Opportunities for succession planning with staff taking on new management roles
- Increased expertise gained by staff supporting colleagues and sharing expertise
- Improvements in the staff's confidence in supported school when they are effectively led
- Acknowledgement and recognition of the existing staff expertise in the receiving school

Summary issues / comment

- The factors described briefly above should help to inform the new school-to-school cluster model. The working group felt that, if rigorously applied by all parties, then Calderdale's schools should be in a position to demonstrate improvement.

4. LESSONS FROM NEIGHBOURING LOCAL AUTHORITIES

We were keen to find out how neighbouring authorities were now addressing school improvement. We met with a scrutiny chair and senior officers in two local authorities.

The meetings were interesting and informative and indicated the diverse way in which the local authorities had developed their services for schools. Both were considerably larger than Calderdale and emerging from a situation where school improvement services had been previously out-sourced.

Consequently, both were in a position of taking back the school improvement responsibility and were in the process of building trust with local schools again. At the time of writing this report both local authorities had retained a significantly larger central team but it was evident that their strategic planning was no further ahead than in Calderdale.

5. CABINET AND SENIOR OFFICERS' VIEWS ON THE FUTURE OF THE SERVICE

The two cabinet members and the two senior staff with responsibility for School Effectiveness were questioned by the working party. All admit that there is some way to go before the service is of the quality the schools might expect.

Systems appear to be in place for cabinet members and, particularly, the member for Schools and Lifelong Learning to keep themselves informed about developments and their effect on standards in schools.

Senior officers are working hard to implement this massive change in the agenda for school support and improvement but the service has been hampered by the time taken to appoint permanent members to the team who could build up a relationship of trust and challenge with regard to the schools.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The working party acknowledges that the role of the local authority has changed significantly in recent months and involved a shift of emphasis from it as 'supporter and provider' to the schools themselves taking on this responsibility.

The local authority retains a statutory role in monitoring standards in schools and taking decisive action to intervene, where necessary, and this aspect of work is developing but progress is too slow.

The working party, therefore, asks the Scrutiny Panel to receive this first report and accept the recommendation that the working party reconvenes and reports in the late summer of 2013 to report on progress in the following areas:-

- How effective the school-to-school support systems put in place from September 2012 are proving to be in terms of raising standards and ensuring good quality leadership and governance across all Calderdale schools
- How well the central school effectiveness team has developed its strategies for monitoring and intervening in schools causing concern
- The impact of the new governor training programme
- The number of schools currently causing concern to the local authority
- The number of schools placed in a category during this academic year following an OFSTED inspection
- The number of schools deemed good or outstanding following and OFSTED inspection during this academic year

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The report be endorsed and approved by the Scrutiny Panel and that the duration of the Working Party is extended until September 2013, to allow for the remaining areas of work, as outlined in this report, to be undertaken, and for a Final Report on be produced in due course.

Recommendation 2

We are disappointed at the length of time it has taken to advertise the School Effectiveness Officer vacant posts, and hope that the current recruitment campaign results in the appointment of permanent staff to fill these important positions as soon as possible.

Recommendation 3

The Local Authority should intervene with formal warnings and interventions more quickly in the future in cases of failing schools or schools in difficulty. We want to see all children in the Borough receive the best education possible, so we wish to see the School Effectiveness Service inform the Governors and Sponsors of academy schools of any concerns they have identified about the performance of those schools as well as the schools it maintains.

Recommendation 4

Strong Leadership is vital to the success of schools and so the Working Party should include in their second report an assessment of the role of Governors in school effectiveness and recommendations for any changes it feels necessary.

Recommendation 5

The Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel should discuss school performance every six months.

Appendix One

Membership of the Working Party (2012/13)

Councillor Mrs Anne Collins (Chair)
Councillor Stephen Baines, MBE
Councillor John Ford
Councillor Colin Raistrick
Councillor Adam Wilkinson (until August 2012)

Membership of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel (2012/13)

Councillor Colin Raistrick (Chair)
Councillor Stephen Baines, MBE
Councillor James Baker
Councillor Mrs Anne Collins
Councillor John Ford
Councillor Helen Rivron
Councillor Adam Wilkinson

Mrs Shelagh Hirst, Church of England (Co-Opted Voting Member)
Mr David Gott, Roman Catholic Church (Co-Opted Voting Member)
Ms Alison Grant – Parent Governor Representative (Co-Opted Voting Member)
Mrs Emma Carter - Parent Governor Representative (Co-Opted Voting Member)
Mr Philip Hume – Calderdale Foster Care Association (Non Voting Co-Opted Member)

(Support to this Scrutiny Working Party was provided by Mike Lodge, Senior Scrutiny Support Officer and Paul Preston, Scrutiny Support Officer, Democratic and Partnership Services)

Appendix Two

Summary of Witnesses Giving Evidence

Andrew Midgley, Head Teacher, Dean Field Community Primary School

Judith Priestley, Vice-Chair of Governors, Dean Field Community Primary School

Nan Oldfield, Head Teacher, Copley Primary School

Helen Cooper, Acting Head Teacher, New Road Primary School

David Kirk, former Executive Head Teacher, Calderdale

Jeanne Watson, Executive Head Teacher, the Brooksbank Academy Sports College, Park Lane Learning Trust and Calder High

Kevin McCallion, Head Teacher, the Brooksbank Academy Sports College

Anthony Briggs, Director / Principal Consultant, B11 Education Ltd

Councillor Ralph Berry, Portfolio Holder for Children's Services, City of Bradford MBC

Mr Chris Wightman, Headteacher, Todmorden CE (VA) J&I School and Executive Head Teacher, Sowerby Village CE (VE) Primary School

Mrs Lesley Bowyer, Headteacher, Carr Green Primary School and Executive Headteacher, Ferney Lee Primary School

Ms Helen Hannah, Headteacher, Ferney Lee Primary School

David Whalley, Head of Learning Services, Children and Young People Directorate

Janet Gabanski, Service Manager, 11-19 Learning Services, Children and Young People Directorate

Lindsey Murray, School Effectiveness Officer, Children and Young People Directorate

Billie Farrell, Interim School Effectiveness Officer, Children and Young People Directorate

Judith Harrisson – Interim School Effectiveness Officer (part time), Children and Young People Directorate

Councillor MK Swift, Lead Member, Children's Services, Calderdale Council

Councillor Ashley Evans, Portfolio Holder, Education and Lifelong Learning, Calderdale Council

Paul Brennan, Deputy Director for Learning, Skills and Universal Services, Children's Services, Leeds City Council

Jim Tarpey, Interim Lead for Learning Improvement, Leeds City Council

Gail Webb – Designate Lead for Learning Improvement, Leeds City Council

Kevin Paynes, School Improvements Adviser, Leeds Children's Services, Leeds City Council

Sarah Ruddy, Head Teacher, Bankside Primary School, Leeds

Appendix Three

References and Bibliography

Calderdale Council document – Partnership Framework for Securing School Improvement in Calderdale – September, 2012

Department for Education Guidance – Schools causing concern – guidance for local authorities

Calderdale Council Children and Young People Directorate Leadership Team document - November 2012 – Schools Causing Concern

City of Bradford MDC Department for Children’s Services document – Education Improvement Strategy 2012-15

Information Pack:-

- School Cluster and OFSTED Information
- OFSTED – the framework for school inspection (Published June 2012)
- OFSTED – School Inspection handbook (Published June 2012)
- OFSTED – A good education for all document (Published June 2012)
- Janet Gabanski – Senior School Effectiveness Officer – presentation document – “Understanding the implications of the OFSTED Framework for Inspection – January 2012 and changes for September, 2012

Copies of OFSTED Inspection reports – Calderdale Schools – period September, 2012 – January, 2013

Information Pack provided by Leeds City Council:-

- Primary Performance analysis 2011, version 3.0: cover note and data disc
- The Leeds Education Challenge: Leeds Children and Young People’s Improvement Plan 2011-15
- A strategy for School Improvement – The Leeds Approach Part A, Part B and Part C
- Primary School Improvement – Service Level Agreement
- Primary School Improvement – Academy Contract
- Primary School Improvement – Adviser and Consultant Support Brochure
- Secondary School Improvement – Service Level Agreement
- Leeds Secondary Schools Schedule of Meetings
- 4Heads website – print screen
- Making Leeds a child friendly city – Pack of Useful Information

Notes of all meetings of the School Effectiveness Working Party - held by the Scrutiny Support team.

Appendix Four

List of Maintained, Academy and Trust Schools including date of last OFSTED Inspection and Grade

Schools (Primaries)	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
Abbey Park Junior, Infant and Nursery School	4	Dec 2012
All Saints' Cof E VA Junior and Infant School	1	Jan 2009
Ash Green Community Primary School	1	Jan 2007
Bailiffe Bridge Junior and Infant School	3	Mar 2011
Barkisland Cof E VA Primary School	1	Apr 2011
Beech Hill Academy	2	Jan 2011
Bolton Brow Primary Academy	2	Mar 2008
Bowling Green J&I School	2	April 2012
Bradshaw Primary School	2	Sept 2007
Burnley Road Academy	2	Feb 2011
Carr Green J, I and N School	1	Dec 2011
Castle Hill Primary School	2	Dec 2009
Castlefields Infant School	3	Sept 2012
Central Street Infant and Nursery School	2	Sept 2012
Christ Church Pellon CE VC Primary School	3	Jul 2011

Schools (cont.) (Primaries)	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
Christ Church CE VA Junior School Sowerby Bridge	2	Dec 2012
Cliffe Hill Community Primary School	3	Jul 2010
Colden Junior and Infant School	1	Nov 2007
Copley Primary School	2	Nov 2008
Cornholme Junior, Infant and Nursery School	2	Sept 2008
Cragg Vale Junior and Infant School	2	Dec 2011
Cross Lane Primary and Nursery School	4	Dec 2011
Dean Field Community Primary School	2	Jun 2012
Elland Cof E Junior and Infant School	2	Oct 2012
Ferney Lee Primary School	3	Mar 2011
Field Lane Academy	3	Mar 2012
Greetland Primary Academy	1	Jan 2007
Hebden Royd Cof E VA Primary School	2	Oct 2010
Heptonstall Junior Infant and Nursery School	2	Dec 2011
Highbury Primary Special School	2	Dec 2011
Holy Trinity CE (VA) Primary School	1	Jan 2008
Holywell Green Primary School	2	Jul 2011

Schools (cont.) (Primaries)	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
Lee Mount Primary School	1	Nov 2007
Lightcliffe CofE VA Primary School	2	Oct 2012
Ling Bob Junior, Infant and Nursery School	2	Jan 2013
Longroyde Junior School	2	Apr 2010
Luddenden Dene CofE (VC) Junior Infant and Nursery School	3	Jun 2012
Luddendenfoot Academy	2	Nov 2008
Midgley School	2	Jan 2012
Moorside Community Primary School	2	Nov 2012
Mount Pellon Junior and Infant School	4	Apr 2012
New Road Primary School	2	Oct 2012
Norland C of E Junior and Infant School	2	Nov 2011
Northowram Primary School	2	Mar 2011
Old Earth Primary School	2	Dec 2010
Old Town Primary School	2	Feb 2011
Parkinson Lane Community Primary School	1	Oct 2011
Rawson Junior and Infant School	3	Jan 2012
Ripponden Junior and Infant School	2	Nov 2008

Schools (cont.) (Primaries)	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
Riverside Junior School	4	Jan 2012
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School, Sowerby Bridge	2	Nov 2012
Salterhebble Junior and Infant School	2	Jan 2012
Salterlee Primary School	1	Mar 2009
Savile Park Primary School	2	Sept 2009
Scout Road Academy	1	Nov 2007
Shade Primary School	2	Apr 2010
Shelf Junior and Infant School	3	Mar 2011
Siddal Academy	1	Oct 2010
Sowerby Village CofE VC Primary School	4	Jun 2011
St Andrew's Church of England (VA) Infant School	2	Feb 2012
St Andrew's CofE (VA) Junior School	3	May 2012
St Augustine's Cof E VA Junior and Infant School	3	Sept 2011
St Chad's Cof E (VA) Primary School	3	Feb 2012
St John's (Cof E) Primary Academy, Clifton	1	Apr 2008

Schools (cont.) (Primaries)	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
St John's C of E VA Primary School, Rishworth	2	Jul 2010
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, Brighouse	2	Feb 2012
St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, Halifax	1	Nov 2008
St Joseph's RC Primary, Todmorden	3	Feb 2013
St Malachy's Catholic Primary School	2	Jun 2011
St Mary's Catholic Primary School	3	May 2012
St Mary's Cof E (VC) J and I, Sowerby Bridge	2	May 2012
St Michael and All Angels Cof E Primary School	2	Feb 2012
St Patrick's Catholic Primary School	3	Jan 2013
Stubbings Infant School	2	Jan 2012
Todmorden Cof E Junior and Infant School	2	Sept 2011
Triangle C of E VC Primary School	1	Jan 2007
Tuel Lane Infant School	2	Mar 2010
Wainstalls School	3	Jun 2012
Warley Road Primary School	2	Sept 2012

Schools (cont.) (Primaries)	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
Walsden St Peter's CE (VC)Primary School	2	Apr 2011
Warley Road Primary School	2	Sept 2012
Warley Town School	2	Oct 2009
West Vale Primary School	2	Feb 2012
Whitehill Community Academy	1	Jun 2008
Withinfields Primary School	2	Apr 2010
Wood Bank Primary Special School	1	Jul 2010
Woodhouse Primary School	1	Nov 2006
Schools(Secondary)	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
Brighouse High School	2	May 2012
Calder High School	4	Jan 2012
Halifax High at Wellesley Park	3	May 2011
Hipperholme and Lightcliffe High School	2	Feb 2011
Park Lane Learning Trust	3	Jan 2011
Rastrick High School Academy Trust	2	Jun 2010
Ravenscliffe High School	1	Nov 2012
Sowerby Bridge High School	3	Dec 2012

Schools (cont.) (Secondary)	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
St Catherine's Catholic High School	4	Jan 2011
The Brooksbank School	2	Sept 2008
The Crossley Heath School	1	Feb 2011
Ryburn Valley High School	4	Feb 2012
The North Halifax Grammar School	1	Jan 2011
Todmorden High School	3	Jun 2010
Trinity Academy, Halifax	No grading published	Jan 2011
Other:	Grade	OFSTED date of Inspection
Pupil Referral Unit	2	Jan 2011

NOTES to Appendix 4

Note 1:

The Inspection Grades Inspectors use when making judgements:

Grade 1=outstanding;

Grade 2=good;

Grade 3=requires improvement (formally categorised as “satisfactory” under the old Inspection regime);

Grade 4=inadequate.

Note 2:

The number of school causing the Local Authority concern, as at February 2013 were: 7 Secondary Schools and 20 Primary Schools

Any enquiries or requests for background information,
please contact Paul Preston, Democratic and Partnership
Services, Calderdale Council, Halifax Town Hall, Halifax,

HX1 1UJ

Tel: (01422) 393250

Email: scrutiny@calderdale.gov.uk

<http://www.calderdale.gov.uk>