

# Rikkyo School in England

Independent school progress monitoring inspection report

---

DfE registration number	938/6188
Unique Reference Number (URN)	126132
URN for social care	SC014681
Inspection number	382570
Inspection dates	30 June 2011
Reporting inspector	Michael Best
Social care inspectors	Diane Thackrah and Sharon Lewis

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 Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, work-based learning and skills training, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, 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 copy all or parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes, as long as you give details of the source and date of publication and do not alter the information in any way.

To receive regular email alerts about new publications, including survey reports and school inspection reports, please visit our website and go to 'Subscribe'.

Royal Exchange Buildings  
St Ann's Square  
Manchester  
M2 7LA

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)

No. 090137

© Crown copyright 2011



## Purpose and scope of the inspection

This inspection was carried out by Ofsted under Section 162A of the Education Act 2002, as amended by schedule 8 of the Education Act 2005, and under the Care Standards Act 2000 having regard to the national minimum standards for boarding schools or residential special schools.<sup>1,2,3</sup>

The inspection was conducted at the request of the Registration Authority for independent schools in order to monitor the progress the school has made in implementing its action plan following the previous inspections.

## Information about the school

Rikkyo School is a co-educational Anglican Christian secondary school that was founded in 1972 primarily for the children of Japanese families living and working in the United Kingdom (UK) and Europe. It occupies a large rural site near Horsham in West Sussex. The school teaches the Japanese national curriculum and aims to provide a high quality of education that will enable students to secure entrance to high-ranking Japanese universities. The school is registered with the Department for Education (DfE) in England to admit a maximum of 160 students between the ages of 11 and 18 years. There are currently 63 boys and 54 girls on roll and all are boarders. There are no students with a statement of special educational needs. There are 59 students whose families live in Japan.

## Context of the inspection

The education provision was last inspected in October 2010. Following this, the school submitted an education action plan which was evaluated and accepted in January 2011. A welfare inspection was carried out in January 2010 to assess the school's compliance with national minimum standards for boarding schools. The Department of Education served a notice on the school on 7 July 2010 and requested a re-inspection of the boarding provision. This took place in October 2010 when the school's progress in implementing its social care action plan of July 2010 was also assessed. A number of actions taken by the school were found to be unsatisfactory. An extended deadline of 31 March 2011 for these issues to be addressed by the school was set by the Department of Education. A further social care action plan, evaluated in April 2011, was judged inadequate as it failed to fully address a number of issues. This integrated monitoring visit was made by one additional inspector and two social care inspectors to check the progress made by the school in implementing its action plans.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2002/ukpga\\_20020032\\_en\\_14#pt10-ch1-pb4-l1g162](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2002/ukpga_20020032_en_14#pt10-ch1-pb4-l1g162)

<sup>2</sup> [www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts2005/ukpga\\_20050018\\_en\\_15#sch8](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts2005/ukpga_20050018_en_15#sch8)

<sup>3</sup> [www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/ukpga\\_20000014\\_en\\_1](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/ukpga_20000014_en_1)

## Summary of the progress made in implementing the action plan

At the time of the education inspection in October 2010, the school did not provide, or make available, all of the required information for parents, carers and others. The action plan submitted by the school in October 2010 indicated that it had published a copy of its safeguarding policy on its website and so met regulation 24(1)(c), and also provided and made available on its website all of the necessary information to meet regulation 24(1)(b). It was confirmed on this visit that the school has made satisfactory progress in rectifying weaknesses in the provision of information. All part 6 regulatory requirements are now met. The school has gone beyond the requirements in placing full copies of some policies, in both English and Japanese, on its website.

When the boarding provision was inspected in October 2010 a large number of national minimum standards were not met. The school did not make boarders and their parents and carers aware that, so far as was possible, they could choose to see either a male or female doctor. In its action plan, the school stated that boarders and their parents and carers would be made aware of this option and such information would be provided in written guidance. On this visit, it was confirmed that all boarders are informed during their induction orientation day that they have a right to see a male or female doctor, and the school documentation, available to parents and carers, confirms this. This aspect of national minimum standard 15 is now met.

In October 2010, the surgery and the filing cabinet containing medical records were not always locked when nursing staff were not in the surgery. In its action plan, the school proposed to remind staff of their responsibility for medicines and medical records security and had fitted a self-locking device to the surgery door. On this visit, new secure keypads on the outer surgery door and inner cupboard doors were seen to be fully operational and adequate security procedures were adopted. This aspect of national minimum standard 7 is now met.

The October 2010 boarding inspection judged that written school records of all medication and first aid administered to boarders were not regularly monitored by a designated senior member of staff. In its action plan, the school proposed to monitor staff's administration of medication and record keeping. On this visit, a detailed monitoring log of medicine and first aid administration was seen and the implementation of procedures had been checked by the headteacher. Documentation seen indicates that regular health and safety audit reports are now given to the headteacher and the monitoring undertaken includes: signing the accident book; checking medical administration records; an audit of medication and disposal of medicines. This aspect of national minimum standard 15 is now met.

In October 2010, the school did not ensure that an appropriate staff member prepared and worked to a written and agreed individual 'welfare plan', that had also been agreed with parents and carers, for any boarder with special welfare needs,

significant emotional or behavioural difficulties, or who does not see his or her parent or legal guardian at least three times a year. In its action plan, the school proposed to put such plans in place, where required. On this visit, suitable welfare plans were seen for boarders that required them. Scrutiny indicated that these plans are clearly understood and agreed with boarders, staff, parents and carers. This aspect of national minimum standard 17 is now met. At the time of the last boarding inspection, boarders were not given a choice of menu and a vegetarian option was not available at every meal. In its action plan, the school stated that a vegetarian option would be implemented but no proposal was made as to whether all boarders would have a choice of meal. This visit found that boarders are now able to choose a different meal from the main menu one week in advance and that vegetarian diets are catered for. This aspect of national minimum standard 24 is now met.

In October 2010, older boarders did not have appropriate facilities in which to store food and prepare their own hot and cold snacks and drinks hygienically. In its action plan, the school stated that girls could use the kitchen in the dormitory and that boys would be provided with hot and cold water and a toaster. However, it was not clear what facilities would be available for storage. The facilities seen on this visit for the storage and preparation of hot and cold snacks and drinks in both the boys' and girls' boarding houses meet this aspect of national minimum standard 25.

At the time of the last boarding inspection, no written school record was kept of all medication brought into the school (including Japanese medication) and there was no clear written protocol for its use. Written parental permission had not always been obtained in advance for the administration of first aid and appropriate non-prescribed medication to boarders. In addition, there was no written protocol for the use of all medication, including inhaler medication, to be administered in accordance with the advice of a qualified medical or nursing professional. In its action plan, the school stated that records and protocols had been updated to ensure good practice in this area and that the school's general practitioner would be consulted with regard to all prescribed medication that boarders manage themselves. The school proposed to provide secure storage space for individuals to store their medication in their dormitory. The school also proposed to obtain the necessary permissions from parents and carers. The school stated in the action plan that the school medical officer had been asked to provide a protocol for non-prescribed medication. However, no proposals were made about prescribed medication and the school did not make clear whether the school medical officer was a qualified medical practitioner or nursing professional. Records seen on this visit indicate that all medication brought into the school is appropriately logged and is suitably stored. Clear written protocols are now in place for all medications. Individual assessments for self-medication also have input from parents and carers. Parental consent forms are held in the surgery and include permission for the administration of first aid by staff; permission to administer prescribed and non-prescribed medicines and permission for the administration of home remedies. The school's general practitioner has signed separate protocols for administering inhaler medication and

for simple remedies to be used in school. These aspects of national minimum standard 15 are now met.

The last boarding inspection judged that the school did not ensure that all staff, including newly appointed and ancillary staff, received a briefing or training on responding to suspicions or allegations of abuse and knew what action that they should take in response to child protection suspicions or allegations. In addition, the school did not ensure that its child protection policy was known to staff and, as appropriate, to older boarders in positions of responsibility. Also, where senior boarders were given positions of responsibility over others, the school did not ensure that they were briefed on the appropriate action to take should they receive any child protection allegations of abuse. In its action plan, the school stated that all staff had been trained in child protection and had been given a copy of the school's child protection policy. The school also proposed that senior boarders would be briefed in child protection procedures. This visit found that records are in place indicating that all current staff have received appropriate child protection training and a recent briefing regarding child protection. Confirmation was also provided that all older boarders have been briefed about their role in child protection. The documentation provided to older boarders gives clear information regarding reporting any concerns about child protection to the relevant staff members. These aspects of national minimum standard 3 are now met.

In October 2010, the school did not ensure that boarders had sufficient and suitably timed free time each day. In addition, the school did not ensure that a satisfactory range and choice of activities were provided for boarders out of class time throughout the year, both indoors and outdoors as appropriate. In its action plan, the school stated that a new timetable had been put in place to ensure that boarders had more free time and earlier bedtimes had been introduced. In addition, a wide range of activities had been put in place and more opportunities made available for boarders to visit local towns. On this visit, evidence seen in the school handbook indicates that the free time allocated to boarders is sufficient and suitable. Boarders confirm that they are busy but not overworked. Bedtimes have been brought forward and boarders agree that this has been a positive move. Details were seen of a wide range of activities, including many trips off site. A wide range of sports and music activities are provided on site with excellent facilities for these. Boarders are pleased with the range and quality of the opportunities available to them. These aspects of national minimum standard 11 are now met.

The last boarding inspection found that the school did not ensure that where there were unusual or especially onerous demands on boarders, these did not unacceptably affect boarders' welfare. In its action plan, the school stated that earlier bedtimes had been introduced and staff had been asked to monitor boarders' welfare in order to identify signs of stress and fatigue. In addition, the school proposed to carry out a boarder survey to seek their views. On this visit, boarders said that they were busy but not overworked and onerous demands were not made.

Staff are monitoring boarders' behaviour for signs of becoming overtired. This aspect of national minimum standard 27 is now met.

In October 2010, the school did not ensure that boarders had a suitable, secure and accessible place to keep their personal possessions and valuables. In its action plan, the school proposed that all boarders would have a lockable storage box in their dormitories. As seen on this visit, the school has provided secure storage boxes for all boarders in their dormitories. This aspect of national minimum standard 20 is now met.

When boarding was last inspected the school did not ensure that the girls' showers were maintained to a satisfactory standard in order to avoid frequent repairs. In its action plan, the school stated that replacement valves had been fitted to girls' showers and proposed to refurbish them in April 2011. This work has been completed, with boarders involved in choosing the colour scheme. Shower facilities are good. This aspect of minimum standard 44 is now met.

In October 2010, the school did not ensure that all members of staff with boarding duties were provided with written up-to-date guidance on the school's boarding policies and guidance. In its action plan, the school stated that monthly reviews were to be carried out on all boarding policies and guidance. However, the dates provided referred to the review of the safeguarding policy and the first aid policy. No reference was made to how staff would be provided with written guidance about the school's policies and guidance. On this visit, senior staff provided inspectors with a copy of the staff handbook. This provides staff with suitable, up-to-date guidance on the school's boarding policies and guidance. This aspect of national minimum standard 34 is now met.

At the last boarding inspection the school did not ensure that it reviewed its boarding policy and procedures to ensure that boarders were looked after by permanent, qualified staff. The school did not ensure that it had systems in place to monitor the welfare provision for the boarders or that there was clear management and leadership of the practice and development of boarding. In its action plan, the school stated that senior boarding staff had been given a copy of the national minimum standards and a summarised action plan. It also stated that training was to be provided to senior staff regarding boarding practices. However, the action plan did not provide any detail about what systems would be put in place to monitor the welfare provision in the school, other than to put in place welfare plans for relevant boarders. This visit found that the headteacher and the head of boarding have completed recognised training for boarding to fulfil their duties and that they have cascaded information from this training to existing staff, with further training planned on a termly basis. The school proposes that a staff member will attend recognised boarding training on an annual basis in future. Documentation seen on this visit confirms that members of the senior management team are suitably involved in the monitoring of the day-to-day welfare of boarders. Records indicating regular checks are undertaken on the welfare of boarders and these have been monitored and

signed by the headteacher. Leadership roles in boarding are clearly delineated to appropriately monitor the welfare of boarders. Boarding staff are suitably qualified. These aspects of national minimum standard 8 are now met.

In October 2010, safeguarding procedures in boarding were not robust enough. Arrangements did not ensure that recruitment checks for all staff members were in accordance with national *Safeguarding Children and Safer Recruitment in Education* guidance. In addition, the school had not carried out Criminal Records Bureau checks on all of the people who live on site but were not employed by the school. In its action plan, the school stated that it had completed the required checks on those people living on the site who were not employed by the school. In addition, police (List 99) checks had been carried out on six staff but the action plan provided no further information about the other checks required, including Criminal Records Bureau checks. On this visit, the procedures followed for the four most recently recruited staff members were checked and files found to contain all of the required safer recruitment documentation. The designated person for child protection has a clear understanding of safe recruitment practices. Senior staff are clear that not all staff recruited in the past have undergone full recruitment checks. The school was advised by social care inspectors that retrospective checks should be made on staff employed within the last twelve months where there are no written references and where there are gaps in employment histories and that the required information should be entered in the single central register. National minimum standard 38 is not met and this results in the school's non-compliance with three of the independent schools regulatory requirements: 19(2)(e), 22(3) and 22(4).

At the time of the last boarding inspection, the school did not ensure that all members of staff with boarding duties had job descriptions that reflected such duties and that they have received induction in boarding when newly appointed. In its action plan, the school stated that all staff had been issued with job descriptions and induction would be provided to all new staff appointed in April 2011. Documentation seen on this visit indicates that job descriptions are in place for boarding staff, and induction days are planned for all new staff. Records seen indicate that one new staff member has undergone induction training but there are no records indicating that the three other new members of staff have undergone appropriate induction. This aspect of national minimum standard 34 is not met.

In October 2010, the school did not ensure that all of the requirements detailed in the national minimum standards were adhered to prior to placing boarders in a host family. In its action plan, the school proposed that host family accommodation would in future be inspected every year, and guidance notes and written agreements would be produced for hosts. However, the action plan did not indicate: how these checks would be carried out; how hosts would be provided with information about appropriate behaviour management; how the school would take up references or keep a record of the host's suitability assessment. Documentation seen on this visit indicates that references are now obtained for all new host families. However, the school does not have references for thirteen host families accepted more than twelve



months ago. The school was advised by social care inspectors that in order to meet this standard, references should be obtained for these host families retrospectively. The school produced records indicating that the homes of host families are checked by the school. These show that some but not all of the required checks are made. National minimum standard 51 is not met.

The school has made satisfactory progress overall in implementing its action plan. It now meets most regulations for independent schools and national minimum standards except for the areas of non-compliance noted below.

## **Compliance with regulatory requirements**

As a result of this inspection, the school must take action to meet The Education (Independent School Standards) (England) Regulations 2010<sup>4</sup> ('the Regulations'), as follows:

- ensure that the school complies with standard 38 of the national minimum standards for boarding schools (paragraph 19(2)(e))
- ensure that the single register shows that, in the case of staff who care for, train, supervise or are in charge of children for whom accommodation is provided, a check was made to ensure compliance with standard 38 of the national minimum standards for boarding schools (paragraphs 22(3) and 22(4)).

In order to meet the national minimum standards for boarding schools and associated regulations, the school should:

- ensure that written reference and gaps in employment histories are obtained for staff employed in the school (national minimum standard 38)
- ensure that all members of staff with boarding duties receive induction in boarding when newly appointed (national minimum standard 34)
- ensure that all requirements detailed in this national minimum standard are adhered to prior to placing young people in a host family (national minimum standard 51).

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/1997/contents/made](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/1997/contents/made)

## School details

<b>School status</b>	Independent		
<b>Type of school</b>	Japanese boarding school		
<b>Date school opened</b>	1972		
<b>Age range of pupils</b>	11–18 years		
<b>Gender of pupils</b>	Mixed		
<b>Number on roll (full-time pupils)</b>	Boys: 63	Girls: 54	Total: 117
<b>Number of boarders</b>	Boys: 63	Girls: 54	Total: 117
<b>Number of pupils with a statement of special educational needs</b>	Boys: 0	Girls: 0	Total: 0
<b>Number of pupils who are looked after</b>	Boys: 0	Girls: 0	Total: 0
<b>Annual fees (boarders)</b>	£15,000–£20,400		
<b>Address of school</b>	Guildford Road, Rudgwick Horsham, West Sussex RH12 3BE		
<b>Telephone number</b>	01403 822107		
<b>Email address</b>	eikoku@rikkyo.w-sussex.sch.uk		
<b>Headteacher</b>	Roger Munechika		
<b>Proprietor</b>	Rikkyo School in England Trust		