

Cambridge Education  
Demeter House  
Station Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2RS

T 01223 578500  
F 01223 578501  
Risp.inspections@camb-ed.com

Ofsted helpline  
0845 640 4045



15 January 2007

Miss Foskett  
Headteacher  
Reffley Community School  
Reffley Lane  
King's Lynn  
Norfolk  
PE30 3SF

Dear Miss Foskett,

#### OFSTED MONITORING OF SCHOOLS WITH NOTICE TO IMPROVE

Thank you for the help which you and your staff gave when I inspected your school on 12 December 2006, for the time you gave to our phone discussions and for the information which you provided before and during my visit. During the visit only two parts of lessons were observed, due to many classes being out of action because of the Foundation Stage and Key Stage 1 Christmas performance.

As a result of the inspection on 24 and 25 April 2006, the school was asked to:

Increase the pace of pupils' progress between Years 2 and 6, tracking pupils' progress each year and taking action where needed.

Ensure that work in lessons is matched to pupils' capabilities.

Monitor the quality of teaching and learning.

Establish effective processes for the school's self-evaluation.

Having considered all the evidence I am of the opinion that at this time the school is making satisfactory progress.

The school has in place good tracking systems which check how much progress children have made. Evidence gathered shows that in most classes the rate of children's progress is improving slowly. However, some children, especially those with average abilities, are not making enough progress and the progress children make in English is better than that in mathematics. The

school has used the tracking systems effectively to identify groups of children who are not making adequate progress and has put in additional support. The 2006 Year 6 tests results did not show a significant improvement compared to the previous year. Furthermore, the added value indicators showed that progress in Years 3 to 6 was inadequate.

In a sample of teachers' lesson plans seen, evidence varied in demonstrating that work was being matched to children's different abilities. In some plans there was very little to suggest that different work was being set and too often more able children were expected to do more of the same work or have less adult support. This picture of teaching was confirmed in children's work. The school does not have a common format for planning and this does not lend itself to ensuring that enough thought is given to matching work effectively to children's different abilities.

Following the inspection in April no formal observations of teaching took place during the summer term. However, since September teaching has been monitored with the support of the acting assistant headteacher. All teachers have been given feedback on their teaching and records show that pointers for further improvement have been given. The monitoring cycle has not been in place long enough to check on whether this advice has been followed. All subject leaders have worked alongside the acting assistant headteacher to monitor lessons. Along with checking on teachers' planning and children's work, the school has begun to build up a picture of provision. This work is at very early stages and too early to evaluate the impact.

A number of teachers have visited other schools where good practice has been identified. Teachers have also observed good lessons in other classes in Reffley. Although this has helped teachers to identify good practice, these opportunities have not always improved their own teaching.

The school has begun to make the process of evaluating its effectiveness more robust. The senior management team (SMT) has meetings fortnightly and since the inspection has focused effectively on the progress the school has made. The tracking systems and improved work of the subject leaders has ensured that this work is better informed. The self evaluation form (SEF), which is a commonly used document that asks schools to make judgements about the quality of provision, is discussed at governor meetings. Governors are now linked to subject areas and some now visit school and monitor improvements.

Support from the LA has been disrupted by a change in key staff supporting the school. The few visits that have been made have been useful. The SMT has successfully focused the school on dealing with underperformance. It is recognised that the school has already come some way in putting in systems

and sharing expectations that could bring about improvement. However, the consistency of these improvements and the long-term embedding of this work is now vital in ensuring the school moves on.

I hope that you have found the visit helpful in promoting improvement in your school.

Yours sincerely



Her Majesty's Inspector