

# A G E N D A

## Education Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Tuesday, 5th October, 2004**

---

Time: **10.00 a.m.**

---

Place: **The Council Chamber,  
Brockington, 35 Hafod Road,  
Hereford**

---

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of the meeting.

*For any further information please contact:*

*Paul James, Members' Services Tel: 01432  
260460 Fax: 01432 260286*

***e-mail: [pjames@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:pjames@herefordshire.gov.uk)***

---

**County of Herefordshire  
District Council**



# AGENDA

## for the Meeting of the Education Scrutiny Committee

<b>To:</b>	<b>Councillor</b>	<b>B.F. Ashton (Chairman)</b>
	<b>Councillor</b>	<b>J.P. Thomas (Vice-Chairman)</b>
	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>H. Bramer, N.J.J. Davies, R.M. Manning, Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, Mrs. S.J. Robertson, D.C. Taylor, Ms. A.M. Toon and W.J. Walling</b>
	<b>Church Members</b>	<b>J.D. Griffin (Roman Catholic) and Revd. I. Terry (Church of England)</b>
	<b>Parent Governor Members</b>	<b>Ms K. Fitch (Primary Governors)</b>
	<b>Teacher Representatives</b>	<b>C. Lewandowski (Secondary Teachers) and J.D. Pritchard (Primary Teachers)</b>
	<b>Headteacher Representatives</b>	<b>Ms. E. Christopher (Primary Headteachers), A Marson (Secondary Headteachers) and Miss S. Peate (Primary Sector Headteachers)</b>

	<b>Pages</b>
<b>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
To receive apologies for absence.	
<b>2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)</b>	
To receive details any details of Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Committee.	
<b>3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
<b>4. MINUTES</b>	1 - 8
To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd June 2004.	
<b>5. YEAR 2004 RESULTS FOR HEREFORDHSIRE SCHOOLS</b>	9 - 12
To consider the Summer 2004 <b>provisional</b> results at Key Stages 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for Herefordshire Schools.	
<b>6. TEACHER'S WORKLOAD AGREEMENT - MONITORING OF PROCESS</b>	13 - 16
To inform the Committee of the progress being made, both locally and nationally, in implementing the National School Workforce Remodelling Programme.	

<b>7. STAFF SICKNESS ABSENCE</b>	To consider levels of staff sickness and absence in the Education Service.	17 - 20
<b>8. UPDATE ON OFSTED SCHOOL INSPECTIONS SINCE SEPTEMBER 2003</b>	To up-date the Committee on the outcomes of Ofsted School Inspections since 1 September 2003, and in particular those inspections for which reports have been published since the end of the school year 2003 –2004.	21 - 28
<b>9. BEST VALUE REVIEW OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS</b>	To consider the Stage 3 Report of the Best Value Review of Special Educational Needs Provision and Support Services.  (A copy of the Stage 3 Best Value Report (45 pages in length) is enclosed separately for Members of the Committee and is available to the public on request.)	29 - 30
<b>10. SCHOOL TRAVEL INITIATIVES - PROGRESS REPORT</b>	To provide an update of progress on the school travel initiatives being pursued by the Council to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport for journeys to school.	31 - 34
<b>11. REVIEW OF SMALL SCHOOLS - BRILLEY PRIMARY, ST. MARY'S OF HOPE CE PRIMARY, KINGS CAPLE PRIMARY, LONGTOWN PRIMARY AND DILWYN PRIMARY</b>	To provide information about pupil numbers in 5 very small schools at the start of the autumn term, 2004 and invite the Committee's comments about the extent to which the position of any of the five schools, whose pupil numbers are below the review levels specified for in Herefordshire's School Organisation Plan, should be examined further.	35 - 38
<b>12. ANNUAL REVIEW OF SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN</b>	To seek comments on the draft school organisation plan 2004-2008.	39 - 40
<b>13. PROGRESS OF MAJOR CAPITAL SCHEMES (AND TARGETED CAPITAL FUND)</b>	To report on progress on the education capital programme.	41 - 48
<b>14. EDUCATION REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2004/05</b>	To report on the monitoring of the revenue budget for education.	49 - 52
<b>15. COMPLAINTS, COMPLIMENTS AND APPEALS</b>	To consider the summary of comments, complaints and appeals relating to the Education Directorate, for the period 1st November 2003 to 31st August 2004.	53 - 56
<b>16. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME</b>	To outline the range of business that it is anticipated the Committee will need to consider during the coming financial year 2004/05.	57 - 60

## **PUBLIC INFORMATION**

### **HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL'S SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

The Council has established Scrutiny Committees for Education, Environment, Health, Social Care and Housing and Social and Economic Development. A Strategic Monitoring Committee scrutinises Policy and Finance matters and co-ordinates the work of these Committees.

The purpose of the Committees is to ensure the accountability and transparency of the Council's decision making process.

The principal roles of Scrutiny Committees are to

- Help in developing Council policy
- Probe, investigate, test the options and ask the difficult questions before and after decisions are taken
- Look in more detail at areas of concern which may have been raised by the Cabinet itself, by other Councillors or by members of the public
- "call in" decisions - this is a statutory power which gives Scrutiny Committees the right to place a decision on hold pending further scrutiny.
- Review performance of the Council
- Conduct Best Value reviews
- Undertake external scrutiny work engaging partners and the public

Formal meetings of the Committees are held in public and information on your rights to attend meetings and access to information are set out overleaf

# **The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings**

## **YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -**

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public Register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

## **Please Note:**

Agenda and individual reports can be made available in large print. Please contact the officer named on the front cover of this agenda **in advance** of the meeting who will be pleased to deal with your request.

The meeting venue is accessible for visitors in wheelchairs.

A public telephone is available in the reception area.

## **Public Transport Links**

- Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via the service runs approximately every half hour from the 'Hopper' bus station at the Tesco store in Bewell Street (next to the roundabout junction of Blueschool Street / Victoria Street / Edgar Street).
- The nearest bus stop to Brockington is located in Old Eign Hill near to its junction with Hafod Road. The return journey can be made from the same bus stop.

If you have any questions about this agenda, how the Council works or would like more information or wish to exercise your rights to access the information described above, you may do so either by telephoning the officer named on the front cover of this agenda or by visiting in person during office hours (8.45 a.m. - 5.00 p.m. Monday - Thursday and 8.45 a.m. - 4.45 p.m. Friday) at the Council Offices, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford.

## **COUNTY OF HEREFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**BROCKINGTON, 35 HAFOD ROAD, HEREFORD.**

### **FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to Assembly Point J which is located at the southern entrance to the car park. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.



COUNTY OF HEREFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**MINUTES of the meeting of Education Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, Brockington, Hafod Road, Hereford on Tuesday, 22nd June, 2004 at 2.00 p.m.**

**Present:** Councillor B.F. Ashton (Chairman)

**Councillors:** H. Bramer, J.D. Grffin, R.M. Manning, Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, Mrs. S.J. Robertson, J. Stone, D.C. Taylor, Ms. A.M. Toon, W.J. Walling and S.E. Wright.

**Church Members:** J. D. Griffin, Revd. I. Terry.

**Parent Governor** Ms. K. Fitch, Mrs. S. E. Wright

**Members:**

**Co-opted Teacher** C. Lewandowski, J. D. Pritchard

**Representatives:**

**Co-opted** A. Marson, Miss S. Peate

**Headteacher**

**Representatives**

**In attendance:** Councillors T.M. James, R.I. Matthews, D.W. Rule (Cabinet Member - Education) and R.M. Wilson (Cabinet Member – Highways and Transportation).

**1. CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**

The Committee noted the reappointment at Council on 21st May, 2004, of Councillor B.F. Ashton as Chairman and Councillor J. P. Thomas as Vice-Chairman.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Ms. E. Christopher and Councillors N. J. N. Davies and J. P. Thomas.

**3. NAMED SUBSTITUTES**

Councillor J. Stone substituted for Councillor N. J. J. Davies.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor R. M. Manning and Mr. A. Marson declared personal interests in agenda item 11 – Review of Discretionary Policies Applicable to Home to School Transport.

**5. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 5th April, 2004 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**6. POLICY ON 14-19 EDUCATION**

The Committee was informed of the key issues surrounding the 14-19 phase of education both locally and nationally.

The Head of Inspection, Advice and School Performance Services reported that

nationally the situation regarding 14-19 education was complex. In essence, the government was seeking to increase the numbers of pupils staying in education and training post –16; provide a wider range of choice of courses to young people; target the skills gaps and broaden the curriculum at Key Stage 4 (14-16 year olds) with particular emphasis on preparation for the world of work. The report highlighted the work of the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) in this area of education; the likely impact of the “Tomlinson Report”; details of areas in which Herefordshire performed well and those areas where further improvement should be strived for; the work undertaken since the 14-19 Conference held in October 2003; the employment of a consultant to draft a “Strategic Framework for the implementation of the 14 – 19 agenda in Herefordshire” and the establishment and roles of The Herefordshire Learning Partnership.

The Committee noted that the Increased Flexibility Programme (IFP) for 14 – 16 year olds, funded by the LSC and managed by the Marches Consortium was now into its second year of operation. Nine secondary schools were involved in the programme and it was anticipated that more would be involved in due course.

**RESOLVED: That the report be noted.**

## **7. HEALTH AND SAFETY OF PUPILS DURING EDUCATIONAL VISITS**

The Committee was informed of the action taken to ensure the safety of pupils and young people engaged in off-site activities and visits.

The Committee heard that, in accordance with guidance issued by the DfES, written guidance, including policy and good practice, had been revised by the Authority and distributed to all Local Education Authority (LEA) schools involved in off-site trips and activities.

An advisory service had been set up and made available to schools, the Youth Service and Duke of Edinburgh Awards Group. In response to DfES recommendations a national programme of training for Educational Visit Co-ordinators (EVC) had been launched. The report outlined the local delivery of training and course content (Appendix 1 to the report). One of the duties of the advisory service was to monitor off-site activities and visits and this was undertaken through a system of approval and notification – further detailed in appendix 2 to the report.

The Committee noted that more specific training had been offered to schools including: the basic Expedition Leader Award; 6-hour first aid and 16-hour outdoor first aid courses and that these were payable from school budgets at cost price. It was fully appreciated that the health and safety of pupils was of paramount importance. However, concern was expressed that schools may be dissuaded from organising visits due to the official procedures involved. In response to questions concerning training for parents assisting on visits, the Committee were informed that it was for the Headteacher or Group Leader to decide the number of assistants and the level of skills required. Concern was also expressed about both the issue of teachers who also undertook the driving duties on visits and the general availability of teaching staff to undertake such visits following implementation of the Workforce Reform Agreement.

In view of the various concerns the Committee requested that a further report be submitted to a future meeting.

**RESOLVED: That the report be noted and in view of the concerns raised a**

further report be submitted to a future meeting.

#### 8. THE STANDARD SCHOOL YEAR PROPOSAL FOR 2005/2006

The Committees views were sought on proposals for the standard school year for 2005/2006.

The Head of Inspection, Advice and School Performance Service reported that the Local Government Association (LGA) had issued a document (Appendix 1 to the report) which included a letter from the Secretary of State stating that he was attracted to the arguments in favour of standardising the length of school terms. The LGA continued to have meetings, especially with the NASUWT, and had agreed a number of principles, outlined in the report. Following consultation with local teacher unions, 4 options for school term and holiday dates, copies of which were appended to the report, had been distributed to schools and Diocesan Authorities for consultation. Results of the survey gave a clear signal that version C was preferred, followed by version B. Further consultation had been undertaken with the Herefordshire Association of Secondary Headteachers and Unions who had reaffirmed support for version C. He further reported that during the same period negotiations had continued across the region with many Councils receiving rejections of the LGA proposal about the school return date after the Easter break. A number of Councils in the region appeared to have agreed a 7<sup>th</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> April holiday break.

The Committee discussed the report and was generally in favour of standardising the school terms thereby bringing a degree of uniformity across the region.

**RESOLVED: That the action taken in the report be agreed and that the Cabinet Member (Education) be recommended to consider adopting the school terms and holiday dates 2005/2006 as set out in Version C contained in Appendix 2 to the report.**

#### 9. MONITORING THE PROGRESS OF CAPITAL SCHEMES

The Committee received a report on capital expenditure for 2004/05 and were provided with information about progress towards the replacement of Staunton-on-Wye Primary School, and the prospect for "Building Schools for the Future".

The Head of Policy and Resources reported that projected expenditure on capital projects in Education for 2004/05 had been summarised in Appendix 1 to the report. Projects were shown individually where building contracts had been let and construction was underway, or where projects were still at the design stage. During 2004/05, major building schemes were to be completed at Lea Primary School (June 2004), Green Croft Early Excellence Centre (July 2004) and Cradley Primary School (October 2004). Design work was currently underway on a number of other major schemes. Acquisition of the new site for the replacement Whitecross High School had not been completed during the last financial year, as anticipated, but the acquisition would need to be completed this summer to allow the PFI scheme to proceed. Allowance also needed to be made for other land acquisition at Staunton-on-Wye, Sutton St. Nicholas and Little Dewchurch. Information on the replacement of Staunton-on-Wye Primary School was detailed in the report.

The Head of Policy and Resources further reported that government ministers had decided not to support any further 'pilot' authorities under the "Building Schools for the Future" scheme. The Herefordshire bid had been assessed as good and was realistic in terms of the ability to deliver. The bid was, however, assessed as being "high risk" in terms of what the DfES called "corporate capacity" due to the small size

of the Authority and its limited experience with the single PFI project. It was anticipated that an announcement would be made later in 2004 on the schemes to be given approval to start in 2006/07 and 2007/08.

The Committee noted the position regarding the replacement Staunton-on-Wye Primary School. In response to questions regarding the "Building Schools for the Future" scheme the Committee noted that long-term funding for the scheme was thought to have been committed by the government. The Committee also noted that notwithstanding the failure to secure funding under the scheme for the long-term improvement of schools in the County, the long-term education capital programme may be further complicated by the likely impact of the "Tomlinson Report" concerning the physical constraints of school buildings to deliver changes to curriculum subjects suggested in the report.

**RESOLVED: That the report be noted.**

#### **10. REVENUE OUTTURN 2003/04 AND BUDGET 2004/05**

The Committee considered a report on the revenue budget outturn for 2003/04 and the revenue budget estimate for 2004/05.

The Manager of LMS and Planning reported that the revenue budget outturn for 2003/04 showed an uncommitted underspend of £403,000 (0.5%), further detailed in Appendix 1 to the report. Due to lower than anticipated levels of inflation and improved efficiencies in Home to School Transport, savings in this area had been greater than projected. He further reported that the Authority had met both DfES performance indicators for the Education budget 2004/05. Spending delegated to schools had met the target set by the DfES and spending on central items was within the limit set by the DfES. A summary of school balances were detailed in appendix 2 to the report. The Committee also noted that the Education Directorate were working with the Governors of the one secondary school currently in deficit to formulate and implement a budget recovery plan for the school.

The Committee noted that the system of 'banded funding' did not replace 'statemented' funding. Funding for 'statemented' pupils transferred into the County would be honoured. However, they would be subject to the usual statement review process. Anomalies between the 'statement' and 'banded' system, highlighted during the first year of operation, would be reviewed, an example being the difference in the maximum level of support available under the systems.

**RESOLVED: That the report be noted and an update report on the banded funding scheme be considered at a future meeting.**

#### **11. REVIEW OF DISCRETIONARY POLICIES APPLICABLE TO HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT**

Councillor R. M. Manning and Mr A. Marson declared personal interests in this item.

Comments of the Committee were sought on the conclusions of the review of the discretionary policies for provision of home to school transport.

The Head of Policy and Resources reminded the Committee that as part of the cross-service Best Value review of transport, the Committee had established a working party to review the discretionary policies, detailed in appendix 1 the report, for the provision of school transport.

He reported that following initial consultation the Working Party felt that no change

should be made to the policies covering: Boarding points; Year 10/11 whose home address changes; Travelling times; Vacant seats for all age groups and Public Service route subsidy. Further consultation had been undertaken on: Denominational transport; Post-16 transport; Transport for under 5s and Transport for children with SEN, the results of which were detailed in the report.

In relation to denominational transport he reported that the Working Party had identified the following four options for consultation: 1. Maintain the status quo; 2. Remove any form of subsidy; 3. Seek parental contributions and 4. Free transport with mileage limits. These were further defined in the report. The Working Party had concluded that options for the future should be between 1, 2, and 3. However, due to the limited number of responses and no clear pattern the Working Party were reluctant to make a particular recommendation and proposed that the Scrutiny Committee consider options 1, 2 and 3.

The Committee debated the options. Particular consideration was given to the low response to the questionnaire; the nature of the questions asked; the range of consultees involved; the government's support for distinct and specialist schools into which category denominational schools might fall; the potential effect on poorer families in rural areas; the high degree of inter-school support between all schools in the County and the fact that many LEAs did not support denominational transport. Concern was expressed that the bigger picture needed to be considered when weighing up the potential financial savings, particularly when any changes could only be implemented over a number of years.

The Head of Policy and Resources briefly reported upon the options considered concerning Post-16 transport; Transport for under 5s and Transport for children with Special Educational Needs (SEN), further detailed in the report.

**RESOLVED: That the report and recommendations of the Working Party be noted and the following recommendations be submitted to the Cabinet Member (Education) for consideration:**

- a) **Denominational Transport.**  
That the status quo be maintained.
- b) **Post 16 Transport**  
That the current charging levels be maintained (subject to annual review) but no additional subsidy be offered on the basis that Education Maintenance Allowances (EMAs) were available to cover costs.
- c) **Transport for Under 5s**  
No change to existing policy.
- d) **Transport for Children with Special Educational Needs**  
That the existing policy be amended to benefit only those students who have not reached their nineteenth birthday, and those students not in receipt of a mobility allowance.

## 12. EDUCATION OF EXCLUDED PUPILS

The Committee were informed about the current policy and practice for the placing of pupils in alternative schools following permanent exclusion.

The Head of Children's and Students' Service reported that a relatively low number of children were permanently excluded from primary schools and that there were

arrangements, outlined in the report, to support such pupils. The majority of permanent exclusions came from secondary schools (indicated in Appendix 1 to the report). Usually, permanently excluded students would be placed, as an interim measure, in the Reintegration Support Base (RSB) attached to the Aconbury Centre, Hereford, where their needs would be assessed. Parents of students were given advice and support from a specialist Social Inclusion Assistant. Most of the students were subsequently placed, via the cluster arrangements (indicated in Appendix 2 to the report), in a secondary school, if this was felt to be appropriate. The report briefly described the 'cluster' system and the development of a protocol, the draft of which was included at Appendix 3, to clearly state the policy and practice for placing permanently excluded pupils in schools.

The Committee debated the current exclusion policy, particularly in relation to schools with a zero tolerance policy towards drugs, and noted the position concerning the appointment of independent exclusion appeal panels to hear exclusion cases. The Committee also noted that the cluster groups, indicated in Appendix 2, required review. Clarification was requested on the relationship between the Council's exclusion policy and a schools zero tolerance policy to drugs.

**RESOLVED: That the report be noted and a briefing note be circulated to Members on the relationship between the Council's exclusion policy and a schools zero tolerance policy to drugs.**

### 13. PUPIL REFERRAL SERVICE (PRUS): PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee considered progress made towards implementing the targets identified during the Best Value Review in 2002 (Appendix 2 to the report) and considered any further action that needed to be taken.

The Head of Children's and Students' Services briefly highlighted the work of the Pupil Referral Units (PRU) for Key Stage 4 pupils at St. David's, Hereford, and The Priory, Leominster, and the PRU for Key Stage 3 pupils at the Aconbury Centre, Hereford. She commented that all three PRUs had had very successful Ofsted inspections in 2000 (summarised at Appendix 1) and anticipated that further good reports would be achieved.

She reported that Appendix 2 to the report listed targets identified during the Best Value Review of the Service – reported to the Committee on 3rd December 2002 – which had been updated to show current progress. Following the Best Value Review, an outreach class has been developed and piloted for 6-8 statemented pupils with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (EBD). That class provided for KS4 pupils and was attached to The Brookfield School, Hereford.

She highlighted that currently there was cause for concern about the consequences of there being a very small number of girls for whom an EBD statement for The Brookfield School was appropriate. The specific point of concern was that, at any moment in time, Brookfield did not have an appropriate peer group of girls for the school to be regarded as co-educational provision. The situation, which had attracted comment from Ofsted, would be kept under review. She reported that if it proved to be a longer-term problem, alternative provision may need to be developed for the small number of relevant girls.

In response to questions the Committee were informed of the range of full time; part-time or out-placements offered by PRUs. The Committee also noted that the pressures on staff in the service were high and the stress levels were a major factor in staff movement.

**RESOLVED: That the progress report on the Pupil Referral Service be noted.**

**14. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2003-2004**

The Committee considered the outcomes on the national Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) relating to the Education Directorate for 2003-2004.

The Head of Policy and Resources reported upon the performance indicators and highlighted that 12 targets had been achieved or exceeded; 9 targets had been missed by a narrow margin and 4 targets had been missed by over 10 %. The report outlined the reasons or actions being taken to improve the situation.

**RESOLVED: That the report be noted.**

**15. BEST VALUE REVIEW OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS SERVICES**

The Committee considered the progress of the Best Value Review of Special Educational Needs Services.

The Committee noted that the initial review had been extended to encompass all Special Educational Needs (SEN) Services and this had necessitated further and more extensive research. The Review Team would shortly produce the Stage 3 report and expected to submit the report to the Committee in October 2004.

**RESOLVED: That the progress of the Best Value Review of Special Educational Needs Services be noted.**

**16. OUTCOMES OF PARENTAL APPLICATIONS FOR YEAR 6 PUPIL TRANSFERS TO HIGH SCHOOLS, SEPTEMBER 2004**

The Committee were informed of the outcomes of parental application for Year 6 pupils into High Schools for September 2004, including details of appeals.

The Head of Policy and Resources reported that formal appeals had taken place for applications relating to five high schools and the results were detailed in the report. He commented that the new system of 3 preference applications had produced a considerable improvement in the number of parents satisfied with the outcome. The report indicated the places allocated for September 2004, compared with the number of places available. The waiting list, which included pupils whose parents decided not to appeal, would remain open until September. Currently there were no Year 6 pupils unplaced for September 2004. However, the position was subject to change as families moved over the coming months. While the introduction of the new secondary sector transfer system had been relatively smooth, he warned that the introduction of a similar system for the primary sector may be more problematical due to difficulties in establishing robust data on parents of children entering the primary sector.

**RESOLVED: That the update report on the transfer of pupils for September 2005 be noted.**

The meeting ended at approximately 5.00 p.m.

**CHAIRMAN**





**YEAR 2004 RESULTS FOR HEREFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS****Report By: Head of Inspection, Advice and School  
Performance Service****Wards Affected**

Countywide

**Purpose**

1. To consider the Summer 2004 **provisional** results at Key Stages 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for Herefordshire Schools.

**Financial Implications**

2. None

**Report**

3. Each summer, pupils sit national tests at the ages of 7, 11, 14 and 16 (i.e. Key Stages 1,2,3 and 4 respectively). Post 16 (Key Stage 5) pupils sit a range of examinations, including 'A' levels and GNVQ. The Government has decided that the performance of schools and of LEAs should be measured principally by the percentage of pupils who attain defined thresholds at each Key Stage.
4. The results for 2004 are still provisional and are subject to a margin of error, in general, of + or – 1% because schools in all phases have returned a number of papers for re-marking. National comparative data is not yet always available or remains provisional. In addition, the Key Stage 3 English results have been withheld due to extensive difficulties with the accuracy of the marking and are not likely to be available before the end of September.
5. Overall, the results indicate another successful year for pupils and schools across the County with some significant improvements at the end of primary school in English and Maths, and a sustained level of high performance at Secondary schools. Again, the results reflect well on Herefordshire schools and the commitment given by the Council for the provision of good professional support and the highest possible level of resources in school budgets.
6. **Key Stage 1: (7 year olds)** The national target standard for Key Stage 1 is level 2 or above. Level 2 is sub-divided into 3 bands – level 2c (lowest), 2b and 2a (highest). Pupils can also achieve a level 3 which is above the expected standard. The results listed below indicate the percentage of pupils achieving level 2 or above, with the 2003 results in brackets alongside.

<b>Level 2+ %</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Writing</b>	<b>Maths</b>
Herefordshire	87 (87)	82 (84)	91 (91)
National	85 (84)	82 (82)	90 (90)

---

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Ted St George, Head of Inspection Advice and School Performance Service (01432) 260803

7. The results at Key Stage 1 are broadly similar to last year and in line with the national average.
8. **Key Stage 2: (11year olds)** The national target standard for Key Stage 2 is level 4, with the spread of results normally ranging from level 3 to level 5. The established expectation is that pupils need to achieve level 4 when they leave primary school in order to access the secondary school curriculum.
9. Pupils are tested in English, maths and science. In English, reading and writing are combined to give a single level for the subject. The provisional results below indicate the percentage of pupils achieving level 4 plus or level 5. Last year's (2003) figures are in brackets.

2004 Level 4 +	English	Maths	Science
Herefordshire	81 (76)	76 (73)	89 (90)
National	77 (75)	74 (73)	87 (86)

2004 Level 5	English	Maths	Science
Herefordshire	29 (26)	32 (30)	47 (45)
National	27 (26)	31 (28)	43 (40)

10. These are a very good set of Key Stage 2 results at both level 4 and level 5 for Herefordshire.
11. David Miliband (Minister of State for School Standards) has written to the Director of Education asking him to pass on his congratulations to pupils and teachers "because the results for English and maths combined mean that the cumulative results achieved by children in Herefordshire are amongst the most improved this year".
12. **Key Stage 3: (14 year olds)** the national target standard for Key Stage 3 is level 5 and the spread of results normally range from level 3 to level 6. The provisional results for Key Stage 3 are listed below with the 2003 results in brackets.

2004 Level 5+	English	Maths	Science
Herefordshire	N/A	79 (77)	71 (75)
National	N/A	73 (70)	66 (68)

2004 Level 6+	English	Maths	Science
Herefordshire	N/A	58 (55)	39 (46)
National	N/A	52 (49)	34 (40)

13. These provisional results indicate an improved performance in Mathematics at level 5+ and Level 6, but a decline in science. This, by and large, mirrors the national picture though the local situation will be examined carefully, especially on science. Before the English results were suspended nationally, early indications suggested a rise in Herefordshire's results.
14. There is evidence that secondary school teachers are losing confidence in the Key Stage 3 testing programme because of persistent difficulties with the quality of

marking, particularly in English. This, in turn, creates problems for the validity of the value added data increasingly used to judge school and LEA performance.

15. **Key Stage 4: (16 year olds)** The results of pupils' performance at GCSE are provisional with some schools still waiting to receive the results of papers sent for remarking. The figures below are likely to be correct within a margin of error of + or – 1%. Last years 2003 figures are in brackets.

GCSE 2004	5+A+-C	5+A+-G
Herefordshire	58 (58)	92 (92)
National	N/A (53)	N/A (89)

16. No Herefordshire school fell below the 30% 5A+ - C floor target set by the government. The individual school range was from 33% to just under 90% of pupils achieving 5A+ - C. The 5A+ - C performance in 2004 remains very similar to last year but early indicators are that 5A+ - B levels have risen.

17. **Key Stage 5 (18 year olds)** Pupils in Herefordshire wishing to enter a 6<sup>th</sup> form can study at five different institutions. The figures below in brackets for 2003 broadly indicate the numbers of students enrolled (column A) and the numbers of pupils entered for advanced level GCE and VCE (column B).

	A	B
Lady Hawkins High School	(50)	(23)
John Masefield High School	(160)	(70)
The Minster College	(70)	(20)
John Kyrle	(162)	(70)
Hereford 6 <sup>th</sup> Form College	(1300)	(530)

18. The table below, using the revised method of calculating average point scores, is one measure for comparing relative performance.

Average Score per candidate in Year 13 attempting 2 or more A/AS Levels		
	2003	2004
Lady Hawkins	261	228
John Masefield	226	244
Minster College	209	174
John Kyrle	185	250
6 <sup>th</sup> Form College	345	364

19. Caution needs to be exercised to avoid reading too much into these scores, particularly where the numbers and prior attainments of pupils vary so much between providers. All these institutions are regularly inspected by Ofsted including Sixth Form provision. Last year, both Lady Hawkins and John Kyrle (for example) received good inspection reports.

20. In 2004 Herefordshire 6<sup>th</sup> Form College was again one of the highest performing colleges in the County and both John Kyrle and John Masefield High Schools results

---

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
 Ted St George, Head of Inspection Advice and School Performance Service (01432) 260803

improved. There is strong evidence to suggest that the overall provision for Herefordshire pupils wishing to study at 'A' level is good. As always, there were many pupils whose results were truly remarkable.

## RECOMMENDATION

**That the Committee comment on the results achieved in 2004, and identify any matters requiring particular attention.**

### Background Papers

- None identified.

**TEACHERS' WORKLOAD AGREEMENT – MONITORING OF PROGRESS****Report By: Head of Inspection, Advice and School Performance Service****Wards Affected**

Countywide

**Purpose**

1. To inform the Committee of the progress being made, both locally and nationally, in implementing the National School Workforce Remodelling Programme.

**Financial Implications**

2. The costs to schools of the School Workforce Remodelling Programme have to be met from the budgets to schools under LMS arrangements. However, the National Union of Headteachers at their Easter Conference made it clear that additional school funding would be necessary to implement the contractual changes in 2004/2005 and 2005/2006. There is likely to be an on going public debate between the signatories to the agreement about this matter. Appendix 1 contains extracts from the Minister of State for School Standards (David Miliband) recent statement on school funding in 2005 – 2006 as it relates to workforce reform.
3. The Education Directorate has received a 100% direct grant of £91,000 from the DfES in 2003/4 and of £170,238 in 2004/2005. The grant is specifically designed to 'help LEAs develop their capacity to support schools in remodelling their workforce'.
4. This DfES grant is being used to fund the Workforce Reform Adviser (who took up post on 7 June) and partly fund some officer time in support of the programme. In addition, the funding is used for conferences, training programmes and to give some financial support to those schools who are currently engaged in the re-modelling programme. The funding has been allocated on a formula based on pupil numbers at PLASC 2003. A school of fewer than 100 pupils receives £1000, schools between 100-200 pupils £1500, schools between 200-300 pupils £2000 and schools over 300, £3000. This applies to schools in tranches 1 to 4 and is intended to sustain the programme as more schools join the remodelling programme.

**Report**

5. The report to Committee on 23 September 2003 (Agenda Item 7) outlined the number of contractual changes being phased in to reduce the workload burdens on teachers and to enable teachers to focus on their professional responsibilities, as set out in the following three paragraphs.

**6. From September 2003**

- Teachers should not **routinely** be required to undertake administrative and clerical tasks.
- Governing Bodies and Headteachers will need to ensure that their staff have appropriate workloads, in support of a reasonable work life balance and having regard to their health and welfare
- Every teacher, including the headteacher, should have a timetable that provides a reasonable allocation of time in support of their leadership and management responsibilities

**7. From September 2004**

- There should be a limit on the extent to which teachers at a school can be asked to cover for absent colleagues, with progressive movement towards the shared objective that this should not happen regularly. Initially, the limit on hours will be set at 38 hours per year for the school year 2004/05.

**8. From September 2005**

- Teachers should have guaranteed time for planning, preparation and assessment (PPA), set at the equivalent of at least 10% of a teacher's normal timetabled teaching time
- Teachers should not **routinely** be required to invigilate external examinations
- Headteachers must have dedicated time to lead their schools, not just manage them

9. Herefordshire schools have made good progress in relieving teachers of the 24 administrative and clerical tasks they are no longer routinely required to undertake, and there is no evidence that this part of the agreement is proving to be a major hurdle in any particular school. It is important to stress, however, that comments made at the Work Force Remodelling Forum held each term indicate some problems do exist, and that they vary between schools. Collecting money from pupils and parents and classroom displays are two such examples. There is concern that an increased burden is falling on headteachers, particularly in primary schools.

10. It is less easy at the moment to measure progress in achieving a reasonable work-life balance and, for teachers and managers, providing a reasonable allocation of time to discharge their responsibilities.

11. Running alongside the required contractual changes lies the remodelling programme itself. Sometimes referred to as a 'change management process', over the next two years every school is expected to have a change management team, or as one Herefordshire headteacher said, a working party that looks at the different roles and responsibilities of all staff in school. This provides a good opportunity for schools to take a fresh look at how they operate.

12. The re-modelling agenda seeks to help schools:

- Focus teachers' time and energies on teaching and learning
- Eradicate time-consuming and unproductive activities
- Develop the use of new technologies to improve efficiency and effectiveness

- Assist headteachers and school change teams to make the best use of resources to meet contractual changes
  - Learn and share innovative practices within and between schools
  - Enable schools to deliver solutions to workload issues appropriate to their individual context and circumstances
  - Encourage school leaders to take control and lead developments appropriate to the school
  - Implement the National Agreement to raise standards and tackle workload
13. At the time of writing this report, just over 40% Herefordshire schools have either started on the re-modelling agenda or are preparing to start. The Early Adopter School (Whitecross High School) entered the programme in September 2003, tranche 1 (4 schools) in November 2003, tranche 2 (5 schools) in January 2004, tranche 3 (5 schools) in February 2004 and tranche 4 (14 schools) in April 2004. Tranche 5 is being launched on 29 September at The Three Counties Hotel and 26 schools have signed up to take part. It is anticipated that over 50% of county schools will be involved in the remodelling initiative by the start of the coming academic year (which is well ahead of the DfES target).
14. The re-modelling agenda is a key initiative for Central Government. It is a significant component of the Primary and Secondary (Key Stage 3) strategies, an important part of the Higher Level teaching assistants programme and integral to the national school improvement agenda. Government expectations are high about the programme's ability to reduce the bureaucratic burden on teachers and, by doing so, enable them to concentrate on teaching pupils. It is hoped that the reduction achieved in bureaucracy will lead to an improvement in the quality of education provided and rising levels of pupil achievement all Key Stages.
15. Locally, good progress has been made since September 2003 in delivering the teachers' Workload Agreement and Remodelling Programme. Nevertheless, it is important to stress that it is early days still and that the contractual changes due in September 2004 in respect of cover for absent colleagues and the introduction of 10% planning, preparing and assessment for all teachers in September 2005, present schools and LEAs with a formidable challenge, with substantial impact on resources.

## RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the committee consider the report on Teachers' workload and comment upon the local implications for schools and the LEA.**

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

- None identified

## APPENDIX 1

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS  
SCHOOL FUNDING 2005 – 06

**The Minister of State for School Standards (David Miliband): This statement relates to school funding in 2005 – 06.**

5. We have also considered the costs of the implementation of the National Agreement on workforce reform. Earlier in the year, with the support of our partners, we undertook a survey of schools in 6 LEAs to get a better understanding of their starting points, how they plan to deliver the workforce reforms and to what extent this can be achieved through the redeployment of existing resources. I am grateful to all those LEAs and schools for their help.

6. This work confirms that the pressures of workforce reform, and in particular guaranteed time for planning, preparation and assessment, will impact mainly on primary and nursery schools in 2005 – 06. The precise cost for individual schools will, of course, depend on the strategies chosen to implement the reforms and the amount of time that needs to be created, but we expect the average cost pressure to be between 0.8 and 1% for primary and nursery schools. The survey also indicates that most secondary and special schools will be able to implement the September 2005 contractual changes from their existing resources. We recognise that some secondary and special schools may incur additional costs, and will undertake further work with our partners during the autumn term to examine the nature and extent of these costs, including in particular the transfer of exam invigilation from teachers. It will be for schools and LEAs to take forward the results of this work through workforce remodelling and through the headroom provided under the arrangements I am announcing today.

7. Of course, remodelling is not just about extra funding. We will continue to work with our partners, the National Remodelling Team and the network of LEA remodelling advisers and consultant leaders to offer guidance and support for all schools in implementing workforce reform. In particular, we will examine the support required by schools to manage effectively the transfer of exam invigilation from teachers from September 2005.

14. Our work with LEAs on the cost of workforce reform also suggested that the costs of implementing the national agreement are likely to be highest for very small schools – i.e. those with under 100 pupils. The main reason for this is that it can more difficult for a very small school to secure small proportions of support staff time in order to release teachers for planning, preparation and assessment time. In urban areas schools can collaborate to resolve these difficulties, but that can be harder to do in rural areas where travelling distances are greater. Subject to consultation, I therefore propose to apply a larger increase to the sparsity unit costs in the primary formula within the Schools Formula Spending Share, to direct more resources to authorities with a high proportion of schools in this situation. I am also doubling the announced increase in the School Standards Grant band for schools with under 100 pupils, to ensure that all small schools have some extra help with the costs of workforce reform.



**STAFF SICKNESS ABSENCE****Report By: Directorate Personnel Officer, Education****Wards Affected**

Countywide

**Purpose**

1. To consider levels of staff sickness and absence in the Education Service

**Monitoring**

2. The following staff absence figures have been produced for the Education Service from the period 01.01.01 to 31.08.04:

	Blackfriars %	Teachers %	School Support Staff %
01.01.01 – 30.04.01	2	5	4
01.05.01 – 31.08.01	1	3	4
01.09.01 – 31.12.01	2	3	5
01.01.02 – 31.04.02	3	4	6
01.05.02 – 31.08.02	2	3	6
01.09.02 – 31.12.02	2	6	7
01.01.03 – 31.04.03	2	5	3
01.05.03 – 31.08.03	3	3	5
01.09.03 – 31.12.03	5	4	6
01.01.04 – 31.04.04	5	3	7
01.05.04 – 31.08.04	2	5	7

Information from 01.01.04 is not directly comparable following the introduction of a new payroll system

3. At Blackfriars, a small number of staff have had significant periods of absence for serious reasons. Given that the overall number of staff is not large, their total lost time accounts for the increased absence percentage in the last quarter of 2003, and into the first quarter of 2004, according to the provisional figures for that period.
4. In the case of school-based employees, teachers' absence averages around 5%. School support staff absence continues at a higher level and has been influenced by a number of long-term cases where there are complications about finalising arrangements for ill-health retirement. At the beginning of the Autumn term, there were 27 long-term absence cases in schools comprising 10 teachers and 17 support staff.

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Nick Austin, Directorate Personnel Officer, Education on (01432) 260932

## Stress as a Problem in Schools

5. In recent years, there has been growing concern about levels of pressure and stress as experienced by employees in schools, much of it associated with the volume and pace of innovation, and the development of regular systems for monitoring improvement, including target setting and testing, and formal inspection by Ofsted. Such national concern is a principal reason for the National Workload Agreement discussed in the preceding item on this agenda.
6. At any given time, of Education Personnel's current referrals to the Occupational Health Unit, about a third will be on grounds of stress. The spectrum of conditions that qualify to be called "stress" is very broad and the term needs to be used with some caution. The Senior Occupational Health Physician, says that "Stress arises where there is a mismatch between the pressures placed on an individual and the individual's perceived ability to manage these pressures. In work stress situations, both personal and organisational interventions may be helpful at addressing the problem."
7. The experience of Education Personnel shows a broad range of situations in which "stress" is seen to be a factor. Sometimes, stress is associated with concerns about professional capability or with the day to day pressure of meeting professional and parental expectations.
8. There are also cases, of course, that are far more complicated from a medical point of view, and may arise from personal rather than from work-related circumstances.

## Remedial Measures

9. There are a number of measures and activities that have been put in place and are on-going that should ultimately have an effect on staff absence and stress in particular.
10. Schools have been advised of "Teacherline", a national 24 hour helpline service run by the Teachers' Benevolent Fund, which is supported by both the employers' and employees' organisations within education. The service is based upon teachers being able to telephone trained counsellors who will offer help over a wide range of circumstances that might affect teachers. This service is totally confidential, free of charge and involves no reference back to any employer.
12. Schools have also been advised of the opportunity for employees to self refer to the team of trained counsellors, retained by the Council via the Occupational Health Service. Again this is confidential. The identity of employees is not revealed to either the head teacher or anyone else in the Council.
13. This service runs in parallel with employee referrals to Occupational Health, initiated by Education Personnel and head teachers. A constant *cri de coeur* of the Council's counsellors is that they do not see enough people **before** they go off sick as early assistance is the most effective way of averting periods of ill health.
14. The national campaign for school **workforce remodelling**, backed up by statutory changes to teachers' terms and conditions in relation to administrative tasks, covering for absent colleagues and 10% preparation and planning time (to be introduced in September 2005), should create a better balanced working

environment for teachers. There will probably also be a further increase in school support staff, subject to the ability of school budgets to fund such additions.

15. In the long term these measures should change the working environment for both teachers and school support staff, and thus, perhaps, also lead to a lowering of the absence rate.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT the report be noted with comments upon any further action that might be appropriate.**

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- None identified.



**UPDATE ON OFSTED SCHOOL INSPECTIONS SINCE  
SEPTEMBER 2003****Report By: Head of Inspection, Advice and School  
Performance Service****Wards Affected**

Countywide

**Purpose**

1. To up-date the Committee on the outcomes of Ofsted School Inspections since 1 September 2003, and in particular those inspections for which reports have been published since the end of the school year 2003 –2004.

**Financial Implications**

2. None

**Report**

3. This report is a continuation of the report presented to Committee on 5 April 2004 (Agenda Item 8). The reports on the following schools have now been published and Appendix 1 contains the summary paragraphs that give an overall evaluation of each school.

Barrs Court Special  
Blackmarston Special School  
Bredenbury Primary School  
John Kyrle High School  
Lea CE Primary School  
St Mary's of Hope CE Primary School  
Weobley High School  
Westfield Special School

4. Where Committee members have a particular interest in a school, it is advisable to read the complete summary report, or full report which can be obtained directly from the individual school or via the Herefordshire Education web-site [education@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:education@herefordshire.gov.uk) or the Ofsted web-site [www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk).
5. During the 2003 – 2004 academic year Ofsted inspected a total of 14 Herefordshire Schools, including 7 primary, 3 special and 4 high schools. This is a smaller number than in previous years being a 13% sample of all schools. The sample contained 8% of primaries, 75% of special schools and 28% of Secondary Schools.

6. Overall, the evidence emerging from these Ofsted inspections supports the notion that Herefordshire has a successful and robust education system in which pupils receive a good quality of education. It is, however, very disappointing that one school, Weobley High School, was placed in special measures, the first school to be placed in this category for over two years
7. A new and much more challenging inspection regime was introduced by Ofsted in September 2003 and this has led to a sharp increase nationally in the number of schools being placed in special measures. The inspection process is being revised again for September 2005. It is abundantly clear that any school that cannot demonstrate consistently high standards of teaching, an improving examination performance and positive value added is vulnerable to being placed in special measures.
8. The Inspection, Advice and School Performance (IASPS) is working very hard with all schools, particularly those that are likely to receive an inspection within the next year, to ensure that headteachers, staff and governors are fully aware of the inspection standards now required.
9. Herefordshire has a good record for having had very few schools in special measures since 1998 and for the speed in which such schools have improved. The 2004 – 2005 academic year and beyond presents the County with a continuing challenge that this record is both maintained and improved.

## RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the Committee are asked to note the report.**

## Background Papers

- None identified.

**APPENDIX 1****BARRS COURT SCHOOL (56 pupils, January, 2004)**

Barrs Court School is a good and improving school with many very good features. The very effective leadership of the new headteacher is having a significant impact on improving the quality of education and in clearly defining the role of the school. There are a number of barriers to raising pupils' achievement, particularly related to accommodation, which are being addressed through substantial remodelling of the building and which are significantly mitigated, although not entirely overcome, by the high quality of teaching. This ensures good learning and, as a result, pupils and students achieve well. The school is providing good value for money.

The school's main strengths and weaknesses are:

- The quality of leadership by the headteacher is providing inspiration for the staff.
- The very effective senior management team translates vision into secure planning and implementation.
- Teachers' assessment and planning, including the very effective use of support staff, underpin pupils' learning very well.
- Arrangements to include all pupils ensure that pupils of all abilities have equal access to the curriculum.
- Relationships, based on mutual respect, are excellent.
- The school promotes pupils' personal development and independence skills very well.
- Support and guidance, including advice on courses and careers, is very effective.
- Planning for the use of information and communication technology (ICT) across the curriculum is insufficient to support learning and develop pupils' skills.
- In spite of improvements, accommodation is unsatisfactory and constitutes a barrier to learning.

The extent of the school's improvement is good. Pupils are now making better progress because the curriculum and its assessment have been significantly improved so that work is carefully planned to meet their individual needs. The progress made in dealing with the key issues from the previous inspection has been good overall, although much of the progress has been recent. In addition to curriculum and assessment, particularly strong improvement has taken place in school improvement planning and in the way leadership and management promote the professional development of staff.

**BLACKMARSTON SCHOOL (48 pupils, January, 2004)**

This is an effective school. Pupils, in relation to their previous learning, achieve well. This is because their needs are very well identified, relevant targets are set and because teaching is good. The curriculum at each stage of education is very relevant. The level of care and welfare is extremely well organised and supports the needs of all pupils. The school has a very good ethos for learning, and ensures that all pupils have the maximum opportunities to make progress. The school provides good value for money.

The school's main strengths and weaknesses are:

- The school is very well led and managed by the headteacher and the senior management team.
- All pupils achieve well, especially in communication and personal development.
- The children in the Early Years and Foundation Stage are provided with a very good start to education, and the needs of autistic pupils in the newly established class are met very well.
- The curriculum is very relevant for all pupils, and is well taught by teachers with a high level of expertise.
- Very good links have been forged with parents, other schools, and the community
- Subject leaders do not manage their subjects well enough to provide them with an overview of the quality of the provision.
- There is insufficient recording of the progress that pupils make in some subjects of the curriculum.
- Some of the classes have too many pupils in them for the needs and difficulties of the pupils and the space available, and there are some safety issues arising from the combination of a soft play room within a storage area.

The key issue from the last inspection has been addressed, and the school is now much more effective than it was at that time. The curriculum is better, assessment, and the targets in pupils' individual education plans are improved. There are more effective links with mainstream schools under the inclusion programme. The level of support for medical needs and for communication is much better. The school has risen well to the challenge of meeting the greater needs of pupils.

#### **BREDENBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL (56 pupils, January, 2004)**

The overall effectiveness of the school is good. Bredenbury is a very caring school, highly valued by pupils and parents, where teaching and learning are good. Pupil's attitudes, behaviour and achievement are good; relationships are very good. Standards in year 6 National Curriculum tests were very low in 2003 compared with schools nationally; in particular due to the numbers of pupils with learning difficulties joining the school in years 4 and 5. The leadership of the headteacher is good. The leadership of other key staff, the overall management of the school and governance are satisfactory. Costs per pupil are high because of the size of the school; nevertheless, it provides satisfactory value for money.

The school's main strengths and weaknesses are;

- Good care, welfare and support are provided for pupils and the school has a very strong partnership with parents.
- Pupils' good behaviour, attitudes and very good relationships enhance their learning.
- The headteacher has insufficient time and support to fulfil management responsibilities.
- Achievement is good; pupils with special educational needs (SEN) achieve well, due to good support and teaching.
- Assessment is not used consistently or effectively to improve pupils' progress in Years 3–6.
- School self-evaluation procedures are not sufficiently effective in improving teachers' performance or pupils' progress.
- Standards in mathematics in Years 3–6 are below average.
- Most pupils use information and communications technology (ICT) skilfully and confidently.



How the effectiveness of the school has changed since last inspection.

Overall, improvement since the 1998 inspection is satisfactory. The school has addressed the key issue in the last report concerning school development planning. The following were satisfactory in the previous inspection and are now good; pupils' attitudes, behaviour and achievement, teaching and learning, provision for children under five and for pupils with SEN, as well as standards in science. Relationships with parents were good and now they are very good. National test results for Year 2 and Year 6 have declined in comparison with schools nationally, but provisional results for Years 2 and 6 show improvement in 2004. School self-evaluation is now in place, but has had insufficient impact on teaching, learning and improvement.

### **JOHN KYRLE HIGH SCHOOL (1,068 pupils, January 2005)**

This is a good school, with many very good features and provides good value for money. Driven by the dynamic and determined leadership of the headteacher, the school is ambitious for further improvement. Standards are above average and improving. Pupils' achievements are good as a result of consistently good teaching.

The school's main strengths and weaknesses are:

- The very good leadership of the headteacher and key staff is providing a strong sense of common purpose and direction
- Hardworking staff are committed to providing high quality teaching and learning
- Good teaching and the confident and positive attitudes of pupils ensure that most achieve well.
- Productive and increasingly effective links with partner schools and the wider community help to promote achievement.
- Assessment procedures and systems for monitoring pupils' progress are thorough and provide a very effective means of monitoring progress and supporting pupils.
- The impact of Technology College status has been very good, enhancing the quality of learning across all subjects, and particularly in design and technology which has made impressive improvements and has the potential to be a centre of excellence.
- Self-evaluation procedures are good but need further consistency at subject level to ensure that they are fully effective.
- The attendance of a small minority of pupils is unsatisfactory

Overall, the school has made substantial improvements since the last inspection in 1997, maintaining the strengths identified and making confident and secure improvements elsewhere. Most importantly there is now a strong and positive culture for school improvement. Standards in Year 9 tests and in GCSE examinations have been improving more rapidly than the national trend. A-level performance has been more mixed, although recent improvements are marked and much better results are predicted for 2004. Key issues at the time of the last inspection have been tackled effectively.

**LEA PRIMARY SCHOOL (72 pupils, January 2004)**

This is a good and effective school. The pupils do well because the teaching is good. The headteacher provides very strong leadership and manages the school very effectively. The school provides sound value for money.

The school's main strengths and weaknesses are:

- The headteacher leads the school very effectively
- The teaching is generally good, and very good in the Foundation Stage and years 5 and 6
- The pupils achieve well and make good progress
- The curriculum is very rich, well planned, lively and interesting
- There are strong links with the parents, the community and other schools
- The school's ethos is caring and inclusive
- The teaching assistants provide very good support, particularly for the pupils with special educational needs.

The school has made good progress since the last inspection. The provision for, and standards in, ICT have improved significantly and are now above average, assessment is used effectively and the pupils with special educational needs are now very well supported. The school has succeeded in making improvements in standards in writing, but they are not yet as high as they should be.

**ST MARY'S OF HOPE CE PRIMARY SCHOOL (17 pupils, January 2004)**

This is a good school where the good leadership and teaching explain why pupils achieve well. The very good care and support make this a happy school where pupils behave well and enjoy learning. Parents speak highly of the good quality of education. Costs are very high with so few pupils but the school provides sound value for money. The school's main strengths and weaknesses are:

- Pupils' achievements are good overall, and very good in history by year 5
- The headteachers' leadership is good and has helped to create a good team of staff
- There is a high degree of racial harmony and all groups of pupils get on well with each other
- The school cares for pupils very well and there are very good systems to ensure that all pupils, whatever their background or ability, have equal opportunities to learn.
- There is too little evaluation of teaching and learning to ensure consistently good practice in each class.

The school has done well since the last inspection, and has rectified the main weaknesses in assessment, curricular planning and the governors' annual report to parents. The teaching, leadership and care of pupils have improved and the new target-setting systems are helping pupils to attain higher standards but the evaluation of teaching remains a weakness.

**WEOBLEY HIGH SCHOOL (483 pupils, January 2004)**

This is a poor school in which teaching, leadership and achievement are poor; it gives poor value for money.

The school's main strengths and weaknesses are;

- The school has gone downhill in recent years as a result of poor leadership and management.
- Standards are only average by year 11; pupils' achievement is poor because of poor teaching.
- The provision for science, ICT and religious education is poor.
- The school is now starting to improve under the good leadership of the new headteacher.
- Behaviour is unsatisfactory, because too many teachers cannot control their classes.
- The curriculum is poor, it has not changed in response to the changing nature of the school's intake.
- Pupils do very well in design and technology as a result of very good teaching.

Improvement since the last inspection has been poor. Standards are worse and GCSE results have fallen, despite a higher attaining intake. Results in the national tests have improved faster than the national average because of rapid improvements in mathematics. Behaviour is worse; there are now more exclusions. Teaching is much worse.

***[Both IASPS and Weobley High School accept the verdict of special measures, although collectively there is regret about the language used, particularly in the parents' summary. The school is moving forwards positively under the leadership of the new headteacher, Mrs Woodrow, who has just completed her first year in post.]***

**WESTFIELD SPECIAL SCHOOL (35 pupils, January 2004)**

The needs of all pupils are satisfactorily met. The standard pupils achieve continued to be limited by the unsatisfactory accommodation. The school gives satisfactory value for money.

The school's main strengths and weaknesses are:

- The accommodation limits the quality and range of pupils' learning and their access to the work of therapists.
- The teachers' high expectations for learning and behaviour do not realise equivalent progress because of inconsistent planning for learning and inadequacies in the procedures for tracking the gains made by pupils.
- The work of the school is not checked sufficiently well by senior managers or by governors especially the planning for learning and the procedures for tracking the progress of pupils
- The caring ethos that is based on very good relationships between staff and pupils.
- The very good attitude pupils have to their work and their commitment to doing their best.
- For the older pupils, the length of the teaching week is too short.

Satisfactory improvement has been made since the last inspection, although some of the issues identified then have not been fully attended to. The monitoring and evaluation of teaching remains too informal and the older pupils continue to spend too little time learning science. The curriculum now meets National Curriculum requirements, the development plan has improved and the procedures for financial planning are satisfactory. The unsatisfactory accommodation continues to impose limitations on what pupils can learn.

---

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Ted St George, Head of Inspection Advice and School Performance Service (01432) 260803

## **BEST VALUE REVIEW OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS PROVISION AND SUPPORT SERVICES - STAGE 3 REPORT**

**Report By: Manager of Special Educational Needs**

### **Wards Affected**

Countywide

### **Purpose**

1. To consider the Stage 3 Report of the Best Value Review of Special Educational Needs Provision and Support Services.

### **Financial Implications**

2. The financial implications vary with each option for future provision. However, the preferred option is thought to be cost neutral.

### **Report**

3. The Best Value Review of Educational Services for Schools began in March 2003. The original scope of the Review covered individual support for statemented pupils and the contribution of educational psychology. This remit was considered too narrow and representations, which were accepted, were made to Education Scrutiny Committee. The Review was extended to encompass the physical and sensory, medical and behavioural and learning support services. Stage 3 has now been completed. A copy of the Stage 3 Best Value Report (45 pages in length) is enclosed separately for Members of the Committee and is available to the public on request.
4. The conclusions of the Review process are that the Special Educational Needs Support Services perform well overall with particular strengths being:
  - Staff flexibility and adaptability
  - Contributions to mediation and SENDIST tribunals
  - Multi agency links and collaboration
  - Quality of working relationships with schools
  - Monitoring of performance and planning in HPS, MBSS, PASS and HLSS

However, there are some key areas of weakness that need to be addressed:

- Statutory assessments and processes need to be reviewed
- Further coordination of the services is required to build capacity for fully implementing national initiatives e.g. early intervention, value for money and monitoring pupil outcomes
- Robust service planning needs to be implemented across all areas

- The availability and accessibility of information need to be improved.
5. The Best Value Review Team recommend that the way forward most likely to deliver improvement to the services provided would be to maintain current provision but to implement improvements (9.1). This would retain continuity of provision and enable known issues to be rectified.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT Members consider the outcomes and findings of the review and recommendations contained in the Options Appraisal Stage 3 Report (Sections 9 and 10 commencing pages 41 of the report) with a view to making recommendations to the Strategic Monitoring Committee.**

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- Best Value Review of Special Educational Needs Provision and Support Services, Stage 3 Report.

## **SCHOOL TRAVEL INITIATIVES – PROGRESS REPORT**

**Report By: DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION**

### **Wards Affected**

Countywide.

### **Purpose**

1. To provide an update of progress on the school travel initiatives being pursued by the Council to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport for journeys to school.

### **Financial Implications**

2. As specified in this report.

### **School Travel Initiatives**

#### **School Travel Plans**

3. The Council has received an allocation of £32,000 through the joint DfES/DfT School Travel Initiative which has been combined with Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding to make possible the recruitment of a full-time School Travel Adviser and a term-time only School Travel Support Worker who have just taken up post.
4. Good progress was made in advance of the new School Travel Adviser and Support Worker taking up their posts in August and September respectively. Officers in the Transportation Unit started work in support of the new initiative and all maintained schools were surveyed to ascertain the status of school travel plans across the County. Support was provided to schools in the process of developing travel plans, in the form of guidance on best practice, encouraging broad participation and providing examples of practical measures to encourage positive shifts in travel behaviour. All of the plans received were reviewed with regard to DfES minimum criteria and were graded using a point system. Points were awarded for inclusion of each of the following:
  - Baseline survey of pupils' patterns of travel to school
  - Statement of objectives and annual targets
  - Detailed action plan
  - Commitment to monitor and review progress and actionsAdditional credit was given for inclusion of the following:
  - Description of travel/ transport issues
  - Demonstration of broad community involvement/ partnership working

---

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Linda Sinker, School Travel Adviser on (01432) 260967

- Provision of quality support materials
5. The following nineteen county schools met the deadline for the first year of the grant scheme and had signed off School Travel Plans by the end of March:

The Aconbury Centre, Hereford	Orleton CE Primary
Almeley Primary	Shobden Primary
Bosbury Primary	Stoke Prior Primary
Burghill Community Primary,	St. James CE Primary, Hereford,
Colwall CE Primary,	St. Martin's Primary, Hereford,
Cradley CE Primary	St. Thomas Cantilupe, Hereford,
Kings Cople Primary	Walford Primary
Little Dewchurch Primary	Wigmore High School
Lord Scudamore Primary, Hereford,	Wigmore Primary
Lugwardine Primary	

These schools will now be able to apply for the grant to spend on implementing their travel plans.

### **Safer Routes To School**

6. It was reported in November 2003 that the Council's Transportation Unit had embarked on 3 phases of Safer Routes to School Studies including 18 schools. During 2003/4 a number of important schemes have been undertaken with these schools including:
- Ledbury Primary School – new footway cycleway adjacent to school incorporating improved security fencing, new cycle shelter
  - Leominster Junior School – Safety improvements at George Street access, new cycle shelter
  - St Thomas Cantilupe Primary – new cycle parking, crossing improvements on Barrs Court Road
  - Hampton Dene/St Paul's Primary Schools – comprehensive 20mph zone
  - Kingstone and Thruxton Primary School – 20mph zone (B4349)
7. Studies for the phase 3 Safer Routes to School projects have recently been completed and several schemes have been programmed for 2004/5, including:
- Haywood High School (Hereford) – Marlbrook Road/Falstaff Road cycleway, Mayberry Avenue/Ross Road junction improvement
  - St Thomas Cantilupe Primary (Hereford) – new cycle link to Great Western Way via Merton Meadow car park
  - Broadlands Primary School (Hereford) – improvements to Aylestone Hill mini-roundabouts, dropped crossing improvements on Venns Lane
  - John Masefield High School (Ledbury) – pedestrian safety improvements at school entrance (now complete), access improvements including lighting from Mabels Furlong, new footway at Oatley Road, pedestrian crossing on New Street



- John Kyrle High and Ashfield Park Primary (Ross), St Peter's Primary (Bromyard)  
– final scheme selection to take place

## Next Steps

8. A key priority for the new School Travel Adviser and Support Worker is to work with schools that are high up the Safer Routes to School priority ranking to help them develop school travel plans in advance of LTP funding for infrastructure improvements. School Travel Plan development work will be carried out in 2004/5 enabling the identification of infrastructure schemes to be programmed for the next financial year as part of the Safer Routes to School programme.
9. The School Travel Adviser and Support Worker will continue to support the 19 schools referred to above (at paragraph 5) to implement their School Travel Plans during 2004/5. They will also assist 19 other schools who have indicated an interest in developing a School Travel Plan by March 2005 in order to qualify for Grant in 2005/6. In addition they will approach again all other County schools to reiterate the benefits to the school of a Travel Plan. The School Travel Support Worker is a former Headteacher who will be concentrating on promoting Travel Plans and safer travel to school to pupils through the curriculum.
10. An early task for the School Travel Adviser will be to re-establish the School Travel Officer Working Group to bring together a range of officers with responsibilities impacting on school travel including Road Safety, Education Transport, Healthy Schools Initiative and Property Services. Partnership working through this group will enable key areas to be identified where wider support is available to assist schools to address school travel issues.
11. The DfT and the DfES will require monitoring and evaluation of all the School Travel Plans completed so far in order to determine whether funding for the project will continue after 2006.

## RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the Committee note the report and comment on the initiatives outlined in the report.**

### Background Papers

- None identified.



**REVIEW OF SMALL SCHOOLS - BRILLEY PRIMARY,  
ST. MARY'S OF HOPE CE PRIMARY, KINGS CAPLE  
PRIMARY, LONGTOWN PRIMARY AND DILWYN  
PRIMARY****Report By: HEAD OF POLICY AND RESOURCES****Wards Affected**

Castle, Golden Valley South, Hampton Court, Golden Cross with Weobley, and Old Gore.

**Purpose**

1. To provide information about pupil numbers in 5 very small schools at the start of the autumn term, 2004 and invite the Committee's comments about the extent to which the position of any of the five schools, whose pupil numbers are below the review levels specified for in Herefordshire's School Organisation Plan, should be examined further.

**Financial Implications**

2. There are no financial implications at this stage.

**Report****The Review Policy in the School Organisation Plan**

3. The policy concerning the review of primary schools is contained in Section 2D of the School Organisation Plan, (paragraph 2.27), i.e.

*"2.27 The Council would normally review schools in the following circumstances -*

***Primary Schools***

- (a) *a school with fewer than 36 pupils in the September of a school year, or a school whose numbers are expected to fall below that level within the following 5 years, would be reviewed by the Council, in consultation with the relevant Diocesan Education Authority where a Church school is concerned;*
- (b) *schools with 36-45 pupils, which would be monitored by the Director of Education, with the relevant Diocesan Director of Education where a Church school is concerned, to assess whether or not numbers are likely to drop below 35 pupils within 5 years, and to determine whether or not there are other grounds for concern about the future of the school;*
- (c) *where a pyramid of primary schools has unused capacity at a level that could accommodate the closure of the smallest school, with up to 15% unused capacity still remaining if closure were to occur;*

---

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Mr G Salmon, Head of Policy and Resources (01432) 260802

- (d) *where a school is identified by Ofsted either as having serious weaknesses or in need of special measures;*"

### Schools falling within the review categories in the Autumn Term 2004

#### Review Categories (a) and (b)

4. Under categories (a) and (b) above, there are 3 Primary schools with fewer than 35 pupils and 2 with 36 to 45 pupils on roll at the start of the autumn term, 2004. The size of each year group, and the number of children under the age of 5 known to be living in the catchment area of each school, are given in the table below.

School	CHILDREN IN CATCHMENT AREA AGED				CHILDREN IN SCHOOL AGED							
	0 note 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total In School
St. Mary's of Hope CE Primary	?	4	4	3	1	2	1	2	4	2	3	15
Brilley	?	3	4	4	2	4	6	3	2	11	1	29
Kings Caple	?	5	4	8	1	5	6	5	6	5	7	35
Dilwyn	?	4	5	5	8	2	4	7	8	6	6	41
Longtown	?	5	10	3	5	5	8	7	7	4	8	44

Note 1. Data for children under 1 year old is awaited.

#### St Mary's Primary School at Hope Under Dinmore

5. St Mary's remains the smallest school in the County. A previous proposal to close the school was rejected by the National Adjudicator in June 2002, when the school roll was 23 pupils. The policy within the SOP now applies i.e. "If, following (such) review, a school is judged to be currently viable, then no further review of that school would be undertaken for at least 5 years, unless pupil numbers were to fall by a further 25% below the level considered during that review." The current roll of 15 pupils amounts to a drop of 35% compared with the 23 pupils on roll at the time of the previous review. The Happy Days Nursery group, which is located at the school, currently has 3 three year olds attending but no four year olds.
6. The standard of teaching and learning does not cause concern. The school had a recent Ofsted inspection which recognised improvements since the last inspection and concluded that it is a good school with good leadership and teaching.
7. The latest information, including the figures for take-up of places set out in paragraph 8 below, indicates that St Mary's will struggle to sustain its present pupil roll of around 15 pupils though there may be minor variations up and down as families leave or come into the Cherrybrook estate which provides most of the children at the school. The known children database indicates that only 3 or 4 pre-school children per year group live in the school's catchment area. Current and previous experience suggest that only a proportion could be expected to enrol. At the time of the previous review, there were approximately 6 children aged 3 living in the catchment area, giving the potential, it was argued, for the roll to rise towards 30.
1. Parental support for the school seems to have diminished since the previous review. In summer 2004 (the latest available County pupil database), 34 children were resident in St Mary's catchment area but only 13 of those children attended the

---

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Mr G Salmon, Head of Policy and Resources (01432) 260802

school despite the fact that neither free home to school transport nor good public transport is available to other schools. Most of the local children who do not attend St Mary's are enrolled at Bodenham, St Michael's Primary School, but there are also a few children at Wellington, Stoke Prior, and the two Leominster schools.

9. In view of the very small number at the school - at Key Stage 1 there are now only 5 pupils in aggregate across the three year groups – further discussions will be held with the Diocesan Education Authority and the school to consider options for the future.

**Brilley and King's Cagle primary schools.**

10. Numbers at both schools have been falling slowly for several years. Indications from the statistics suggest that pupil numbers available within both schools' catchment areas will fall further over the coming few years.
11. Brilley currently has 29 on roll. There is only one pupil leaving in July 2005 but there is a large group of 11 pupils due to leave in July 2006. Known children in the area number only 3 or 4 per year. If present admission levels continue, therefore, the school roll would drop to the low 20s in 2 years time. In the past, Brilley has relied on out of area admissions to keep its numbers above 30. In the summer term 2004, 25% of pupils on roll were from Brilley's own area.
12. Falling rolls across the County have increased the number of spare places elsewhere and Brilley's geographical location close to the Welsh border is less convenient than other schools. The school had an Ofsted inspection in March 2000, which concluded that it was a good school and that teaching and learning are generally good. A range of improvements was suggested and the school has been taking action over the last 3 years to address those suggestions.
13. Numbers on roll at King's Cagle have fallen over the past few years to its present level of 35. Known children in the area have dropped from approximately 11 per year 5 years ago to 4 or 5 below school age at present. Parts of its designated catchment area are not far from several other schools. The Ofsted inspection in May 2000 concluded that Kings Cagle was an effective school with more strengths than weaknesses with standards above the national average.
14. Both schools have recently appointed headteachers who will need time in which to demonstrate the longer term prospects for the school. Over the course of the coming year, further information will be gathered about the demography of the catchment areas of the two schools and included in the annual review report in September, 2005.

15. **Longtown and Dilwyn primary schools**

Longtown and Dilwyn primary schools have been small schools for many years, with pupil admissions rising in some years and falling in others. They differ from the schools discussed above, however, because they do not appear to be in immediate danger of falling further.

16. Longtown's roll has remained between 35 and 45 pupils for over 10 years. The school takes a very high percentage of pupils from its own catchment area. The number of known children of pre-school age available in the school's area continues to indicate a similar number of admissions as in the past. The Ofsted inspection in

January 2003 concluded that the school was very effective with consistently good teaching.

17. Dilwyn's roll was around 40 pupils ten years ago, peaked at 54 five years ago and is currently 41. With around 5 pre-school children per year available in the catchment area, the school could expect to sustain 35 children in the medium term. The school's Ofsted inspection in December 2001 praised the quality of teaching, achievements and good relationships but had concerns about some aspects of management. The school is currently operating with an acting headteacher.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT the Committee note the report and indicate views as to further action that may be needed.**

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- None identified.

**ANNUAL REVIEW OF SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN****Report By: HEAD OF POLICY AND RESOURCES****Wards Affected**

Countywide

**Purpose**

1. To seek comments on the draft school organisation plan 2004-2008.

**Financial Implications**

2. Any financial implications arising from the recommendations in the plan would need separate approval.

**Report**

3. Local Education Authorities are 'strongly advised' to review annually the demographic information relating to existing and future pupil numbers, and by implication to identify if action is needed to ensure provision of school places meets need.
4. The School Organisation Committee considered the information on 26th May and recommended that it be distributed to schools and other interested parties for comment.
5. A copy of the information is in the Members Room or is available on request from the below named contact. The main issues identified in May were:
  - (i) the continued fall in primary numbers;
  - (ii) admissions to high schools have peaked in the future size of Year 7 cohort will fall; sixth forms in high schools are expected to continue to grow (see table below).

School	Age	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
The Minster College	16+	49	49	46	53	47	54
	17+	37	40	40	37	43	38
	<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>92</b>
The John Kyrle High School	16+	83	91	72	87	84	83
	17+	77	71	72	57	69	66
	<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>149</b>
The John Masefield High School	16+	67	76	74	90	86	74
	17+	61	58	62	60	73	70
	<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>144</b>
Lady Hawkins High School	16+	29	33	28	25	25	29
	17+	24	29	32	27	24	24
	<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>53</b>
Combined	16+	229	249	220	255	242	217
	17+	199	198	206	181	209	182
	<b>Total</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>499</b>

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Mr G Salmon, Head of Policy and Resources (01432) 260802

- (iii) the numbers of pupils from an ethnic background other than British remains small (2.3%) but there is an increase, which is also found in the additional number of requests from schools to support pupils who speak little English.
6. In light of the information provided from schools, the School Organisation Committee requested that a review of primary school provision in Hereford City be undertaken. A meeting of the head teacher of the primary schools has been arranged for Wednesday 22nd September, 2004, and an account of that discussion will be provided fully at the meeting of the Committee.
7. The main points to be discussed are:
- Overall the trend in pupil numbers which are expected to fall by 300 over the next 3 years, although admissions in reception are likely to stabilise at current levels.
  - South of the river, pupil numbers may increase. There should be no further reduction in pupil admission numbers. Planned admission levels may need to increase to cater for housing development and the known numbers of children.
  - West of Hereford, there may be advantages, after allowing for the expected increase in admission levels in 2008, in reducing admission limits to help individual school organisation and planning.
  - Outside central Hereford, no increase is expected in pupil numbers. In the absence of any large scale housing development, consideration could be given to reducing admission limits to help in school organisation and bring greater stability to school planning.
8. The School Organisation Committee also suggested that a debate be initiated on the future of primary school provision in Leominster given the way in which the town has expanded and will continue to do so towards Baron's Cross. This issue has been addressed in a meeting with the head teachers of the schools in the Leominster pyramid, in the North Herefordshire Local Area Forum, and in a combined meeting of the Governors of Leominster Infant and Junior schools. No strong support for any change to the current arrangements was given in any of these discussions. The Governors of the Junior and Infants schools felt that improved provision on the existing site would be preferable.

## RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the Committee considers the issues raised, and make comments for further consideration by the School Organisation Committee prior to finalising the School Organisation Plan for 2004-2008.**

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

- None identified.



## PROGRESS OF MAJOR CAPITAL SCHEMES (AND TARGETED CAPITAL FUND)

Report By: HEAD OF POLICY AND RESOURCES

### Wards Affected

Countywide

### Purpose

1. To report on progress on the education capital programme.

### Financial Implications

2. As set out within the report.

### Report

3. At the time of writing this report, 26% of the capital resources allocated for education building projects have been spent. Projected expenditure on capital projects in Education for 2004/05 is summarised in the confidential Appendix 1. Projected spend on completed projects with final payment still to be made is shown in aggregate at the top of the table. Projects are shown individually where building contracts have been let and construction is underway, or where projects are still at the design stage.
4. Since the last meeting, major building schemes have been completed at Lea Primary School (June 2004) and Green Croft Early Excellence Centre (July 2004), and it is expected that Cradley Primary School will be completed by October 2004. The improvements to staffrooms at Weobley High School were completed at the end of September. The remaining works to the offices and the provision of a library and refurbished science laboratories at Weobley are due for completion at the end of October, 2004.
5. Design work is currently under way on major schemes at:

Fairfield High School	Construction of new Design Technology block and Art room. Planning application has been approved. It is anticipated that a start on site will be made in January, 2005.
Ledbury Primary School	New Nursery accommodation. Planning application has been approved. Building work anticipated to start on site in November, 2004.
Kington Primary School	New Nursery accommodation in conjunction with a Sure Start Family Centre. Planning application made. Site start anticipated in January, 2005.
6. Acquisition of the new site for the replacement Whitecross High School has been completed this summer and it is hoped to sign the PFI contract by the end of October.

---

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Mr G Salmon, Head of Policy and Resources (01432) 260802

There will be a need to undertake off-site highway works prior to the school opening in Easter, 2006.

7. Allowance has also been made for other land acquisition at Staunton-on-Wye, Sutton St. Nicholas and Little Dewchurch, along with playing fields for the new LEA and Cradley Primary Schools.

#### **Building Schools for the future**

8. The DfES have stated that decisions on when every LEA will be placed in the 15 years programme under Building Schools for the Future will be announced in October/November.

#### **Condition Improvement Works**

9. Appendix 2, referred to in Appendix 1 - project xvi Condition Improvement Works, indicates the Planned School Maintenance Programme 2004/05. The specific Budget Cost Estimate figures have not been included as these are considered to be exempt information under the tendering process. Should Members require further information they should contact either Mr G. Salmon or Mr C. Birks.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT The Committee comment on any issues of concern arising from the capital programme progress report.**

#### **Background Papers**

- None identified.

## EDUCATION CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2004/5

	<b>2004/5 Estimated Payments to 31.3.05 £</b>
Payments on Schemes Completed within the current and previous financial years.	<b>296,700</b>
Projects in Progress or in Design Stage	£
i. Ledbury Primary – Nursery Accommodation	162,000
ii. Site Acquisition (Incl. Whitecross, Cradley , Lea, Sutton, Little Dewchurch & Staunton)	680,000
iii. Ross, John Kyrle – Sixth Form Extension	506,331
iv. Temporary Classroom Programme	175,000
v. Haywood High – Dining Room Extension	151,250
vi. Fairfield High – Playing Fields	160,000
vii. Fairfield High – Design Technology Block	297,000
viii. Credenhill, St. Mary's – New School Design	10,000
ix. Weobley High – Staffroom Extension	54,000
x. Weobley High – Science/Admin/Library/Car Park	422,000
xi. Kington Primary – Nursery Accommodation	122,000
xii. Weobley High – Tennis Courts	210,000
xiii. Seed Challenge Schemes – Various	218,391
xiv. Sutton Primary – New School Design	5,000
xv. Holme Lacy Primary – Access Road	40,500
xvi. Condition Improvement Works (see Appendix 2)	1,200,000
xvii. Disabled Access Works	250,000
xviii. Little Dewchurch Primary – Upgrade Playing Field	85,000
xix. Feasibility Work	60,000
xx. Kingstone High – Sports Hall	215,000
xxi. Michaelchurch Primary – Office Extension	20,000
xxii. Kingstone & Thrupton – Improvements following fire damage	100,000
xxiii. School Kitchen Improvement Programme	65,000
xxiv. Whitecross Off Site Highway Works	65,000
<b><i>Sub-Total</i></b>	<b>5,273,472</b>
<b>TOTAL ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURE (payments made to 17.09.04)</b>	<b><u>5,570,172</u></b>
	(1,512,752) (26%)
<b>Total Resources Available ***</b>	<b>5,820,131</b>

\*\*\* Resources available consist of borrowing approval from the DfES amounting to £5,104,167 and additional income from various grants and capital receipts amounting to £715,964.



## Appendix 2

### Planned School Maintenance Programme 2004/5

Premises	Scheme	Budget Costs Estimate £
Bosbury Primary	Replacement Fire Alarm, Lighting & Distribution Boards	
Bromyard, St. Peter's Primary	Emergency lighting	
Burley Gate Primary	Replacement Fire Alarm System	
Clehonger Primary	Replacement Lighting	
Clehonger Primary	Fire Alarm and Lighting	
Eardisley Primary	Lighting	
Ewyas Harold Primary	New Boiler and Controls	
Ewyas Harold Primary	Fire Alarm and Lighting	
Ewyas Harold Primary	Replace Window Winding Gear	
Hereford, Broadlands Primary	New Boilers, Pumps & Controls	
Hereford, Hampton Dene Primary	Heating System to Dining Hall	
Hereford, Lord Scudamore Primary	New Boilers & Flues to Junior School	
Hereford, Lord Scudamore Primary	Construction of Boiler House	
Hereford, Trinity Primary	Replace Boiler Plant	
Holme Lacy Primary	Fire Alarm & Lighting	
Kington Primary	Replacement Lighting to Corridors	
Ledbury, John Masefield High	Reconstruct Roof Over CDT Rooms	
Ledbury, John Masefield High	Rewire to Classroom Block	
Ledbury, The John Masefield High	Replacement of Distribution Boards to Admin Area/Hall	
Leominster Junior	Replacement DBR3 to SEN Classroom	

Leominster, The Minster College	RCD's to Blocks A, C, L and Sixth Form	
Leominster, The Minster College	Replacement of Main & Sub Main Distribution Boards to Tower Block	
Orleton Primary	New Heating Boilers	
Ross, Ashfield Park	Replacement Curtain Walling – Phase 3	
Ross, Ashfield Park	Replacement Fire Alarm	
Ross, Ashfield Park	Replacement Lighting & Distribution Boards	
Ross, John Kyrle High	Emergency Exist Signs to Gym & Rewire of Kitchen	
St. Weonards Primary	Replacement Lighting & Distribution Boards	
Weobley High	Fire Alarm System	
Ashperton Primary	Replacement Lighting	
Clehonger Primary	Replacement MS Screens to Rear Elevation – Phase 1	
Dilwyn Primary	New LPHW Heating System & Boiler House	
Garway Primary	Replacement Lighting	
Hereford, Broadlands	Reroofing Works	
Hereford, Hampton Dene Primary	Recladding Works	
Hereford, Haywood High	Replacement Lighting	
Hereford, Lord Scudamore	Replacement Water Drains	
Kingstone High	Replacement Fan Convectors	
Ledbury Primary	Fire Alarm Panel, Sounders & Call Points	
Ledbury, John Masefield High	Replacement Roof Covering to Former Sixth Form Covered Way	
Ledbury, John Masefield High	Reconstruction of Roof Over CDT Rooms	
Leominster Junior	Replacement Windows and Repairs	

Leominster Junior	Reprofile Roof to Corridor outside Staffroom	
Walford Primary	Replacement Windows	
<b>Total</b>		<b>903,200</b>

**NB –**

- The scheme costings have not been included it is considered that these inform the tendering process.
- There are other schemes, which may form part of the programme, but these are dependent on actual costs of the schemes above.





**EDUCATION REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING  
REPORT 2004/05****Report By: DIRECTOR of EDUCATION****Wards Affected**

Countywide

**Purpose**

1. To report on the monitoring of the revenue budget for education.

**Financial Implications**

2. As set out within the report.

**Report**

3. The County Treasurer's monitoring report to the 9th September meeting of the Cabinet, based on expenditure to 31st July 2004, anticipated that the Education Revenue Budget would be underspent by £220,000 (less than 0.5%). The trend has been confirmed by monitoring of spending to 31st August as indicated in the figures set out in Appendix 1.
4. The budget will continue to be monitored carefully in the coming months, bearing in mind that new trends may emerge during the new school year, which always causes significant changes in the call on resources. A further report will be presented at the next meeting on 14th December.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT the monitoring report on Education Revenue Expenditure to 31st August, 2004 be noted.**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- None identified.



## Education Revenue Budget Monitoring Report – August 2004

	2004/05 BASE BUDGET £'000	2004/05 FORECAST £'000	2004/05 VARIANCE £'000	NOTES
<b>1. Delegated to Schools Budget</b>				
Primary Schools	29,580	29,688	108	Distribution to schools
Secondary Schools	29,800	29,930	130	(£225,000) and LSC
Special Schools	2,246	2,254	8	extra income
Specific Grants	2,000	2,000	-	(£21,000)
<b>2. Spent on Schools</b>				
Reserve for schools in Deficit	256	256	-	Delegated to schools
Provision for Children with Special Needs	2,563	2,638	75	Banding and Centrally funded statements
Pupil Referral and Education Otherwise	1,549	1,549	-	
Early Years Education	3,000	2,700	(300)	Projected phasing of take up for 3 yr olds
Other Services for schools	1,047	1,047	-	
<b>Total Schools Budget</b>	<b>72,041</b>	<b>72,062</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>3. LEA Budget</b>				
Strategic Management	1,279	1,129	(150)	Staff vacancies
Severance, Pension Liabilities and school sickness scheme	494	494	-	Spend as per 03/04
Specific grants	574	574	-	Standards Fund
Special Education Services	881	881	-	
School Improvement	782	982	200	Targeted funding
Transport, Admissions and Asset Management	6,754	6,254	(500)	Route efficiencies and 6 fewer days (3%)
PFI Fees	0	150	150	Higher consultancy fees
Awards & Grants/YOT	341	226	(115)	Reduced take up
Learning Skills Council	(1,993)	(2,014)	(21)	Increased income
<b>Total LEA Budget</b>	<b>9,112</b>	<b>8,676</b>	<b>(436)</b>	<b>- 4.8%</b>
Accommodation Charges	296	296	-	Charged at budget
Central Support Charges	481	481	-	Charged at budget
<b>Education Budget 2004/2005</b>	<b>81,930</b>	<b>81,515</b>	<b>(415)</b>	<b>- 0.5%</b>



**COMPLAINTS, COMPLIMENTS AND APPEALS****Report By: DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION****Wards Affected**

Countywide.

**Purpose**

1. To consider the summary of comments, complaints and appeals relating to the Education Directorate, for the period 1st November 2003 to 31st August 2004.

**Report**

2. The major part of parental and public contact with the Education Service is with schools, which have their own procedures for responding to enquiries and complaints. Such direct contacts between parents/public and the schools are outside the scope of this report, except in the case of unresolved complaints referred to headquarters' services from parents not satisfied with the responses they have received from schools.
3. Much of the work of the Education Directorate itself is concerned with providing resources and support services to schools. Such activities are also outside the scope of this report, which focuses on those parts of the Directorate that provide direct service to parents – in particular, home to school transport, pupil admissions, special education and other children's services matters, including the complaints about schools that require LEA involvement.
4. For the period November 2003 to the end of August 2004, complaints and formal appeal requests have been as follows –

Service Area	Complaints	Appeal requests
Transport	7	
Pupil Admissions	2	68
Early Years Provision	1	
Pupil Exclusions (permanent)	-	6
Special Education	2	5
Other Children's Services issues	1	
Personnel	-	
Capital Programme	-	
Student awards and post-16 education	-	
Miscellaneous	-	

For further information on the subject of this report is available from  
Dr Eddie Oram, Director of Education on (01432) 260801

5. It should be emphasised that the figures above relate only to matters that have involved appeals or complaints about the way in which the service has been provided. The figures obviously do not include the huge volumes of daily contact that occur dealing with applications and enquiries. The formal complaints and appeal requests received need to be seen in the context of the overall service levels, which include, for example –

5,000 applications annually for pupil admissions and transfers

daily transport for 6,500 pupils/students

3,000 pupils/students at the various stages of the SEN Code of Practice

more than 900 pupils/students with statements of Special Educational Need

## Outcomes

### Complaints

6. Thirteen complaints were received during the period; one of the complaints has been referred by a parent to the Local Ombudsman. When investigating complaints, the Directorate always considers seriously improvements that might need to be made to its procedures or information, although most of the complaints received arise from individual situations.
7. **Transport** There were 7 complaints about transport during the period to the end of October – 3 related to eligibility for transport one of which was agreed, and 4 to the operation of a particular service. All 7 of the complaints have been resolved.
8. **Pupil Admissions** There were 2 complaints during the period about pupil admissions. Both were to do with incorrect allocation of places, and in both cases the complaint was upheld and a school place allocated in accordance with parental wishes. In addition to the complaints there were 68 appeals (see paragraph 14 below).
9. **Early Years** The 1 complaint related to provision for Early Years and is currently being considered by the Director of Education.
10. **Exclusions** There were no complaints about exclusions, though there were 6 appeals (see paragraph 15 below).
11. **Special Education** Both of the complaints on Special Education related to parents' requests for placement in a special school of children whose special needs fell below the level for which special school placements are appropriate. In both cases, the parents accepted the decision not to allocate a place. There were also 5 appeals to the Tribunal (see paragraph 16 below).
12. **Other Children's Services Issues** The one complaint related to safety issues at a particular school and is currently being considered by the Local Ombudsman.

### Formal Appeals

13. Pupil admissions and SEN appeal requests are dealt with according to formal statutory procedures involving independent appeals arrangements.

14. The 68 admission appeals related to a mixture of initial intakes, and other age group admissions, to primary and secondary schools. 21 of the appeals were for primary school places – 12 for the reception years (8 upheld) and 9 for other year groups (2 upheld). The 47 secondary school appeals comprised 22 for Year 7 (7 upheld) and 25 for other year groups (7 upheld). In each of the 24 cases upheld, the Panel accepted the Council's assessment that the relevant school was full, but allowed the appeal in response to individual family circumstances.
15. There were 31 permanent exclusions during the school year - 28 from high schools and 3 from primary. In 6 of the 31 cases, parents appealed to the independent panel. In 3 cases, the appeals were upheld and the pupils reinstated. In the other 3 cases, two students have been admitted to the pupil referral service and the other student is currently awaiting a place
16. There were 5 appeals to the Special Educational Needs and Disability Tribunal for the period. They were all against a refusal to carry out a statutory assessment. As a result of subsequent discussions with the parents, statutory assessments were agreed in all 5 cases and the parents withdrew their appeals. The appeals still count because the appeals had been registered with the Tribunal.

## RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the Committee consider the report, with a view to identifying any points of concern about how complaints have been dealt with or about particular areas of complaint.**

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

- None identified.





**COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME****Report By: Director of Education****Wards Affected**

Countywide

**Purpose**

1. To outline the range of business that it is anticipated the Committee will need to consider during the coming financial year 2004/05.

**Financial Implications**

2. None.

**Report**

3. The Chairman, and the Strategic Monitoring Committee, have suggested that the Committee should regularly consider the possible agendas for forthcoming meetings. The aim is to improve the planning of the Committee's business and to ensure that individual meetings have the appropriate amount and balance of business.
4. Appendix 1 lists the wide range of matters that will need to be reported to the Committee in the coming year, with a provisional indication of the particular meetings at which individual items will most appropriately be considered.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT the Committee is invited to amend the list of potential agenda items, and the proposed timing.**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- None identified.



# APPENDIX 1

## POSSIBLE AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS OF EDUCATION SCRUTINY, 2004/05

SUBJECT	Date	Lead Officer
<b>Policy issues</b>		
1. Monitoring of SEN banding proposals (and extension to high schools)	December 2004 and March 2005	AH/PL
2. Teachers' Workload Agreement – monitoring of progress	March 2005	TSG/NA
3. Policy on Education for 14-19 age group	December 2004	TSG
4. Education Welfare Service	December 2004	AH
5. Support for Pupils for whom English is an additional language	December 2004	AH/JT
<b>Best Value</b>		
5. BVRs (Improvement Plan)	March 2005 (Inspection and Advice)	EO/SH
<b>Monitoring items</b>		
6. School Admissions – progress report	Regular reports across the year. March 2005	GS/MCh
7. Local Public Service Agreements – progress monitoring	December 2004	GS/AH/TSG
8. Pupil Performance in exams and assessments Summer 2004	December 2004	TSG
9. Staff sickness absence	March 2005	NA
10. Compliments, Complaints, Appeals etc	March 2005	EO
11. Monitoring of Business Plan	December 2004	EO/SH
12. Monitoring of Capital and Revenue	December 2004 and March 2005	GS/MG
13. Progress of major capital schemes (and targeted capital fund)	March 2005	GS
<b>Information items</b>		
14. Termly Report – Ofsted Inspections of Schools (from Sept 2003)	March 2005	TSG

### SEMINARS

8th December 2004 p.m. – Schools in Special Measures – strategies for improvement  
 21st March 2005 p.m. – ICT, including software

