

A G E N D A

Education Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Monday, 19th January, 2004**

Time: **10.00 a.m.**

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

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

For any further information please contact:

*P. R. James, tel, 01432 260460. e-mail:
pjames@herefordshire.gov.uk*

**County of Herefordshire
District Council**

AGENDA

for the Meeting of the Education Scrutiny Committee

To: Councillor J.P. Thomas (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors 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
 Church Members: J.G. Griffin (Roman Catholic), Rev. I Terry (Church of England).
 Parent Governor Members M. Burges (Primary), Mrs S. Wright (Secondary).
 Co-opted Teacher Representatives: Ms. E. Christopher (Special), C. Lewandowski (Secondary), J.D. Pritchard (Primary).
 Co-opted Headteacher Representatives: A. Marson (Secondary), Miss S. Peate (Primary).

	Pages
1. CHAIRMAN	
To note the appointment of Chairman of this Committee at Council on 16th January, 2004.	
2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
To receive apologies for absence.	
3. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)	
To receive details any details of Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Committee.	
4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
5. MINUTES	1 - 8
To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 18th November, 2003.	
6. BANDING IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS - INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT	9 - 20
To consider the progress made to date with regard to the banding project in primary schools.	
7. ICT TECHNICAL SUPPORT	21 - 24
To consider the progress made towards a satisfactory ICT technical support service to schools.	
8. YEAR 2003 RESULTS FOR HEREFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS	25 - 28
To up-date the Committee on the Summer 2003 results at Key Stage 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for Herefordshire Schools.	

9.	HEREFORDSHIRE PLAN AND PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS REPORT	29 - 38
	To consider progress in implementing the Herefordshire Plan, particularly that of the Learning Education and Training Ambition Group.	
10.	MONITORING OF PERFORMANCE TARGETS IN EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN 2003 - 2004	39 - 52
	To consider the performance against Key Local Targets in the Education Business Plan between April and December 2003.	
11.	SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS WITH SCHOOLS	53 - 56
	To consider the content of Service Level Agreements with schools for 2004/05.	
12.	MONITORING OF EDUCATION REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS FOR 2003/04	57 - 64
	To report on expenditure to date on the Education Revenue Budget, and to inform the Committee about the progress of the 2003/04 Capital Programme for Education.	
	NOTE Appendix 2 to this report is exempt information as it discloses the amount of any expenditure proposed to be incurred by the authority under any particular contract for the acquisition of property or the supply of goods or services.	
13.	CPA - EDUCATION COMPONENT	65 - 72
	To consider the rating of the Education Service contained within the Corporate Performance Assessment of the Herefordshire Council.	
14.	COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME	73 - 76
	To outline the range of business that it is anticipated the Committee will need to consider during the coming financial year 2003/04.	

PUBLIC INFORMATION

HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL'S SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

The Council has established Scrutiny Committees for Education, Environment, 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 three 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 the Cabinet, 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, 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 (10p per sheet).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, its Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

Please Note:

Agenda and individual reports can be made available in large print, Braille or on tape. Please contact the officer named below in advance of the meeting who will be pleased to deal with your request.

The Council Chamber where the meeting will be held is accessible for visitors in wheelchairs, for whom toilets are also available.

A public telephone is available in the reception area.

Public Transport links

Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via bus route 104 shown in dark grey on the enclosed map. The service runs every half hour from the hopper bus station at Tesco's in Bewell St (next to the roundabout at the junction of Blueschool Street/Victoria St/Edgar St) and the nearest bus stop to Brockington is 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 Mr Paul James on 01432 260460 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 Brockington, Hafod Road, Hereford on Tuesday, 18th November, 2003 at 10.30 a.m.

Present: Councillor J.P. Thomas (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: N.J.J. Davies, Mrs. J.A. Hyde, R.M. Manning, Mrs. J.E. Pemberton, Mrs. S.J. Robertson, D.C. Taylor, Ms. A.M. Toon and W.J. Walling

Church Members: J.D. Griffin

Parent Governor members: Mrs S.E. Wright

Teacher Representatives C. Lewandowski, J.D. Pritchard.

In attendance: Councillor D.W. Rule MBE (Cabinet Member – Education)

32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor H. Bramer, Mr M. Burgess and Mr A Marson.

The Committee stood in silence in memory of the late Councillor Reverend D.C. Short MBE.

33. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor Mrs J.A. Hyde substituted for Councillor H. Bramer.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

35. MINUTES

In response to a question the Head of Policy and Resources agreed to provide a written answer on the use by schools of devolved capital allocations to support the schools' revenue budgets.

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd September, 2003 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

36. SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOLS

The Committee considered the opportunities and action taken to date for developing arrangements designed to produce safer routes for schools.

The Committee had been informed in March that a need had been identified to ensure that schools benefiting from Safer Routes to School in the future should begin work on developing their own school travel plans. It had been recognised that additional resources would need to be allocated to support schools in this task.

Funding had been identified within the Local Transport Plan (LTP) to appoint a School Travel Adviser or School Travel Advisers using funding allocated for Safer Routes to School Training Support. A best practice example in North Yorkshire had recruited qualified teachers as advisers.

In September 2003, the Government had announced the provision of additional funding over the next 2 years to help support the development of school travel plans. This would include funding for more local authority based school travel advisers as well as capital resources. It was proposed to combine these resources with the funding earmarked within the LTP to provide 1 full time co-ordinator and up to 3 part-time teachers. This would establish a good level of support for Schools seeking to develop a School Travel Plan.

In the course of discussion the following principal points were made:

- That an advantage of employing part-time teachers rather than creating an extra post within the Education Department was that they were familiar with the way in which schools operated but did not require the Council to provide them with office space. The example of North Yorkshire had demonstrated the merits in this approach.
- The development of travel plans was linked into the curriculum encouraging pupils to participate in developing plans and schools to take ownership of the plans.
- Some concern was expressed that there were insufficient resources available under the programme to fund bigger schemes such as footpaths to rural schools eg Burghill Primary School. It was acknowledged that there was a particular difficulty in financing that Scheme.
- It was asked whether once a scheme had been implemented it was ever re-evaluated as part of a safety audit. The Senior Transport Planning Manager said that resources did not permit this, however, the relevance of measures should be ensured by reviewing travel plans with each new intake of pupils. An annual re-survey was part of the Council's procedure although this was reliant on feedback from parents and schools. If a particular concern existed this should be reported. He noted that a number of safety measures were outside the remit of the safer routes to Schools Programme.
- It was suggested that the proposed approach would place an additional burden on teachers and raise false expectations but would not provide a solution.
- It was confirmed that the Council was mindful of the opportunities linked to new building developments and travel plans could prove helpful justification in pursuing these.

RESOLVED

That (a) the proposed arrangements for developing safer routes to schools be generally welcomed but noting

- (i) that the availability of funding for the physical infrastructure for larger schemes needed to be considered;**
- (ii) the importance of parental involvement**

(iii) the advantages in safety audits for both new and existing schemes

(iv) the importance of coordination between Directorates

(b) an update be provided in six months time including information showing the output from travel plans to establish that they were providing value for money.

37. HOME TO SCHOOL/COLLEGE TRANSPORT - DISCRETIONARY AREAS OF POLICY

The Committee considered the remit, Membership and timetable of a Group to consider discretionary policies on home to school/college transport.

The Committee had been advised in September of the Government's publication of a consultation document: "Travelling to School: a good practice guide", describing what the Government considered needed to be done to change the way children travelled to school. It was reported that the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) were now seeking the views of local education authorities and others prior to making any legislative changes.

It was suggested that it would be appropriate for the Council to take account of these potential changes when reviewing the Council's current discretionary arrangements. The DfES were inviting LEAs to pilot schemes in the autumn of 2004, and it was suggested the Group's remit was widened to develop proposals for consideration as a pilot as well as considering the Council's current discretionary arrangements and options for modifying those policies.

The report set out the proposed membership of the Group and a suggested timetable for its work. In the course of discussion it was proposed that the composition of the Review Group as set out in the report be modified so that instead of providing a place each for both the Diocesan authorities they should hold one place between them and with the vacated place being filled by a teacher representative.

It was requested that Members of the Committee be informed of the areas the Review Group agreed should form the initial consultation.

RESOLVED: that a Review Group be established comprising one representative nominated by the Diocesan Authorities; Mrs S Wright as a parents representative, Mr C Lewandowski as a teachers representative, the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Committee; and Councillors R.M. Manning and D.C. Taylor.

38. SOCIAL INCLUSION EDUCATION POLICY

The Committee considered the document: "Inclusive Education in Herefordshire setting out the commitment of the Herefordshire Education Service to inclusive education.

It was noted that the document, a copy of which was appended to the report, was one of a range of elements in the Council's strategy for dealing effectively with inclusion issues.

The Head of Children's and Student's Services reported that one omission identified to date was looked after children. The document had already been discussed within the Education Directorate and Special Schools. A wider consultation was currently underway.

In the ensuing discussion the following principal points were made:

- In response to a question the Head of Policy and Resources advised that he considered that the Authority was in a position to be able to meet its responsibilities under the Disability and Discrimination Act 1995.
- There was support for the view expressed in the policy that adequate resourcing was the key to the confidence with which teachers felt able to approach the inclusion of learners with disaffection or disability. It was requested that the broader issue of staff training in this context should be borne in mind.
- It was confirmed that in implementing its policy care was taken to ensure that in meeting the needs of the pupils concerned the Authority's actions could not be construed as seeming to condone or encourage poor behaviour and that, whilst meeting any special needs, pupils were not unnecessarily singled out.
- It was noted that the Policy stated that when developing new provision for children with special educational needs the Council would promote inclusive options. It was suggested that there were circumstances in which special provision was required. The Head of Children's and Student's Services acknowledged that for certain children full-time mainstream education would not be appropriate, necessitating the continued use of the Special schools. She also noted the development of a completely new school for children with Emotional and Behavioural difficulties.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

39. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE

The Committee was invited to note the bid submitted to the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) for inclusion in the first phase of the Government's initiative: "Building Schools for the Future".

The report described the initiative and noted that the Cabinet had agreed that a bid should be made covering all 14 of the County's high schools. This acknowledged that Whitecross High School would require no further expenditure beyond the PFI scheme and the strategy for the two aided high schools may be implemented through national arrangements for aided schools.

The DfES had indicated that they were seeking to support one rural pilot in the first phase of the programme and it was to be hoped that Herefordshire's bid, allowing all the County's schools to be improved, would be chosen. If the bid were unsuccessful the Council would be allocated a place in the national programme between 2006 and 2020. In those circumstances the Council hoped it would be selected in the later years of the programme.

In the course of discussion the Head of Policy and Resources confirmed that account was being taken of falling rolls and whilst the bid included all 14 schools it envisaged reduced capacity at each school. This would be the subject of further discussion with Schools.

A summary of the draft proposals for each school was appended to the report. The Head of Policy and Resources reported that in submitting the bid some assumptions had been made, including one that a new sports hall would have already been provided at Kingstone High School following a successful bid on the New Opportunities Fund (NOF). However, having been passed to external consultants by NOF the scheme had been modified resulting in a £150,00 shortfall. In response to questions he explained that the new design afforded higher priority to changing facilities for people with a disability. Whilst the Council was not opposed to this design it had led to the increase in cost. His view was that the Council had the resources available to meet the shortfall and the Scheme totalling £1.3 million should proceed.

The Committee expressed some dissatisfaction at the way in which the Council's plans had been disrupted but supported the view that work should proceed to provide the long-awaited facility at Kingstone High School. The Head of Policy and Resources agreed to explore the principle of generating income from the facility making it available to the wider community but cautioned that the indications were this would be problematic.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and the action to proceed with the development of a sports hall at Kingstone High School supported.

40. REVIEW OF SMALL SCHOOLS - BRILLEY PRIMARY, ST. MARY'S OF HOPE CE PRIMARY SCHOOL (HOPE-UNDER-DINMORE), KINGS CAPLE PRIMARY, LONGTOWN PRIMARY AND DILWYN PRIMARY

The Committee was informed of pupil numbers in 5 very small schools and asked whether or not the position of any of the five schools, whose pupil numbers were below the levels specified for review in Herefordshire's School Organisation Plan, should be examined further.

The report set out the Council's policy governing the review of small schools and described the position at each of the five primary schools. No action was proposed at 4 of these schools. Concern was, however, expressed about St Mary's Primary School, Hope under Dinmore. The latest evidence suggested that the school would continue to struggle to achieve and sustain numbers above 20 and did not appear to have the whole-hearted support of the community.

The Head of Policy and Resources reported that since the report had been prepared an additional child had enrolled in the school. More children were also attending and due to attend the Happy Days Nursery Group, located at the school.

In the ensuing discussion the following principal points were made

- The Head of Policy and Resources said that it was hard to pinpoint a particular reason a number of local children did not attend St Mary's.
- That the policy in the School Organisation Plan was that no further review of St Mary's should be undertaken within five years of the previous review unless pupil numbers were to fall by a further 25% below the level considered during that review. It was confirmed that numbers at the start of the Autumn term were above the 25% level.
- The Local Member commented that the growth of the Happy Days Nursery Group gave the school potential. The School had to be allowed time and the

importance of the role of village schools in the community should not be overlooked. In his view the school did have the community's support. The Council should be looking to support the school not to review it with the associated pressure that would bring.

- That the school was shortly to be inspected by Ofsted and the outcome of that inspection would be pertinent to any future review of the school. The Head of Policy and Resources suggested that it would be logical to revisit the position in September 2004 as part of an annual assessment of school numbers.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet Member (Education) be advised that no action be taken in relation to St Mary's Primary School, Hope Under Dinmore.

41. EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2002 - 2007

The Committee received an update on progress made in implementing the second Education Development Plan 2002-2007 (EDP2) and the potential impact of the Single Education Plan (SEP) and the Department for Education and Skills (DfES)/Local Education Authority (LEA) compact.

The Head of the Inspection, Advice and School Performance Service (IASPS) presented the report and commented on performance against targets. He highlighted the achievement that no school in the County was within a negative OFSTED category although he cautioned that with changes in the inspection regime it was becoming harder to continue to maintain this position. Results during 2002/2003 were in line with the experience nationally. Performance in primary schools in particular had plateaued, but there were continuing improvements at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4. Results remained above the average at every Key Stage. He also drew attention to a report in the Sunday Times on a league table of percentages of pupils achieving A and A* grades at GCSE which showed 4 Herefordshire schools in the top 50. On the basis of pupils attaining 5 GCSEs at grades A-C Herefordshire ranked 25th out of 150 LEAs. Herefordshire was therefore one of the top performers in the Country.

A year 2 supplement to the EDP 2 had been produced as required by the DfES and a summary was appended to the report. No feedback on this had yet been received from the DfES. The head of IASPS noted that the importance of the EDP was being reduced, drawing attention to the DfES intention that each LEA would have a Single Education Plan which would become operational with effect from 1 April, 2005. In addition the LEA was expected to draft and agree a School Improvement "Compact" with the DfES by the end of December, 2003. It was likely that the SEP and Compact would supplement and then replace the EDP over the coming year.

In response to a question as to whether the development of the SEP would mean that the Authority would face new targets the Head of IASPS commented that he believed the targets in the Council's Local Public Service Agreement remained valid but the situation was complex and he intended to prepare a report on target setting.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

42. POST-OFSTED INSPECTION ACTION PLAN MONITORING

The Committee considered progress made in implementing the Action Plan prepared in response to the LEA Ofsted report in January 2001.

In the course of discussion the following principal points were made:

- That written responses would be prepared explaining how recommendation 7 could show an overall progress rate of 100% and the action in relation to recommendation 11.
- Some concern was expressed about communication in the area of special Education Needs and progress in relation to recommendations 17, 18 and 19, whilst noting the action planned to implement these recommendations.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

43. COMPLAINTS, COMPLIMENTS AND APPEALS

The Committee noted the summary of comments, complaints and appeals relating to the Education Directorate for the period 1st July, 2003 to 31st October, 2003.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

44. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee noted the range of business it was expected it would need to consider in 2003/2004.

It was requested that consideration be given to the length of future agendas.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 12.50 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

BANDING IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS – INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT

Report By: Head of Children's and Students' Services

Wards Affected

Countywide

Purpose

1. To consider the progress made to date with regard to the banding project in primary schools.

Financial Implications

2. None

Report

3. Prior to the introduction of banding in September 2003, resources for children with severe and complex special needs (those whose needs cannot be met by School Action or School Action Plus) were allocated through the statutory assessment process. This process is bureaucratic and long-winded, and the cost of implementing the procedure often exceeds the value of the resources allocated to the pupil at the end of it. To increase efficiency and flexibility, the banding project was devised as an alternative method of funding for pupils with severe and complex needs. It has the advantages of:
 - making it easier for schools to understand and to apply for funding;
 - access to appropriate resources more quickly;
 - being more flexible, allowing schools to decide how the money can be best spent to meet the needs of the child.
4. The new method of allocating resources was introduced as an outcome of the revised Special Educational Needs Policy and Action Plan, as outlined to the Education Scrutiny Committee on 3rd October 2002.
5. Banded funding is divided into 4 levels, each carrying a different monetary value:

Level 1	£1,500
Level 2	£3,000
Level 3	£6,000
Level 4	£9,000

Eligibility for funding at any level is determined by clear criteria. Schools must demonstrate at all levels how they have used their own resources to meet the needs of the child, and show why additional funding is required and how it will be used.

6. Following a pilot study, the proposal to introduce banded funding initially in primary schools was included as part of the LMS consultation that took place in January 2003. The results of that exercise were outlined to Education Scrutiny on 26th March 2003. Further meetings were held in the Spring to introduce the new system to schools, including governors, parents and other interested parties. As a result, banding was introduced for all **new** requests for additional funding in primary schools from September 2003.
7. As anticipated, with any new system, there have been teething problems and the procedures are being adjusted, where necessary, to take account of the feedback that has been received from schools. A question and answer booklet (now in its 2nd edition) is available for schools (Appendix A) and a parent-friendly version is being written by the Parent Partnership Officer.
8. The response from schools has generally been positive. A letter is being sent to all schools in January to update them about progress so far, and to identify any other further work that needs to be carried out.
9. A preliminary comparison of statistics is included as Appendix B. These give an early indication that the number of requests for statutory assessment (which is still an option open to schools and parents) is falling. This is a positive outcome as it releases valuable resources, including the support services, to be used more creatively in supporting a wider number of pupils.
10. The figures also demonstrate a healthy interest from schools in accessing banded funding. The feedback received from schools is proving valuable in producing an efficient and effective method of allocating resources to pupils with the highest need.
11. A working party is currently looking at the introduction of banding into secondary schools for September 2004. This will be a natural progression as primary pupils move at phase transfer and it will introduce the benefits of the banded system to secondary age pupils

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Committee considers the progress of the banding project to date and identifies any areas of concern that might arise in the future.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

SEN Policy and Action Plan
LMS Consultation questionnaires



Banded Funding for Special Educational Needs

Questions and Answers

Second Edition

**Education Directorate
Children's & Students' Services**
P.O. Box 185
Blackfriars Street
Hereford
HR4 9ZR

September 2003

(01432) 261976
www.education.herefordshire.gov.uk

- ***Is it worth applying at a higher level in case it is reduced by the panel ?***

No – the panel will be trying to achieve fairness and consistency on the basis of available evidence. In some cases it may disagree with a school about the level and offer lower (or higher) funding. However, if it mistrusts the evidence because it feels that a school has 'bid up' the application, it may not offer funding at all – or it may ask for a resubmission with more evidence.

- ***Why are there only four levels ?***

The banding system was designed to make it as straightforward as possible. There was also an attempt to avoid a 'ladder' system in which schools felt the need to apply for level one, level two and so on. Consequently, the vast majority of allocations will be at level one or level two. There is then quite a large differential between level two and level three because the higher levels are designed to safeguard the interests of children with more significant long-term needs. Some of the banding systems which operate in other parts of the country have become so complex, with points scores and 'added factors', that it can be very difficult to demonstrate that they are fair.

Banded Funding for Special Educational Needs

Questions and Answers

Second Edition - September 2003

- ***What is banded funding ?***

Banded funding is a way of providing extra resources for schools to help children with special educational needs. Money is allocated on the basis of how serious the child's needs are, but the school can decide how best to use it. If the child moves to another school in Herefordshire, the money goes with them. It is designed to make it easier for ordinary schools to include children with a range of difficulties. For many children it will mean that they do not have to have a statutory assessment or a statement of special educational needs in order to be supported.

- ***Why has banded funding been introduced ?***

Under the previous system, if schools or parents wanted extra support for a child with special educational needs, they usually had to have a statutory assessment and a statement of special educational needs. This can be a long process which involves everyone in a great deal of paperwork and takes up a lot of professional time. Sometimes, more money is spent on producing the statement than the child actually gets in support. Statutory assessment makes it difficult to help a child at short notice, especially when they first go to school, and statements can often prevent the school from helping the child in the way they think best. Under the system of banded funding, the whole process is quicker and more flexible. Over time it will free up the work of educational psychologists and advisory teachers to help schools to prevent the children having problems in the first place.

- ***What do you get instead of a statement ?***

When banded funding is allocated, the special services section will issue an allocation document which relates to the level. This will indicate the start and end dates, where applicable, and any special conditions attached to the funding. It will show the review arrangements and any success criteria, usually based on the IEP supplied by the school. In more complex cases, the document may comment on any staff training needs and possible accessibility issues or 'reasonable adjustments' under disability legislation. It could also comment on the possible need for a statutory assessment. A copy of the document will be supplied to the parents, the school, relevant professionals and other agencies. It will also be copied to the finance section so that the money can be allocated to the school budget as soon as possible.

- ***Is banded funding about saving money ?***

No – the budget for special educational needs has not changed – though, of course, the county is not likely to be suddenly given any extra money by the Government. However, it is probable that the Government will insist that even more of the available funds are put directly into schools and banded funding will be a good way of ensuring that the right amount of it is spent on children with special needs. It is certainly the case that the Council will not be able to keep back any money for special needs in ordinary schools, so the money available for banded funding has to be used wisely. Some of it must be put aside for emergencies – such as a child with significant needs moving into the county from somewhere else.

- ***Who is banded funding for ?***

At present it only operates in primary schools. Discussions are taking place about using a similar system in secondary schools from September 2004 (which is when the first children with banded funding will arrive from the primary schools). It is also hoped to have a similar system in nurseries and playgroups at some stage, but this is more complicated because there are more people involved in supporting children before they get to school.

- ***How many children are likely to get banded funding ?***

Probably about two or three children out of every hundred will get banded funding. It would be possible to allocate money to more children than this but then each child would get less. This would disadvantage a small school which had only one or two children with special educational needs. The final numbers will depend on how successful the Council is in reducing the numbers of statutory assessments for children in mainstream schools.

statement, ‘support’ will not be allocated by the banding panel – though it might be suggested. In many cases, the criteria for banded funding will specify that support does not hamper the development of the child’s independence. By using banded funding creatively, schools may be able to invest in special teaching materials, training, advice or help for the teacher.

- ***What about special equipment ?***

Routine items of equipment are usually bought from schools’ ordinary budgets. If a child needs specialist equipment relating to a special need or disability, this will usually be provided from a separate budget that the Council holds, after discussion with the school and advisory teachers. Banded funding would not be the typical way of providing this. It may also be possible to provide equipment from funds which are designed to improve curriculum access for children with disabilities.

- ***What are the review processes ?***

When a child has a statement, the school is obliged to hold a review at least once a year. In the case of banded funding, the review process will vary, depending on the child’s needs and the length of the funding. It will be specified by the panel when the funding is agreed. In the case of time-limited funding, it is likely that an advisory teacher or psychologist will be asked to liaise with the school to see if the child has made the desired progress and the school will be asked to report to the parents. In the case of long-term funding for significant needs, the school is likely to be asked to carry out an annual review process, with the involvement of the parents and the relevant professionals. The Council is in the process of establishing a special needs monitoring team. One of its remits will be to report on banded funding and whether schools are using it to improve the outlook for individual children. In some cases, funding may be conditional on the school reporting progress on a regular basis or on updating IEP targets to the satisfaction of a named professional.

are technically disabled or not, and without them having to be labelled in any way.

- **What about children with behaviour problems ?**

Children with behaviour problems have not always been seen as having special educational needs, even if they need exceptional support in making academic progress. In primary schools, in particular, it has been comparatively uncommon for children with behaviour problems to have statements. With banded funding, this is not an issue. There is a clear category based on emotional, social or behaviour difficulties and schools can be provided with a checklist to help to determine how serious the problems are.

- **Where does banded funding fit with the Code of Practice ?**

When the Code of Practice on Special Educational Needs was revised in 2001, the original five 'stages' were reduced to two – called 'school action' and 'school action plus'. Even children with statements are now still the responsibility of the school and are at 'school action plus'. A child does not have to be at any particular stage before the school can apply for banded funding but, in practice, they will usually be at 'school action plus'. This is because the school will already have expressed concerns to the parents and should have had an individual education plan in place for some time.

- **What can the money be spent on ?**

This is a decision for the school to make. There is no obligation to pay for individual teaching assistant support for the child. In many cases, the school may decide to pool the money for a group of children and devise a combination of individual and group work. In some instances, the banding panel will put conditions on the money, in effect obliging the school to address certain targets and, of course, parents will usually want assurances that their child is getting what they need. In contrast to the statutory assessment process and

- **How does the system work ?**

Children's difficulties are put into a number of different types – such as learning difficulties, physical problems or hearing impairment. For each type there are up to four levels of severity. The levels indicate how much money is given to the school to help the child. This money is in addition to the money the school already gets to help children with special educational needs. In some cases, the money will be for one or two terms to help the child over a difficult patch. In others, it may be available for the whole time the child is in school. Levels are worth the same regardless of the type of problems the child has.

- **What is the timetable for banded funding ?**

Some children in primary schools received funding from the start of the summer term 2003. There were a number of children who already had what was called 'stage 3' support and, in a few cases, this was converted to banded funding. In addition, the panel which considers requests for statutory assessment suggested that other children should be offered it to save them having to have a statement. From September 2003 there will be a single process in primary schools which will be the same for all children who meet the criteria. Secondary schools are likely to join the system in September 2004 and there will be consultations about this early in the year. It is possible that preschool children and those in special schools and units will have their own system some time in the future.

- **Is banded funding only happening in Herefordshire ?**

Many education authorities have introduced banded funding, though some of them use it only to give money for children with statements. Others have deliberately tried to cut the statutory assessment rate. Somerset, for example, has a system which has reduced the number of statutory assessments dramatically, but the children still get good quality support. Herefordshire looked at lots of other models over a period of two years but the Council decided to develop its own system because the county has many small schools and its own particular needs.

- **What does the Government think about banded funding ?**

The Government has not expressed any views about banded funding though, of course, it knows it is happening. It fits in very well with the Government's policy of putting more money directly into schools because it provides a fair way of doing it related to the actual needs of the children. However, the Audit Commission has been very positive about the idea and has even included a reference to the Herefordshire model in its 'good ideas' website.

- **How long does the money last ?**

If banded funding is allocated to a child, it will always be for at least a term so that the school can spend it on some positive way of moving the child forward. If a child clearly has long-term needs, the funding can continue until the child leaves school – which could, in theory, be as late as 19. Sometimes the banding panel, which makes decisions on the allocations, may put conditions on the funding or suggest particular strategies to the school to help the child. If the funding is time-limited, it will be open to the school to apply for an extension but, in some cases, they may think it is better to free up the money to help another child.

- **Who can apply for banded funding ?**

Because the money goes directly to the school, it is for the school to apply. However, there will usually be some discussion between the school and the parents. Under the Code of Practice on Special Educational Needs, the school must, in any event, tell the parents if they think a child has special needs.

- **How do you apply for banded funding ?**

All primary schools in the county have been supplied with application forms and instructions on how to apply. The forms are very straightforward and can be supplied by e-mail or on computer disc. The forms for levels one and two only take up one side of A4 paper.

information to the primary school that the child will attend. Banded funding helps to encourage good quality liaison between schools and preschool settings.

- **Who does the assessment ?**

Schools usually have a very good idea of the needs of their children and part of the idea of banded funding is to avoid a lot of unnecessary assessment by outside agencies. Much of the evidence will already be available in school. For level one and level two, the assessment will usually be done by the school, though if other reports are available already they can be submitted. For level three and level four, an assessment by an educational psychologist is needed and the psychologist will report on that in the way they see fit. In some instances, specialist reports may be appropriate. These may be, for example, from a health professional, a welfare officer or a therapist. For children with physical or sensory difficulties, a specialist advisory teacher should always have the option of doing an assessment and writing a report. However, applying for banded funding it not intended to be a competitive process and schools will not stand a better chance simply by producing more paperwork.

- **What about inclusion ?**

Under the law, children who do not have a statement must be educated in an ordinary school. Banded funding is designed to support this idea by making it possible for children with a high level of need to be supported in mainstream schools without needing a statement. Of course, children with statements can also attend ordinary schools.

- **What about disability ?**

Legally, disability is a separate issue from special educational needs. However, in the past, many children with disabilities have been statemented in order to receive support. With banded funding, children can be helped without anyone having to decide whether they

- ***Is there any appeal over banding decisions ?***

No – there is no automatic appeal right, though head teachers will be able to submit further evidence to the panel if they wish. If parents or schools are still unhappy, their recourse would be to ask for a statutory assessment which does give parents automatic appeal rights.

- ***What about special schools ?***

The present model of banded funding does not apply to special schools. This is because the law has recently been changed to say that all children in special schools must have a statement. However, there are likely to be discussions about the possibility of an extension to the banding model to include all statemented children. This would be designed to help to improve the fairness and consistency.

- ***What about children who are not in school yet ?***

At present there is no banded funding before children get to school. However, if parents, early years special needs co-ordinators, reception class teachers or colleagues in the health service are keen that children should be supported when they get to school, they can ask the primary school that the child will attend to make an application in advance. As long as the primary school makes an application in the term before the child starts school, the funding can be made available in good time – assuming that the panel agrees to it. To do this, the school will need to talk to the preschool agency about the child's difficulties and, at the very least, ask for a copy of an up to date IEP. There will also typically be some kind of health service report which indicates standardised scores for the child and, in some cases, the child will have been assessed by an educational psychologist.

It should be remembered that all preschool settings which receive public money must have a special needs co-ordinator and must let parents know if a child has special needs. They should also have clear procedures to pass on individual education plans and other

The school is also asked to supply the results of certain assessments, depending on the child's difficulties and, in some cases, the Council is supplying the assessment materials and training free to the schools. If a child has significant problems, other professional assessments may need to be carried out and the school may be asked for medical information. Cases of children who have physical disabilities, hearing difficulties or problems with their vision, at whatever level, should always be discussed with an advisory teacher from the Physical and Sensory Support Service (PASS). In some instances, the school may want to discuss a child with an advisory teacher from the learning support service (HLSS) or the medical and behaviour support service (MBSS). In all cases, the school will be asked to supply an up-to-date individual education plan (IEP) – which should already have been discussed with the parents. This is so that the money can be linked to an indication of how the school proposes to help the child.

Application forms have to be endorsed by someone outside the school. For level one this can be an advisory teacher (HLSS or MBSS) or another professional who has had some involvement with the child. They do not need to have carried out an assessment, but they should be able to confirm that the evidence the school intends to submit is adequate. If the child has physical or sensory problems it will usually be sensible for a member of the PASS team to endorse the application. For level two, an educational psychologist must endorse the application. Again, no assessment is needed, but it gives the psychologist the opportunity to take a view about whether the school's interpretation of the child's difficulties is likely to be correct. For levels three and four, the psychologist's endorsement must be accompanied by a report so that the Council can decide, if necessary, whether the child also needs a statutory assessment.

When the forms are complete, they are sent to the special services section of the Education Directorate in Blackfriars Street in Hereford and are then put forward to the banding panel.

- ***Who makes the decisions ?***

At present, decisions about banded funding are made by the same

panel that decides on statutory assessments. This is called the Herefordshire Referral Panel and it meets every month in term time. The panel consists of a group of people with a great deal of experience of special needs. The panel is chaired by the Manager of Special Needs and has representatives of primary and secondary head teachers, social services, the health service and early years providers. It also has the Principal Educational Psychologist and the organisers of the Herefordshire support services – covering learning, physical and sensory difficulties and medical and behaviour difficulties (HLSS, PASS and MBSS). Because the money for special educational needs really belongs to the schools, the plan is to set up a special banding panel. This may start some time in the autumn term 2003 and will probably be mostly practising teachers, with representatives of the Council and the Primary Care Trust.

It should be noted that, although certain professionals are asked to endorse applications for banded funding, they do not make the funding decisions, and this endorsement does not guarantee success. Consequently, schools should not regard advisory teachers or psychologists as ‘gatekeepers’ of provision – their role is to advise schools about the quality of the application or the nature of the child’s difficulties. It remains the sole responsibility of the school to decide whether to apply and at what level.

- ***What about children who already have statements ?***

Children who already have statements are not affected by banded funding. There are no proposals to take statements away. However, if schools and parents agree that banded funding is a better option because it is more flexible and takes away the possible stigma of having a statement, the Council will be happy to consider ceasing to maintain the statement.

- ***Can a child still have a statutory assessment ?***

Yes – parents, and almost all professionals who work with a child, can still ask for a statutory assessment because it is a legal entitlement. It will continue to be the Herefordshire Referral Panel, on

behalf of the Council, which will decide whether to agree to the request for a statutory assessment, and the parents will continue to have appeal rights to the Special Educational Needs and Disability Tribunal (SENDIST). However, in many cases, the choice may be between having banded funding support soon or waiting for the outcome of the statutory assessment – which will typically be six months. In some cases, the Council will take the view that a child needs a statutory assessment because not enough is known about their problems, or because it wants the interests of the child to be legally protected. In purely financial terms, schools are unlikely to benefit from a child having a statement as opposed to banded funding.

- ***Can you have a statement and banded funding on top ?***

No – because the statement takes precedence. However, there may be cases where the panel offers banded funding while the statutory assessment takes place. If a school is not sure which to apply for, it makes sense to apply for banded funding first.

- ***Is it possible to have joint applications ?***

No – because funding is allocated for the needs of an individual child, it is not possible to apply for more than one child at a time, even though this seems like an economic use of resources. It is always open to a school to use the funding it gets to support children creatively, but parents need to know that the interests of their child are being protected.

- ***Will applying for statutory assessment improve the chances of getting banded funding ?***

No – each case will be decided on its merits. When the banding panel is separate from the referral panel, there will be no automatic transfer from one to the other – though if the banding panel feels that a child’s needs are beyond its remit, it will be able to pass the papers over.

STATISTICS FOR REQUESTS FOR STATUTORY ASSESSMENT AND BANDED FUNDING 2002-2003

STATUTORY ASSESSMENT**April 2002 – March 2003**

Total number of requests for statutory assessment	143	
Total number of requests agreed	102	(71%)

April 2003 – October 2003

Total number of requests for statutory assessment	48	
Total number of requests agreed	28	(58%)

BANDED FUNDING**April 2003 – October 2003**

Total number of requests for banded funding	131	
Total number of requests agreed	87	(66%)

Agreed requests broken down into Band Levels

Level 1 (£1,500)	54
Level 2 (£3,000)	25
Level 3 (£6,000)	8
Level 4 (£9,000)	0

Total requests agreed per year:

2002/03	102
2003/04 (first 6 months only)	115

ICT TECHNICAL SUPPORT**Report By: Head of Inspection, Advice and School Performance Service****Wards Affected**

Countywide

Purpose

1. To consider the progress being made towards providing a satisfactory ICT technical support service to schools.

Financial Implications

2. Schools buy into the service from their delegated budgets. However, an additional £40,000 is provided centrally to support SIMS (the school administration software) and £120,000 is currently allocated from the Standards Fund grant for Broadband connection to support the ICT technical team.

Report

3. The Council is required to ensure that schools have access to good quality ICT technical support service for school administration and for ICT in the curriculum. The Council, however, does not have to provide the service directly. The difficulty for Herefordshire schools and for the Council is that the alternatives available within the County are very limited.
4. Some schools employ their own technicians and this has proved successful in a number of large high schools. A few schools have bought in services from outside companies but these have often been very expensive, particularly when the companies themselves have gone out of business in the middle of a contract. In addition, schools have found that private companies tend to deliver exactly what is in the contract and no more.
5. The provision of an ICT technical service to all schools is always going to be problematic in a rural County such as Herefordshire.

The main difficulties are:

- (a) the geographic spread of 105 schools and PRUs, many of them very small, and the considerable time taken in travelling between them;
- (b) many schools cannot afford the true cost of such a service and some have unrealistic expectations as to what an ICT technician can do for them;
- (c) schools have a huge variety of ICT systems, hardware and software operating, particularly within the curriculum;
- (d) the technology keeps changing: five years ago few schools had access to broadband, internal networks or electronic whiteboards;

- (e) the problem of recruiting and retaining technicians of the right quality who understand the needs of schools and can multi-specialise;
 - (f) the technical expertise of teachers themselves in ICT; some are outstandingly good, some have more limited knowledge and others have no technical knowledge at all.
6. The feedback from schools, particularly in the last financial year 2002–2003, suggested some discontent with the way in which the service was operating, particularly in relation to technical support for ICT in the curriculum. The main cause of frustration was not the quality of work undertaken by the technicians when they arrived at school, but rather the inability of schools to find out whether or not a technician would be coming and when they would be on site. Schools also felt that the service they were receiving from the helpline was unreliable, with many calls not returned expeditiously.
 7. Before the start of the new financial year 2003–2004, the Education Systems Support (ESS) Service who deliver the service from Rotherwas had a series of meetings with headteachers and representatives from the ICT curriculum team in IASPS, in an attempt to sort out the problems and establish a realistic set of expectations as to:
 - what the ESS services could actually deliver
 - what schools could properly expect once they had bought into the service
 8. In order to increase the number of technicians available to support the work in schools, charges to schools were raised and technical support increased via the broadband project. The technicians were re-organised on a regional basis so that schools with contracts could expect a routine visit from the same technician once a fortnight. This has enabled closer relationships to be established and allowed technician to understand the particular needs of the schools with which they work.
 9. Informal evidence suggests that the contracts are now working much better. There has been a sharp reduction in the number of complaints from headteachers coming directly to the Head of IASPS, and a noticeable drop in the number of complaints raised at routine Headteacher meetings. However, a recent survey (October 2003) undertaken as part of the best value review of the IASPS service, suggests that around 10% of schools still consider the service to be unsatisfactory. Evidence from the school take-up figures listed in paragraphs 10 and 11 below suggests that it is in the area of ICT technical support in the curriculum where continued monitoring is needed.
 10. Currently, 104 of the 105 schools and PRUs have signed up for ICT technical support for school administration. The annual charging system is as follows –

	<i>Fixed Charge</i>	<i>Charge per pupil</i>
High School	£1025	£4.90
Primary Schools with FMS	£720	£4.60
Primary School	£360	£4.60

11. Currently 64 schools have signed up for ICT technical support for the curriculum. The annual charging system is as follows –

	<i>Fixed Charge</i>	<i>Charge Per Pupil</i>
100 Pupils	£1130	£4.40
100-300 pupils	£1690	£4.40
300+pupils	£3380	£4.40

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee consider the report and comment on areas of concern and the scope for further improvement.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- None identified

YEAR 2003 RESULTS FOR HEREFORDSHIRE SCHOOLS**Report By: Head of Inspection, Advice and School Performance Service****Wards Affected**

Countywide

Purpose

1. To up-date the committee on the Summer 2003 results at Key Stage 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for Herefordshire Schools.

Financial Implications

2. None

Report

3. This report supplements the information presented to Committee on 23 September 2003 (Agenda item 5). At the time of writing this report the national league tables, including value added data, have been published for Key Stage 2 (11 year olds) and Key Stage 3 (14 year olds). The GCSE tables (16 year olds) and Post 16 tables are due to be published on 15 January and any new or revised information will be tabled at the meeting.
4. The national performance tables are published by the DfES on their website. Councillors wishing to examine individual schools have performed can access this information by visiting the DfES web-site on www.dfes.gov.uk/performancetables/.
5. Every school shares performance information with their Governing Body, reports their performance to parents and engages in a dialogue with the LEA about their performance targets results for 2004 and beyond.
6. However one of the difficulties now faced by parents, governors, elected members and, indeed, education professionals, is the quantity of performance data now available on individual schools, on LEAs and nationally. Performance can be measured in absolute terms, compared to similar schools or statistical neighbours or calculated on a value-added basis. Trends can be calculated over one, two, three or more years and the results can look very different depending on which year is used as the 'base' year. There are persistent difficulties over the quality of the marking, particularly in English at Key Stages 2 and 3. In addition, in the rush to publicise information as close to the summer testing schedule as possible, unvalidated data is used and only corrected several months later. Consequently, a negative or positive result can be misleading for schools and LEAs, and difficult to correct once it is in the public domain.

7. Nevertheless, despite the reservations about the use of data listed in paragraph 6, the results available for Herefordshire schools and pupils indicate another positive overall performance in 2003.

8. **Key Stage 1: (7 year olds)**

Level 2+ %	Reading	Writing	Maths
Herefordshire	87 (86)	84 (88)	91 (89)
National	84 (84)	81 (86)	90 (90)

These results are similar to 2002. In general, the County performs above the national average with girls continuing to out perform the boys. Last year's 2002 figures are in brackets.

9. **Key Stage 2: (11 year olds)**

Level 4 + %	English	Maths	Science
Herefordshire	76 (76)	74 (74)	89 (88)
National	75 (75)	73 (73)	87 (86)

Level 5+ %	English	Maths	Science
Herefordshire	27 (30)	30 (28)	45 (41)
National	27 *28)	29 (27)	41 (37)

10. These audited results for Key Stage 2 have made only minor changes to the figures in the previous report to committee. In general, the County performs close to, or just above the national average but results locally appear to have reached a plateau which reflects the situation nationally. Last year's 2002 figures are in brackets.
11. However, Herefordshire's Key Stage 2 performance appears significantly better when the new "value added" league tables are used. Using the Government's own value added measures Herefordshire is in the top 25% of all Local Education Authorities, the highest achieving in the West Midlands (14 LEAs) and better than all our statistical neighbours. The LEA positive 'score' was 100.2 where 100.00 represents neither positive or negative value added.

12. **Key Stage 3: (14 Year olds)**

Level 5+	English	Maths	Science
Herefordshire	72 (74)	76 (74)	74 (74)
National	69 (66)	71 (67)	68 (66)

Level 6+	English	Maths	Science
Herefordshire	35 (39)	55 (53)	46 (41)
National	34 (32)	49 (45)	40 (33)

13. The level 5+ results at Key Stage 3 are the confirmed results and are published on the DfES site, but the level 6+ results are based upon the LEA's data (the level 6 figures are not nationally published). Last years 2002 results are in brackets.

- 14. In general, the County performs better than the national average at Key Stage 3. Herefordshire also performs well using the Government's own value added measures having a positive 'score' of 100.3 which places Herefordshire in the top 25% of all Local Education Authorities.
- 15. **Key Stage 4: (16 year olds)** The audited results for GCSE are due to be published on January 15 2004. The provisional figures for GCSE are listed in the table below with last year's 2002 results in brackets.

GCSE	5+A*-C	5+A*-G
Herefordshire	58 (56)	92 (92)
National	53 (51)	89 (87)

- 16. It is anticipated that these figures will be confirmed but any alterations will be tabled at the meeting. At the 5 A* - C benchmark only Shropshire and Solihull (on 59%) score higher than Herefordshire in the West Midlands and the County is about 8% higher than the West Midlands average.
- 17. **Key Stage 5: Post 16.** The audited results for 'A' levels are due to be published on January 15, 2004. Only a small proportion (approximately 10%) of pupils remain in the four school-based sixth forms, the vast majority taking 'A' levels attending the Sixth Form College in Hereford.
- 18. The 8 October 2003 early release of statistical information contained a provisional score of performance at 'A' level that was very encouraging for the County. Using the average point scores for 16-18 year olds per candidate for the score for Herefordshire (including the results from the FE colleges and the Sixth Form College as well as schools) was 289.4. The West Midlands average was 235.9. The Herefordshire score was the highest in the West Midlands and the third highest of all the LEAs in England. This appears to be an exceptionally good performance by Herefordshire pupils at 'A' level.
- 19. In relation to these results it is worth noting that wage rates in Herefordshire are the lowest in the West Midlands and are one of the lowest in the whole of the United Kingdom. Whilst recognising that improvement is always possible and that the whole education service including pupils, teachers, governors and elected members will be seeking further improvement in 2004, it is important to note that the 2003 results reflect very well on the quality of education offered to Herefordshire children and young people.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee comment on the results achieved in 2003, and identify any matters requiring particular attention.

HEREFORDSHIRE PLAN AND PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS REPORT

Report By: HEAD OF POLICY AND RESOURCES

Wards Affected

County-wide

Purpose

1. To consider progress in implementing the Herefordshire Plan, particularly that of the Learning Education and Training Ambition Group.

Financial Implications

2. None.

Considerations

Background

3. The Herefordshire Plan, published in June 2000, was one of the first wave of community plans in England. The Plan sets out a vision, guiding principles and ten ambitions, which together form a ten year strategy for Herefordshire. The Plan is entering its fourth year.

Partnership Arrangements

4. Implementation of the Plan is supported by a comprehensive partnership including over 100 organisations from the public, private and voluntary sectors. Core partners with the Council include the Chamber of Commerce and Business Link, Herefordshire Association of Local Councils, Herefordshire Primary Care Trust, Learning and Skills Council, Voluntary Organisations, and West Mercia Constabulary.
5. The Partnership is led through ten ambition groups which take responsibility for delivering each ambition in the Plan. The Ambition Groups are supported by a Management Group and Board of senior officers from the core partner organisations. In addition there are common themes running through the activity of all Ambition Groups. For example there is an Information Communications Technology (ICT) Group responsible for the ICT development within the Plan.
6. The Ambitions are listed in the table below, showing the Cabinet Member within whose remit the ambition falls and the Scrutiny Committee responsible for monitoring progress towards achieving the ambitions.

Ambition	Cabinet Member	Scrutiny Committee
Improve the health and wellbeing of Herefordshire People	Social Care and Strategic Housing	Health Social Care and Housing
Reduce crime and disorder and make Herefordshire safer	Leader	Strategic Committee Monitoring
Tackle poverty and isolation in Herefordshire	Leader	Strategic Committee Monitoring
Encourage communities to shape the future of Herefordshire	Community and Social Development	Social and Economic Development
Develop Herefordshire as an active, vibrant and enjoyable place to be	Community and Social Development	Social and Economic Development
Protect and improve Herefordshire's distinctive environment	Environment	Environment
Provide excellent education, training and learning opportunities in Herefordshire for all ages	Education Community and Social Development	Education Social and Economic Development
Meet Herefordshire's accommodation needs	Social Care and Strategic Housing	Social Care and Housing
Support business growth and create more and better paid work in Herefordshire.	Economic Development, Markets and Property Rural Regeneration	Social and Economic Development
Develop an integrated transport system for Herefordshire	Highways and Transport	Environment

7. Although the responsibility for the scrutiny function for each ambition group is clearly defined, in service terms the Education Directorate supports to varying extent all but one of the 10 ambitions.
8. In September 2001, the Strategic Monitoring Committee agreed that individual Scrutiny Committees should receive six monthly reports setting out progress to date, work in hand and future timetables.

Progress to date

9. The Audit Commission's Corporate Assessment of the Council in December 2002 commented that:

"the Plan has provided the focus for partnership working and has contributed significantly to the Council being able to attract significant external funding to deliver projects tackling local priorities, such as rural access and pockets of deprivation in Hereford City. In this respect the Plan has enabled the Council to punch above its weight as a small low-funded authority".

10. A similar conclusion was reached in the Ofsted Inspection of the LEA. In practice, the Herefordshire Plan has been helpful in framing successful bids to the DfES and gaining approval to policy documents.
11. The Education Service supports many of the ambitions listed. Details of some of the specific achievements involving the Education Directorate are listed below under the golden thread and ambition group headings:

12. **A) Overall Themes**

(i) Geographic Communities

- Parish plans have been completed on a number of villages in the County and more are underway. In particular the Education Directorate has been involved in the plan for Sutton St Nicholas and the proposals for community use of the new school.

(ii) Communities of Interest

- The Early Years Development Childcare Partnership is viewed by the DfES as being one of the most successful in the West Midlands in terms of effective working. This has resulted in the designation of the Early Excellence Centre and the Sure Start Rural Pilot, and the establishment one of the first Neighbourhood Nurseries in the country.

(iii) Information and Communications Technology

- All high schools are on broadband.
- There are 3 community learning centres on school sites as part of a network of LearnDirect centres in Herefordshire's towns and villages.
- ICT provision in schools exceeds NGFL targets.

B) Ambition Groups

(i) Improve The Health And Well Being Of Herefordshire People

- Healthy Schools Programme.
- Sports Development Programme in Schools.
- Children's Rights Officer Appointed.

(ii) Reduce Crime and disorder and make Herefordshire Safer

- Involved in a specialist young persons' substance misuse team to meet the treatment needs of young people and work on early intervention and prevention.

(iii) Reduce poverty and isolation in Herefordshire

- Sure Start in Leominster and Kington and a 'mini' Sure Start in Bromyard.
- Children Centre's strategy

(iv) Encourage communities to shape the future of Herefordshire

- Working partnership to draw down money to fund community development and community economic regeneration- for example, Community facilities at Hunderton Junior School and in former Marlbrook Primary School premises.

(v) Develop Herefordshire as an active, vibrant and enjoyable place to be

- John Masefield High School, Arts College
- 8 schools have Artsmark award
- 12 schools have Sportsmark award.
- Appointment of Education and Outreach Officer at Courtyard Theatre.

(vi) Protect and enhance Herefordshire's distinctive environment

- Development of Environmentally Sustainable School Buildings
- 29 schools gained eco-school award

(vii) Develop an integrated transport system for Herefordshire

- New Safer Routes to Schools introduced
- X School Travel Plans completed.
- Integral member of cross-cutting Best Value Review

(viii) Meet Herefordshire's accommodation needs

This is one area in which the Education Directorate has little direct input. However, advice on housing issues is given for High school pupils as part of the citizenship programme

(ix) Support business growth and create more and better paid work in Herefordshire**(x) Provide excellent education, training and learning opportunities in Herefordshire for all ages**

The Learning Education and Training Ambition Group produced an action plan which is set out in Appendix 1. Progress in pursuing the targets of the action plan are listed in the final column of Appendix 1.

There has been substantial progress because of good partnership working. However, the number of different partnership arrangements within the field of Education prompted a review of the organisation of the Learning Education and Training Ambition Group. Following a consultants report it is now proposed to combine the Learning Partnership (which essentially oversaw community education) with the ambition group to create one group at which strategic issues could be considered.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee asked to note the content of the report and identify any areas of significant concern.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- Herefordshire Plan
- Herefordshire Plan Progress Review 2001/2002

LEARNING, EDUCATION AND TRAINING AMBITION GROUP – ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX 1

The Ambition Group defined 3 broad aims, namely partnership, quality and opportunity, under which more detailed targets were set, and milestones defined for Years 1, 5 and 10 of the plan. The current position is set out in the end column.

Aim A PARTNERSHIP – ‘The sharing of skills, information and knowledge wherever possible’.

	Target	Year 1	Year 5	Year 10	Current Position
A1	Identify and develop formal and informal partnerships in which individual organisations and groups participate.	List and evaluate the current partnership arrangements.	Clear embedding of all identified groups into the planning process. Provision mapped and developed ensuring the best use of resources and elimination of wasteful competition.	Strong partnership culture across all providers with increasing range of provision across Herefordshire to maximise outcomes.	The Herefordshire Lifelong Learning Partnership combining the Learning Education and Training Ambition Group is due to have its inaugural meeting in January.
A2	Ensure the linkage of geographical communities and communities of common interest into the learning process.	Map current provision in identified geographical areas and in common interest areas which transcend geographical areas. Target – 20 focus groups established during 2001/2002.	Increase focus groups established and learning opportunities created. Plans in place to cover gaps.	All parts of county have access to local learning provision which reflects local need.	Although this target was created particularly for community education, it is to be noted that there are 13 local early years partnerships operating in the County, and the 12 Community High Schools work with their feeder primary schools.
A3	Promote strong links between education and business in the county.	Re-launch of Education Business Partnership for Herefordshire.	10% of businesses involved in education.	Culture of natural involvement for Herefordshire businesses to support education. Increase in growth and quality of work experience placements for pre and post 16 students.	

LEARNING, EDUCATION AND TRAINING AMBITION GROUP – ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX 1

Aim B QUALITY – ‘To provide high quality education and learning opportunities for all’.

	Target	Year 1	Year 5	Year 10	Current Position
B1	Achieve and exceed key national and local targets for participation and achievement.	Compare current outcomes in relation to National and Local targets.	Agreed levels of improvement in participation and achievements are met and exceeded.	Embedded culture of standard setting.	Local results at all Key Stages tend to exceed the national averages year on year with good value added performance.
B2	Achieve high standard of service delivery.	Map current status of external reports on providers of learning, education and training.	Weaknesses identified being addressed leading to clear levels of improvement in standards and learner satisfaction.	Community recognised as high quality provider validated by learners and external agencies.	The fact that there are no schools in special measures or judged to have serious weaknesses by Ofsted.
B3	Ensure excellent early years provision.	Identify the performance of Herefordshire settings compared to the National average.	Aim to ensure that the performance of Herefordshire settings are significantly improved.	Universal high quality provision across county for those who want it.	This is subject of one target within the LPSA. At present there is good progress in terms of playgroups wishing to become accredited under a quality assurance scheme, and playgroups with an unsatisfactory outcome to their Ofsted inspection.
B4	Encourage and support people of all ages to enjoy and participate in cultural, learning and community experiences.				Although the ambition group set no milestones for this, the vitality of the music service, the success of John Masefield High School Specialist Arts College Status, and the joint appointment of an education officer at the theatre reflect the work in this area.
B5	Improve and enrich the learning environment and experience in Herefordshire.				The Herefordshire Bid under Building Schools for the Future reflects the strong desire to make progress under this heading. The DfES have advised that decisions will now be announced in February 2004.

LEARNING, EDUCATION AND TRAINING AMBITION GROUP – ACTION PLAN

APPENDIX 1

Aim C OPPORTUNITY & ACCESS – *‘Eliminating the barriers to education and training. Improving access to and increasing the range of educational opportunities available locally to all. Ensuring appropriate advice is given post 16, helping them to make good progress’.*

	Target	Year 1	Year 5	Year 10	Current Position
C1	Seek to remove the barriers to education and learning (for example childcare, transport, cost & time).				The Leominster/Kington Sure Start Project has done much both to provide childcare to allow parents to pursue training and to provide transport for under 5s from remote places so they can benefit from early years education.
C2	Raise the attainment of identified groups.				The need to raise the attainment of boys in high schools has been recognised within the EDP. Good practice and strategies are being shared under the EAZ Initiative family learning programmes were directed at those families expressing interest.
C3	Ensure appropriate information, advice and guidance is given to young people and adults, enabling them to maximise their potential.				The Education Directorate and those schools with sixth forms produced a common information pack with the college on what was available post-16 and the transport provision for those courses.
C4	Widening of participation and achievement.				In the early years field, funding to allow all 3 year olds to childcare will be available from April, 2004. At the post-16 level an LEA/college working party is exploring ways in which the transport barrier to post-16 participation can be overcome.

**MONITORING OF PERFORMANCE TARGETS IN
EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN 20032004****Report By: Director of Education****Wards Affected**

Countywide

Purpose

1. To consider the performance against Key Local Targets in the Education Business Plan between April and December 2003.

Report

2. In addition to Best Value Performance indicators and LPSA targets (which are reported separately), the Education Directorate also sets local targets for areas of particular local relevance to Herefordshire. These targets were reviewed as part of the business planning process in April 2003.
3. There are currently 74 local targets supporting the eight priorities set by the Education Directorate. Appendix 1 summarises progress to December 2003, showing that 16 targets have been achieved, 2 have been superseded, 52 are on target, and there are 4 exceptions. Appendix 2 gives fuller details of each of the targets.
4. Of the 4 exceptions, one identifies performance that has exceeded the original target (target 8.8). A new personnel system was planned for introduction in April 2004. This target was achieved seven months ahead of schedule and has been in use since August 2003.
5. In the case of the other 3 exceptions performance has fallen below the targeted level. The publication of revised advice for schools on child protection (target 4.4) was originally planned for Sept 2003 and December 2003 respectively. The document regarding allegations of child abuse will be published in March 2004 and guidance on the use of restraint in summer 2004 following consultation with schools.
6. A review of education funding through the Schools Forum, beginning with the budget formula, early years funding and funding for inclusion and special education was planned for completion in March 2004 (target 8.3). Owing to recent changes in Government policy - specifically the decision to give funding guarantees to schools, based on funding in the previous year - this review has been deferred until later in the year.
7. The decision to go ahead with the agreed appointment of a 14-19 Policy Development Officer with the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) for September 2003 (target 6.10) was delayed until the 14-19 Conference had been held jointly with the LSC in Autumn 2003. The Conference confirmed the importance of the appointment and recruitment is being planned for Spring 2004.

RECOMMENDATION

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

THAT the Committee considers the performance against targets, and identified any points of concern.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

SUMMARY: The Education Business plan contains 74 local targets. 16 have been achieved, 52 are on target, 2 have been superseded, 1 is ahead of target and 3 are behind target.

Target	Responsible	On target?	Target	Responsible	On target?	Target	Responsible	On target?			
EARLY YEARS											
1.1	R. Sinfield	On target	3.11	L. Selfe	On target						
1.2	R. Sinfield	On target	3.12	L. Houghton	Achieved	7.1	P. Aldred	On target			
1.3	R. Sinfield	On target	3.13	J. Treble	On target	7.2	P. Aldred	On target			
1.4	A. Murphy	On target	3.14	L. Nash	On target	7.3	P. Aldred	On target			
1.5	P. Daniels	On target	3.15	M. Fowler	On target	7.4	P. Murray	On target			
SOCIAL INCLUSION											
SCHOOL PLACES											
2.1	A. Blackman	Achieved	4.1	L. Houghton	On target	7.6	G. Parfitt	On target			
2.2	A. Blackman	Achieved	4.2	L. Kernan	On target	7.7	P. Murray	Achieved			
2.3	A. Blackman	On target	4.3	L. Kernan	On target	7.8	P. Murray	Achieved			
2.4	A. Blackman	On target	4.4	D. Longmore	EXCEPTION	7.9	P. Murray	Achieved			
TEACHING QUALITY/PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT											
2.5	G. Parfitt	On target	5.1	T. St.George	On target	7.10	P. Murray	Achieved			
MANAGEMENT & SUPPORT SERVICES											
2.6	G. Parfitt	On target	5.2	M. Horsburgh	On target	8.1	A. Blackman	Achieved			
2.7	G. Parfitt	On target	LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES 14-19			8.2	A. Blackman	On target			
2.8	G. Parfitt	On target	6.1	T. St.George	On target	8.3	L. Dunmall	EXCEPTION			
2.9	A. Blackman	On target	6.2	M. Fowler	Achieved	8.4	L. Dunmall	On target			
2.10	A. Blackman	On target	6.3	M. Fowler	On target	8.5	L. Dunmall	On target			
2.11	A. Blackman	Achieved	6.4	M. Fowler	Achieved	8.6	L. Dunmall	On target			
SPECIAL NEEDS											
3.1	G. Parfitt	Achieved	6.5	T. St.George	On target	8.7	M. Fowler	On target			
3.2	J. Hughes	On target	6.6	T. St.George	On target	8.8	N. Austin	EXCEPTION			
3.3	L. Nash	On target	6.7	V. Ward	On target	8.9	M. Fowler	Achieved			
3.4	L. Nash	Achieved	6.8	V. Ward	On target	8.10	M. Fowler	On target			
3.5	J. Treble	On target	6.9	M. Fowler	On target	8.11	M. Fowler	On target			
3.6	L. Nash	Superseded	6.10	V. Ward	EXCEPTION	8.12	M. Fowler	Achieved			
3.7	L. Nash	On target	6.11	V. Ward	On target	8.13	M. Fowler	Superseded			
3.8	L. Dunmall	Achieved	6.12	T. St.George	On target	8.14	M/ King	On target			
3.9	L. Dunmall	On target							8.15	L. Dunmall	On target
3.10	L. Dunmall	On target									

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

① EARLY YEARS	
AIM: To secure high quality education and care for young children.	
Target April 2003	Progress to December 2003
<p>1.1 To put in place universal nursery education for 3-year-olds by April 2004 (DfES definition of universal is 85%)</p> <p>1.2 To establish a minimum of 3 childminding networks across the county by April 2004 by implementing "Growing Together"</p> <p>1.3 To establish children's centres in areas of disadvantage, enabling 1,044 children to have access to childcare services (from 92 children in areas of disadvantage in 2002)</p> <p>1.4 To raise the quality of childcare in Herefordshire by raising training levels from 80% of setting Leaders with a level three qualification in 2003 to 100% in 2004.</p> <p>1.5 100% families with newborn babies in Children's Centres and Sure Start Local Programme areas to be visited in the first two months of the babies' life by 2006 from 41% in 2003.</p>	<p>Universal funding in place for April 2004. On target</p> <p>1 network established, 2 in progress in conjunction with Children's Centres. On target</p> <p>Children's Centre strategy has been approved by Cabinet and has been submitted to DfES for approval. On target</p> <p>Audit information currently being collected. Anticipate results will show on target</p> <p>On target, currently visiting approximately 65% of families.</p>

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

② SCHOOL PLACES	
AIM: To provide sufficient and suitable school places.	
Target April 2003	Progress to December 2003
2.1 All in-area applications for places to primary and high school are met in September 2003/2004	100% applications met in September 2003
2.2 First preference admissions no lower than 97% in September 2003,	98% of first preferences met in September 2003
2.3 Implementation of new, co-ordinated admissions policy for High Schools under Education Act 2002 (September 2004)	New software purchased and in operation. Offers will be issued on 1st March 2004. On target.
2.4 100% of parents to obtain 1 of first 3 high school preferences from September 2004	Systems in place to support target. Outcome will be known in March 2004.
2.5 New Sixth Form accommodation at John Masefield High School by September 2003 and at John Kyrle High School by September 2004.	John Masefield completed 31/10/03. John Kyrle on target.
2.6 Successful implementation of PFI project at Whitecross High School by September 2005	Outline planning approval granted on 29/10/03, bids due in on 31/10/03
2.7 Completion of new school buildings for Lea and Cradley Primary Schools by September 2004	On target
2.8 New site purchased for Staunton-on-Wye Primary School by September 2006	On target – discussions with land agent 31/10/03
2.9 Review of discretionary elements of home to school/college transport policy by end of March 2004	Under review by Education Scrutiny Sub Committee. Ongoing
2.10 Joint planning of routes with Environment Directorate and Social Services from September 2003 with a real term 5% cost reduction to be achieved by December 2004	Software has been ordered and will be installed Easter 2004. Planning of routes will commence from April 2004. On target.
2.11 Co-ordinated post-16 transport policy – all student applications processed within 4 weeks of receipt from September 2003	Target achieved.

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

③ SPECIAL NEEDS	
AIM:	To assess, review and provide for children with particular learning, emotional, behavioural, physical, and sensory needs.
Target April 2003	Progress to December 2003
3.1 Extension and refurbishment of former John Venn Unit for St David's Pupil Referral Unit with provision for children with mental health problems by September 2003	Completed.
3.2 Extend the use of soundfield systems to enhance acoustic conditions in Herefordshire schools – from 20 classrooms in 2003 to 32 by April 2004	On going and on target.
3.3 Third version of SEN policy available by September 2004	On going and on target.
3.4 Update Accessibility Strategy by September 2004.	2003/2006 version published. To be reviewed in April 2004.
3.5 Strategies from the Teaching Talking Project in regular use in 30% of schools by September 2003 and at least 60% of schools by 2007.	In progress and on target.
3.6 Inter-agency co-operation with Social Services and the Primary Care Trust in the context of the 'Serving Children Well' initiative (targets and dates to be defined by central government)	Superseded by white paper 'Every Child Matters'.
3.7 Steering group membership and liaison with Social Services and Health to the inter-agency Identification, Referral and Tracking (IRT) initiative for children and young people at risk. Completion of initial project by April 2004 with the 4 key area strategies defined and in place.	In progress and on target.
3.8 Introduction of working model on banded funding from September 2003 to ensure clearer system for delegated resources and to ensure the allocation of money is pupil-led rather than place-led. Pilot phase in summer term 2003.	Pilot phase complete. Working model in operation. Completed September 2003.
3.9 Implement banded funding formula for SEN in primary schools (phased in from September 2003) and high schools (phased in from 2004)	School budget allocations to be re-issued in early November 2003. On target.
3.10 Completion of Best Value Review for SEN assessment and provision for statemented pupils by March 2004	Review has completed Stage 1 and has completed much of the data gathering required to inform Stage 3. On target

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

3.11 Psychological advice provided within statutory deadlines at 92% or better	48% achieved in early 2003. Since September 2004 100% has been achieved.
3.12 100% sick pupils to have an individual programme of support aimed at ensuring minimum disruption to their education by December 2003	Achieved.
3.13 To implement joint working practices between PASS and HLSS with regard to pupils with specific difficulties with written communication, by establishing systems for assessment (2004) and providing training for HLSS staff (2005)	Some training has taken place and an assessment system is in progress. On target.
3.14 Establishment of a protocol for special needs grading and monitoring of schools to contribute to IASPS assessment of school performance by April 2004.	In progress and on target
3.15 Implementation of the SEN database with key data being entered by September 2003	On target. Data currently being entered.

④ SOCIAL INCLUSION AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

AIM: To give vulnerable or disaffected children opportunities to benefit from full-time education, and encourage all young people to become healthy, well-informed and responsible citizens.

Target April 2003	Progress to December 2003
4.1 Joint work with Social Services and on alternative provision for the most challenging pupils and tripartite policy on funding by September 2004	In progress.
4.2 Increase in the number of schools with a School Council by from 25 in 2003 to 40 in 2006	On going and on target.
4.3 All high schools using 'Balance', the Drugs Education resource by April 2004	13 high schools, all special schools and Pupil Referral Units using Balance. On target.
4.4 Publication revised advice to school staff about Child Protection documents – allegations of child abuse by Sept 2003, and use of restraint in schools/PRUs – by December 2003	Child Protection – allegations of child abuse in draft form and will be published in March 2004. Use of restraint in draft form, to be distributed to schools for consultation and will be published in summer 2004. EXCEPTION.

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

⑤ TEACHING QUALITY AND PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT	
AIM: To sustain high standards of teaching, learning and pupil achievement.	
Target April 2003	Progress to December 2003
<p>5.1 EDP2 outlines all key priorities, activities and targets for the period 2002/2007 (see EDP, pages 30-59). The key priorities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raising attainment in early years and across the full primary curriculum 2. Raising attainment at Key Stage 3 3. Raising attainment at Key Stage 4 and post-16 4. Tackling underachievement and narrowing the performance gap 5. Support for schools causing concern to ensure no school in special measures/serious weaknesses 6. Inclusion 7. Using ICT to improve teaching and learning in a rural county 	<p>Progress on these targets is regularly reported to Scrutiny Committee as part of the Performance of Herefordshire Schools.</p>
5.2 100% schools using Whiteboards by September 2004 (from 50% in 2003)	77% of primary and 85% of high schools using whiteboards.

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

⑥ LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR 14-19 YEAR OLDS	
AIM: To encourage and support development of broad and balanced learning opportunities for 14-19 year olds.	
Target April 2003	Progress to December 2003
<p>6.1 EDP outlines all the key priorities, activities and targets for the period 2002/2007</p> <p>2 Raising attainment at Key Stage 3 (EDP, page 41)</p> <p>3 Raising attainment at Key Stage 4 and post-16 (EDP, page 44)</p> <p>4 Tackling underachievement and narrowing the performance gap (EDP, page 48)</p> <p>6.2 Further refine the use of pupil performance data at Key Stage 4</p> <p>6.3 To collaborate on post-16 data with all post-16 partners</p> <p>6.4 Continue the improvements at GCSE benchmarks</p> <p>6.5 Continue to improve whole school approaches to self-evaluation</p> <p>6.6 Continue to develop networks for promoting dissemination of good practice</p> <p>6.7 Continue to improve relevance of curriculum for all students 14-19</p> <p>6.8 Support continued improvement for the development of citizenship education</p>	<p>Progress on these targets is regularly reported to Scrutiny Committee as part of the Performance of Herefordshire Schools.</p> <p>New Fischer data rolled out to all schools November 2003. Completed.</p> <p>In progress, data collated and disseminated bi-annually.</p> <p>Achieved in 2003 – GCSE results up by 2%</p> <p>New self-evaluation guidance and pro forma sent to all schools in September 2003. Annual updates are planned.</p> <p>Work in this area is ongoing including Excellence Cluster, Advanced Skills Teacher programme, 'What If?' networks of head teachers and specialist school provision.</p> <p>Work is ongoing on 14-16 curriculum including the Flexibility project and appointment of 14-19 Advisor jointly funded with the Learning and Skills Council. 14-19 Strategy is being written jointly with the Learning and Skills Council.</p> <p>Training evening for Youth Service held in November 2003. Managing Citizenship Healthy Schools Standard introduced in targeted schools. Wigmore and Fairfield High schools have hosted and organised a day training course.</p>

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

<p>6.9 Collaborative project for post-16 tuition with 6th form colleges and high schools</p>	<p>Sixth Form College working with John Masefield High School to provide post 16 thinking skills course via video conference link.</p>
<p>6.10 Appointment of 14-19 Policy Development Officer with LSC for September 2003</p>	<p>Target not met, appointment delayed beyond the 14-19 Conference held jointly with the Learning and Skills Council in Autumn 2003. The Conference restated the value of appointment and a fresh attempt is being made to recruit in Spring 2004. EXCEPTION</p>
<p>6.11 Develop, with the Learning and Skills Council, an agreed strategy for the 14-19 age group by October 2004. First meeting planned for October 2003).</p>	<p>14-19 Strategy is being written jointly with the Learning and Skills Council.</p>
<p>6.12 Developing a strategy with high schools so that each school has a unique identity or specialism in order to share expertise across Herefordshire</p>	<p>Currently 5 high schools are specialist colleges. A further 3 are bidding for specialist status. The remaining 6 high schools are actively considering either specialist or leading edge schools status.</p>

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

⑦ CULTURAL, LEARNING AND COMMUNITY EXPERIENCES	
AIM: To encourage and support people of all ages to enjoy and participate in cultural, learning and community experiences.	
Target April 2003	Progress to December 2003
7.1 Increase cello, bassoon, double bass, trombone and French horn tuition to 4,400 pupils overall by the end of 2003	Free tuition and instrument hire introduced in January 2004 for 1 term and new bursary scheme being introduced. Pupil numbers available in February 2004. On target.
7.2 Increase Herefordshire Youth Music ensemble membership, half termly, ongoing.	Overall numbers are showing a gradual increase.
7.3 INSET increased activities for September 2003 including conducting classes and examination/assessment with Trinity College of Music	Meeting with Trinity held in September 2003 to discuss teacher training in order to introduce examinations. INSET has increased with more staff attending than in previous years.
7.4 LEA Arts Showcases to include music, art, dance and drama by 2005	Education Officer in post from December 2003. 2-day festival illustrating all art forms planned for 2005/06. On target
7.5 Education Outreach Officer appointed (jointly with Courtyard Theatre) by 2003 to help 50% of High Schools and 25% of Primary schools to achieve either Artsmark or Sportsmark status by 2007	Achieved, Education Officer in post from December 2003.
7.6 New sports halls at Whitecross, Kingstone and Weobley High Schools, and at Sutton Primary School	Kingstone – application made to NOF. Weobley and Sutton – awaiting funding, Targeted Capital Bids (DfES initiative) submitted
7.7 Creative Partnership Organiser in post by September 2003	Completed
7.8 Dance Festivals to be held in Herefordshire to support dance in schools (2003-2005) First County Schools Art Exhibition (June 2003)	Art Exhibition held in June 2003. Working with Dance Fest and festival agreed and in planning stage.
7.9 First Shakespeare in schools project (October 2003)	Completed
7.10 Drama teacher support group established in liaison with the 6th Form College (2003)	Completed. Drama teacher support group up and running.

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

⑥ MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT SERVICES	
AIM: To provide or identify high quality strategic management, support services for schools.	
Target April 2003	Progress to December 2003
8.1 Implementation of co-ordinated new admissions policy for high schools for September 2004 (with 3 parental preferences)	Achieved.
8.2 Implementation of Transport Best Value Review action plan to provide efficiency savings and reorder priorities – including review of discretionary policies and route planning system by March 2004	On target – Education Scrutiny Sub Committee reviewing discretionary element.
8.3 Review of Education funding through the Schools Forum, beginning with the budget formula, early years funding and funding for inclusion and special education by March 2004	Due to recent proposed changes in Government policy regarding funding guarantees to schools, this review has been rescheduled for Summer or Autumn of 2004. EXCEPTION.
8.4 Spending at Education FSS and at least 99% of indicated amount for Schools Budget	Anticipated amounts have been delegated for 2003/2004. On target.
8.5 Address the issue of large balances in some schools, by March 2004	Currently being discussed at the School's Forum. On target
8.6 Improve benchmarking services for schools under the national consistent financial reporting framework, by July 2004	In-house measures are already in place. National DfES benchmarking website anticipated in November 2003. On target.
8.7 Three new schools core databases modules (pupil, transport and admissions), and new personnel and payroll databases, by July 2004	Admission module purchased and functioning, transport module pending purchase.
8.8 Introduction of new personnel system by April 2004	Ahead of schedule – new system in use in Education Personnel from 18/09/03. EXCEPTION.
8.9 Provide improved search facilities on Directorate Web Site (August 2003)	Completed. Continuing improvements being made.
8.10 Liaise with Council IEG group to migrate public information to Herefordshire Council Web Site by September 2003	Currently liaising with group. Information will be made available on request.
8.11 Provide Herefordshire Council Web Site with appropriate public data by	Information available on request.

EDUCATION BUSINESS PLAN ~ KEY LOCAL TARGETS 2003/2006

March 2004		
8.12 Ensure all Herefordshire high Schools are connected to the broadband services at 4Mb/s by August 2003	Ensured all Herefordshire high Schools are connected to the broadband services at 4Mb/s by August 2003	Achieved October 2003.
8.13 Ensure all Herefordshire LEA primary and specials schools and PRUs are connected to Broadband Services at 2Mb/s by August 2006	Ensured all Herefordshire LEA primary and specials schools and PRUs are connected to Broadband Services at 2Mb/s by August 2006	New target is August 2004 – project brought forward by 2 years. EXCEPTION.
8.14 Maintain performance and process 100% of contracts of employment within 8 weeks of start date.	Maintain performance and process 100% of contracts of employment within 8 weeks of start date.	Currently achieving 99% + On target.
8.15 Maintain 100% take up of Service Level Agreements from schools in LMS, Personnel, Property Management and Facilities Maintenance Services.	Maintain 100% take up of Service Level Agreements from schools in LMS, Personnel, Property Management and Facilities Maintenance Services.	SLA take-up currently at 100% for the four services. On target.

SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS WITH SCHOOLS**Report By: HEAD OF POLICY AND RESOURCES****Wards Affected**

Countywide.

Purpose

1. To consider the content of Service Level Agreements with schools for 2004/05.

Financial Implications

2. As set out in the report.

Report

3. Since April 2000, a high proportion of support services has been offered to schools under SLAs. Consultation prior to delegation of services showed that the majority of schools did not want their budgetary arrangements to be made more complicated by the change. It was agreed, therefore, that core services would be delegated to schools, usually on the simple basis of a flat rate plus an amount per pupil, with charges at the same level for schools wishing to join. Schools were also keen not to be bombarded with customer care surveys and questionnaires. For Best Value purposes, Facilities Management (SLA 1) have surveyed their users every year, but other services have relied on informal and targeted feedback (usually meetings and customer discussions) to guide their development.
4. Over the last 3 years, all services have been developed and improved as a result of a contribution of customer feedback, amended legislation and IT developments. In some cases, the price structure has been altered – for example where it was felt that the charge did not reflect the value of the service. Some services have also been asked to offer extra services, outside the original agreement, for an additional charge. The principle that the charge and allocation are the same, however, has been retained wherever possible and prices are shown separately within the budget allocation process. This means that, if a support team puts up its prices, additional funding is generally provided so that schools can afford the increase.
5. A short description, of the service is given in Appendix 1 below. The list does not cover IT support services through ESS because those services were delegated and established many years ago on a different charging basis.
6. In addition to the services offered to schools, each of the SLA teams performs central functions for the LEA such as health and safety, data collection, reports, statutory monitoring requirements and emergency intervention.

Changes to the Service Level Agreement for Staffing and Appointments

7. The maintenance of the LEA's teacher supply register and vacancy list will be withdrawn from the delegated part of the SLA in the 2005. It will then be managed centrally, in future, to ensure that schools can be confident that necessary employment checks have been carried out.
8. The issuing of contracts of employment for all teaching and non-teaching staff will be transferred to the delegated part of the SLA.
9. The net effect of the two changes will be to increase the amount of funding delegated to schools. However, schools will still be able to join the service for the same charge as the delegated sum in their budget allocation.

Changes to the Service Level Agreement for Occupational Health

10. Currently, the costs of pre-employment medical checks are borne centrally, but it has been agreed that they should now be included in the SLA. The effect will be a further delegation of funds to schools and a corresponding increase in the charge.
11. The range of optional services offered by Occupational Health continues to expand. Although some of those services will be of help to schools in certain circumstances, (for example "fast track Physiotherapy Service" and the back pain remedial service) take up is left to schools' discretion with separate charging then incorporated into the standard SLA.

Possible Further Changes

12. Members of the Schools Forum considered and accepted these proposals at their meeting in October. A general survey of schools, taking place during the Spring Term, contains a short question about each service, and the responses will be used to guide consideration of possible further changes.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee are invited to note the report, and make comments about areas where improvements might be made in the proposed arrangements for 2004/05.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

APPENDIX 1

Service Level Agreement	Summary of Service	Proposed change (if any)
1. Facilities Management Catering	Monitoring catering services, management of contracts, nutritional standards and catering staff development & training.	Schedule revised March 2003. No changes proposed.
Grounds Maintenance	Monitoring services, management of contracts, technical specifications, plans and use of materials.	Schedule revised March 2003. No changes proposed.
Building Cleaning	Monitoring services, management of contracts or deployment of staff, technical advice and specifications, appropriate cleaning standards, staff development.	Schedule revised March 2003. No changes proposed.
2. Education Personnel	Advice and support for staffing issues and assisting schools to meet their legal obligations	No changes proposed.
3. Education Staffing and Appointments Service	Advice on contracts, conditions of service, variations in employment arrangements, costs, pension and severance entitlement.	Adjustment of services being drawn up, see text below.
4. Herefordshire Payroll Service	To provide a payroll service with market standards, relevant support, advice and statistics	Schedule and prices revised April 2002. No further changes proposed.
5. Legal Services	Specialist legal advice and indemnity for costs arising from courts and tribunals.	Schedule revised April 2001. No further changes proposed.
6. LMS Budget Support Services	Helpline for budget and accounts queries, budget planning services, training.	Schedule revised April 2002. No further changes proposed
7. Occupational Health	A range of medical referral and counselling services, first aid training.	Range of services on offer needs to be re-considered. See text below.
8. Property Maintenance	Advice and guidance on property issues, condition surveys, contract monitoring.	Schedule revised April 2002. No further changes proposed.
9. Schools Library Services	Provides library services to schools including books and museum items	Service reviewed in April 2002. No further changes proposed.

MONITORING OF EDUCATION REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS FOR 2003/04

Report By: DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

Wards Affected

Countywide

Purpose

1. To report on expenditure to date on the Education Revenue Budget, and to inform the Committee about the progress of the 2003/04 Capital Programme for Education.

Financial Implications

2. As specified in the report.

Report

Revenue Budget

3. As in all years, there has been some increase in costs that are projected to exceed particular budget headings as well as some areas of savings. Provision was made to deal with such contingencies.
4. The review of revenue expenditure to the end of November suggests that, overall, it is likely that there will be a small underspend, amounting to about £200,000, (0.25 % of overall budget) by the end of the financial year. Within the overall total, a number of budget adjustments are now being made.
5. **School** budget allocations will need to increase by at least £400,000. Such adjustments are needed mainly to take account of newly delegated banded funding for pupils with SEN in primary schools, and for the extra cost of insurance premiums above the level of inflation. In addition, pupil admissions have increased slightly above the estimated level, with consequential increases needed in the allocations to individual schools. Provision had been made to cover those additional costs.
6. As was reported previously, **central spending within the Schools Budget** will need to be increased by £200,000 as a result of new SEN placements and to cover a 10% increase in fees at independent special schools that reflects the changes in teachers pay and superannuation costs. That increase, and a small number of other budget adjustments, are covered within the **LEA Budget** from the reserve set aside to cover an anticipated overspend of £367,000 from 2002-03. The actual overspend of £89,000 left £278,000 to cover other costs.
7. The main change from the position reported in September is that it appears likely that there will be a saving of approximately £200,000 on home-to-school transport. A great deal of work has been undertaken to reduce costs in this area, by making routing more efficient and making other changes, where appropriate. The timing and

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

quantity of savings, however, is difficult to predict precisely as there are many other factors affecting cost. Secondary school student numbers continue to rise, rail and bus tickets costs frequently rise above inflation, and special needs transport is highly unpredictable. A number of transactions take place at the end of the financial year and the true position will not be known until the accounts are closed.

The list of key changes producing a projected underspending of £200,000 is shown at Appendix 1.

Capital Budget

8. Progress over the last quarter

The most recent monitoring report on capital was submitted to this Committee on 23rd September, 2003. Since then -

- Several major schemes have been completed - St. David's PRU has moved into refurbished premises, has been significantly expanded the accommodation available to the sixth form at John Masefield High School, major improvements have been achieved at Much Marcle Primary School and Lugwardine Primary School, accommodation has been provided for neighbourhood nurseries at Hunderton Infants and St Martins Primary School, and improving laboratories have been improved at St. Mary's RC High School and The Minster College, Leominster.
- Building work continues on the replacement schools at Lea and Cradley, and on the major refurbishment at Mordiford Primary School.
- Contractors have started work on the Greencroft Early Excellence Centre at Marlbrook Primary School.
- The New Opportunities Fund for PE and Sport in schools has given final approval to the Sports hall scheme at Kingstone High School, and architects have been instructed to proceed to tender stage.
- The design brief for the development of the site at Sutton St. Nicholas for a replacement school and houses has been approved by Planning Committee.
- Environmental Impact Assessments have been completed for Sutton Primary School, Credenhill Primary School and Staunton on Wye Primary School.
- Planning applications have been made for relocation of Credenhill Primary School and Staunton on Wye Primary School.
- Outline planning permission has been granted for education use of the site on Three Elms Road, Hereford to allow the building of new premises for Whitecross High School under the PFI scheme. Acquisition of the site should now be achieved before the end of the financial year. Bids from two PFI consortia have been received, and are being evaluated against technical, legal and financial criteria. It is envisaged that a report to Cabinet will be made during March 2004, recommending the appointment of a preferred bidder, and detailing the revenue implications of the preferred bidder's proposal.

At the September, 2003 meeting a sum of £600,000 was identified as being unallocated, and support was given for schemes to be developed at Kington Primary School, Ledbury

Primary School, Fairfield High School and Weobley High School. Briefs for these projects have been prepared, and the Property Services Manager Herefordshire instructed the Council's external consultants Owen Williams to begin design work at Ledbury Primary School and Fairfield High School. Further feasibility work is being undertaken in-house on Kington and Weobley prior to further instructions being given to Owen Williams.

9. Financial Position

Payments to 31.11.03 amount to £4,727, 000 which represent 58% of the capital funding available in the current year. The position on individual schemes is set out in Appendix 2. Although architects have been instructed to proceed on the 4 new schemes, underspending of £ 390,000 by 31.3.04 is anticipated. Given the receipt of planning permission for the Three Elms Road site, it is proposed to fund its acquisition from the remaining underspending in 2003/04, rather than use Schools' carry forwards as had previously been considered).

10. The Committee should also be aware that decisions are awaited from the DfES on the major bid under Building Schools for the Future initiative and under the Targeted Capital Initiative. Decisions should be made by the end of January on the targeted schemes, with announcements now expected in February on Building Schools for the Future.
11. The first call on resources will be expenditure resulting from existing commitments. At present, is estimated to be £1.9M in 2004/05 and £1.9M in 2005/06.
12. The second call on the resources should be the continuation of the schools maintenance programme at the level of £1.2M to ensure that existing premises are in good condition to use and the backlog of maintenance (estimated at £13m) is reduced.
13. The remaining capital resources in 2004/05 amount to £21/2m. The £21/2m will allow the four schemes previously approved for design purposes to be implemented. Final costings on these schemes have yet to be given. The DfES have also postponed their decision on bids under Building Schools for the Future until February 2004. It is prudent to await the outcomes of this bid, and the final costings on the four schemes prior, before bringing forward any other scheme.

Recommendation

THAT the Committee are asked to consider any areas of concern in the monitoring information for revenue and capital expenditure.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Education Revenue Budget Monitoring Report – December 2003

	2003/2004 BASE BUDGET £'000	VARIATIONS At August 2003 £'000	NOTES
A. Schools Budget (Net Revenue)			
Schools Formula Allocations	58,867	+400	Banded funding, insurance, pupils
LEA Contribution to delegated Specific Grants	2,000		
Central spending within the Schools Budget			
Provision for LEA Children with Special Needs	1,513	-200	Reserve for banding
Fees to Independent Schools for SEN placements	800	+200	Fees and placements
Pupil Referral / Education Other than in Schools	1,386		
Early Years Education	2,380		
Other Services for Schools/contingency	838	-200	Reserve
Total School Budget (Net Revenue)	67,784	+200	
B. LEA Budget			
Strategic Management	1,646	-270	To cover variations
Severance, Pension Liabilities and Staff Sickness	518	+17	Updated costs
Specific Grants	540		
Special Education Services	964		
School Improvement	703	+53	Professional support
Transport, Admissions and Asset Management	6,405	-200	Transport
Youth Offending Team and Student Awards and Grants	310		
Learning and Skills Council	(1,922)		
Total LEA Budget	9,164	-400	
Central Support	719		
Education Budget 2003/2004	77,667	-200	Underspend overall

Document is Restricted

CPA – EDUCATION COMPONENT**Report By: DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION****Wards Affected**

Countywide

Purpose

1. To consider the rating of the Education Service contained within the Corporate Performance Assessment of the Herefordshire Council.

Financial Implications

2. None.

Report

3. The Corporate Performance Assessment of Herefordshire Council, as updated to take account of statistical information collected annually, was reported in December, 2003. The Assessment included a rating for the Education Component which showed a movement from the previous year from 4 stars (Excellent) to 3 stars (Good).
4. The detailed analysis attached at Appendix 1 indicates that the difference in ranking between the two years is explained by changes in what has been included in the scoring. The biggest influences are the inclusion of Lifelong Learning for the first time, following representations made by urban LEAs, and changes in the SEN factors. There were also other areas in which Herefordshire's performance was affected by changes of more than 0.4. The key changes are as follows, with a score of 1 being the best rating and 4 being the lowest rating.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

5. **Current performance** has dropped from 2.0 to 2.42. That worsening has come about because support for schools in ICT has been introduced, which scored 3 in 2003.

SEN

6. **Current performance** has dropped from 1.5 to 3.0 owing to removal of % of *pupils in mainstream schools*, on which Herefordshire scored 1 in 2002, and the addition of statements completed within 18 weeks, which scored a 4 in 2003.

SOCIAL INCLUSION

7. **Indications of Improvement** – Herefordshire shows a much improved score in this area, due to significant improvements in attendance rates at both primary and secondary.

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

8. **Capacity to Sustain Improvement** – the improvement shown in this area is due to addition of the percentage of schools graded G or V for climate – which scores 1.

LIFE LONG LEARNING

9. **Current performance** – this is an addition to the assessment and scores a relatively low 3.5, following the Ofsted inspection of the service in 2003.

CONCLUSION

The Herefordshire Education component would have retained its “Excellent” rating if the previous year’s exercise had simply been repeated, with updated figures.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee are asked to note the report.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appendix I Corporate Performance Assessment – Comparative Scores 2002 & 2003.

Corporate Performance Assessment - Comparative Scores 2002 & 2003

Aspect	Current Performance		Indications of Improvement		Capacity to Sustain Improvement	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
School Improvement	2.0	2.42	2.3	2.57	2.4	2.0
SEN	1.5	3.0	2.3	3.0	2.5	4.0
Social Inclusion	2.8	2.5	3.2	1.5	3.5	2.67
Life Long Learning	-	3.5	-	-	-	1.0
Strategic Management	1.8	1.83	2.0	-	2.5	2.33
Average Score	2.0	2.53	2.5	2.35	2.7	2.31
Rank	(10)	-	(24)	-	(73)	-
Category	***	** Upper	***	Proven	***	Secure

Summary of changes to indicators (excluding weightings)

	Current Performance	Improvement	Capacity
School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 removed • 5 added • 3 maintained performance • 1 reduced performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 removed • 1 improved performance • 2 maintained performance • 4 reduced performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 improved performance • 4 maintained performance
Special Educational Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 removed • 1 added • 1 maintained performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 removed • 1 maintained performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 removed • 1 maintained performance
Social Inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 removed • 1 added • 2 improved performance • 2 maintained performance • 1 reduced performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 removed • 3 improved performance • 1 no score recorded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 added • 2 improved performance
Life Long Learning Strategic Management of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 added (new category) • 4 maintained performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No indicators • 2 removed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 added (new category) • 2 maintained performance • 1 no score recorded
OVERALL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 removed • 8 added • 2 improved performance • 10 maintained performance • 2 reduced performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 removed • 0 added • 4 improved performance • 3 maintained performance • 4 reduced performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 removed • 2 added • 3 improved performance • 7 maintained performance • 0 reduced performance

APPENDIX I

In the following tables a change of '+1' indicates that the LEA has improved, whilst a score of '-1' indicates that performance has deteriorated. A '0' indicates no change between 2002 and 2003. Some rows have been shaded to indicate that no comparison is possible as the criteria have changed.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT	Scores														
	2002					2003									
Change	CURRENT PERFORMANCE	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
N/A	Percentage of schools causing concern								0.00						
N/A	% Schools in special measures	0.0													
-1	2001 KS2 English Average Point Score		27.3					0.5			27.1				0.5
0	2001 KS2 Maths Average Point Score		26.9					0.5	100.9	27.0					0.5
N/A	2002 KS2-KS3 VA														0.5
N/A	2002 KS3-GCSE VA										98				0.5
N/A	2001 KS3 English Average Point Score		33.9					0.17							
N/A	2001 KS3 Maths Average Point Score		35.9					0.17							
N/A	2001 GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage		54.1					0.67							
N/A	JRS 14 – support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT											5			
0	JRS4 - Effectiveness of strategy for school improvement			4							4				
0	JRS 1 (Context) – JRS 2 (Performance)		1							1					
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						2.0							2.42	
Change	IMPROVEMENT	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
N/A	2001-2002 % of primary schools causing concern trend								-1.76						0.5
N/A	2001-2002 % of secondary schools causing concern trend								-3.57						0.5
-2	1999-2001/2000-2002 KS2 English average point score trend			0.3				0.5					-0.09		0.5
-1	1999-2001/2000-2002 KS2 mathematics average point score trend			0.1				0.5				-0.01			0.5
-2	1999-2001/2000-2002 KS3 English average point score trend	0.7						0.17			0.36				0.17
-2	1999-2001/2000-2002 KS3 mathematics average point score trend		0.6					0.17				0.38			0.17
N/A	2000-2002 KS3 science average point score trend											0.66			0.17
0	1999-2001/2000-2002 GCSE average point score trend			0.7				0.67			0.59				0.50
0	JRS 5 – progress in implementing strategy for school improvement			4							4				
+1	1999-2001/2000-2002 GCSE 5+ A*-C percentage trend		0.0						7.74						
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						2.3							2.57	

APPENDIX I

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT		Scores													
		2002					2003								
Change	CAPACITY	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
+2	Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency				69.7					83.5					
0	JRS 6 – allocation of resources to priorities		3							1					
0	JRS 25 – performance management of services to support school improvement			4						3		4			
0	JRS 27 – effectiveness of services to support school improvement		3							3					
0	EDP Grade	2							2						
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						2.4							2.00	

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS		Scores													
		2002					2003								
Change	CURRENT PERFORMANCE	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
N/A	Percentage of statemented pupils placed in mainstream schools	75.2													
0	JRS 30 – effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations		3							3					
N/A	Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks											42			
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						1.5							3.00	
N/A	Percentage of statemented pupils in mainstream schools 1999-2001 trend	0.0													
N/A	Percentage of statements that have been reviewed and discontinued			0.7											
0	JRS 31 – effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement			4							4				
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						2.3							3.00	
0	JRS 29 – effectiveness of strategy for SEN		2	3	4	5									
N/A	Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate	96.0			5								5		
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						2.5							4.00	

APPENDIX I

SOCIAL INCLUSION		Scores													
		2002					2003								
Change	CURRENT PERFORMANCE	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
N/A	Percentage of EY settings on year 2 Ofsted inspection cycle			9.5											
+1	2001/2003 Primary attendance rate			94.0				0.5		94.5					0.5
+1	2001/2003 secondary attendance rate		91.7					0.5	92.6						0.5
-1	2001/2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage (children in public care)	81.3								63.6					
0	2001/2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage			96.0							96.5				
N/A	Staying on rates post 16 for education and training				78.0										
N/A	Youth service participation rate per 1,000														
N/A	JRS 39 LEA support for behaviour										4				
0	JRS 16 – support for EM and traveller children			4.0							4				
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE							2.8						2.5	
Change	IMPROVEMENT	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
N/A	Percentage of EY/Childcare settings taking part on a QA scheme														
+4	1999-2001/2001-2003 primary attendance rate trend					-0.4		0.5	0.23						0.5
+3	1999-2001/2001-2003 secondary attendance rate trend				-0.3			0.5	0.46						0.5
N/A	Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools		20.0												
+1	2001/2000-2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage trend			0.3						0.44					
N/A	Staying on rates post 16 for education and training trend														
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						3.2							1.50	
Change	CAPACITY	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
0	JRS 33 – overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion		3												
0	JRS 42 – effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism					6							6		
N/A	Percentage of schools graded G or V for climate								97.9						
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						3.5		6					2.67	

LIFE LONG LEARNING		Scores													
		2002					2003								
Change	CURRENT PERFORMANCE	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
N/A	16-17 year olds participation rates in education and training										76.0				
N/A	Inspection judgements for % V, G provision for foundation stage											50.0			
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE													3.5	
Change	CAPACITY	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt
N/A	JRS 49 – effectiveness of coordination of actions in support of priorities								2						
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE													1.0	

APPENDIX I

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION		Scores														
		2002					2003									
Change	CURRENT PERFORMANCE	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	
0	JRS 52 – overall effectiveness of the LEA		3							3						
0	JRS 45 – effectiveness of decision making		3							3						
0	JRS 34 – extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places)		3					0.5		3					0.5	
0	JRS 34 – extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions)	2						0.5	2						0.5	
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						1.8							1.83		
Change	IMPROVEMENT	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	
N/A	JRS 50 – progress made by the LEA since last inspection															
N/A	Percentage of all schools graded V or G overall		75.8													
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						2.0									
Change	CAPACITY	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	1	2	3	4	5	Ave	Wt	
0	JRS 51 – capacity of the LEA to improve			4							4					
0	JRS 7 – effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement		3							3						
N/A	Percentage of all schools graded V or G overall									79.5						
	AVERAGE POINT SCORE						2.5			9				2.33		

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 2003/04.

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

POSSIBLE AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS OF EDUCATION SCRUTINY, 2004

SUBJECT	Date	Lead Officer
Policy issues		
1. Monitoring of SEN banding proposals (and extension to high schools)	Spring 2004	AH/PL
2. Review of school catchment areas (Kingstone, Much Birch, Ewyas Harold)	Autumn 2004	MCh
3. Teachers' Workload Agreement – monitoring of progress	Summer 2004	TSG/NA
4. Home to school/college transport - Review of discretionary areas of policy, progress report	Spring 2004	EO/GS/MCh/AB
5. Policy on Education for 14-19 age group	Spring 2004	TSG
6. Policy and procedures for placing excluded pupils in alternative schools	Spring 2004	AH
Best Value		
7. Monitoring of Best Value Improvement Plans	Spring 2004	TSG/GS/SH
8. BVRs (IASPS and SEN)	Spring 2004	EO/SH
Monitoring items		
9. School Admissions – progress report	Spring 2004	GS/MCh
10. Local Public Service Agreements – progress monitoring	Regular reports across the year	GS/AH/TSG
11. Pupil Performance in exams and assessments Summer 2003	Spring 2004/Autumn 2004	TSG
12. Staff sickness absence	Regular reports across the year	NA
13. Compliments, Complaints, Appeals etc	Regular reports across the year	EO
14. Monitoring of Capital and Revenue Reports – PFI (Whitecross)	Regular reports across the year	GS/LD
Information items		
15. Termly Report – Ofsted Inspections of Schools	Regular reports across the year	TSG

SEMINARS

Tuesday, 23rd March 2004 – Management of falling rolls in primary and secondary schools
 Thursday, 24th June 2004 – Extended Schools

