

**EDUCATION AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES CABINET  
COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 8 July 2015.

PRESENT: Mr L B Ridings, MBE (Chairman), Mrs P T Cole (Vice-Chairman), Mr D L Brazier, Mr D Brunning, Mr L Burgess, Mr G Cowan, Mrs M E Crabtree, Mr S C Manion, Mr M J Northey, Mr J M Ozog, Mr C R Pearman, Mr R Truelove, Mr T L Shonk, Mr A Tear and Mr M J Vye

ALSO PRESENT: Mr R W Gough, Mr P M Hill, OBE and Mr P J Oakford

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr P Leeson (Corporate Director Education and Young People Services), Mr K Abbott (Director of Education Planning and Access), Ms G Cawley (Director of Education, Quality and Standards), Mr D Adams (Area Education Officer - South Kent), Mr J Nehra (Area Education Officer - West Kent), Mrs M White (Area Education Officer - East Kent), Mr T Doran (Head Teacher of Looked After Children - VSK), Ms S Dunn (Head of Skills and Employability), Mrs J Ely (Head of SEN Assessment and Resources), Mr N Fenton (Interim Head of Kent Integrated Family Support Service), Mr R Hallett (Head of Business Intelligence), Mrs C Jenden (FTC - Review Team Manager), Mr I Watts (Area Education Officer – North Kent), Mr D Weiss (Head of Public Private Partnerships and Property Team), Mr N Wilkinson (Head of Youth Justice and Safer Young Kent) and Ms C A Singh (Democratic Services Officer)

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

**75. Apologies and Substitutes**  
*(Item A2)*

Apologies were received from Mr Q Roper.

**76. Declarations of Interest by Members in items on the Agenda**  
*(Item A3)*

No declarations of interest were received.

**77. Minutes of the meeting held on 15 April 2015**  
*(Item A4)*

RESOLVED that, subject to Mr Cowan's declaration of interest as he is a foster parent being noted in Minute 67 (1), the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 April 2015 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**78. Verbal Updates**  
(Item A5)

1. The Cabinet Members, Mr Gough, Mr Oakford and Mr Hill; and the Corporate Director, Mr Leeson, gave their verbal updates highlighting the following:-
2. Mr Gough spoke on Special School Developments, advising that he welcomed the development on the Furness site and the work being carried out on the Ridge View School, Tonbridge. There had been some objections; and issues raised by Southern Water which lead to the decision to withdraw the planning application. An alternative proposal had been drawn up for Ridge View and was being brought forward for Ridge View to be on the Yeoman's field site, a playing field currently used by the Judd School. [Judd school was accelerating its development of playing fields which it had already bought] this was all subject to planning permission.
3. A small schools conference was held last week where speakers present included; Mr Leeson and Mr Tear. Those present considered a piece of work by Melanie Cox, former HMI looking at the issues on small schools; the challenges and the advantages and how to build up federations between schools across a variety of groupings to give them strength for a good future.
4. There had been much interest in the school funding since the recent general election. The F40 Group, which KCC was a member of, consisted of the lowest funded counties in the country. Kent was underfunded and was keen if there was any debate on this issue that Kent's voice was heard strongly. Mr Gough advised that he had written to Kent MPs setting KCC's position on key issues, particularly on the £390m designed to support some of the lowest funded authorities. Kent did not receive support from this funding pot and felt penalised for acting on what the government was keen that local authorities should devolve as much money into schools as possible; this lead to Kent schools appearing, on block, to be well-funded resulting in Kent not receiving additional funding. Mr Gough was keen for Kent not to be bypassed on issues regarding schools funding.
5. Mr Leeson advised that the provisional Key Stage 2 results had been received for this summer. 80% of pupils received level 4 in reading, writing and mathematics combined which was a 2% improvement on last year. Mr Leeson said that he expected the validated result to show a slight increase by 1%.
6. The Cabinet Committee was advised that the Education and Adoption Bill had been introduced which made provision for schools to be automatically sponsored by an academy trust if they failed an Ofsted inspection.
7. Mr Leeson explained that the government had produced new definition of a "coasting school". He considered that a reasonable explanation of a coasting school would be a school where even though the standards were high it was making less than expected progress or some groups of pupils were making less than expected progress. He advised that the new definition of a coasting school meant that a school would be coasting if it was not making the expected progress for pupils and if the school's attainment in GCSEs was below 60% for a Secondary school and the key Stage outcomes were below 85% of outcomes in Primary school. This would mean on the attainment measures that nearly half of Primary schools in Kent would

be coasting schools and 57 of Kent's Secondary schools would be coasting schools if the progress measures were also not good enough.

8. Mr Leeson advised that 82% of Kent schools were now good or outstanding which was in line with the national average. The improvement rate in Primary schools was welcomed with 82% of Primary schools being good or outstanding overall in Kent; that represented a significant amount of hard work and very good leadership on the part of Primary school headteachers especially. Mr Leeson concluded that 83% of pupils in Kent were now attending a good or outstanding school, compared to 74% at the same time last year.

9. Mr Leeson referred to the new Common Inspection Framework that was being introduced by Ofsted from September 2015. The Framework would be used across Further Education, Early Years settings and independent and maintained schools, Adult education and Skills etc. It would continue to judge on the overall effectiveness, leadership and management, teaching and learning, and achievement and progress. There were two important developments which Mr Leeson noted; (i) it emphasised even more that pupil progress would be the key measure that inspectors would look at rather than just published data around outcomes. Mr Leeson welcomed this development, and (ii) a change to the inspection process. It would now be a short inspection or visit for good schools every 3 years to validate whether the school continued to be a good school. If there was an indication that the school had slipped then there would be a full inspection brought forward and if there were indications that the school had improved to outstanding there would also be a full inspection. Mr Leeson welcomed this development too.

10. Mr Leeson concluded that there had been a change in how the Ofsted inspectors were trained and recruited. It had brought this back in-house. All inspectors were directly employed and trained directly by Ofsted and organised on a regional basis therefore Ofsted was guaranteeing a better consistent quality of inspection and would be able to monitor the inspection activity closely in the local area.

11. The new Early Help and Preventative Service had been in place since April 2014, the service was designed to support vulnerable children and families who fell below the criteria for a referral to statutory Children Social Care. Kent's expectation was to support more children in Kent so that they do not need to have the statutory social care measures applied and that this would lead to a reduction in the number of children in the statutory social care service. This was important for the families that their needs do not escalate to specialist intervention and for Kent to use its resources more effectively. The trend was monitored on a monthly basis. Mr Leeson reported that the statistical trends from January to May this year indicated that referrals were down from 28% to 22%. There was also a reduction in the number of cases stepped up to Children's Social Care from Early help from 15% to 8%. There was also an increase in step down of cases from 22% to 27%. There was a significant increase in the number of closed cases with positive outcomes for the children and the families from 49% in January to 69% in May 2015. Cases were being tracked and monitored.

12. Mr Oakford advised that he had visited many children's centres across the county and welcomed the significant improvements that he observed. He made reference to positive comments by the staff and users of the service on the restructure of the children's centres, in particular the leadership of the service. There

was evidence of the children's centres and Social Services working together and improved relationships between the children centres and the schools. Mr Oakford mentioned his attendance at a briefing session on children centres attended by Sue Gregory an ex Ofsted inspector, staff and management, that he considered one of the most beneficial meetings he had attended at a County Councillor.

13. Mr Oakford advised that the Select Committee that been appointed to review the role of Corporate Parenting within Kent County Council had sought an extension of 2 months to carry out more in-depth research to produce a robust report.

14. Mr Oakford referred to the Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) that recently entered Kent. He advised that in June 2015, 85 new UASC were brought into the care of KCC, and by 6 July, 42 additional UASC were brought in Kent. Mr Oakford reminded Members that Millbank Reception Centre could accommodate 50 young people to date there were 101 young people being accommodated at Millbank, this meant there were mattresses on floors and 3 people in a room. Measures were being taken to find an additional facility as a reception facility. He advised that agency social workers were being employed to cover the additional assessments and work with the UASC. Mr Oakford stated that there were additional pressures on services including; the Virtual School Kent, housing, education, health services; and the local community. Mr Oakford said that discussions were going to take place with the Home Office and Kent MPs on this issue.

15. Mr Hill advised Members on the current situation regarding Bewl Water Outdoor Centre, Lamberhurst, a residential education centre facility. Mr Hill advised that the sailing facility was in financial difficulty, although there was no direct impact on the education centre, there was a concern regarding this as an important facility used by children and adults of the centre, as this was a large and successful sailing club. The situation would continue to be monitored.

16. Mr Gough, Mr Oakford and Mr Leeson responded to questions by Members as follows:

- (a) Mr Oakford advised that the cost to Kent for the UASC was £3m before the rise in number in the last six weeks. Colleagues in Finance and Social Services were currently working on up to date data and statistics to aid the discussions with the Home office and Kent MPs.
- (b) Mr Oakford explained that the situation with the UASC in 2011 was different to how it was at present. He advised that there had been a decision to close Millbank Reception Centre because it was not being utilised and it was fortunate that this did not happen. He explained that there had been a 90% increase of UASC in the last few months. Following these recent developments the Home Office would be meeting with KCC this week to discuss the issue.
- (c) Mr Leeson advised that the Early Help and Preventative Service was designed to look at three ranges of services. (i) Children with multi disadvantage issues in their lives who do not meet the criteria for children in social care but have quite high areas of need were considered the most important group. (ii) Children who need a targeted need, a single service response in order to help address an issue and (iii) to provide a range of universal access to services that would make a difference to the more

vulnerable eg Children Centres and Youth hubs etc. so that needs do not escalate. Mr Leeson explained that there was an issue with managing expectations. He said that some schools were doing a great deal to support children that they recognised were vulnerable children and only referred those children when its support had been exhausted and required additional help to support a child and family. Work had been carried out by the Early Help and Preventative Service with schools to manage their expectations and sign posting the schools to the correct service they need, this had helped to reduce the number of referrals.

- (d) Mr Leeson explained that the number of children, presently 5500, being supported by the Early Help and Preventative Services was considered too high and some of their needs could be met elsewhere. The Service needed to be carefully targeted. He advised that the Service was tracking the referrals as part of its monthly data, and the response times were ambitious but could be met. He advised that when a school made a notification to Early Help it would hear back in two weeks with an explanation of what was being done. If an Early Help notification went forward to having an assessment and Early Help Plan this would take place in four weeks. The latest number of notifications had risen to 69%, which meant that nearly 70% of the work was happening within the timescale. If a school had concerns they were advised to invite the Local District Manager to the school and present them with the issues that needed to be addressed. The Service was clear that it was to deliver good outcomes. The Cabinet Committee noted that it would receive regular progress reports and that monthly data was being produced and was widely available.
- (e) Mr Gough said that the pressures for school places in particular areas of Kent were recognised. At present the UASC mentioned by Mr Oakford had yet to enter the system to be allocated a school place. He advised that some of the pressures on school places were due to the increase in the birth rate, housing development and migration from both inside and outside the UK. He considered that overall Kent was delivering good school places in line with parental preferences.

17. **RESOLVED** that the information given in the verbal updates and the responses to questions by Members be noted with thanks.

**79. Expansion of Halfway Houses Primary School**  
(Item B1)

1. The Area Education Officer, East Kent, Mrs White and the Director of Education Planning and Access, Mr Abbott, introduced a report that gave details on the outcome of the public consultation on the proposal to permanently expand Halfway Houses (Foundation) Primary School from 2FE to 3FE and the Governing Body's decision to expand the school, pending approval by the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform to support this financially as set out in the recommendation of the report.

2. The Cabinet Committee noted that Halfway Houses had already taken additional pupils on a temporary basis into its current school buildings. As the school is now being rebuilt under Priority School Build 1 on the former Danley site, this was an opportunity to expand the school by an additional form of entry. A consultation

was carried out and 136 written responses were received by the governing body: 119 respondents supported the proposal; 6 objected to the proposal and 11 respondents were undecided. Mrs White advised that the objections received were mainly regarding the school becoming too large. In response parents were given the assurance that the structure and family atmosphere of the primary school would not be lost as the school was already a third of the way to the proposed cohort.

3. RESOLVED that the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee endorsed the decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform to:
  - a) allocate £1,384,353.56 from the Education and Young People's Services Capital Budget, being Kent County Council's contribution towards the priority school building scheme which has been agreed with the Education Funding Agency (EFA), subject to any necessary additional works or necessary variations.
  - b) The Corporate Director for Education and Young People's Services in consultation with the Cabinet for Education and Health Reform be authorised to negotiate with the EFA as to the necessity and cost of any additional work or variations identified, to ensure that any further contribution is minimised. Any agreements will not exceed current approved financial limits; and
  - c) The Executive Scheme of Delegation for Officers set out in Appendix 2 Part 4 of the Constitution (and the directorate schemes of sub-delegation made thereunder) provides the governance pathway for the implementation of this decision by officers. In this instance the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support is expected to be the nominated Authority Representative within the relevant agreements and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts.

## **80. Capital Funding Approval** *(Item B2)*

*(Mr Cowan made a declaration of interest as he is a foster parent of a child that attends one of the schools)*

1. The Area Education Officer, South Kent, Mr Adams, and the Director of Education Planning and Access, Mr Abbott, introduced a report that sets out the allocation of capital funding to a number of school projects and sought the Cabinet Committees support for the proposed decisions to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform for various Capital Programme projects.

2. Mr Adams, Mrs White and Mr Abbott, responded to questions by Members which included the following:

- Mrs White advised that the Highways works at Tunstall CE Primary School would commence in 23 July. This would include further works to culverts, highways lighting and a road crossing. The abnormal costs [a building term for costs outside the normal budget] entail the drainage works and foundation works for the school. Mrs White advised that the contractors were currently on

site and the expected completion date was 16 March 2016 [included in the contract].

- Mr Adams advised that there were significant capital pressures within the budgets and addressing the local community's needs that came with those expansions, such as perception on traffic and congestion, added to those pressures. The Highways Authority was a consultee in the school expansion process and had a view on what would need to happen to allow a development to be considered suitable, sustainable and deliverable. Those requirements had to be factored into the budget.

Mr Adams explained that a piece of work was being carried out, with colleagues in Growth, Environment and Transport Directorate, looking at all school estates to identify which schools could be expanded and what issues there might be in terms of physical infrastructure etc in achieving the expansions. This work would identify where highways works were required, so these could be costed in at an earlier stage, and be factored into requests for developer contributions where appropriate.

- Mr Adams agreed to look at the issue of funding for highways improvements at Green Park Community Primary School, Dover and discuss the matter with Mr Cowan.

3. RESOLVED that:-

(a) the responses to questions by Members be noted; and

(b) the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee endorsed the decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform to approve the following capital projects, and allocate funding, from the Education and Young People's Services Capital Budget, of the following amounts in order that the proposals may go ahead:

(i)

- a. A further £2.3m for Tunstall CE Primary School, Swale.
- b. A further £2.2m for Kings Hill Academy, Tonbridge & Malling.
- c. £9m to the rebuild and expansion of Portal House School, Dover.
- d. £1.4m to the expansion of Green Park Primary School, Dover.
- e. £6m to the building of Finberry School, Ashford.
- f. £2.5m to the expansion of The Judd School, Tonbridge & Malling.

(ii) To expand Portal House School by 20 places from 1 September 2015 as part of the project to rebuild the school on its current site.

(iii) The Executive Scheme of Delegation for Officers set out in Appendix 2 Part 4 of the Constitution (and the directorate schemes of sub-delegation made thereunder) provides the governance pathway for the implementation of this decision by officers. In this instance, the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support to be the nominated Authority Representative with the relevant agreements and to enter into variation as envisaged under the contracts.

**81. The proposed amalgamation of Murston Infant and Junior schools**  
(Item B3)

1. The Cabinet Committee considered a report on the proposal to amalgamate Murston Infant School and Murston Junior School by closing the current Infant and Junior Schools and establishing a 1.FE, single Community Primary School and maintained Nursery unit for children aged 3 and 11 years.

2. The Area Education Officer, Mrs White, advised that the report was for information as the consultation was still in process and would conclude on 15 July 2015 and gave Members the opportunity to comment on the proposal. Mrs White explained that if following consideration of the responses to the consultation if the Cabinet Member agreed to issue a public notice, it was planned that the four week notice period would be 11 September to 8 October 2015. Following the end of the notice period, details of the proposal together with the consultation information and Cabinet Member recommendation, would be forwarded to the Schools Adjudicator for a determination.

3. Mrs White advised that to date: 32 responses had been received and were in support of the proposal [a breakdown of 21 in support from the Infant school and 11 in support from the Junior school]; 2 undecided; and no objections had been received. The Local Member, Mr Bowles, had also expressed his support.

4. The Chairman advised that he had attended the public meeting and said that the Infant school was very positive regarding the Junior School.

5. Mrs White advised that a 2 Form Entry was not required at the school at this present time as there were vacancies but the position may change if a proposed housing development was realised in the future.

6. RESOLVED that the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee endorsed the decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform to amalgamate Murston Infant and Junior schools following consideration of the results of the outcome of the consultation and to:

(i) Issue a public notice to discontinue Murston Infant School and Murston Junior School and establish a 1.5FE, single Community Primary school and maintained Nursery unit on 1 September 2016.

And, subject to no objections being received to the public notice

(ii) make recommendations to the Schools Adjudicator for determination for implementation on 1 September 2016.

## **82. Closure of Furness School and Expansion of Broomhill Bank** *(Item B4)*

1. The Cabinet Member, Mr Gough, introduced a report that provided an update to the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee regarding the closure of Furness School and the expansion of Broomhill Bank Special School on the same site. He highlighted the information in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.3 regarding the aim to deliver better SEN school provision in West Kent in accordance with the SEND Strategy and the Commissioning Plan for Education by proceeding with the closure of Furness Special School and a consultation to be undertaken for Broomhill Bank Foundation Special School to expand onto the Furness School site with effect



from 1 September. He advised that the governing body were unanimous with this proposal.

2. Members congratulated the decision, which they considered would guarantee continuity. It was noted that parents were happy with the proposal for the consultation.

3. The Area Education Officer, North Kent, Mr Watts, advised that following a parents meeting, held at Broomhill Bank special school, there had been 26 requests and 26 offers made for places of which 12 were parents from the existing Furness School.

4. RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the comments by Members be noted; and
- (b) the update and the progress achieved in developing provision for the future on the Furness site for pupils with autistic spectrum disorder needs be noted.

**83. Proposed alternations to Five Acre Wood School and Holmesdale Technology College**  
*(Item B5)*

1. The Area Education Officer, West Kent, Mr Nehra, introduced a report on the results of the public consultation on the proposed changes to Five Acre Wood School (Maidstone) and Holmesdale Technology College (Tonbridge and Malling).

2. Mr Nehra advised that physiotherapists were employees of the National Health Service. Mr Leeson agreed to provide an update report that would also include the issue of commissioning speech therapy and language therapy, in the Autumn.

3. RESOLVED that the Education and Young People's Services Cabinet Committee endorsed the decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform to issue a public notice to:

- (i)
  - Increase the designated number of places offered at Five Acre Wood School, Boughton Lane, Maidstone ME15 9QF from 275 to 330 places for 4 January 2016
  - Establish a Satellite provision at Holmesdale Technology College, Malling Road, Snodland ME6 5HS for 70 students with moderate to severe learning difficulties for 4 January 2016.
  - Alter the lower age range at Five Acre Wood School, Boughton Lane, Maidstone ME15 9QF to include nursery provision for 1 September 2016.

And, subject to no objections to the public notice not already considered:

- (ii) implement the proposals according to the dates identified above
- (iii) allocate £495,000 from the Basic Need Budget

- (iv) Authorise the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support in consultation with the Director of Law and Governance to enter into any necessary contracts/ agreements on behalf of the County Council
- (v) Authorise the Director of Property and Infrastructure Support to be the nominated Authority Representative within the relevant agreements and to enter into variations as envisaged under the contracts

**84. Facing the Challenge**  
*(Item B6)*

1. The Market Engagement Team Manager, Mrs Jenden, introduced a report that provided a detailed account of the back office procurement process and documented the journey of the Customers Services (Contact Point and Digital Communications), Finance, HR, ICT and EduKent procurement project which is part of Phase 1 of Facing the Challenge.
2. The Chairman confirmed that further update reports would be submitted to each Cabinet Committee meeting and between meetings when necessary.
3. The Director of Transformation, Mr Hallett and the Market Engagement Team Manager, Ms Jenden, advised that nothing had changed with the information set out on page 75, in paragraph 2.5.6, of the report. Mr Hallett advised that comparing in-house with outhouse there was an independent value for money judgement between the bidders in terms of the lots that they were bidding for and the internal comparator ie what would happen if the contract was not allowed. He advised that the process was robust and there would be a further report when the process was completed. Mrs Jenden added that there were 2 bidders remaining CGI for Lot 1 and Agilisys Lot 3.
4. RESOLVED that the Education and Young People's Cabinet Committee noted and endorsed the progress of the procurement process to date and the next steps.

**85. The Local Authority, Academies and the implications of the Education and Adoption Bill**  
*(Item C1)*

1. The Cabinet Member, Mr Gough, introduced a report that provided an update on the current position of academies in Kent, the work that the Education and Young People's Services undertook in respect of academies and the potential implications of the key academy related elements of the Education and Adoption Bill.
2. Mr Gough referred to section 4 of the report headed "School Improvement" and explained that as the expansion of schools moved from Primary to Secondary the local authority would continue to work with academies on their expansion plans. Members were reminded that following the Academies Act 2010 the powers of intervention were moved to the Department for Education (DfE) with academies.

3. Mr Gough referred to the new measure for Ofsted of “coasting” schools which was wide ranging. He considered that the definition of “coasting” was critically important.

4. Mr Gough responded to questions by Members as follows:-

- A suggestion was made that the Cabinet Committee should receive separate reporting for schools that were not run by the local authority. Mr Leeson advised that the local authority adopted the approach that it had the responsibility for all the children in Kent. The local authority worked constructively with all academies in Kent and when academies did not do well the local authority was able to voice concerns to the DfE.
- Mr Tear advised that the diocese wanted to encourage the local authority to continue to engage with academy trusts on school improvement. Mr Leeson stated that there had been issues with academies run by national chains where there had not been sufficient improvement support given to those academies, he gave the example of Hextable. He suggested the way forward was to have smaller local academy trusts. Strong schools could affect other schools to bring about rapid improvement; he gave the examples of Swale, Stour and Coastal that had worked with other schools not in their Trust. He stressed that transferring to academy status did not mean automatically becoming a better school. Kent could not afford for another school to close.
- It was suggested that a way to foster good relationships with academies was to appoint local authority governors, which many academies already did.
- Mr Gough advised that he considered that it would be quite a while before all schools became Free schools or academies, but it had to be accepted that there would be an increase.
- A comment was made that it was concerning that there was no space for the local authority to influence what was on the school’s curriculum.

5. RESOLVED that the responses to questions by Members and the current position and the issues identified in the report be noted.

## **86. Community Learning and Skills Annual Performance Report 2013/14** *(Item C2)*

1. The Head of Skills and Employability, Mrs Dunn, introduced a report that explained the Community Learning and Skills (CLS) Performance Management Framework and provided an overview of the outcomes of the service for 2013/14. The Cabinet Member, Mr Hill, advised that he fully supported the report at a time when the local authority was becoming the commissioning authority.

2. The Corporate Director, Mr Leeson, and Mrs Dunn responded to questions by Members as follows:

- Mrs Dunn explained that the reason for the higher percentage of females to males in the data could be due to the types of services on offer. The CLS carried out a lot of research and tried to put on programmes for learners needs and what Kent communities ask for.

Mrs Dunn advised that for every £1 received from the government the CLS had to raise £2. She suggested that another reason may be that the CLS did not offer engineering and maths. Mr Leeson said that there was a trend for girls and women to participate more, whereas boys and young men tended to drop out of training more from secondary age onwards.

- A Member was pleased with the apprenticeships figures detailed in the report and thanked Mrs Dunn and her Team for all their work.
- Mrs Dunn confirmed that the CLS worked with the Jobcentre providing English and mathematics courses.

3. RESOLVED that responses to questions by Members and the CLS financial (2014/15) and operational (academic year 2013/14) performance outcomes and future strategic direction be noted.

## **87. Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) Training for Schools** *(Item C3)*

1. The Head of Youth Justice and Safer Young Kent, Early Help and Preventative Services, Mr Wilkinson, introduced a report that outlined key national and local developments concerning Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and the safeguarding children within Kent schools. Mr Wilkinson highlighted key points in the report explaining that this was a national issue. There had been numerous reports written with many recommendations including Alexis Jay's regarding the CSE in Rotherham; Ann Coffey published "Real Voices" and Louise Casey's review into Rotherham MBC. There had been media attention on those national reports and earlier in the year the Prime Minister in a statement said that this was a national threat on the same lines as the issues on counterterrorism.

2. Mr Wilkinson advised that there were CSE training courses available at multiagency professionals. During 2014-15 staff from 22 schools attended the training, including schools most affected by Operation Lakeland. CSE training was mandatory for frontline Early Help and Preventative Services (EHPS). Officers within EHPS had been trained to conduct the KSCB CSE classroom training. Many schools had engaged in this training.

3. Mr Wilkinson noted comments and responded to questions by Members as follows:

- A comment was made that 22 schools attending the training was not many out of the total number of schools in Kent. It was hoped that this small number of schools attending was not due to people thinking that "it couldn't happen here".
- A suggestion was made, regarding paragraph 3.2 of the report that highlighted points from the Coffey report regarding the public attitudes and negative stereotypes towards children whom were sexually exploited and to address this, the whole community needed to be involved and a key player to bring this about was the local police, in a leadership role.
- Members commented that this was a good report and would be taken seriously.
- It was suggested that it was important that the training was far reaching to include every culture and agreed that this issue should remain a top priority.

4. The Corporate Director, Mr Leeson, advised that the schools were required to ensure that their safeguarding and child protection leads were trained on a regular basis on a yearly cycle and this was monitored to ensure that they did meet that expectation. In the last year more than 2000 teachers in schools attended safeguarding training for which CSE would have been some part.

5. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the comments and responses to questions by Members and the report be noted; and
- b) a further report be submitted to this Cabinet Committee later in the year in relation to the lessons learnt and recommendations of the Operation Lakeland multi-agency review and the impact of the introduction of the multi-agency Child Sexual Exploitation Team in Kent.

## **88. Virtual School Kent Update** (Item C4)

1. The Headteacher, Virtual School Kent (VSK), Mr Doran, introduced a report and highlighted the following data on children in care's outcomes, the direction of travel in level 4 plus reading writing and mathematics combined over the last 3 years there had been a 9% improvement in attainment and a 3% narrowing of the gap of national outcomes, Kent had a significantly larger cohort than most local authorities. He broke this down as follows; 14% rise in mathematics and a reduction in the gap of 8%. There was an 11% improvement in attainment in reading and 7% reduction in the gap; and a 15% improvement in attainment in writing and a reduction of 7% in the gap. The Key Stage 4 outcomes, GCSE examinations, the picture was in two parts; (i) was the direction of travel in 2010 2013 was an 8.6% in improvement in attainment with 5A\*-C including English and Mathematics and reduced the gap with the national by 5.9%. (ii) 2014 results. He explained that The Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) wrote to all Headteachers to say that 2014 results were not comparable to previous results for multiple reasons including vocational qualification equivalencies were downgraded and those children were far more successful with modular vocational qualifications. The shift in weighting of certain key examinations eg English GCSE moved the weighting of the final examination to 60% before it was 60% on the course work. There was also the introduction of the first entry county for the GCSE qualifications.

2. Kent had a 1.4% downturn to 13% achieving 5A\*-C including English and Mathematics looking at the first entry this dropped to 8%. The drop for best entry was line national for Children in Care. Nationally 3% of Children in Care were from an Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) background, the vast majority were in care for just over 12 months. The year 11s cohort, 20% were UASC, nearly seven times the national average. In terms of their literacy and English as an additional language it was not possible to achieve 5A\*-C including English and mathematics.

3. Mr Doran stated that if the weighting was applied with Kent's outcomes that pulled Kent in line with the national outcomes of 3%, Kent would have exceeded the national outcomes.

4. Mr Doran explained that the identification of NEETS UASC enable the strengthening of the destination offer.

5. There had been case studies on the Pupil Premium, which identified positive work being carried out across Kent schools on a child by child basis. He gave the example of Leigh Academy that were doing work on managing feelings and emotions.

6. Mr Doran explained that his Teams area of work had increased in commissioning to extend support to 16-18 year olds in care in Kent, working closely with the Skills and Employability Team and other services within Education and Young People's Services Directorate.

7. Mr Doran responded to questions by Members as follows:

- Mr Doran explained that VSK took over the Education Assessment Service three years ago. That service was set up to support UASC and to carry out their initial education assessment. At their peak they were commissioned to carry out 18 education assessments per calendar month at the highest point they were delivering 38 education assessments per calendar month. Since June 24 until 7 July there had been 102 arrivals, four times higher than the Education Assessment Service had experienced before.
- A Member commented that there were concerns in Ramsgate too.
- A request was made for a picture of where UASC under 16 years old were in school and where all the remaining UASC were, 16 to 18 years old and beyond, to show the spread of achievements across the county. It was advised that the landscape was changing rapidly and so different to how it looked before. They would arrive at Milbank to be process and orientated and then they would be placed from there elsewhere in the County.
- A Member commented that it was difficult to have comparison with UASC as it took time for those children to be assessed and once assessed it took at least a year for them to settle them into school. He considered that the results of Children in Care were good as they came with many issues.

8. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the comments and responses to questions by Members be noted;
- b) the validated position on 2014 performance outcomes for Kent's children in care be noted; and
- c) the work of the Virtual School Kent (VSK) with particular reference to post 16 developments be noted.

**89. Progress Implementing the Troubled Families Programme**  
*(Item C5)*

1. The Cabinet Member, Mr Hill, introduced a report explaining that this was a very important issue and top of the corporate and political agenda. And had been pleased with the results of Phase 1 of the programme. It had been a major achievement to turn around 100% of the families in that cohort in a new area of work. Mr Hill read a statement from Louise Casey, Head of Troubled Families Programme giving praise to the achievements of the Kent Team. He highlighted that there were new challenges with the new cohort to be delivered with less funding, but this would be delivered.

2. The Head of the Troubled Families Programme, Mr Weiss, highlighted key points from the report advising that this programme was jointly governed by KCC at a county level, led by the Leader, Mr Carter, and the Cabinet Member, Mr Hill; and at a local level by all the borough and district councils. The Trouble Families was in two phases. Phase 1, which has been the last three years and Phase 2, which was the next five years. For Phase 1 2560 families had been turned round. The criteria was to get children back into school, to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and to get members of the family that were unemployed, back into work. Kent had the third highest number of turn round families in the country and in terms of returning people back to work Kent had the second highest in the country. Phase 2 would be more challenging with three times more families to be turned round, 8960 families. The criteria had also broadened with a separate section on domestic violence, trying to encourage people to manage their health problems, engaging parents where children need early help, children in need or child protection.

3. Mr Leeson and Mr Weiss noted comments and responded to questions by Members as follows:-

- Members congratulated the Team for all the work carried out to achieve this success.
- Mr Weiss advised that the vast amount of families were identified through notifications to Early Help, this could be through schools, Community Safety Teams, Police or someone from the local community. If families did not come forward the Team would look through the data and try to identify families that way. He stated that there were very few resistant families which included families who in the past had not wanted to cooperate through Social Care or Social workers but had accepted intervention through a family project worker. He considered that it was the relationship that had been forged with those families that had made the difference.
- Mr Weiss advised that in Phase1 there were not the tools to track families once they were turned around but very few families returned to the Team. He agreed that it was important to understand that this was sustainable and was the change meaningful. In Phase 2 families would be tracked for a year and if a family started to have problems we or another agency would reengage at the earliest time. Mr Leeson explained that when a notification was received a Triage Team would look at the data to identify whether the child or the family had been helped in the past, so that it would be obvious when an Early Help notification was made that a family had or had not previously been supported by the Troubled Families Programme.

- Mr Wiess advised that there were good links with the Department for Work and Pensions and Job Centre Plus that had seconded staff into the Programme and helped families onto a path back to work.

4. RESOLVED that comments and responses to questions by Members and the success of the Troubled Families Programme in Phase 1 and the approach to delivering the Expanded Programme in Phase 2 be noted.

**90. Work Programme 2015**  
(Item C6)

1. A request was made for a report on how the NHS worked with the Education and Young People's Services Directorate to include a list of the commissioned services and how they are monitored.

2. RESOLVED that, subject to the request detailed above being included, the Work Programme for 2015 be noted.

**91. Education and Young People's Services Directorate Scorecard**  
(Item D1)

1. The Corporate Director, Mr Leeson, introduced a report that monitored targets and the milestones for each year up to 2018, set out in the Strategic Priority Statement, Vision and Priorities for Improvement, and service business plans.

2. RESOLVED that the new Education and Young People's Services performance scorecard which had been designed to reflect the expanded scope of the work of the Directorate be noted.

**92. Ofsted Inspection Outcomes Update**  
(Item D2)

1. The Corporate Director, Mr Leeson, introduced the report that summarised the performance of Kent Schools in Ofsted inspections from 1 September 2014 to June 2015.

2. Mr Leeson introduced the newly appointed Director of Quality and Standards, Ms Gillian Cawley. Ms Cawley said that it was good to bring a positive report to her first meeting. Some of the outcomes in the report were now improved and the target of 82% had been met for this year. The percentage of schools requiring improvement was down to 16% and the figure of school in Ofsted category was below national averages at 2.5%. In terms of comparison to September 2014, when Kent had 29 schools in category there were now 13, a significant reduction which meant that 12249 children were in good or better schools.

3. Ms Cawley advised that the rate of improvement for those academies that were judge to require improvement would be monitored and suggested that many may be on their way to being judged good.

4. RESOLVED that response to a question and the information in the report be noted.



**93. Free Early Education for Two Years Olds: Take Up**  
*(Item D3)*

1. The Head of Early Help (West Kent, 0-5 County Lead), Mr Fenton introduced a report highlighting that there were 7000 eligible 2 year olds to take up a Free Early Education place for 2 year olds. There were 10,000 places available at present. Although the challenge had been met to get providers, more work needed to be carried out to improve the take up of those places to meet the 70-70% target, the take up was currently 56%.

2. Mr Fenton responded to questions by Members as follows:

- Members thanked Ms Gamby and Mr Fenton and their Team for all the work undertaken.
- Members noted that £150k had been identified for promoting the scheme.
- A suggestion was made that by providing quality preschool provision children should do better at school, this should be tracked. Mr Leeson advised that 91% of children were accessing good or better placements. This would be tracked through to Early Year Foundation stage. This was one of the narrowest gaps between Children in Care (CiC).

3. RESOLVED that:-

a) the comments and responses to questions by Members be noted; and

b) the actions taken to date and the next steps in promoting and supporting the take up of Free Early Education by eligible two year olds and the report be noted.

**94. Special Educational Needs & Disability Strategy 2013-2016**  
*(Item D4)*

1. The Cabinet Member, Mr Gough, introduced a report with a summary of progress implementing Kent's SEN and Disability (SEND) Strategy. He highlighted section 4.9 of the report that detailed the work that continued for extra capacity both at Special schools and units with mainstream schools to cope with an expanding need while seeking to reduce the number of out of County placements. He then referred to the implementation of the Children and Families Act and the challenge of the Education, Health and Care Plan detailed in paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6. The Head of SEN Assessment and Resources, Mrs Ely, and her Team were working to raise the quality of family and children's engagement and would form an important part of the Education and Young People's Services Directorate.

2. The Corporate Director, Mr Leeson, advised that this was one of the key strategies. The local authority had a major responsibility regarding this but this was a multiagency strategy. There were joint commissioning arrangements with Health and Social Care that had to be right.

3. Kent agreed to help Ofsted carry out a pilot inspection of their new Framework by inspecting Kent's SEND arrangements. The feedback was mostly positive regarding the quality of our strategy and our approach to the Health and Care

planning process. The feedback was particularly positive regarding the engagement with parents and the needs of their children; and what was required in the future.

4. Mrs Ely highlighted the contribution that had been made by the Kent Special Schools and the leading role that they had to deliver the strategy, the outreach and local inclusion Forum Teams which was the way that schools were providing support to each other to increase the level of expertise and drive forward the changes, mentioned in 4.12 and 4.15. Mrs Ely advised that this was a 4 year process.

5. Mr Gough and Mr Leeson respond to comments and questions by Members as follows:

6. Mrs Crabtree congratulated Mrs Ely and her Team and commented that the report did not fully convey the extent of the work that Mrs Ely and her Team had carried out over the past year and half to ensure its success. She listed some of the projects that the Team had delivered including; the local offer and a website.

7. RESOLVED that the progress delivering the Special Educational Needs Disability Strategy be noted as follows:

(i) Significantly more children and young people with SEN in Kent are receiving a better quality education and provision to meet their needs has increased; and

(ii) Emerging effective joint commissioning is improving services and we must maximise further opportunities to address inequalities in access to health services.

## **95. Future Provision of Secondary Education in Kent** *(Item D5)*

1. The Cabinet Member, Mr Gough, introduced a report highlighting various points. Paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10 detailed the standards and performance achieved by maintained Secondary schools and academies. He advised that flat cash Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) settlement would continue. There would be a gradual acceleration of expansions for year 7 at present but this would pick up in 2020s. There were issues with post 16 funding. Mr Gough referred to pressures where secondary schools were underperforming and the support that vulnerable secondary schools would continue to receive to avoid closures like Oasis Academy School and Chaucer Technology School, which had a considerable cost to pupils and school staff.

2. The Corporate Director, Mr Leeson, advised that there was a need to deliver a significant number of secondary school places in the forthcoming years; 20 forms of entry in the next two years and 60 forms of entry in the succeeding years. A number of those schools that may need to expand were having financial difficulties and some were underperforming. Mr Leeson highlighted that 11 secondary schools were vulnerable and would need additional resources. [An inadequate rated school cannot be expanded]. This issue was being raised with the Education Funding Agency, to pursue the ability to have more flexibility in the funding formula and the ability to respond to what is envisaged as a short term problem for most of the schools to get over a two year period of where an increasing financial difficulty would hamper their

effort to bring about improvement that was needed, so that they could expand and provide additional places in the next two to three years.

3. The Director of Planning and Access, Mr Abbott, advised that KCC was working with academies. There had been discussions with one academy and the Education Funding Agency (EFA) about options on the formula that could give back some flexibility, which was lost through national changes 2013, at no cost to the government. This would apply to both maintained and academy schools. The financial difficulties needed to be addressed before they escalated.

4. RESOLVED that the necessary actions taken to support 'vulnerable' Secondary schools to increase Secondary school capacity to meet the demands of a growing Secondary school population detailed in the report be noted.

**96. Review of the Kent Commissioning Plan for Education 2015-19**  
*(Item D6)*

1. The Cabinet Member, Mr Gough, introduced a report that reviewed the progress made since November 2014 and the achievement was sufficient places for the September 2015 intake of pupils in Primary and secondary schools.

2. The Area Education Officer, South Kent, Mr Adams, advised that there had been temporary school expansion put in place to ensure that every child had a school place. He highlighted that there was a struggle in the North West of the County because of Oasis Academy, Hextable closing.

3. RESOLVED that the progress achieved and the issues identified for further development that will feature in the next version of the Commissioning Plan in autumn 2015 be noted.