

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

EDUCATION CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Education Cabinet Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 10 July 2012.

PRESENT: Mr A R Chell, Mrs P T Cole, Mr G Cooke (Chairman), Mr H J Craske, Mrs P A V Stockell, Mr R Tolputt, Mr L Christie, Mr M J Vye and Mr J M Cubitt

ALSO PRESENT: Mr M J Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education Learning and Skills

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr P Leeson (Corporate Director Education, Learning and Skills Directorate), Mrs M White (Strategic Business Advisor (ELS)), Mr D Adams (Area Education Officer - Mid kent), Mr S Pleace (Lm & Budget Manager), Mrs C A Singh (Democratic Services Officer) and Mrs Rogers (Director, Quality and Standards)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

12. Membership

(Item A2)

RESOLVED that Mr Davies has replaced Mrs Dagger of this Cabinet Committee be noted

13. Declarations of Members' Interest relating to items on today's Agenda

(Item A4)

RESOLVED that Mr Craske made a declaration regarding Item D2 that this wife was a governor at Ifield School, Gravesend. *(Mrs Stockell, Mr Vye, Mr Chell, Mr Cubitt, Mr Tolputt, Mr Cooke, Mr Craske declared that they were governors of Kent schools)*

14. Minutes 9 May 2012

(Item A5)

1. A Member referred to Minute 6 3 (a), (b) and (e), Mr Leeson agreed to produce a summary on the work of the Kent Lead Advisory, submit a monitoring report on Ofsted results to every meeting and strategy report on the retirement and recruitment of Headteachers and teachers to be submitted to the September meeting.
2. RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2012 were agreed and be signed by the Chairman, subject to the words "charging KS2" being deleted in paragraph 6 (1) bullet point 2 and the word "had" being replaced with "were proposing to" in paragraph 6 (2) bullet point 5.

15. Verbal Update - Cabinet Member and Corporate Director

(Item A6)

(Verbal Update by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning and Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills)

1. The Chairman invited Mr Whiting and Mr Leeson to give their verbal updates. Mr Whiting began by advising Members on of the following:

- 31 of 449 Primary schools were now academies
- 59 of 100 Secondary schools were now academies
- One of the 24 special schools was now an academy
- The Government had announcement that 261 schools would be rebuilt or refurbished across as part of the Priority Schools for Building Programme. He was pleased to announce that included in the list were 14 Kent schools, including Leyland Gap Special School. He was disappointed that the DFE had not approved the other applications from Kent that included the Foreland special school and Hartsdown Technology College. Both were in the original list for BSF but no funding has been granted to them. Work would continue for those schools that did not receive funding in this tranche. KCC's funding would be looked at so that those schools in most urgent need of capital funding can be supported. He concluded that academies in the County had been successful in their individual applications including Fulston Manor School that received over £3million for capital build.

2. Mr Leeson gave his verbal update and advised Members on the following:

- The Strategy for Improvement in Kent was to both support the schools that need improvement most, in a targeted way; and to promote a wider strategy for improvement with all Kent schools, to encourage schools to work with each other in partnership and work with the local authority. There was a clear commitment from good and outstanding schools in Kent to support other schools. There was now a developing network of schools in Partnership between groups of schools across Kent to share resources and share expertise. This focused on three key issues:
 - To improve Standards of Literacy, especially at Key Stage 2;
 - To improve the quality of teaching in schools from satisfactory to good overall; and
 - To increase the rate of Kent schools overall, for those judged to be satisfactory to become good schools or outstanding schools.
- There were targets set within Bold Steps for significant improvement by 2015 in those areas mentioned above.
- The Kent Association of Headteachers was proving to be effective organisation in supporting and promoting this work too.

3. There was a determination to be more effective at District base working. Each District worked differently, they had different issues and the locality was the

most meaningful way to think about improvement and joint working. Work was being undertaken to create a district base model. There were now, through the recent restructuring, dedicated named officers who would be working together as a team in each district in both Education and Social Care. This was proving helpful to schools in having a clear contact point for support in their area.

4. Resources were being removed from county level to a district based model. Mr Leeson gave the example of the devolution of the Specialist Teaching service being moved to a district base model referred to in a later agenda item. There was also a review of the Pupil Referral Unit provision in Kent. The Districts had been asked to come forward with their own proposals on how they would like to see this happening in the future.

5. The 14-24 Strategy would be published in the early Autumn of 2012, this would include the development of local district based 14-19 Partnerships of schools employers and colleges and other agencies so that the work to be carried out for young people was more effective on the ground in Kent.

6. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:

- a) A request was made for a list of the 14 Kent schools, in each category, that were on the School Refurbishment Programme list to receive capital funding. The Chairman advised that there was a Capital Monitoring Group which gave the opportunity for Members to discuss and monitor the Capital Programme in more depth. Mr Whiting advised that he and Mr Leeson had written to both the DfE and Lord Hill, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Schools, for information and clarification on why those particular 14 schools had been chosen over and above those that were not chosen. Mr Whiting stated that he felt, that although those 14 schools were deserving cases, there were schools that were equally deserving and in need of assistance yet had missed out. Kent needed to understand why these 14 schools were allocated funding in this tranche and not the other 34 that were on Kent's.
- b) A Member referred to a recent report on Schools that was built on Building Schools for the Future (BSF). That concluded that when a school was built fit for purpose, those schools had improved their pupils' academic achievement, showing that if you build an educational environment it improved the standards of attainment. Mr Whiting responded saying that he considered BSF was unaffordable. The Chairman added that 9 of the 14 schools that were on the list were primary schools therefore would not have qualified under BSF.
- c) In reply to a question, Mr Whiting advised that the 14 schools were not Kent's top 14 schools. All of the schools on Kent's list were felt to be a priority. Some academies had put in their own bids. Kent would continue to pursue capital funding for those schools.
- d) In response to a request, Mr Leeson agreed to supply the details of the nominated district Officers to Members of this Cabinet Committee.

- e) Clarification was sought on the terms “Kent Schools” and “Local Authority Schools”; Mr Whiting explained that they were all “Kent Schools”, he did not differentiate. Mr Leeson added that he saw little difference in schools being academies. We had to use different language for different schools maintained by the DFE and local authority and in applications for funding.

7. RESOLVED that :-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- b) a report on the Capital Priority Programme be submitted to the next meeting of this Cabinet Committee.

16. Permanent and Temporary Classroom Programme 2012-13

(Item B1)

(Verbal Update by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning and Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills)

1. The Chairman advised the Committee that this decision had to be taken between meetings as it could not be reasonably deferred to this meeting of the Education Cabinet Committee and that his views as Chairman and the views of the Group spokesmen had been sought prior to the decision being made in accordance with the new governance arrangements.

2. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:-

- a) Members welcomed the determination to have sufficient places in Reception and Year1 classes in the county.
- b) A request was made for details on the types of temporary classrooms that were available and their cost. The Chairman agreed to this forming part of the Capital Priority Programme Report to be submitted to the next meeting of this Cabinet Committee.

3. Mr Christie said that he did agree with the procedure for taking this decision between meetings but had concerns as to why a decision was being taking in July 2012 for places in September 2012. He sought assurance that the permanent classrooms would not be put into popular schools that would impact on neighbouring schools where there were places available, which he did not agree with. Mr Christie then commented on St Botolph’s, Church of England School in Northfleet that was receiving extra places which meant that the admissions arrangements that apply to the spaces being provided would be Church of England arrangements, which he did not consider was solving the problem in Northfleet as local children could not get into local schools because of the Churches insistence. Mr Whiting explained that Kent would always look to secure places in good or outstanding schools where there was space to do so but would not look to increase a school that was in special measures. Care had been taken to ensure that all the schools’ availability in the area that the school that was to be expanded was taken into account. He advised that there were continued discussion with the faith schools about admissions criteria. He advised that his view was that there should be good local schools for local people. There needed to be fair access for all children in every locality.

4. Mr Leeson recognised that this was not a decision that should be made in July normally. In publishing the draft Education Commissioning Plan a more systematic approach was being taken in planning ahead to make enough provision available for local parents to have a good choice of schools for their child. In future the Commissioning Plan would allow decisions to be made at an earlier part of the cycle on those issues. The decision was not just about provision of places but about giving parents reasonable diversity in their choice of good quality education. There had been decisions made earlier on where schools have had to take a bulge class which was often temporary as the following year there may not be the need to expand. In some places the data was sufficiently robust where we can commit money to permanent expansion. Within this decision there is a commitment for permanent expansion but nothing had happened yet. It will be consulted on and would be part of the formal process. Those decisions would come back to this Cabinet Committee.

5. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- b) the decision on Permanent and Temporary Classroom Programme 2012-13 taken between meetings in accordance with the procedures of the Constitution be noted.

17. Specialist Teaching Service Devolution

(Item B2)

(Report by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning and Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills)

1. The Committee considered a report on the proposed new model for the delivery of the Specialist Teaching Service, to be devolved to a lead Special School in each District.

2. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:

- a) It was considered that this Cabinet Committee monitored this service.
- b) In reply to a question, Mr Leeson advised that the Specialist teachers were a peripatetic teaching service. They worked with children in School Action Plus. They would be based in special schools, mainly primary. The resource would be prioritised with Outreach. Outreach would offer advice and support where it was needed. This would be monitored and evaluated.
- c) In reply to a question, Mr Leeson advised that academies were involved in using this service.
- d) In response to a comment and questions, Mr Leeson apologised and agreed "Gravesend" being altered to read "Gravesham" in the report. He then advised that Ifield school, Gravesend, [an outstanding school] which had considerable capacity was being asked to take on the overarching responsibility for

Gravesham and Dartford work in this area for a short period of time, for no longer than a year, as there had been a recent change of teachers at Rowhill School, Gravesend and they needed time to get established in the post. This arrangement would be monitored. He then advised that the redundancies were voluntary.

3. RESOLVED that:

- a) The responses to comments and questions by Members be noted;
- b) the overall positive feedback on the consultation and support for the proposed devolution be noted;
- c) the proposed model as described in paragraph 2 of the report be noted;
- d) the implementation of the proposed staffing structure as outlined in paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 of the report be noted; and
- e) the “next steps” identified in paragraph 7 of the report be noted.

18. Commissioning Plan for Education Provision 2012-17

(Item C1)

(Verbal Update by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning and Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills)

(Mr D Adams, Area Education Officer was present for this item)

1. The Chairman invited the Corporate Director, Mr Leeson to introduce the report. He highlighted the following points:

- The principles of having the Commissioning Plan are:
 - Good quality school places
 - Good preferences for parents
 - Manage and process resources in an organisation and systematic way
 - Bring the data up to date to be able to project forward growth [it was predicted that there would be significant growth in numbers for school places from 2015-16 onwards.
 - A range of meetings to take place in the districts with schools. The data would not only be used for demographic information but to capture local issues.
 - The draft Plan would be revised and redrafted for the Autumn. The final plan would be more detailed in what was happening in each district.
 - The Plan would include issues on Early Years and about the development of provision in Special Educational Needs would feature stronger in the Plan in future.
 - The Plan would be reviewed annually to assist with forecasting Capital Funding and investment required.
 - The Education Cabinet Committee would receive regular update reports.

- a) Mr Cubitt advised that he attended a Gravesham Forum meeting for regarding the Commissioning Plan, which other Members of this Cabinet Committee attended. He asked that the following comments that were aired at that meeting be taken into consideration as part of the consultation comments for Gravesham:
- There was concern that there was an increase in faith schools Published Admission Number (PAN) and not in mainstream schools.
 - There was concern on the numbers were about primary schools and not secondary schools.
 - The Diocesan Boards should be the point of contact if we want changes to the PANs of Church schools.
 - It was considered that the data used was heavily bias towards birth rates. In Gravesend there were specific issues of migration fluctuation.
 - There was concern that the PAN being increased at St Botolph's Church of England School, Northfleet and Rowhill School for children with special needs, Northfleet would not answer the problems in Gravesend. There should be provision made in Ebbsfleet.
- b) Mr Christie added the following feedback from the Gravesham Forum:
- there were concerns regarding the final number of houses being built by Land Securities in the area. The agreed number was 350 but building had stopped at 330. It was hoped that Land Securities would build the school and that the school would have a less rigid admissions criteria.
- c) Mr Christie gave his opinion on the summary of responses received on the consultation that included the following:
- he did not agree with the comments on; page 52 regarding the "Equality Impact Assessment", page 61 Standards closures "Expansion of popular schools", and on page 62 "Sevenoaks Satellite".
 - In response Mr Adams referred to the comment on the Equality Impact Assessment that said that Kent was violating its duty. The issue of parent's preferences mentioned in the comment was a discussion to be had.
- d) It was highlighted that the district and local authority need to fill the school governor vacancies.
- e) A Member pointed out that the data from Health appeared to be two 2 years out of date. Mr Adams advised that the Public Health Observatory used data received form the General Practitioners. The difficulty with data was the interpretation around the data protection. The pin points were where the child lived, this information was now unavailable. It was now available at district level. Work had been undertaken with the University of Leeds on innovation forecasting ie if you have a number of children in a locality where did they go to school. What was masked was where they lived. The question to be answered was; do you expand where the schools are or where the children live.

f) Other issues to be considered where the skewed information on housing developments information, migration forecasts which were inherently out of date

g) In reply to whether there were to be expansions on FE colleges, Members were advised that this would be covered in the 14-24 Strategy which would feed into the Commissioning Plan.

2. Mr Leeson advised that there needed to be a balance between improving the schools and parents preferences. He also agreed to forward Mr Christie details on Land Securities in Gravesham.

3. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and questions made by Members and the report be noted, with thanks.

19. 14-24 Education Strategy

(Item C2)

(Verbal Update by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning and Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills)

1. The Chairman invited the Corporate Director of Education Learning and Skills, Mr Leeson, to introduce the report. Mr Leeson highlighted the following points:-

- The 14-24 Strategy would be published in the Autumn of 2012.
- The Strategy was driven by national policy with the aim of reducing the level of unemployment. It was expected that young people would not leave education before they were 18 years old. The development of vocational training, a network of provision in locality, significantly better work with employers would be undertaken through the use of the local employer network and the development of courses and pathways to take advantage of employment opportunities.
- The number of young people was a challenge. The number of NEETs had risen to 6% in Kent overall [10% in Thanet].
- The report outlines a summary of what the directorate will address in the future. This would be carried out with a strategic approach involving more partnerships including; schools, FE colleges, employers and Job Centre Plus.
- There had been a mismatch in vocational courses and jobs available. The aim was to give better advice guidance on local employers needs.
- Apprenticeships had moved from the portfolio of Customer and Communities Portfolio to Education Portfolio.

2. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:-

- a) A request was made for a "picture" of all the apprenticeship schemes.
- b) A suggestion was made that there should be a One Stop Shop for apprentices and employers and for the process to be made as simple as possible.

- c) A request was made that the skills/employment matching needed to be monitored. There needed to be planning on the capacity of people being trained in any one occupation.
- d) There should be focus on integrating support for young people with learning difficulties.
- e) A point of view was expressed that without the government being lobbied to support economic growth all of the targets would be undeliverable by 2015, which was 2 years following the general election.
- f) There was a view expressed that the targets were aspirational rather than realistic targets.
- g) A Member advised that in Dartford the school exclusion rate was exceptionally low and that they would be happy to share what they had learnt.
- h) A request was made for information on the University Technical Colleges.

3. Mr Leeson responded saying that the strategy was about delivery and where Kent wanted to be year on year. He did consider this aspirational giving the example of exclusions and Referral Units targets of zero tolerance on permanent exclusions, at present an alternative did not exist. There had to be positive alternatives.

4. Mr Leeson advised that Kent employers were saying that they cannot recruit in Kent because the skills do not exist and young people did not come with the right attitude. There was no employer that would employ a 16, 17 or 18 year old without learning/training or formal training certificate.

5. Responding to a comment, Mr Whiting added that this was not about electioneering it was about regeneration and creating growth, which the local authority could not do on its own, he gave the example of the lobbying of government for regeneration funding. Kent received £35 million.

6. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and questions by Members and the report be noted, with thanks.

20. Education Directorate/Portfolio Financial Outturn 2011/12

(Item D1)

(Verbal Update by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning, Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills, and Mr K Abbott, ELS Finance Business Partner)

(Mr S Pleace, Revenue Finance Manager was present for this item)

1. The Revenue Finance Manager, Mr Pleace, introduced the report and highlighted points that included the following:-

- This was the first finance report on the 2011/12 outturn.
- The ELS Directorate underspend was £2.8 million on the non delegated budget and £3.898 million underspend on the schools delegated budget which had been transferred to reserves. There was also a small underspend in Early years and Childcare Service of £0.718million.
- There were no revenue issues coming out of the 2011/12 outturn which were expected to impact in 2012/13, except for the saving on Home to

School transport which has been built into the 2012/15 Medium Term Financial Plan.

- For 2012/13 there are no revenue variance currently reported for the ELS portfolio.
- Mr Pleace made the Committee aware of a recommendation going to the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee that invited Members to set up a Budget IMG similar to previous years.

2. Members made comments and asked questions, points raised included:-

- a) In reply to a question, Mr Pleace advised that the schools were allowed to keep reserves from one year to the next. These were controlled by balance control mechanism that limits primary and special schools to 8% and secondary schools to 5%. Kent schools reserves currently total £37 million at 31 March 2012, of which £10 million was held for specific commitments. The £27 million held as uncommitted was for emergencies the school can not pay for from its annual budget. The Chairman advised that where the reserves were excessive there were "clawed back" arrangements made.
- b) A view was expressed that the contracts cost for Home to School transported were too costly.

3. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted, with thanks.

21. Education, Learning and Skills Performance Scorecard

(Item D2)

(Report by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning, Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills)

(Mrs M White, Strategic Business Adviser and Mrs S Rogers, Director Quality and Standards were present for this item)

1. The Strategic Business Adviser, Mrs White gave a brief introduction to the report and highlighted the following points:

- This was the first stage of the development for Members of this Committee to review the performance framework against the targets set out in the Bold Steps for Education.
- Members' comments on how accessible they found the Framework were sought and whether there were any issues that were not in the document that they wished to monitor.
- In parallel to the development of the ELS score card, work had been undertaken to produce score cards for the 12 District Councils, which were being consulted through District Headteacher meetings. The aim of this was to show the variances in performance within the districts across the range of indicators.

2. Mrs Rogers explained that the schools were collaborating by producing action plans. Funding would not be released until those effective action plans were

produced. The score cards would be monitored at the Board meetings which would be attended by Members of the Directorate.

3. Members were given the opportunities to make comments and ask questions which included the following:-

- a) Members needed time to study the document to identify what had not been included in the Performance Framework.
- b) Clarification was sought on the percentage of Statements that had been issued in Kent, Mrs Rogers advised that this was a rolling total and therefore was not the final percentage. A request was made for a report on the gap in attainment between LAC and Free school meals.
- c) Members were reminded of the Member Monitoring Group that looked at the schools' attainment in detail.

4. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and questions by Members and the report be noted.

22. Business Plan Outturn Monitoring 2011/12

(Item D3)

(Report by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning, Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills)

(Mrs M White, Strategic Business Adviser and Mrs S Rogers, Director Quality and Standards were present for this item)

1. The Chairman invited the Director Quality and Standards, Mrs Rogers to introduce the report. Mrs Rogers highlighted the following points:

- The report sets out the outturn for 2011 report that was written before Bold Steps for Kent and when the Directorate was "Children Families and Education" before the Directorate was restructured.
- The priority areas of action had been taken through to the new Education, Learning and Skills Directorate. In the majority of cases most activity and priorities had been delivered. Where they had not been delivered was due to; in some cases, government funded initiatives no longer existed and in others, where action had not been completed, they would have been taken into the current Business Plans.

2. Members made the following points:

- a) A request was made for comparisons with neighbouring local authorities. In response Mrs Rogers advised that there was not a table available nationally that shows a comparative with our statistical neighbours. Mrs Rogers had spoken with the DfE through Kent's local advisor and they were very unwilling to release the numbers of schools below floor level.

b) In reply to a question, Mr Whiting advised that the list referred to at County Council question time was a list produced by gathering information from all the counties websites, which took some time to compile. There was an average figure from across the country. Mrs Rogers explained that she met with the South East Directors where there was agreement to share information. Information would be collated in September and that information would be shared with Members.

3. RESOLVED that the responses to the comments and questions made by Members and the report be noted, with thanks.

23. Ofsted Inspection Outcomes)

(Item D4)

(Report by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning, Skills and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills)

(Mrs S Rogers, Director Quality and Standards were present for this item)

1. Mrs Rogers introduced the report advising that there had been 80 schools inspected since January 2012 under the new Ofsted Inspection Framework. There were major challenges for schools. The breakdown of this was:

- 62 Primary schools
- 11 Secondary schools
- 3 Special Schools
- 4 Pupil Referral Units

The Ofsted Inspection judgements were as follows:

- One school was judged to be outstanding
- 37 schools were judged to be good and
- 30 schools were judged to be satisfactory [this included a small number of schools that declined from a previous good judgement]. The Judgement of satisfactory was due to be changed to "Requiring Improvement".
- 12 schools were judged inadequate
- A number of schools improved from satisfactory to good
- 56 schools were going into the Ofsted category and
- A number of schools were at risk of reaching a satisfactory judgement.

2. Mrs Roger explained that the schools that reached an Ofsted judgement of outstanding was a slow process moving from good to outstanding. There were appeals on 3 judgements which were not upheld. There was also an issue of the conduct of the Inspectors being pursued.

3. Mrs Rogers also mentioned that since the introduction of the new Ofsted Inspection Framework, that had higher expectations for teaching quality and achievement, the programme "Every Lesson Counts" had been extremely successful tracking the progress in schools. There were still problems in attracting the quality of teaching staff in areas of deprivation and more support needed to be offered to the school governors to challenge the leadership in their schools.

4. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:-

- a) In reply to a question, Mrs Rogers advised that there was no data to compare Kent with its neighbouring local authorities. There was an interim review in March/April 2012 that showed too many schools were declining.
- b) Members congratulated officers on the work of "Kent Challenge". The Chairman concurred and requested a report that sets out the impact of Kent Challenge against Ofsted Inspections to be submitted at the next meeting.

5. RESOLVED that:

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members and the report be noted; and
- b) a report setting out the impact of Kent Challenge against Ofsted Inspections to be submitted at the next meeting of this Cabinet Committee.