

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 Wednesday, 21 November 2012.

PRESENT: Mr G Cooke (Chairman), Mr L B Ridings, MBE (Vice-Chairman), Mr A R Chell, Mrs P T Cole, Mr H J Craske, Mr L Christie, Mr J M Cubitt, Mr J A Davies, Mr R J Parry, Mr K Smith, Mr R Tolputt and Mr M J Vye

ALSO PRESENT: Mr M J Whiting and Mr P B Carter

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr P Leeson (Corporate Director Education, Learning and Skills Directorate), Mr K Abbott (Finance Business Partner, ELS Directorate), Mr D Adams (Area Education Officer - Mid kent), Ms S Dunn (Head of Skills and Employability), Mrs Rogers (Director, Quality and Standards), Mrs M White (Area Education Officer - East Kent), Mrs Kitto (Customer Care Manager), Mrs Nolan (Manager - Early Years Childcare) and Mrs C A Singh (Democratic Services Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

37. Future Meeting dates for 2013

(Item A4)

RESOLVED that the Education Cabinet Committee meeting dates for 2013 be noted as follows:

Friday, 18 January
Tuesday, 19 March
Friday, 21 June

Friday, 27 September
Wednesday, 20 November

(All Meetings will commence at 10.00am)

38. Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2012

(Item A5)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

39. Verbal Update by Cabinet Member and Corporate Director

(Item A6)

(Report by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member for Education, Learning and Skills (ELS) and Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director for 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 the following:

- *Academies* - 100 Kent schools had now converted to academy status and a further 25 schools were in the process of converting.
- *Kent Test* - Work was progressing on the Kent Test Consultations. Earlier this year a review of the Kent Test was carried out by Headteachers at the request of the Cabinet Member for ELS. A range of proposals had come forward that may form the basis for change. KCC would be consulting with schools in Kent and with neighbouring authorities shortly before a formal tendering process for delivering any new testing arrangements. The successful company would supply the Kent testing material to those students sitting the test in September 2014. Further information would be provided to the Cabinet Committee as the procurement process continued.
- *Commissioning Plan* – The Cabinet Member for ELS had written to the District Leaders to request that Locality Boards and Member Panels to take an active interest in reviewing that part of the Commissioning Plan pertaining to their district to gain vital local knowledge to meet the needs of the locality. KCC had published the first reiteration of the Kent Commissioning Plan for Education. It was planned that the Commissioning Plan be reviewed every 6 months and updated fully and reissued each October. The progress of the meetings in the districts and Locality Boards would be reported back to this Cabinet Committee. The first meeting would be held with Sevenoaks District Council.
- *Kent Special Educational Needs Strategy* – Work was being carried out to produce a new Kent SEN Strategy and this would be submitted to this Cabinet Committee in the Spring of 2013. The Kent SEN Strategy was timely as KCC faced an increase in referrals for special provision and funding for places in independent schools. The aim was to look where capacity could be created in Kent schools through commissioning additional special school places. The new SEN Code of Practise was expected shortly following the publication of the government's green paper in 2011.
- *Kent Schools Admission Codes* – The Admissions Codes for Primary and Secondary schools for September 2014 were going out for consultation next week. The Cabinet Member would welcome comments from Members and all sections of the community during the consultation.

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

- *Ofsted Inspections* – [Since September 2012 a revised Ofsted inspection Framework was implemented]. 22 schools in Kent had been inspected, 17 primary and 3 secondary, 1 special school and 1 Pupil Referral Unit. Only 56% of Kent's primary schools were good or outstanding, which needed to improve significantly for the future. Approximately 70% of secondary schools were good or outstanding. Nearly all special schools were judged to be good or outstanding and approximately half of the Pupil Referral Units were good or outstanding. Recent inspections show a good improvement rate from what was called "satisfactory" [now called "requiring improvement"] to good.
- Of the 17 primary schools that were inspected since September; 10 were rated as "good schools, 5 were judged as requiring improvement and 2 were placed in special measures. The 3 secondary schools

inspected under the Pupil Referral Unit improved from satisfactory to be judged as good. The special school inspection was also judged as a good school. Mr Leeson said that this was a good trend of schools moving from satisfactory to being good schools. He explained that the journey from “requiring improvement” to being judged a good school had happened with the schools working with KCC. This had been achieved through a range of training opportunities being offered to schools on the new Inspection Framework used by Ofsted. Also the quality of teaching had been improved and was consistent. The schools were tracking and monitoring their pupils’ progress to demonstrate to Ofsted, when being inspected, the progress being made by their pupils. This would continue to be monitored and reported back to this Cabinet Committee on a regular basis.

- *“Closing achievement Gaps” and the use of the Pupil Premium* - The Pupil Premium was worth over £80 million, which was £18 million worth of additional funding going to schools to support strategies to raise attainment of under achieving pupils. There would be more money for those schools with significant pupils receiving free school meals or Children in Care. Mr Leeson advised that all schools were aware that to be judged a good school they had to show evidence of closing those gaps and of making a difference to the progress rates for pupils who were eligible for free school meals and Children in Care. In Kent the picture was encouraging there was a continuing closing of the gap at foundation stage, which was important and had been closing progressively for 5-6 years and was well below the national attainment gap for 5 year olds, when assessed against the Early Years Foundation stage profile. In 2012, the gap in Kent was 24% between the bottom 20% and other children aged 5 years, compared to the national gap of 30%. The outcomes overall for Foundation Stage in Kent were well above the national average. Kent was doing well against the national picture to establish the early foundations of learning. A detailed report would be submitted to the 18 January meeting.
- *Key Stage 1(KS1)* - There was a narrowing of the gap at level 2 and above at KS1 in 2012. Kent was still above the national average figure or wider than the national gap at KS1. The gaps became wider as the children got older if the right strategies were not employed. KCC had to do all that it could to ensure that that gap was minimised and decreased over time.
- *Key Stage 2 (KS2)* – There was a significant narrowing of the gap at KS2 in 2012. The national gap at KS2 was 20% between level 4 outcomes in English and Maths for pupils on free school meals and other pupils. In Kent that had narrowed to 22%, close to the national gap. Kent needed to ensure that it was less than the national gap, meaning that Kent would be able to say that Kent was doing better for children in Kent on free school meals than was the case nationally. In 2012 the gap has narrowed from 27% in 2011 to 22% in 2012, which Mr Leeson considered a significant reduction in the gap overall for Kent at KS2. This was the result of a number of focussed pieces of work in most schools in Kent using nationally recognised tools including the Sutton Trust Learning that helped schools to understand what the most effective strategies were for narrowing gaps between groups of pupils. Those strategies included focused teaching in small groups, one to one

support, a determination to focus on literacy, good assessment practise with good monitoring and tracking of progress in schools which helped the schools to know better what was happening for different pupils and what more could be done for them to support their progress.

- *Key Stage 4 (KS4)* - The gap at KS4 remained very wide and had barely move in 2012. At KS4 the national gap at GCSE including English and maths was 27%. In Kent it was 33%. Mr Leeson said that this was a clear concern. Looking at the reduction in that gap by district most districts in Kent had reduced the gap. Although it was patchy there were significant issues in some places and in certain schools but overall there was an encouraging reduction in the free school meals gap at KS4 in a number of districts in Kent and in a great number of schools.
- Every school had to publish on its website what it was doing with the Pupil Premium (PP) and Kent schools were doing that. A number of discussions had taken place with Headteachers on how the PP was being used and encouraging them to share their most effective practises in the way in which they were using the PP. Officers in the School Improvement Service were doing all they could to ensure that the schools were using things like the Sutton Trust Learning Tool Kit that was recognised nationally as a way of focusing schools on the most high impact but low cost strategies in order to effect a greater closing of the gap. Mr Leeson advised that a detailed report would be submitted to the 18 January meeting.
- Mr Leeson advised that there was significant catch up work being undertaken by the secondary schools to ensure that those pupils that started secondary school with achievement below level 4 that their needs were addressed, that the catch up was effectively tackled and many secondary schools could point to significant increases and accelerated rates of progress for pupils in years 7 and 8. Those secondary schools to focus on those particular progress rates for those pupils in order to accelerate them further.

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

- a) In response to a question regarding siblings, Mr Leeson advised that there was a National Admissions Code that KCC had to abide by. One of the priorities in the Code was that siblings were given priority in the admission to school. However, there was also local discretion given on distance travelled to school and those change overtime depending on what was happening with local demography and travel patterns to the school etc. Those were issues that could be looked at during a local review but the local authority had to abide by the Admissions Code.
- b) In reply to a question, Mr Leeson advised that of those schools that had already converted to academy status; 69 were secondary schools and 31 were primary schools. 27 primary schools were in the process of converting to academy status. Mr Leeson agreed to supply a list of those schools converting to academy status.
- c) In response to a question, Mr Leeson advised that the improvements Kent was seeing in standards across primary and secondary schools was the result of a systematic, clearly thought out,

well targeted, School Improvement Strategy for Kent. The services were being effective about change, supporting schools to focus on the right strategies to improve teaching and pupil progress and the kind of school leadership that needed to be in place in order to bring that about. The Strategy was considered to be challenging in the right way; about best practise, expectations and the most effective kind of school leadership needed in all schools to bring around educational outcomes. He considered that it was about improving progress for every pupil in every school.

- d) In reply to a comment, Mr Leeson agreed to investigate whether some Kent schools had increase their Published Admission Number in the recently published School Admissions Code book before the consultations had been completed and the decisions taken.
- e) Members welcomed the 6 monthly review of the Commissioning Plan.
- f) In response to a request, Mr Leeson agreed to provide information to the Cabinet Committee on the number of apprenticeships and data on the destinations of apprentices on a regular basis. The Leader of the County Council, Mr Carter, added that a time limited Select Committee was due to be set up to look at the outcomes of apprenticeships.
- g) Concern was raised on the cost of school converting to academy status. Members were advised that nationally the County Councils could not recoup the money paid out to convert a school. The school received £25 000 to convert. KCC continued to protest about the considerable cost regarding the property, staffing and budget to the Secretary of State.
- h) In reply to a question, Mr Leeson advised that there were County Councillors who sat on academies governing boards. He agreed to forward a list of those Members outside of the meeting. Mr Leeson also agreed to circulate the list of academies that KCC was co sponsor for.
- i) In response to a request, Mr Whiting agreed to submit a report to the 18 January meeting of this Cabinet Committee on the proposals for the Kent Test.
- j) In reply to a question, Mr Leeson advised that there was data to prove that there was no correlation between the state of a school building and the quality of learning. Overall it was the quality of teaching which was key and this could not be achieved without good leadership and attention to the individual pupils. Evidence on what accelerates progress for pupils was to be shared.

4. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and requests by Members and the verbal updates be noted.

40. Decision 12/01977 - Amalgamation of Walmer Science College (community School) and Castle Community College (Academy)
(Item B1)

(Report 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, Mr Leeson to introduce the report. Points raised included the following:-

- Since 2009 the governing bodies wished to amalgamate the schools but the proposals were put into abeyance with the withdrawal of the programme, Building Schools for the Future.
- The projected number of pupils would not sustain two schools.
- The two governing bodies want to assure a better quality of school that was viable and secure to improve outcomes.
- This report provided the results of the consultation regarding the proposal from the governing bodies of Walmer Science College and Castle Community College, together with KCC to bring together the schools to form one secondary school which would be an academy.

2. The Chairman gave Mr Ridings the opportunity to speak.

- a) Mr Ridings advised that he chaired both public consultation meetings. The first was at Walmer Science College and the second at Castle Community College. At both meetings there was an audience of over 150 people in attendance. There were 4 clear factors that were raised; (i) the quality of education and making sure the pupils had the opportunity to meet their plans for options at year 9 and year 11, (ii) there was concern with the original forecast of the number of pupils in the schools; (iii) there were concerns on what would happen to the Walmer site and how the facilities would be use in the future, in particular for the 6th Form which had gone well, the Maritime Section and Adult Education, if it continued to go well; and (iv) Staff at Walmer considered that Castle Community College staff would receive precedence. Mr Ridings considered that schools that were too small did not provide the breath of education necessary for pupils to achieve their future plans. As a governor of academies, he advised that where they were small they struggled to attract the right number of pupils for the future to provide the teacher base and requisite scope of education for the pupils. He expressed his concerns on the number of redundancies which he had seen in small schools because of the inability to attract pupils.
- b) Mr Ridings advised that the rolls between the two schools had remained static over the past 5 years and there was no sign of any significant increases or decreases. Looking at Castle Community and Walmer Science schools combined there was little difference over the 5 years.
- c) Referring to Primary numbers in Deal. Mr Ridings stated that in 2011/12 there were 310 pupils in reception. In 2016/17 the forecast was 256 pupils in reception. Beyond 2016 there was a small increase in the number of students but not sufficient in his opinion, there would still be surplus capacity.
- d) Referring to Secondary school pupil roll in Dover in 2011/12 and advised that there were 1183 pupils [234 surplus places] that increased in 2016/17 to 1319 pupils [74 surplus places]. He considered that some of this increase would be due to new housing. Pupil forecasting indicates 25 to 30 new pupils in Primary schools for every 100 houses and for Secondary School a few less at 25+ pupils.

- e) Mr Ridings advised that the building programme for Dover was behind schedule. If the situation changed dramatically KCC would look at this closely. Currently there were 6000 new houses in Whitfield and 1100 in Aylesham.
- f) Mr Ridings concluded that the Walmer site should be retained for educational purposes. This was being protected through a short term lease to Castle from KCC. It would be impossible to predict what the situation would be in 5 years time but if the Walmer site was used properly for educational purposes that would remain and the best that could be done is to ensure the quality of education from the Maritime section and Adult education and 6th Form is maintained.
- g) There was a question regarding staffing. There were a lot of comments regarding there not being a level playing field with the staffing at Walmer Science College and the staffing at Castle Community College. Mr Ridings gave his assurance that every attempt would be made to ensure that there was a level playing field subject to any legal constraints.

3. Mr Ridings moved the recommendation, seconded by Mr Craske, that Walmer Science College (Community School) and Castle Community College (Academy) be amalgamated to form one school for the Walmer and Deal Community, which would be an academy.

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

- a) The issues raised throughout the consultation need to be address regarding the numbers quoted and whether the Walmer site would be retained. Mr Leeson explained that the numbers referred to in the consultation were accurate and that there had been a further reduction in the schools' roll. A case can be made on the numbers alone they were not sufficient for the schools to be viable. Mr Whiting added that the numbers in the Commissioning Plan looked at the Dover area as a whole. He referred to Hornbeam Primary which was an amalgamation of 2 schools Hornbeam Primary had been asked to take an additional form of entry in the particular bulge year either side of that remained flat. During that bulge year KCC looked at the housing developments and looked at the Primary schools there was no sign looking at the birth rate that this was an increasing trend. The figures dipped again.
- b) The Cabinet Member advised that he was present to listen to the Cabinet Committees comments on the future of the 2 schools. The decision on the Walmer site would form part of a separate decision that would be taken at a later date.
- c) A Member commented that the 2 schools worked together using the Walmer site for the joint 6th Form.
- d) A Member raised concerns that included (a) the Cabinet Committee process did not give Members the opportunity to question the Chairman of Governors, (b) Figures should have been included in the report for the district as well as the comments provided; and (c) that a new name be given to the new school in consultation with the pupils and parents as referred to by local Member, Mrs Rook, on page 15 of the report. The Chairman reminded Members that the Education Cabinet Committee had a similar advisory function as the former School

Organisation Advisory Board and the scrutiny function was solely with the Scrutiny Committee therefore it was unable to call in witnesses.

- e) The Local Member for Deal, Mr Smith was given the opportunity to speak. Mr Smith stated that the focus was about the pupils of Walmer and Deal. He considered that the decision regarding the schools should have been made earlier. He stated that there had been a huge response to the consultation and he was grateful to those that took the time to respond. He had spent many hours on this proposal. He did this by meeting people face to face, meetings with the district and with the Walmer Science Group, through phone calls and speaking with people in the street. He concluded that there were three issues, (i) Site – There was a reassurance that if the site was prospering in 3 years time it would carry on with; adult education, a 6th Form and Maritime. (ii) Maritime Section – Princess Anne opened. This needed to be nurtured. (iii) Student numbers are at the heart of the issue. Any project can not be 100%. The direction of travel was toward an amalgamation. The question was “Were there enough pupils coming through?” The answer was within whether the birth rate, housing development, immigration and new jobs would produce more students. He considered that this would produce some more students but not enough. He said that he could not put the pupils’ future at risk and was certain that the amalgamation of the 2 schools was right for the future. He hoped that the passion, of those who took part in the consultation, would go into the rebuilding of the schooling in Walmer and Deal.

5. The Cabinet Member, Mr Whiting, thanked the parents, local Members and the Cabinet Committee for their comments which he would consider when making his decision on the proposal to amalgamate Walmer Science College and Castle Community College.

6. The Chairman asked the Cabinet Committee to vote on the recommendation, which was unanimous.

7. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted;
- b) the responses to the public consultation be noted; and
- c) the Cabinet Committee endorses the decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Education, Learning and Skills to; (1) Merge Walmer Science College and Castle Community College to form one Academy from September 2013 (2) Issue a Public Notice to close Walmer Science College with effect from 31 August, conditional upon the Secretary of State’s agreement to the enlargement of Castle Community College, (3) the Walmer site be retained for education purposes at least in the short term on a lease. (4) There is a level playing field for teacher recruitment in the newly merged school; and (5) that there be a new name for the school and a new uniform funded by the school.

41. Decision 12/01976 - Proposed expansion of St John's CEPS, Maidstone
(Item B2)

(Report 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)

8. Mr Adams then gave an update on the figures in the report and a broad indication on the comments given in the consultation which included the following:-

- 99 respondents were in favour.
- Those in favour were saying that there was a need for additional capacity in the locality. There was a need for further local schools places for children to come into. There was also positive affirmation for the work that the school undertook and the ability of the school to be able to manage an expansion.
- 30 respondents were undecided about the proposals.
- 102 respondents were opposed the proposal.
- Those that were in opposition to the proposals predominantly had concerns about; traffic congestion in the locality, the disruption when the building works took place. Concerns by some were that St John's Church of England Primary School was currently a small school and enlarging the school would lose its family feel. Some commented that there was a pressure to increase capacity this year and did not support the local authority's view that there would be pressures in the future and perhaps this was an overreaction to the problem.
- Work had been carried out regarding the issue of traffic congestion with the Highways Authority as part of the early planning process. At this time the preference was to create an in out drop off area within the school, which would reduce the traffic outside the school. A fundamental aspect of this proposal was to ensure that the children of this community did not have to be schooled outside that community. When an analysis was carried out, which was reported to County Council in July, there were 404 children within the community that were in the St John's Church of England Primary School catchment area, only 178 of those children were able to attend St John's, which was equivalent to more than 50% of the children travelling outside the community to attend school. This proposal would potentially enable more children to walk to school and produce capacity in other schools which those children would otherwise have attended. St John's Church of England Primary School had a Platinum Award for its Travel Plan and was doing a great deal to reduce traffic congestion. With regard to the management of the build KCC was very experienced in managing this and would work closely with the school and local residents to ensure there was minimal disruption.
- The governing body of St John's Church of England Primary School had confirmed that it wished to proceed with the expansion proposal. KCC had reached agreement with them on the nature of accommodation. A legal agreement had been drafted, which would ensure that both parties would honour the commitments made, should the proposal go ahead.

- Assuming that there was a positive decision from KCC to mirror that of the governing body, the governing body would need to submit a business case to the Education Funding Agency. The Agency would then make a recommendation to the Secretary of State, who then made the final decision on whether he was willing to enter into a new funding agreement with the academy for a larger provision [This was all still conditional on this decision].
- 300 documents were distributed and received 231 responses.

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

- a) In reply to a question, Mr Leeson explained that when the local authority requests the academy to expand the local authority was expected to support the expansion through the basic need funding.
- b) In reply to a question, Mr Adams advised that St John's Church of England Primary School had 2 elements to its oversubscription criteria. The first was; priority was given to practising Members of 3 named churches. The second was; the residence within a defined geographical area which was bordered by Ware Street, nr Notcutts, New Cut Road and along the Ashford Road running up through the railway line between Grove Green and Bearsted. Currently the school can only take from 0.83 miles, which was only half of the Grove Green area. This expansion would mean the school would expand more by its geographical intake than its Church intake.

10. The Chairman asked the Cabinet Committee to vote on the recommendation. Mr Christie abstained, all other Members present voted for.

11. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- b) the Education Cabinet Committee endorsed the decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Education, Learning and Skills to release capital funding to enable the permanent expansion, by one form of entry, of St John's Church of England School.

42. Decision 12/01982 - Early Years Paediatric First Aid Approval

(Item B3)

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

RESOLVED that the Education Cabinet Committee endorses the decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Education, Learning and Skills that Kent County Council adopts option (C), by introducing a full approval system for training providers to not only fully safeguard children being looked after by professionals expected to deliver first aid, but also protect the council from legal challenge from providers.

43. Decision 12/01963 - DfE School Funding Reforms for April 2013

(Item B4)

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

(Mr K Abbott Director, School Resources and ELS Finance Business Partner was present for this item)

12. The Chairman invited the Corporate Director, Mr Leeson to introduce the report. He advised that there were significant changes proposed for school funding that had important implications for the future potential for a wider variation in the levels of funding available to Kent schools. The effect of the government's proposals and create significant challenges to KCC on how it funds these pupil places, mainly pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and those that attend Pupil Referral Units (PRUs).

13. Mr Abbott advised that the changes were the most significant since Local Management was introduced for schools over 20 years ago. The changes being introduced would remove a lot of local discretion and was a concern for KCC, Kent schools and academies. The concerns were included in the responses to three separate consultations that took place last year and this year regarding the changes that had to be implemented from April 2013.

14. Mr Abbott explained the that there were three parts to the changes as follows:

(1) Simplification of the Primary and Secondary Schools Formula. Nationally, local authorities would be restricted to no more that 12 factors, KCC currently used 21 factors. Among the key changes were premises factors. KCC currently distributed £44 million to schools and to academies by looking at floor area and using a condition survey. This would no longer be allowed. Some specific parts of KCC formula came through a local need and the funding was targeting specifically; supporting traveller children and those schools that were specifically supporting services families. This was not sustained in the new model formula as from April 2013. The Deprivation Funding, which was put out though KCC funding using Mosaic would no longer be allowed. KCC would have the choice of using either Free School Meals data, or Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI), which was considered better than the Free School Meals data but did not target the deprivation of funding as well as MOSAIC, which would create turbulence.

(2) Further delegation of the dedicated schools grant budgets as specified by the Secretary of State. This was welcomed as it would bring to an end the vex issue of the academy top up. Discussions had taken place with the Funding Forum and there was an agreed way forward. There were a number of budgets that the Secretary of State had decided to freeze at the current budget levels. This meant that there would be issues on the way that the budgets were managed.

(3) The reform of the funding for SEN [pupils in special schools, mainstream schools SEN Units, PRUs and other settings]. This area caused most concern. This would be a completely different approach and the funding for the high needs pupils would comprise 3 elements; (1) and (2) a core and support element, which gives the school a guaranteed £10k; and (3) the top up which could range from £80,000 for a place in

a residential special school or £100 to £200 in a mainstream school. There was still work to be carried on this. Other changes that come with this included; SEN recoupment, KCC was still recovering funding from other authorities' whose children were placed in Kent's Special Schools. This would be removed and it would be up to the individual schools to recoup the money from the placing local authority. Another concern was the core and support funding at £10,000 per annum. The top up funding had to be moved in real time. This built in instability, especially for schools with built up funds. The movement of one or two pupils and the funding then being taken away the following month would have a big impact because the school would not be able to reduce its cost in terms of staffing in that time scale. This would have an impact on all schools. Cash flows would be impacted with money going in and out of the school on a monthly basis and trying to recoup money from other local authorities. The impact for KCC would be dealing with individual schools rather than a local authority.

15. Mr Abbott advised that KCC Officers had been working with a Working Group of Headteachers looking at transitional arrangements, as these changes would take place mid term, to get schools through next year.

16. Throughout the formula changes whilst the minimum funding remained in place at minus 1.5% per pupil next year and the year after, there were no guarantees beyond that on what may happen with the funding guarantee. The schools had been asked to look at the long term consequences of these changes. Models had been given to the schools in September 2012 to aid their projections for their budgets in the medium term as all of the changes unwind.

17. Mr Abbott advised that a decision would be submitted to Cabinet on 3 December 2012 seeking formal approval on whether KCC used Free School Meals data, or Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI), accompanied by the work from the Working Group of Headteachers on High Needs Funding.

18. Members made comments and asked questions that included the following:

- a) In reply to a question, Mr Leeson agreed to advise Members outside the meeting on whether the School Admissions Code would be changed to give priority to children in service families.
- b) In response to a question, Mr Abbott advised that formally the 3 consultations had finished. The last consultation closed in September and Kent responded to those robustly. There was a letter to be sent to the DfE with the significant concerns Kent had on the consequences of the changes to the school formula for Kent schools' budgets. The report highlights the directed changes made by the DfE and there was little scope to do anything different. The only areas where there was a choice of using either IDACI or Free schools Meals data for deprivation funding and how we deal with pupil growth, all of which had to be implemented in April 2013.
- c) Mr Christie suggested that the Cabinet be recommended to endorse the decision to lobby the government on Kent's concerns on the changes to the school formula.

19. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to the comments and questions made by Members be noted;
- b) the Education Cabinet Committee recommends that the Cabinet endorses the decision of the Education, Learning and Skills Directorate to lobby the government on Kent's concerns on the changes to the school formula; and
- c) the Education Cabinet Committee endorses the decision to be taken by the Cabinet to change the school formula as set out in the report.

44. Decision 12/01897 - Draft 14-24 Learning, Employment & Skills Strategy
(Item B5)

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

(Ms S Dunn, Head of Skills and Employability, was present for this item)

20. The Chairman invited the Corporate Director, Mr Leeson to introduce the report. Points raised included the following:-

- Members considered the draft 14 -24 Strategy at its meeting on 12 October.
- The Cabinet Committees comments were incorporated to the draft strategy and the consultation was launched on 11 October.
- The report updated Members on the responses from the consultation.
- Broadly the Strategy was welcomed. There was an expectation that the targets could be reduced.
- The success of the strategy depended on the partnership working of KCC, Kent schools, colleges; work based learning providers, employers and other stakeholders such as Job Centre Plus. There was a strong response to developing more local partnership arrangements as a way of delivering this Strategy.
- Respondents were clear that the local authority should strengthen the way it carried out certain functions set out in the strategy including; the local authorities role in strategic mapping linked to employers needs, doing more to help employers to employ and offer apprenticeships by having a matching service and actively encouraging apprenticeships across KCC and Kent Schools.
- There was concern in the responses to the strategy that the local authority supports the more vulnerable groups of young people. This required clear links on what we do for vulnerable adolescents.
- A pilot was being held on integrating business support services for districts in Kent, which was designed to provide a more targeted support for vulnerable young people to keep them on track and help to keep them in the system to help provide opportunities that would enable them to continue to engage, to ensure better pathways for them.

- There was strong support for the work in the strategy on apprenticeships and a recognition that the positive trends need to continue.

21. Mr Leeson explained that the draft Strategy that was considered by Members on 12 October required little changing it as it had the right priorities and was going in the right directions and was generally well received by Kent's partners and stakeholders. The Strategy would have some additional clarifications added in some sections before it was submitted to the Cabinet Committee on 3 December 2012.

22. The Chairman invited Ms Dunn to speak on the report. Ms Dunn explained that the Strategy was a different approach in looking at the continuum of education to employment and high level of learning. This was not an area that the local authority had focused on in this way before. There were significant changes to the post 16 funding arrangements which included the introduction of the destination measure for schools, colleges and work base learning providers at 18 years, to declare where young people move onto following their full time education. The 14-24 Strategy underpinned the national changes. Kent now had to look at the implementation of the Strategy to produce the outcomes for local young people.

23. The Chairman stated that from the figures provided to the Cabinet Committee, Kent was a lead in this area nationally. The Committee thanked Ms Dunn and her Team for all of the work undertaken.

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

- a) In reply to questions, Ms Dunn advised that the University Technology College Programme was an academy for 14-19 year olds. Its focus was predominately for pupils that could achieve level 2 in English and maths. There was a proposal to open a UTC in conjunction with Leigh Academy, North West Kent College and Greenwich University in Dartford. KCC supported the principles of the UTC but would need to monitor those developments to consider whether the UTC was the best and appropriate way to deliver those programmes in Kent and whether separate schools needed to be developed to achieve that programme.
- b) In terms of travel, the post 16+ travel pass was developed and Kent was due to carry out an evaluation of that form with a group of Head teachers from the FE sector. The outcome of this would be brought back to a future meeting of this Cabinet Committee.
- c) Ms Dunn advised that work was being carried out regarding all young people in vulnerable groups but there was particular concern with NEET young parents. It was considered that there was urgent and considered work that needed to be carried out on this vulnerable group. Ms Dunn explained that NEET young parents were able to access a grant called "Care To Learn" and Kent had the lowest uptake of that additional finance to support those young people to go back into learning.

- d) In reply to questions, Ms Dunn explained that the government was leaving the legislation open as a permissive piece of legislation on young people continuing learning and training post 16. The Government Department would monitor whether this worked. If it did not work there would be consideration given to sanctions. Through the Raising Participation Pilot, KCC was supporting young people to make positive choices at the age of 16 years that would enable them to progress to higher levels of learning or employment. It was hoped that the young people would not need that sanction if their pathways were clear from 14 to 19 years. Ms Dunn stated that there was a misunderstanding this was not about raising the school leaving age. It was about engaging young people in skills training or apprenticeships or employment training up to 18 years.
- e) A Member suggested that the Locality Boards could be tasked with looking at the issues in their areas.
- f) In reply to a comment, Ms Dunn agreed to keep Local Members informed on any changes to the Vocational Centres in their electoral division.

25. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted ; and
- b) the interim responses to the consultation prior to Cabinet considering the final version of the 14 -24 Learning and Employment and Skills Strategy be noted.

45. Education, Learning and Skills Performance Scorecard

(Item C1)

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

(Mrs S Rogers, Director, Education Quality and Standards was present for this Item)

1. The Chairman invited Mrs Rogers to introduce the report. Mrs Rogers highlighted that in parallel to the development of the ELS Scorecard, work had been undertaken to produce twelve District Scorecards which were consulted on through the last two meetings of the District Headteachers. This had been helpful to Headteachers in understanding their District and creating valuable collaborations.
2. Mr Leeson explained that this report included all of the Bold Steps Targets that were in the Strategic Plans for Education Learning and Skills in which to monitor progress.
3. Members raised the following points:-
 - a) A Member raised the following concerns and asked questions on the indicators with red RAG status including; (1) the large number of areas with persistently absent primary and secondary pupils, (2) Was CAM

involved in the percentage of statements of Special Education Needs being issued in the correct timescale? (3) There were no statistical neighbouring averages or national averages quoted and (4) Were resources being directed to pupils from ethnic minorities with no English, in particular, Dartford and Gravesham?

- b) In response to (1), Mrs Rogers advised that the Head of Inclusion was looking at this carefully and ensuring that resources are directed to those particularly red areas. In the collaboration plans received, a number of collaboratives had highlighted attendance as a major area for development as a group of school to identify what they could do together to improve the situation.
 - c) In response to (2) Mrs Rogers advised that the newly appointed Head of SEN, Julie Ely, submitted a report to the Performance Evaluation Board that looked at the issue of Kent not receiving statements within the 26 weeks as it should. One of the reasons for the delay in the preparation of the Statements was the involvement of Health in the production of the Statements. Discussions with Health would need to take place to overcome this. It was a top priority to resolve the delay.
 - d) In reply to (3) Mrs Rogers explained that the national indicator on Ofsted category was nationally 2.6-2.7% and Kent was above the national average at 3.4-3.5%. There was no comparison with the neighbouring authorities but there had been an increase across the country generally of schools going into an Ofsted category. Mrs Rogers agreed to submit this information to a future meeting.
 - e) In reply to (4) Mrs Rogers advised that My Child at School (MCAS), a bought back service, would need to look at how much time they were supporting the schools in Dartford and Gravesham. Some schools with high levels of English as an Additional Language (EAL) were often performing well and it was not the EAL groups that were causing significant problems it was often other vulnerable groups in the school.
 - f) A Member commented that it was good to see the links that had been made with education and employability in the education report.
4. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and questions by Members and the current performance indicated in the ELS performance management framework be noted.

46. Education Learning and Skills - Annual Complaints report 2011/12

(Item C2)

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

(Ms A Kitto, Customer Care Manager, was present for this Item)

1. The Cabinet Committee considered a report that provided information on the complaints and representations received in 2011/12 about the services provided by the Education, Learning and Skills Directorate.

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

- a) In reply to a question, Ms Kitto advised that one of the ways to judge whether complainants were satisfied with the outcomes of their complaints was by the number of complaints to the Ombudsman. There had been no complaints that went on to the Ombudsman. Satisfaction surveys had been tried in the past and overwhelmingly the respondents were satisfied if their complaint was upheld and dissatisfied if it was not upheld.
- b) In reply to a question, Ms Kitto advised that there were 8 complaints in 2011, which went up to 11 in 2012.
- c) In response to a comment, Ms Kitto advised that she would enquire how Hampshire and Surrey recorded their complaints, which were being used as a comparison in the report. Ms Kitto explained that there were no national standards to monitor complaints because there were no statutory requirements.

3. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and questions by Members and the information on the complaints and representations received in 2011/12 about the services provided by Education Learning and Skills be noted.

47. School Performance 2012 - National Curriculum Test and Public Examination - Confirmed Results
(Item C3)

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

(Mrs S Rogers, Director, Education Quality and Standards was present for this Item)

1. The Chairman asked Mrs Rogers to introduce the report. Mrs Rogers highlighted the following points:-

Key Stage1

- This was the 6th year in succession that the Early Years provision had improved.
- *Key Stage1 (KS1)* - Level 2b for girls and level 2b+ for boys had improved from 2011 [Level 2b was the measure at KS1, which was a secure position for 7 year olds to be in, in order to ensure that they gain level 4 at the end of KS2].
- *High Achievers* - There were issues in making sure that there was acceleration for higher achievers because there was more expectation that more children would achieve level 6 by the end of KS2.
- *Vulnerable Groups* – The gap was closing in reading and maths for free school meals children at level 2+ and faster than the national picture.
- *Priorities for KS1* – To ensure that the direction takes Kent schools above the national average and achieves an upward trajectory. By KS4 it was difficult to close those gaps. The sooner the gaps could be

closed the better. This would need to be tackled from the preschool and Children Centres stage, so that as soon as the gaps appeared, those children had a better experience of school.

2. 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 were six Senior Improvement Advisors who oversaw the Districts. A new Improvement Strategy was launch at the beginning of September 2012 in which the needs were identified of every Kent school. Each school's early years data at KS1 and KS2 was looked at and on that evidence it was decided; which schools needed the most intensive support, which schools needed a "light touch" support, which schools, with KCC support, would work with others and which schools would work well within a collaborative.
- b) KCC was aware of the Kent primary schools that needed support at KS1 to raise their standards. Members of the Improvement Team were working alongside those schools supporting and commissioning appropriate support for reading, writing or maths. They were also having challenging conversations with Headteachers to ensure that the KS1 results were as robust as possible to ensure that the vast majority of children were achieving level 2b+. This year 74% of 7 year olds gained a level 2b. However, 26% of 7 year olds had gone up to year 3 without that solid base. Mrs Rogers stated that this was not just an issue about raising the level at year 2 it was about what was going to be done for those children [26%] in year 3 to ensure that those gaps were closed quickly within year 3 and 4.
- c) In response to a question, Mrs Rogers explained that there were good examples of Children Centres and Private Voluntary Independent provisions working closely with the primary schools that the children feed into. She considered that the connection with children before going to preschool and then going to school needed to be strengthened in terms of understanding when children arrived at school what gaps had already opened and where the focus needed to be. The Early Years Team was working closely with Children Centres and Families and Social Care to take this forward.
- d) In reply to a comment, Mrs Rogers advised that there were different education systems across the world. In countries where children started formal schooling at a later age there was significant investment in pre school education and children were engaged in a lot of formal learning. She considered that if the education provision was right for 5 year olds they did not realise they were learning but were enjoying being at school.
- e) In reply to a question, Mrs Rogers explained that intensive work was being carried out with some Kent primary schools where their data suggested that there were issues. A lot of those Kent primary schools were responding well. When Kent primary schools were considered

vulnerable other solutions were being look at, which included a Federation, formal partnership to strengthen them to ensure that the primary schools standard of education improved as quickly as possible and avoided the school going into category. She explained that schools became vulnerable to academy when they failed their Ofsted inspection and when they went into category they would automatically become an academy.

- f) In reply to a question, Mrs Rogers advised that data showed that Summer born boys, in terms of learning, tended to develop at a lower rate than the rest of the cohort. Some Kent primary schools were good at being able to provide the right kind of learning experiences even for Summer born boys and they did well. However, some primary schools had not grasped this issue and were receiving help with this. There was a question on whether holding those boys back a year would help but evidence on this was not strong enough to keep them back a year. This option would also create issues with peer grouping.
- g) In reply to a question, Mrs Rogers explained that in terms of the drop in performance at KS1 there had been a focus on reading and writing for some time, although she considered that the provision provided for numeracy at KS1 needed to be revisited. At KS2 there was an intense focus on maths. This was due to the judgement on English and maths combined performance, maths had to keep pace. Mrs Rogers reflected that looking at Kent's 5 year data, against the national picture Kent was doing well over the same period of time.

Key Stage 2

- Mrs Rogers then spoke on Key Stage 2. Mrs Rogers referred to the Statistical Neighbour headline in the report advising that Kent's top statistical neighbour achieved 81% in 2012, where Kent achieved 78%. Last year Kent was at 74% and its top statistical neighbour achieved 81%. The statistical neighbour at the top of the table had not made any further progress where Kent had. This was important to show that Kent was closing the gap, by accelerating its progress against its top statistical neighbour. She considered that the progress was encouraging but Kent should be achieving a percentage in the high eighties by 2015.

Floor Standards

- In 2010 there were 95+ schools below the floor standard in English and maths combined and in 2011 this reduced to 70 schools. In 2012 this had been reduced to only 23 schools. Mrs Rogers considered that for a County the size of Kent to have only 23 of its schools below the 60% level 4 in English and maths was a significant achievement by Kent schools. This had been achieved by bringing the lowest performance up a level. Mrs Rogers assured Members that this year the agenda would be pushed further and that the improvement in the Ofsted grades was moving in the right direction to reach the ambitious targets.
- In 2012 there were 17 schools below the 40%. 10 were maintained schools and 7 were academies. There were 99 Kent schools above the 50% future floor standard [The new floor standard would be in place in

2015]. It was expected that an announcement would be made by the Secretary of State for Education that the floor standard would be raised in July 2013-14 to 45% 5A* including English and maths. There had been improvement as 26 schools were below the 40% in 2011. Those schools were receiving intensive support from the Secondary Team with the aim of increase those above 40%.

GCSE

- There had been an increase in; the number of students pursuing A levels and those achieving grades A* to C.

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

- a) In reply to a question, Mrs Rogers explained that attainment and progress needed to be considered separately. It was important that every child made progress. Kent schools were encouraged to look at 3 stages of progress as a minimum at KS1 and KS2. Mrs Rogers considered that there would always be children that had particular difficulty in achieving level 4 at English and maths combined but if they had made the progress they should have made then the school would have done its job. For schools it was not just about attainment they had to close the gaps. If the school was focused on the individual child on how to take them forward the school would get close to achieving 100% at KS2. Mrs Rogers said that the aspiration should be that every child can achieve this.
- b) In response to a question, Mrs Rogers advised that the Quality and Assurance Team would have failed if the school was not sustainable and able to maintain the level for themselves. This rested on the leadership being right in the schools and ensuring that all the teaching was good or better and getting the assessments right. She considered that the collaboratives, the school to school partnerships work was where the sustainability laid in the future. Mrs Rogers reflected that in any local authority there would be schools where there would continue to be significant issues and this was about leadership and the local authority had to support the governing bodies in making those decisions.
- c) When working with schools with SEN Units Kent always disaggregated the data for the Units and the mainstream school.

4. Mr Leeson commented on the ideal of sustainable improvement. He advised that there was still long way to go in achieving this ideal. There were still only 56% of schools that were good or outstanding. There were a number of schools in category that was slightly above the national average, which put Kent at the bottom quartile nationally. Kent would be in the top quartile nationally if we had an above average number of schools that were good or outstanding and no schools in an Ofsted category. It was Kent's intention to ensure that schools were on a track or trajectory of improvement which would mean that they could support their own efforts through collaboration and partnership work with other schools and that should be Kent's goal. The aim was to build a sustainable self improving school system in Kent where there is less variable between schools and less likelihood of schools slipping back when they had been on an improving trend. There were important risk indicators including;

change of headteacher, not continuing to pay attention to the quality of teaching and the individual progress of the pupils, not recruiting the right staff who can do the job and can be developed to be promoted and those schools that do not collaborate or participate or work in partnership, come to meetings or continue to stay “plugged in” to the kind of professional thinking and learning of the heads and other leaders and the staff to keep ahead as education did not stand still. It was the local authority’s role to ensure that the Kent schools were properly informed and sharing good practise. He stated that he would like to say at meetings of this Cabinet Committee that “we are getting a more self sustainable system in schools in Kent”. There was no reason why Kent should not be among the top performing local authorities in the country. He advise that this would take Kent to 90%+ at level 4 and above in English and maths combined.

5. Mr Whiting added that there were ambitious targets in place which were reviewed and raised from time to time. He appreciated the honesty of the officers to this Cabinet Committee and thanked Mrs Rogers and her Team for all that they were achieving through working with Kent schools. He reminded Members that academies were buying in the expertise of Mrs Rogers Team and other Education Teams through EduKent.

6. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted;
- b) the significant improvement in many areas of school performance in 2012 be noted; and
- c) the areas that still require significant improvement and the priorities for action to ensure that improvement was achieved be noted.

48. Education Learning and Skills Directorate - Half Yearly Financial Monitoring 2012/13

(Item C4)

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

(Mr K Abbott, Director School Resources and ELS Financial Business Partner, was present for this item)

1. The Chairman invited the Director of School Resources and ELS Financial Business Partner, Mr Abbott, to introduce the report. Points raised included the following:-

- Members received the detailed 1st quarterly monitoring report in September. This report was the interim update before the Cabinet Committee received the 2nd quarterly report at its next meeting in January 2013.
- There had been no change in the Capital programme and it remained on target as reported in September 2012. There were two underspends

in the revenue budget that were identified by managers. The Directorate in terms of revenue would be forecasting an underspend of £162,000. Work was being undertaken to see whether the underspend would impact next year and the need to be reflected in next years budget.

2. RESOLVED that the revenue and capital forecast variances from budget for 2012/13 for the Education, Learning & Skills Portfolio based on the first quarter's full monitoring to Cabinet and the subsequent exception report be noted.

49. Consultation on 2013/14 Revenue Budget

(Item D1)

(Report by Mr M Whiting, Cabinet Member, Education, Learning and Skills, Mr P Leeson, Corporate Director, Education, Learning and Skills and Mr A Wood Corporate Director of Finance and Procurement)

(Mr K Abbott, Director School Resources and ELS Financial Business Partner, was present for this item)

1. The Chairman invited the Director of School Resources and ELS Financial Business Partner, Mr Abbott, to introduce the report. Mr Abbott highlighted the following:

- The consultation on the Budget 2013/14 had been launched on 6 September and closed on 1 November 2012. This report would be submitted to all Cabinet Committees to summarize for Members the consultation process which had been undertaken on the budget for 2013/14.
- The intention had been for all the Cabinet Committees to receive the results of the Ipsos Mori consultation with the meeting papers but this had not been finalised. This information would now go directly to Cabinet.
- The report included the work carried out by the ECC Budget IMG which met twice to consider the Education Learning and Skills Directorate's Budget position.

2. The Chairman asked Members to vote on each recommendation separately by the Budget IMG (a) to (d). Mr Christie voted against and Mr Vye abstained on recommendation (a) which was carried. The votes for recommendations (b) to (d) were unanimous.

3. RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the proposals for the Education, Learning and Skills portfolio as set out in the publish budget consultation be endorsed;
- (b) there be a more detailed consideration of the longer term consequences of the Home to School Transport Policy and the ongoing review of Special Educational Needs Transport be endorsed;

- (c) the Education Cabinet Committee has a monitoring role regarding the Education Directorates ability to deliver savings through income generated by EduKent related services or more widely be endorsed; and
- (d) Members would not want to see any reduction in staffing levels in the Education Directorate unless they have been provided with a genuine case that demonstrates the level of service to be provided be endorsed.

50. ELS Bold Steps Business Plan Mid - Year Monitoring 2012-13 and ELS Bold Steps Business Planning 2013-14

(Item D2)

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

1. The Corporate Director ELS, Mr Leeson, introduce the report. He advised that the report sets out the progress on the 2012/13 priorities in Bold Steps for Education, Learning and Skills, which was first submitted to this Cabinet Committee in May 2012. The report indicated the key priorities and the achievements to services in relation to those priorities and provided a RAG rating on progress to date. The report sought Members views on next year's ongoing business planning priorities. There was an agreement that the Directorate would publish Bold Steps for Education, Learning and Skills on an annual basis. The document was currently being redrafted and part of the annual business planning process. This would include existing and introduce additional targets and priorities for 2016.

2. The redrafted Bold Steps for Education, Learning and Skills would be submitted to the January meeting.

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

- a) In response to a question, Mr Leeson advised that where in 2012 the targets had already reached the targets set for 2015 the redrafted Bold Steps would reflect this and raise the expectations further especially on KS2 outcomes.
- b) In reply to a comment, Mr Leeson advised that the widening of the gap with children in public care was disappointing. Part of the explanation was that when standards rising incrementally some of those children's outcomes could look further behind. The virtual school in Kent was very well led and received a very positive Ofsted visit. There was significant focused work taking place in schools to address the needs of Children in Care to improve their progress at school. Mr Leeson suggested that it was a RAG rating of amber. He suggested that the Members Monitoring Group could look at the issue of Children in Care in more detail to look at the patterns across the County.
- c) In response to a comment, Mr Leeson advised that it was difficult to use national comparisons about gaps for pupils with SEN. It was important to look at the data but because SEN were identified and assessed in very different ways in different local authorities to make meaningful comparisons was difficult. Kent did not want those gaps to get wider and using the national comparison was a less helpful indicator. Kent

wanted to see those gaps narrow. Both nationally and in Kent the outcomes for pupils with SEN was not good enough although, pupils with SEN were making satisfactory or often good progress in Kent schools. Mr Leeson agreed to forward a detailed note outside the meeting.

4. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to the comments and questions by Members be noted;
- b) the progress being made in delivering Education, Learning and Skills Bold Steps from the Mid-term monitoring sheets of the 2012/13 Education, Learning and Skills Business Plans, attached as Appendix 1 to the report be noted; and
- c) the redrafted Bold Steps for Education, Learning and Skills be submitted to the Cabinet Committee meeting in January 2013.

51. Review of PRUs and Alternative Provision

(Item D3)

(Report 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, Mr Leeson, to introduce the report. Mr Leeson highlighted the following:

- A review of the Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) and alternative provisions began in the Spring of 2012.
- There were 18 PRUs and alternative curriculum provision for pupils at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 in Kent. Just over half of that provision was good or outstanding.
- There had been variable quality of alternative curriculum provision in different parts of Kent.
- The outcomes for pupils in alternative curriculum provision and PRUs was not good. Many of those young people had gone on to become not in education, employment or training (NEET) because they had not been following pathways that offered progression or achieve qualifications level that would give them good enough pathways post 16.
- The provision was offering different quality and flexibility in different parts of the Kent. In some parts of Kent there were good models of PRU provision, offering good reintegration into mainstream schools, good support for mainstream pupils behavioural needs and opportunities for young people to have managed moves between schools if relationships had broken down in one school and a fresh start in another school was the appropriate option. However in other parts of Kent that protocol and way of working was not so in evidence.
- All Districts had opted for a new model of working from the 4 options within the consultation document. Schools were taking more responsibility on managing pupils at risk of exclusion or who were excluded and were agreeing with the local authority that the number of exclusions needed to be significantly reduced.

- Kent had a very high level of permanent exclusion at present and 75% of permanently excluded pupils in Kent had SEN which was the 8th highest figure nationally and had to be improved.
 - A second phase of the consultation was due to begin and run through to the Spring 2013.
 - Each District in Kent would work on the practical details of their models, in terms of staffing, governance arrangements, funding, methodology and new ways of working from April 2013 onwards.
 - The government had brought forward national policy which enabled all PRUs to become schools from April 2013 with governing bodies rather than management committees with fully delegated budgets so Kent would need to align what it was doing with this shift in national policy in how PRUs operate in the future.
 - The intention was to bring the new models of PRUs in place by September 2013.
2. A final report would be submitted to the meeting in March 2013 and the decision on the changes to the funding arrangements etc would be submitted to Cabinet.
3. RESOLVED that:-
- a) the Cabinet Committee notes the progress on the review of the PRUs and alternative curriculum provision to date and supports the undertaking to extend the consultation on the proposed options for change for PRU/AC provision in each District; and
 - b) the final report on the PRUs and alternative provisions be presented to this Cabinet Committee before being submitted to the Cabinet for decision in March 2013.

52. A Strategy report on the retirement and recruitment of Headteachers and Teachers
(Item D4)

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

(Mrs S Rogers, Director, Education Quality and Standards, was present for this Item)

1. The Director of Education Quality and Standards, Mrs Rogers, introduced the report. The following points were made:
- A Recruitment and Retention Group (RRG) was set up following discussions with the Members Monitoring Group which had developed strategies for supporting and recruiting Headteachers as well as retaining them.
 - Work had been undertaken to attract teachers and Headteachers into Kent.
 - Mrs Rogers clarified the opening words in paragraph 1.2 of the report explaining that there were not 55 Kent schools without Headteachers. She stated that no Kent school was without an Acting Headteacher, Executive Headteacher or Head of School or a combination of all 3 who were

covering the Headteacher position while the appointments of the new Headteachers were being made. Ms Rogers advised that the Headteacher appointments were ongoing and appointments had been made and the number of schools with a Headteacher vacancy was now 19.

2. Mr Whiting considered that the report was misleading due to the terminology that was used to describe the Headteacher vacancies in Kent Schools which had led to misleading press coverage. He assured the Cabinet Committee that every school in Kent, whether it was Maintained, Church, academies or Free school, had appropriate leadership in place. He stated that there was a good Core Development Programme in Kent identifying potential and new leaders. There was a good campaign on recruitment, 50 places sat on Kent's Aspiring Leaders Team working with Medway and the National College to train new leaders and Headteachers of the future. The Primary Deputy Heads Conference identified a further cohort of aspiring leaders and 55 deputies registered for that programme. He considered that Kent was in a far better place than the report suggested. Mr Whiting suggested that a revised report be resubmitted to the January meeting of this Cabinet Committee.

3. Mr Leeson advised that the key indicators were vacancy rates in Kent. The Headteacher turnover rate in Kent needed to be explained and the numbers of schools that had gone through to second and third adverts in order to recruit a Headteacher were the issues that should indicate concerns.

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

- a) A Member suggested that information, such as good collaborative ventures between schools could be mentioned in the literature when trying to attract Headteachers to Kent.
- b) In reply to a question, Mr Leeson explained that the difficulty of recruiting Headteachers was a national issue. It was a national issue that more than half of the existing Headteachers would be retiring in the next 2-3 years. Kent needed to be able to carry out its succession planning for the next cohort of senior leaders to be prepared well enough to take on Headships. There was a general concern that it was becoming harder to recruit Headteachers. He explained that many Deputy Headteachers viewed how hard and pressured the Headteacher's role was and did not want to pursue that role although, at the same time, there were many who were keen for the role.
- c) In reply to a comment, Mr Leeson advised that he had regular meetings with all of the professional associations and Trade Unions in Kent to discuss current issues and plans.
- d) A Member commented that the role of Headteacher had been rundown over many years, even by Headteachers themselves and suggested that the Advance Skills Teachers should be considered for the Headteacher role.
- e) The Chairman asked for a report back to explore whether Kent was missing out on recruiting good teachers because of its close proximity to London where teachers would receive London weighting.

5. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- b) a revised report be resubmitted to the next meeting in January 2013.

53. Proposed enlargement of Harrietsham Church of England Primary School
(Item D5)

(Report 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 (Mid Kent), was present for the Item)

1. The Chairman invited the Area Education Officer, Mr Adams, to introduce the report. Mr Adams highlighted that the planning application had been agreed and the section 106 had been signed off in the last few weeks.

2. Members raised the following points:-

- a) In reply to a question, Mr Adams advised that the school was inspected under the previous Ofsted Framework when it was judged satisfactory. It was disappointing that it narrowly missed a good Ofsted judgement. From KCC's perspective, Harrietsham Church of England school was doing well and as it was in a village community it was hoped that the children would go to their local school, accepting that quality of teaching was an important consideration.
- b) The Chairman advised that the housing development was immediately opposite the school.
- c) A Member questioned as Harrietsham Church of England school had been built recently whether it was designed to be expanded. Mr Adams advised that the school was designed to take additional classrooms, which was why it was a cost effective solution.

3. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- b) the ECC endorses the officers' intention to consult on the significant enlargement of Harrietsham CEP School.