

Public Document Pack

Southend-on-Sea Education Board Wednesday 11th October 2017

I confirm that a meeting of the Education Board ('Schools Forum') will be held on **Wednesday 11th October 2017 at 8.15am to 11.30am.**

The meeting will be held at the Tickfield Centre in the Darwin Room (front).

Robert Harris
Clerk to the Forum

AGENDA

Agenda	Item	Lead	Time
1.	Apologies, Substitutions & Introductions (AOB not on the agenda to be identified and dealt with at the discretion of the Chairman).	Chair	5
2.	Membership – report to be tabled	RH	5
3.	a) Minutes of the meetings held on 7th June and 6th July 2017 - Minutes attached Pages 13-14) <u>Matters Arising:</u> - 30 hour entitlement - Provision of Secondary School Places	Chair EH BM	10
	<u>Schools Forum Matters</u>		
4.	Schools Budget 2017/18 Forecast Outturn – report to follow	PG	10
5.	National Funding Formula – Schools and High Needs Funding Reform – report to follow	IA	10

	<u>Education Board Matters</u>		
7.	School Performance Outcomes – Report to Cabinet 19/09/17 attached for information (Pages 15-26)	BM	5
8.	Review of Alternative Provision – Report from the People Scrutiny Committee – In-depth Scrutiny Review of Alternative Provision June 2017 attached for information (Pages 27-44)	BM	5
9.	SEND Peer Review – Report attached (Pages 45-54)	BM	5
10.	Operational Review of Education Board and Sub Groups (also covering PwC Audit Recommendations) – Report attached (Pages 55-66)	BM ALL (for discussion)	10
11.	Feedback from Sub Group Chairs: (a) School Performance S.G. – Neil Houchen (b) Vulnerable Learners S.G. – Jackie Mullan (c) Resources S.G.	NH JM TBD	5 5 5
12.	Update on Current Matters: (a) Catchment Area/School Admission Arrangements; (b) Free School; (c) New data protection regulations from May 2018 Verbal update (no papers)	BM	10
12.	Any other business		10
13.	Date and time of future meetings	RH	5
	Tuesday 5 th December 2017 Tuesday 16 th January 2018 Tuesday 13 th March 2018 Tuesday 5 th June 2018		

Public Document Pack
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of Education Board

Date: Wednesday, 7th June, 2017

Place: Darwin Room - Tickfield

2

Present: Maurice Sweeting - Hinguar Primary Governor (Chair)
Jerry Glazier – Trade Unions Representative
Tim Barrett - Temple Sutton Primary
Niki Lanont (previously Bannister) – Milton Hall Primary Governor
Lisa Clark - Hamstel Infant
Elaine Hammans – Group Manager – A Better Start
Jane Youdale - Essex Pre-School Learning Alliance
Vicky Wright – Professional Association for Childcare & Early Years
Margaret Rimmer - Kingsdown
Jackie Mullan - St Christophers
Robin Bevan - Southend Boys (Vice-Chair)
Lionel Pryor - Fairways Primary Governor
Annette Turner - YMCA

In Attendance: Paul Grout – Finance – SBC
Simon Leftley – Deputy Chief Executive (People) - SBC
Brin Martin – Director of Education – SBC
Catherine Braun – Group Manager – Access & Inclusion – SBC
Christine Hickey – Finance – SBC
Ian Ambrose – Finance – SBC

Start/End Time: 8.15 - 11.00 am

1 Apologies, Substitutions and Introductions

Apologies were received from Councillor Courtenay, Mr J Johnson, Mrs S Reynolds, Mr N Houchen and Mr A McGarel.

2 Membership

The Board received an update on membership and it was noted that Ms Nicky Lamont had been nominated to fill the current vacancy in the maintained primary school sector.

Resolved:

1. That the current membership situation be noted.
2. That further request for nominations be sought to fill the vacancies for maintained primary schools, primary academies, secondary academies and the Pupil Referral Unit.

3 Minutes of the meeting held on 15th March 2017, Matters arising and Summary Action Sheet

(a) Minutes of the meeting held on 15th March 2017

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15th March 2017 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

(b) Summary Action Sheet

Action 307

A meeting has not yet been arranged.

Brin Martin explained that this relates to another item later in the agenda, which has delayed the meeting scheduling. There has been some progress in relation to funding, recruitment and retention – but the group has not yet met.

It was expressed that there is some anxiety in schools in relation to recruitment for the coming year.

ACTION: Brin Martin and Amanda Champ to convene this meeting (as per the minutes of the last meeting).

Action 315

Brin Martin discussed the appropriateness of this continuing agenda item – noting that we do not routinely interrogate individual schools in the way we do with Seabrook. He suggested that this item could be removed from this meeting, and instead discussed at sub groups.

There was some challenge from attendees, who noted that this is an issue that impacts on everybody in terms of accessing the support required for children with additional needs.

Attendees also discussed the use of the funding Seabrook have received, and whether this was affecting change. It was noted that the funding review will have a likely impact on the budget that Seabrook receive.

Brin Martin explained that we are working hard to progress conversion for 1st July 2017. There are plans to reposition the Wentworth building, and we are hoping for completion of the transaction as soon as possible. Once this is done, we can progress the conversion of the building.

Lastly, Brin Martin explained that he has commissioned a full review of Seabrook which is being reported back to the IEB.

Robin Bevan, Southend High for Boys, expressed that in his opinion the primary concern needs to be the establishment of viable provision. He added that we need to consider the number of available places too, and whether this number is right.

Brin Martin agreed and noted that this forms part of the agenda.

Cathy Braun noted that there has been difficulty with schools accepting children back after a temporary placement at Seabrook, and also explained that we have been scrutinising permanent exclusions.

Tim Barrett highlighted that Head Teachers are sometimes unclear of what constitutes a child being placed on the waiting list, and this needs to be clearer.

Cathy Braun explained that this will be a key element of SLA meetings moving forwards.

Jerry Glazier suggested the implementation of a panel to look over the need within this local authority, throughout the different years/key stages.

There was further discussion surrounding a lack of resources to meet the needs of inclusion for children with additional or special needs.

Simon Leftley highlighted that there is also a national rise of children accessing early help, on CIN, CP & LAC, which links to this. He suggested that a piece of work is planned to be undertaken, exploring how Southend is changing demographically, which may need to be considered by this group.

Schools suggested they need better information sharing regarding capacity of other schools, so that they can make clear and realistic plans for children.

ACTION: Sarah Greaves – Vulnerable Learners Sub Group to consider the diagnostic of school places/capacity.

Simon Leftley has asked for a meeting with PLT to determine a 'road map' of their progress/plans in future. Simon asked if there are any specific questions/short term measures that anybody requires to be discussed at this meeting.

The Board asked for a simple flowchart of the referral processes.

4 Schools Budget 2016/17 Final Outturn

Paul Grout presented the report.

It was noted that YMCA had 50 places in 2016/17, not 32 as suggested in the report.

Other schools suggested that they are in a similar situation, with over capacity and not enough funding.

The Chair reflected that the report suggests that the current expenditure cannot continue.

5 SEN Funding

Brin Martin explained that we are not in position to present the report fully at this meeting.

We have tested 3 or 4 models, but none have held up to full scrutiny.

We will propose a single item agenda at an extraordinary meeting with a two phased approach; replacement for temporary arrangement and scrutiny of model.

Jackie Mullen explained that we are required to accept a cut in top up funding. We are working on a model to enable schools to continue doing this work, as the need is present.

It was agreed that a standalone meeting needs to be held to consider Southend's position in terms of SEN Funding, to highlight the budget pressures and declare any projected overspend.

Margaret Rimmer, Kingsdown, highlighted that Essex pupils appear to be moving to Southend schools which is also causing budget pressures.

Cathy Braun noted that we now have recordings of managed moves and their success/movement.

ACTION: An Extraordinary meeting to be held – proposed date of Thursday 6th July at 8.15am to present a proposal for a road map to achieve finances up to September 2017 and beyond.

Brin Martin noted that although there are School Performance and Vulnerable Learners sub groups, two other sub groups were initially due to be set up and have not yet been arranged. Brin Martin suggested setting up a sub group to discuss pre-scrutiny for the Education Board regarding finance/budgets, etc.

6 30 Hour Entitlement for Working Parents of 3-4 Year Olds

Elaine Hammans presented the report. She noted that this proposal will bring opportunities for families in poverty, as well as bring professionals back into the workplace – which is something to be celebrated.

She noted that before April 2017, if a school was running Early Years classes there had to be a teacher in the room at a 1 teacher/13 children ratio.

However, they are now able to employ lower qualified staff to teach these classes at a 1/8 ratio. This would lower the qualifications needed but these roles, assisting with recruitment and staffing costs.

After April 2017, schools are now able to consider what model they would like to work under.

Schools are being individually approached to discuss this on a 1:1 basis.

There is not yet a clear understanding of how many schools will get on board. Not one provider, thus far, has said no. We will have a clearer picture of providers by April 2017, and will have a final figure by September 2017.

Although it is said the agreement is for one year, we will be working with schools on a termly basis.

Jerry Glazier expressed concerns that this initiative could cause schools to dismiss qualified teachers.

Elaine Hammans explained that her team will be on hand to help make appropriate decisions and will attempt to sustain the level of qualified staff we have in Southend.

All agreed the recommendations within this report and suggested that one recommendation will go to the Vulnerable Learners Group.

7 Secondary School Pupil Places Update

Cathy Braun presented the report.

Brin Martin shared that in his opinion the biggest risk is if the DFE say they won't fund a basic need school, with the associate link of several displaced year 7's in 2019 due to a current lack of capacity.

However, he noted that we are confident we can move quickly on an announcement to allow us to get in soon.

Cathy Braun noted that we are in correspondence with DFE to discuss our options, and are hoping that they will agree for a free school, especially given that they have not yet met their targets of this.

All attendees accepted the report.

8 SEND Inspection / Peer Review

Brin Martin presented the report. He explained that this inspection will last for 5 days, and we will receive 5 days' notice.

There is an inspection preparation group organising the scheduling and timetables. Our intention is to receive a truthful reflective review of our strengths and challenges to allow us to draw up a plan for future development.

The recommendations were agreed by all attendees.

9 Update on MJ Awards and PwC Proposed Improvements

We submitted a nomination to MJ Awards for Excellence in Governance and Scrutiny and have been selected as a national finalist.

Brin Martin, the Chair and Councillor Courtenay made a presentation and we will find out on 15th June 2017 if we have been successful.

Brin Martin feels that whether we are selected or not, it is a testament to the work of all attendees around the table that we have received a nomination.

Post Meeting Tribute

At the awards on 1st June 2017, Southend Education Board, were singled out as runners up and awarded 'highly commended'.

10 DfE School Improvement Fund Proposals

It was informed that there are significant school improvement funds that we are able to bid into – there is a fund of £140 million for this financial year.

The School Performance Sub Group met recently and scrutinised possible bids.

There is a strict list of eligibility schools that are included, which we will be guided by.

The bids can be submitted in June, September and November 2017. The current plans are as follows:

June

Primary reading, diminishing the difference (reading for disadvantaged children in primary schools) & LAC at KS4 attainment.

September

Targeted vulnerable secondary schools (3 schools not at a 'good' Ofsted rating).

Attendees did not have any queries or comments.

11 Feedback from Sub Group Chairs

(a) School Performance S.G.

In Neil Houchen's absence, Brin Martin explained that we have asked for interim data to be submitted, which has been received and is being formulated.

We have the ability to request data from academies who have not yet submitted.

We continue to update the risk register and act upon that, which is driving commissioning of support to primary schools.

Brin Martin noted two other major projects, as described below:

Primary Pupil Premium

A free pupil premium review will be completed for 24 primary schools in Southend; first come first serve. This is hoped to identify areas of development.

Grammar School Project **(confidential due to Purdah)**

There will be a project implemented to support a greater number of Southend residents to attend a Southend Grammar School.

It is a view of all members across parties that more Southend residents need to benefit from grammar education.

Brin Martin noted that we will initially be using ways of communication to parents through advertising posters etc.

This was challenged as not very ambitious, as schools have been doing this for a number of years.

Brin Martin noted that some particular schools appear to be having a lack of children entered for 11+ exams, and this will be addressed.

It was noted that all grammar schools have increased their intake, which may have affected the numbers of pupils from Southend.

(b) Vulnerable Learners S.G.

Although no detail was provided, Jackie Mullan informed attendees that the sub group is progressing work effectively.

(c) Consideration of SBC Skills Strategy and the Board's role in influencing greater Education linkages

There is a skills sub group that we have not yet started up , but this may be done.

Simon Leftley explained that we are anticipating significant industry and economic growth.

It was said that some employers have difficulty employing young people as they do not have the necessary skills.

Simon Leftley was of the view that we should be creating an integrated skills strategy to look at the likely future of young people and how they can be supported by education experts and local schools.

Brin Martin will be meeting with the team who have drafted this, and sought volunteers to join him to present from a schools perspective.

ACTION: Brin Martin to send an email to all members of this group to ask for volunteers.

12 Any other Business

(a) Education Board Forward Plan

Nothing to add, no changes.

(b) Maintained School Balances 2016/17

The report was presented to attendees.

It was noted that overall balances have reduced slightly, apart from primary, which have increased.

Revenue still required for capital projects, as previously agreed.

Lisa Clark highlighted that Blenheim was not on the academy list.

(c) Volunteers to attend as a representative at the Local Safeguarding Children's Boards

Niki Lamont agreed to do this, pending availability in her diary.

(d) Children's Centres

It was agreed that at the next meeting there will be an update on Children's Centres (this was due to be heard in December 2017, but to be brought forward to an earlier meeting).

13 Date and Time of Future Meetings

Wednesday 11th October 2017 at 08.15am – Tickfield Centre, Darwin Room (front).

Chairman: _____

Public Document Pack

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of Education Board

Date: Thursday, 6th July, 2017

Place: Committee Room 5 - Civic Suite

- Present:** Mr M Sweeting (Chair)
Mr T Barrett, Dr R Bevan, Ms L Clark, Mr J Johnson, Ms J Mullan,
Ms M Rimmer and Ms V Wright.
- In Attendance:** Ms C Hickey, Mr P Grout, B Martin, R Harris and I Ambrose, A
McIlwraith and Cathy Braun.
- Start/End Time:** 8.15 - 9.45 am

1 Welcome, introductions if required, apologies

Apologies were received from Mr L Pryor, Ms N Bannister, Mr S Reynolds, Mr N Houchen, Mr D Parker, Ms A Turner, Mr A McGarel, Mr J Glazier and Mr S Leftley.

2 High Needs Revised Budget 2017/18

The Board received and considered a report from the Council's Deputy Chief Executive (People) presenting the revised High Needs budget allocations for 2017/18. This report is an updated position from the original budget presented to the Board in March 2017.

The Board had an in-depth discussion on the report and made the following points:

- Recognised the pressures that were not previously planned for in the High Needs Block, i.e YMCA increased place funding;
- The budgetary figures must be right;
- Accurate information is essential regarding the need for special placements and what placements are available moving forward;
- Recognised the challenges for schools with the increasing number of children/young people with special education needs;
- Schools need to be equipped to enable them to support SEN/EHCP children/young people;
- Emphasised that some areas are being 'over-funded' while others are under-funded;
- Concerns were expressed about the impact the reduction in school funding will have on special schools (in real terms they were facing up to a 4% reduction on top up funding rates (excluding place funding which is accounted for in DfE Special School MFG Guidance) and must be recognised that this was not a one-off reduction;
- The Board emphasised its duty to sign-off/agree the proposals in the report recognising that there has been a significant overspend in previous years but stressed that a comprehensive strategic plan was need for the future;

- Emphasised that this was a demand led area and the resources need to go with the child in the context that the funding still needs to be managed and as a principal should work within budget;
- Recognised that this was a national problem and was not specific to Southend;

The Board also asked a number of questions covering a number of areas which the officers responded to, summarised below:-

- How many children are there that need special placements and what placements are available? The number of children is tracked through the data and from the EHCP but it is not possible to predict, particularly those coming into the local authority area. Assurances were given that the department was on top of it and each is dealt with on case by case basis; Discussions were taking place with the DoE regarding the provision of special places;
- How accurate are the figures? They are correct to the best knowledge to date;
- Queried the process for Education Psychologists? The system is demand led and is not predictable – it should follow the child and is therefore not as predictable as perhaps it could be;
- Significant risks around mental health needs – who is monitoring and what is the health contribution – are we ensuring Value for Money? Discussions are on-going with the CCG / health regarding shared funding in this area;
- Will Seabrook provide a secure unit? Provision of mental health support is in the phased plan for Seabrook but it cannot provide a secure unit – there will be provision to support children/young people who are coming out of a secure unit;

Resolved:

1. That the Education Board reaffirms its intention that the High Needs budget for 2017/18 and future years should, in principle, be contained within the High Needs DSG Block allocation.
2. That the 2017/18 High Needs budget be agreed and adopted as presented and the Education Board recognises this budget seeks to manage a budget pressure.
3. That the Local Authority, in conjunction with the Vulnerable Learners Sub Group, work towards a revised and consistent top up funding approach across all settings to be implemented from April 2018. This work should also include recommended funding allocations to other high needs services for future years. Progress reports on the revised funding methodology will be reported back to the Education Board during 2017/18, requiring Board approval on final proposals before April 2018.
4. That the submission of a request to the Department for Education (DfE) for the disapplication of the Minimum Funding Guarantee from April 2018 for any applicable high needs provider, given the serious financial risk that significant high need funding pressures to remain in 2017/18 and therefore will continue into 2018/19. Any implementation of a granted disapplication will be dependent

on the actual High Needs DSG Block allocation for 2018/19 and would only be utilised with the express permission/authority of the Education Board

3 The way forwards for the remainder of phase one

The Board was informed that monthly monitoring reports will be reviewed and discussed by the Vulnerable Learners Sub Group.

4 The way forward for design of phase two

The Board was informed that members will be contacted to support the work on the high needs budget for 2018/19 onwards. This will be an intensive piece of work and a sense check/take stock in October 2017.

The Chairman on behalf of the Board thanked the Council officers for their hard work in bringing the High Needs revised budget together.

5 AOB

(a) Seabrook

The Board was informed that Seabrook will formerly become an Academy on 1st July 2017.

(b) MJ Awards

The Board noted that it had been highly commended at the MJ Awards for governance and scrutiny, effectively runner-up in the category.

6 Meeting close

The meeting finished and all Board members were thanked for attending, given the short notice that this extraordinary meeting was called.

Chairman: _____

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHOOLS FORUM MEMBERSHIP

January 2017

1. Full voting members

3

Maintained Primary Schools (5 places)

Tim Barrett - Temple Sutton Primary	13 October 2019
Lionel Pryor - Fairways Primary Governor	12 October 2020
Jim Johnson – Edwards Hall Primary	24 February 2020
Niki Bannister – Milton Hall Primary Governor	5 th June 2020
1 vacancy	

Maintained Secondary Schools (1 place)

Stuart Reynolds - Futures College	2 December 2019
-----------------------------------	-----------------

Academy Secondary (5 places)

Robin Bevan - Southend Boys (Vice-Chair)	24 February 2020
Neil Houchen - Eastwood Academy	18 March 2019
David Parker - Shoeburyness High Governor	3 December 2018
2 vacancies	

Academy Primary (3 places)

Lisa Clark - Hamstel Infant	7 December 2020
Maurice Sweeting - Hinguar Primary Governor (Chair)	4 December 2020
1 vacancy	

Alternative Provision Academy (1 place)

Annette Turner - YMCA

Pupil Referral Unit (1 place)

Vacancy

Maintained Special (1place)

Margaret Rimmer - Kingsdown	12 September 2020
-----------------------------	-------------------

Academy Special (1 place)

Jackie Mullan - St Christophers	7 December 2020
---------------------------------	-----------------

Early Years (2 places)

Vicky Wright – Professional Association for Childcare & Early Years	24 October 2020
--	-----------------

Lesley Yelland (nomination) - Essex Pre-School Learning Alliance
December 2020

7

2. Members with restricted voting

14 – 19 sector (1 place)

Anthony McGarel - South Essex College

24 October 2020

Trade Unions (1 place)

Jerry Glazier

1 December 2018

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council
Report of Deputy Chief Executive (People)
to
Cabinet
on
19th September 2017

Report prepared by: Brin Martin, Director of Learning

School Performance Report Summer 2017 (Outcomes KS2 & KS4)
People Scrutiny Committee
Executive Councillor: James Courtenay
A Part 1 (Public) Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report informs Cabinet of the high level performance outcome for all Southend schools at all key stages following the summer tests and examinations.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Cabinet notes the overall performance of Southend schools at each of the key stages, in particular relative to the emerging national benchmarks.

3. Background

- 3.1 In previous years, Cabinet has not been sighted upon the early outcomes achieved by schools in the summer teacher assessments, tests and examinations.
- 3.2 It should be stressed that at this stage, the majority of the outcomes are “raw” and unvalidated. Whilst the overall scores are unlikely to change significantly, results for individual schools may fluctuate.
- 3.3 Results for individual schools are not in the public domain until validated, later in the autumn term. However, in view of likely press interest, it is important that Cabinet are aware of the emerging picture.
- 3.5 Lastly, it should be remembered that at GCSE level (year 11 of secondary schools), this will be the first year of new transitional assessment arrangements, moving from a lettered system to a numbered system (9-1, one being lowest) in English and Mathematics only. In essence, the previous benchmark of a “C” grade, regarded as a pass, is now broadly equivalent to either a grade 4, a standard pass, with a 5 regarded as a strong pass.

4. Headline Performance Outcomes

4.1 Across all key stages

- 4.1.1 Cabinet should note that in almost all of the benchmark outcomes, at all key stages, Southend pupils continue to outperform the national averages, in some cases increasing at a higher rate than all schools nationally.
- 4.1.2 For each key stage where available, as indicated in appendix one, results are shown for the headline measurements, and for vulnerable groups of pupils with Special Educational Needs and deprived pupils against their peers.

4.2 By Key Stages

- 4.2.1 In the **Early Years**, the % of pupils achieving a good level of development is 74.3% (70.7% nationally), an increase of 3% points from 2016. 20 schools showed an improvement. **Improvement on last year, above the national.**
- 4.2.2 At the end of **Key Stage One** (infant primary), the percentage of Southend pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading, writing and maths is 66.6% which is an increase of 3.5 percentage points compared to 2016. The emerging national based on results from 152 LA's for KS1 reading, writing and maths combined is 63.7% an increase of 3.4 percentage points compared to 2016, this means the Southend figure is currently 2.8 percentage points higher than the emerging national picture. **Improvement upon last year, above the national.**

The percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths improved in 19 schools with 6 schools improving by more than 10 percentage points compared to 2016 results. The percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard or above fell in 9 schools.

- 4.2.3 The percentage of Southend pupils at the end of **Key Stage Two** (junior primary) achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths test is 65% this is an increase of 9.2 percentage points compared to 2016. The interim national results of pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths test is 61%, an increase of 8.0 percentage points compared to 2016. **Improvement upon last year, above the national.**

Overall the Southend figure is 3.9 percentage points higher than the interim national results. The percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard or above improved in 23 schools (nearly 80%) compared to 2016 results, with 17 schools improving by over 10.0 percentage points when compared to their 2016 results. The percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard or above fell in 6 schools compared to their 2016 results with 2 schools dropping by over 10.0 percentage points.

- 4.2.4 At **Key Stage Four** (secondary CGSE), results have only just been announced, and at the time of drafting this report, they are still both subject to variation, and have not yet been provided for all headline measures by the department. As mentioned in 3.5 above, the means of calibrating outcomes is in the first year of transition. In essence, the previous benchmark of A*-C in both English and mathematics is broadly equivalent to the new numerical measure of a grade 4 or better in both subjects.

From the data obtained so far, **72.3% of pupils achieved the new benchmark of 4+ in the combined subjects.** This is compared to 69% for the similar measure last year. Equally last year, the national figure was 63%, and we understand that this may have reduced slightly this year. If this is the case, not only have Southend schools improved on last year, but they also buck the national trend.

Of the 12 schools 8 showed either sustained results (ie 100%) or improvement, and 4 declined (two by less than two percentage points). We do not at this stage publically share individual school data until validated, but several schools, including two of our more vulnerable schools have shown significant improvement, whilst several of our other non-grammar schools have also sustained significantly high results from last year.

- 4.2.5 At **Key Stage Five** (end of sixth form), provisional results were 11.4% of A-level entries were A* compared to the national average of 8.3%, and 35.8% of entries were A* or A grades, compared to national figures of 26.3%, with 98.5% of all grades being A*- E grade, above the national equivalent of 97.9%. **Improvement upon last year, above the national.**

Based on comparative data from results day last year, there has been an improvement in all measures in Southend (last year saw the rate of entries at A* at 8.2%, A*-A at 29.6% and A*-E at 98.4%).

5. Conclusion and implications

- 5.1 At all Key Stages, Southend schools continue to both improve and outperform against national benchmarks. Whilst we await the individual validated school results, we anticipate that Southend Borough as a whole will continue to improve its rankings nationally and in relation to our statistical and geographical neighbours.
- 5.2 These results will inform the Education Board, and in particular the School Performance Sub Group, in their detailed analysis of both outcomes and progress data through the schools risk register. In turn, the risk register is used to target intervention in schools requiring support and challenge to improve further in particular areas or with specific groups.
- 5.3 This support will be undertaken through our partnership between officers and the local Teaching School, and take the form of focussed support at individual school level, or through improvement programmes such as the narrowing the gap project at Key Stage Two, or the initiative to encourage more Southend residents to attend one of the four Grammar Schools if appropriate. All of these initiatives are funded through the school improvement money allocated by Council in the budget.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

Ensure residents have access to high quality education to enable them to be lifelong learners and have fulfilling employment.

6.2 Financial Implications

None

6.3 Legal Implications

None

6.4 People Implications

None

6.5 Property Implication

None

6.6 Consultation

None required

6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

None

6.8 Risk Assessment

Not required

6.9 Value for Money

Not applicable

6.10 Community Safety Implications

Not applicable

6.11 Environmental Impact

None required

7. Background Papers

None

8. Appendices

Appendix 1: 2017 Provisional School Performance Outcomes for Southend Schools

2017 Attainment Summary – Provisional (16/08/2017)

EYFS Summary 2017

All pupils

- The percentage of pupils achieving a Good Level of Development (GLD) in Southend schools is 74.3%, an increase of 3 percentage points from 2016.
- The emerging national picture, based on 151 LA's, is 70.7% which is 1.4 percentage points higher than in 2016. If this outcome is maintained in the final publication, the improvement in Southend will be more than double that of the national performance.
- The percentage of pupils achieving GLD improved in 20 Southend schools with 5 schools improving more than 10 percentage points from 2016 results. The greatest improvement was 13.3 percentage points.
- The percentage of pupils achieving GLD fell in 8 schools with the largest decline being almost 27 percentage points.
- The average total points score (TPS) fell from 36.6 to 36.2 in Southend but remains well above the emerging national average of 34.4 (based on 142 LA's submitting data).

Disadvantaged

- The percentage of disadvantaged pupils that achieved GLD increased by almost 3 percentage points when compared to 2016, up to 61.5%.
- The gap in the percentage of pupils achieving GLD between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils reduced by 1 percentage point since 2016 to 15.1 percentage points.

SEN

- The percentage of pupils with SEN that achieved GLD increased by 10 percentage points compared to 2016, up to 21%. The gap in percentage between these pupils and those with no SEN achieved GLD decreased by almost 8 percentage points and now stands at 58.3 percentage points
- The percentage of pupils with SEN Support achieving GLD almost doubled between 2016 and 2017 (up to 29.8%) and there was also an improvement in the attainment of pupils with a statement/EHCP (now at 3.2% compared to 0% last year).

Year 1 Phonics Summary 2017

All pupils

- The percentage of year 1 pupils meeting the expected phonics standard in Southend schools is 81.5%, an increase of 1.7 percentage points from 2016.
- The emerging national picture, based on 152 LA's, is 81.3% which is 0.3 percentage points higher than in 2016. If this level is maintained as all Local Authorities submit their data, the 2016 gap between Southend and national performance will have been closed but Southend schools' performance will still exceed the national position.
- The percentage of pupils meeting the phonics standard improved in 18 Southend schools with 2 schools improving by 10 percentage points or more in relation to the 2016 results. The greatest improvement was 14.3 percentage points.
- The percentage of pupils meeting the phonics standard fell in 10 schools with the largest decline being almost 17 percentage points.

Disadvantaged

- The percentage of year 1 disadvantaged pupils meeting the expected phonics standard in Southend schools is 70.3%, an increase of almost 5 percentage points from 2016.
- The gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils meeting the expected phonics standard in Southend is 14.4%, a significant improvement on the 2016 gap of 18.1%.
- The percentage of disadvantaged pupils meeting phonics standards varies considerably from school to school. With schools that have a cohort of at least 30 disadvantaged pupils this percentage ranges from 53.1% to 79.4%.

SEN

- The gap in the percentage of pupils that are working at the phonics expected standard between those receiving SEN Support and pupils with no special education needs is 50.8%. For pupils with a statement or EHC plan this increases to 68.7%.
- For pupils with any SEN the overall percentage of those working at the expected phonics standard has increased since 2016 by over 2 percentage points although the gap when compared to pupils without SEN has remained at 56%.

KS1 Summary 2017

All pupils

- The percentage of Southend pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading, writing and maths is 66.6% which is an increase of 3.5 percentage points compared to 2016.
- The emerging national based on results from 152 LA's for KS1 reading, writing and maths combined is 63.7% an increase of 3.4 percentage points compared to 2016, this means the Southend figure is currently 2.8 percentage points higher than the emerging national.
- The breakdown for each subject is reading (78.2%), writing (71.2%) and maths (76.9%) – Southend is above the emerging national average in each subject and has improved on last year's outcomes.
- 20 Southend schools are currently performing better than national the combined measure of reading, writing and maths.
- The percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths improved in 19 schools with 6 schools improving by more than 10 percentage points compared to 2016 results. The greatest improvement was 26.3 percentage points.
- The percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths fell in 9 schools with the largest decline of 18.3 percentage points.

Disadvantaged

- The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving at least the expected standard in reading, writing and maths was 50.7%, an improvement of over 4 percentage points compared to 2016 results. The attainment of disadvantaged pupils in reading, writing and maths combined exceeded the 2016 performance in 21 out of 29 schools.
- The attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils for achieving the expected standard in combined reading, writing and maths was 20.4%. This is an improvement on the 2016 gap, which was 22.2%.
- Individually, the largest gap was in writing (19.3%), followed by maths (18.1%) and reading (17.3%).

SEN

- The percentage of Southend pupils with SEN achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading, writing and maths is 10% which is an increase of 2 percentage points compared to 2016. The improvement in attainment for pupils receiving SEN Support and for those with a statement or EHC plan is 0.9 percentage points and 4.8 percentage points respectively.
- The percentage of pupils with a statement or EHC plan achieving the expected standard has fallen since 2016 in relation to each separate subject of reading, writing and maths. This was most notable in maths where there was a 10.2 percentage point drop in attainment from 2016, increasing the attainment gap in mathematics between pupils with a statement or EHC plan and those with no SEN to 76.2%.
- The attainment gap between pupils with a statement or EHC plan and pupils with no SEN has widened in each of the above subjects. This is also the case with pupils receiving SEN Support.

KS2 Summary 2017

All pupils

- The percentage of Southend pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths test is 65% this is an increase of 9.2 percentage points compared to 2016.
- The interim national results of pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths test is 61%, an increase of 8.0 percentage points compared to 2016. Overall the Southend figure is 3.9 percentage points higher than the interim national results.
- Individually, the outcomes were 73.7% in reading, 78.4% in writing, 76.4% in maths and 79.4% in grammar, punctuation and spelling. These outcomes were above the national average in each subject.
- 21 Southend schools are currently performing in line or above the interim national results for pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths test.
- The percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths test improved in 23 schools (nearly 80%) compared to 2016 results, with 17 schools improving by over 10.0 percentage points when compared to their 2016 results. The greatest achievement is shared between 2 schools improving by over 30 percentage points compared to their 2016 results.
- The percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths fell in 6 schools compared to their 2016 results with 2 schools dropping by over 10.0 percentage points.

Progress

- The emerging KS1-2 progress for all Southend pupils is better than their peers nationally with a positive progress score of 0.3 for reading, 0.3 for writing and 0.3 for maths.
- For KS1-2 reading progress 19 schools had positive progress scores with 4 significantly above national average.
- For KS1-2 writing progress 18 schools had positive progress with 6 schools significantly above national average.
- For KS1-2 maths progress 20 schools had positive progress with 7 schools significantly above national average.

Disadvantaged

- The percentage of disadvantaged pupils achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths test was 49.6%, an improvement of almost 10 percentage points compared to 2016 results.
- The attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils for achieving the expected standard in combined reading, writing and maths was 22.9%. This is an improvement on the 2016 gap, which was 24%.
- The 8 schools that had a gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils above the Southend overall figure each had a gap of over 30% with the greatest being 44.2%.

SEN

- The percentage of Southend pupils with SEN achieving the expected standard or above in combined reading test, writing TA and maths test is 14.4% which is an increase of 6.5 percentage points compared to 2016. The improvement in attainment for pupils receiving SEN Support and for those with a statement or EHC plan is 7.7 percentage points and 4.9 percentage points respectively.

Appendix 1

- The most significant improvement in test results has been in maths where pupils with SEN Support showed a 12.5 percentage point improvement since 2016 in relation to the percentage of pupils achieving at least the expected standard.
- The poorest comparative test result was in relation to pupils with a statement or EHC plan in maths where there was a 0.7 percentage point drop in attainment from 2016, increasing the attainment gap in mathematics between pupils with a statement or EHC plan and those with no SEN to 70.1%.
- The attainment gap between pupils with a statement or EHC plan and pupils with no SEN has increased in every subject, including test results, teaching assessments and scaled scores.
- The attainment gap between pupils with SEN Support and pupils with no SEN has improved in relation to reading, writing, maths and grammar, punctuation and spelling.

KS4 Summary 2017

- High level summary data from results day suggests that 72.3% of students in Southend schools achieved grade 4 or above in English and maths at GCSE. Grade 4 is the threshold considered to be a 'standard pass' by the Department for Education and the bottom of this grade aligns with the bottom of the previous C grade. Although comparisons with previous years should be treated with caution, this shows an improvement from 2016, when 69% of students achieved C or above in both English and maths.
- There were notable increases in the combined English and Maths basics measure for 2 schools of 16 percentage points and 12 percentage points. Overall, 5 schools saw an improvement of more than 1 percentage point, with 3 schools declining by the same margin.
- Based on provisional results from 10 schools, 83.9% of pupils achieved grade 4 or above in English and 80.0% of pupils achieved this in maths. Although these figures are subject to dip slightly, it suggests an improvement from last year when 82% of pupils achieved A*-C in English and 75.6% achieved A*-C in maths. The national data released by the JCQ indicates that 64.9% of pupils achieved grade 4 or above in English Language, 72.0% achieved this in English Literature and 68.9% achieved this in maths.
- 99.5% of pupils in these 10 schools achieved at least 1 GCSE.
- Based on provisional results from 9 schools, 75.9% of pupils achieved grade 5 or above in English and 69.5% of pupils achieved this in maths.
- In the English Baccalaureate measure, data was only received from 8 schools. The provisional data shows 44.2% of pupils entered the EBACC, with 36.6% achieving based on 4-9 in English and 32.6% achieving based on 5-9 in English.
- The provisional Attainment 8 score for the 8 schools that submitted data was 54.5 (last year's Southend figure was 53.5).

KS5 Summary 2017

- High level summary data from results day suggests that 11.4% of A-level entries were A* compared to the national average of 8.3%, 35.8% of entries were A* or A grades, compared to national figures of 26.3%, with 98.5% of all grades being A*- E grade, above the national equivalent of 97.9%. Please note this excludes data from one school who did not share their results. Figures are not comparable to the DfE headline measures for KS5 which are released in the autumn term.
- Based on comparative data from results day last year, there has been an improvement in all measures in Southend (last year saw the rate of entries at A* at 8.2%, A*-A at 29.6% and A*-E at 98.4%).

This page is intentionally left blank

***‘Alternative Provision –
off site education
provision for children and
young people’***

People Scrutiny Committee
In depth scrutiny project 2016/17

Preface

“The People Scrutiny Committee decided that its in depth project for 2016/17 would be on Alternative Provision, looking at off site education provision for children and young people.

The project team, of which I am Chairman, decided that the specific focus of the review would be on looking at current Alternative Provision for permanently excluded pupils, whether the current provision meets needs and secures good outcomes for every child and make recommendations for the future shape of Alternative Provision.

I would like to thank my colleagues on the project team and those who contributed to the review – this proved to be a timely project – and one which led to many more questions.

I would like to extend my gratitude to all those who have been involved in the project for which I have been proud to take the lead and I commend this report for publication.”



**Councillor James Moyies
Chairman, People Scrutiny
Committee**

“As Vice Chair of People Scrutiny, I am delighted to have been involved with this project reviewing our Alternative Education Provision Services for children and young people in Southend. I am grateful to Members who gathered evidence, to form the basis of our 12 recommendations.

From the outset, we agreed that we should share best practice from schools and providers across our town, placing the child and family at the centre of what we do.

What we learned would be that using consistent assessments, signposting to early interventions as a prevention tool, improving the post 16 pathway, clearly would be fundamental in achieving successful educational outcomes for our young people.

I hope that this report will be a catalyst, to influence education strategy in the future and bring about a positive improvement. I commend this report to you.”



**Councillor Cheryl Nevin
Vice Chairman, People Scrutiny
Committee**

1. Scope of the scrutiny review and expected outcomes

Members of the People Scrutiny Committee undertook an in depth project looking at Alternative Provision – off site educational provision for children and young people. Led by the cross party project team members, the project had the following scope and expected outcomes:-

Scope of the project:-

- (i) To investigate the current Alternative Provision for permanently excluded pupils, those deemed at risk of exclusion and for other pupils who, because of illness, or other reasons (behavioural, emotional, social challenges), would not receive suitable education.
- (ii) To investigate whether the current provision meets the needs / discharges responsibility effectively, it happens in a coordinated way and aims for securing good outcomes for every child. This will include the implementation and effectiveness of the Council's fair access protocol, an agreement between schools as to how we collectively manage the education of these learners.
- (iii) To determine the future shape of Alternative Provision that is the responsibility of the Local Authority to provide and make recommendations to further improve the outcomes, attendance and accountability for those in Alternative Provision.

Expected outcomes:-

As a result of the project, it is envisaged that the Council working through its partners in schools and the Alternative Provision providers will:

- 1. Over time, ensure that learners who are service users of Alternative Provision return to, and remain at, their substantive and permanent school as soon as appropriate;
- 2. Ensure that older service users within Alternative Provision are helped to secure appropriate and relevant sustainable pathways into further education, employment or training;
- 3. That over time, the outcomes for service users improve in comparison to the national relevant cohorts.

2. Background to the report

Legislation, definition of Alternative Provision and current provision in Southend

Alternative Provision is defined as education arranged by Local Authorities for pupils who, because of exclusion, illness or other reasons, would not otherwise receive suitable education; education arranged by schools for pupils on a fixed period exclusion; and pupils being directed by schools to off-site provision to improve their behaviour’.

Local authorities are responsible for arranging suitable full-time education for permanently excluded pupils, and for other pupils who because of illness or other reasons would not receive suitable education without such provision. This applies to all children of compulsory school age resident in the local authority area, whether or not they are on the roll of a school, and whatever type of school they attend (s19 Education Act 1996).¹

Alternative provision is where pupils engage in timetabled, educational activities away from school, for example by attending a pupil referral unit (PRU) or participating in commissioned courses and activities.

This review has looked mainly at the alternative provision that is the responsibility of the local authority to provide for permanently excluded pupils.

PRUs were given delegated budgets from April 2013 and changes to legislation required Local Authorities (LA’s) to delegate budgets to the management committee of the PRU from 1st April 2013. The relevant regulations prescribe how PRU’s budget shares are to be calculated and what funds for high needs pupils can be retained centrally by a LA. The funding arrangements for PRU also changed from 1st April 2013.

The PRU is Seabrook College, which currently delivers alternative provision and prevention pathways; outreach service for behaviour and reintegration support; individual tuition service.

Southend YMCA Community Free School is an alternative provider and opened in September 2013. It caters for up to 40 pupils and provides for children aged 14 – 16 at KS4, who require an alternative offer to mainstream education. Admission is by schools referral.

At the time of the scrutiny review, the Local Authority was in the process of renegotiating the 3 service level agreements currently held with Seabrook College and the new Academy Sponsor Parallel Learning Trust.

¹ *Statutory guidance on alternative provision was issued in January 2013 – see **Alternative provision, statutory guidance** DfE 10th January 2013. Directing a pupil off-site for education to improve behaviour derives from s 29A of the Education Act 2002, introduced by the Education and Skills Act 2008.*

Seabrook College is a federation of two schools/provisions the PRU and special school for Social, Emotional and Mental Health. Under the Parallel Learning Trust there are plans to separate the two provisions into two separate establishments. To support this, the Local Authority are in the process of sourcing new accommodation to meet the needs of both provisions on one site and ensure all key stages have access to suitable accommodation both for indoor and outdoor learning.

Over the last year or so, there have been consistent capacity issues in most year groups due to a steady number of children being admitted to the college but with limited numbers reintegrating back into mainstream. This has had a significant impact on the number of prevention places available due to the rise in pupils on roll. There has also been a significant rise in permanent exclusions from academy secondary schools, impacting upon place need.

The changes in the proposed agreements focus primarily on tightening the service objectives and key performance indicators, in order to measure outcomes more robustly.

Although Seabrook have been able to provide education from the sixth day of permanent exclusion, to date they have had limited impact on reducing the numbers of children being excluded in Southend. The proposed service specifications, focuses upon prevention within mainstream schools and improving schools systems and strategies for nurture and managing behaviours, with specific KPI's measuring pupil exclusions. The Parallel Learning Trust has been successful in improving outcomes both educationally and behaviourally in other areas and in particular is practised in ensuring an effective revolving door, whereby pupils enter the provision, receive the right support and then are enabled to successfully integrate back into mainstream. In addition to measuring the success of the work undertaken with schools, there remains a focus on the success of the work with pupils on the roll of the PRU including improving educational outcomes, behaviour and access to quality, full time education, an area that had previously been raised as a concern by Ofsted.

Permanent exclusions by school type

The following table is taken from the Annual Education Report 2015/16, reported to Cabinet on 21st March 2017.

Permanent exclusions by school type

	2012/13		2013/14		2014/15	
	No. of permanent exclusions	% of the school population	No. of permanent exclusions	% of the school population	No. of permanent exclusions	% of the school population
Primary						
Southend	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
England	670	0.02	870	0.02	920	0.02
Secondary						
Southend	x	x	6	0.05	5	0.04
England	3,900	0.12	4,000	0.13	4,790	0.15
Special						
Southend	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
England	60	0.07	70	0.07	90	0.09
Total						
Southend	x	x	10	0.02	10	0.04
England	4,630	0.06	4,950	0.06	5,800	0.07

Notes

Source SFR26/2016 - Table 16
SFR10/2016 - Table 11.1 for pupil enrolment figures

Data Final

The national school census data for 2015/16 will be published in July 2017. However, local intelligence indicates that since 2015 there has been a year on year increase for both permanent and fixed term exclusions. The trend is of great concern and mirrors national trends.

3. Methods

The Committee was supported by a project team comprising:-

- ✚ Councillor Moyies (Chairman), Councillors Boyd, Buckley, Butler, Walker, Borton, Nevin and Endersby.
- ✚ Officer / partner support – Brin Martin, Head of Learning, Cathy Braun, Group Manager for Access and Inclusion and Fiona Abbott, project coordinator.

Evidence base

The project team met on 7 occasions and considered a range of information and evidence, as set out in the following pages.

Briefing / information considered by project team during review

- (i) Snapshot of Alternative Provision in Southend and exclusion data by schools
- (ii) Relevant legislation
- (iii) Fair Access and Managed Move Protocol
- (iv) Alternative Provision checklist
- (v) Exclusion data
- (vi) Information on national review of Alternative Provision
- (vii) Information from Cllrs Moyies and Boyd's visit to Seabrook College on 8th November 2016
- (viii) Inclusion data
- (ix) Information on funding of Alternative Provision (PRU) and YMCA

Witnesses:-

The questions were sent to the witnesses in advance² and the project team met with the following people at the 3 witness sessions: -

Witness session 1 - Project team meeting on 8th November 2016

- Early Help Family Support - Carol Compton MBE and Jane Arnold
- Fair Access - Cathy Braun
- Executive Councillor – James Courtenay

Witness session 2 - Project team meeting on 16th November 2016

- Mr Mark Schofield, Shoeburyness High School
- Mr Jamie Foster, Chase High School
- Ms Sarah Greaves, Southend Virtual School
- Mr Maurice Sweeting, Southend Education Board

Witness session 3 - Project team meeting on 5th December 2016

- Mr Mark Aspel, Seabrook College
- Ms Annette Turner, YMCA Free School
- Matt King, Trust Links
- Emma Inmonger, NELFT

The project team also met with Mr M, a carer on **30th January 2017** and with representatives from an unregistered alternative provision provider on **16th March 2017**. Three members of the project team arranged to meet with some young people and their families on **8th March 2017**.

The project team would like to formally thank the witnesses for giving up their time to attend and for sharing their insights.

The project team explored the following issues at the session – current provision, whether it is meeting needs effectively, the future shape of provision - and following main themes emerged during the sessions:-

² List of questions at each session is attached at **Annex 1**

Pointers of what was discussed at session 1

Current provision:-

- Dealing with most vulnerable group of learners.
- Ensure an effective revolving door and positive managed moves – expectation has to be for use of Alternative Provision and placements as time limited and schools should get in support instead and keep young person in mainstream – i.e. for them to return to mainstream (unlikely for KS4 in reality).
- Seabrook College is the pupil referral unit (PRU) (also a special school) – Alternative Provision has to be appropriate – schools can also commission their own Alternative Provision. In fact the majority of Alternative Provision is commissioned directly by schools. It is the schools responsibility to commission and monitor educational outcomes and achievements. We do know that the educational outcomes from Seabrook are not good enough.
- It is the schools responsibility to monitor all Alternative Provision for their pupils including unregistered providers. The LA provides guidance pack for them to use.
- YMCA Free School is rated 'Good' by Ofsted but has limited provision – places are commissioned through mainstream or Virtual School. Can be selective in its intake (Seabrook can't as fulfils the LA statutory responsibility).
- Heard about use of Fair Access Protocol but issue is around where they get placed.
- In some cases, rather than child being permanently excluded, often parents move their child to different school in borough – likely to be Futures, Chase etc. – which have own issues.
- Alternative Provision should work alongside parents and strive towards this.
- Mention of Early Help offer and prevention programme which has been beneficial. Single front door process - use whole family approach for different outcomes. However this is reliant upon schools making referrals. Most children permanently excluded or at risk of, have had little or no involvement from early help services.

Meets needs / discharges responsibility effectively?:-

- Some schools have pulled back from using some providers because not meeting needs (educational outcomes).
- Shrinking role of LA, due to Academisation. Role of Regional Schools Commissioner. Education Board has oversight.
- LA have responsibility for providing Alternative Provision for permanently excluded pupils and create a PRU, which is what Seabrook is. Seabrook has strong sponsor and the LA will continue to commission them – also commissioned for preventative work.
- Seabrook needs to be 'Good' – and also get young people back into mainstream "get revolving door unstuck".
- Mainstream school role as well and drive inclusiveness.
- Prevention is key – peaks of referrals are at transition points e.g. Year 6 into Year 7 when move. Behaviour management in mainstream is part of prevention as well.
- Recent example of schools with 'zero tolerance' approach being used which led to the permanent exclusion of a Year 7 within the first 2 weeks of school term – the school didn't refer to Early Help service or engage in preventative approaches.

- Some see behaviour only and so child ends up in Alternative Provision – others see beyond and drive further – can't see child in isolation to other factors.
- Need to remember that far more remain in education than are excluded. Prevention has to be part of whole family approach.
- For prolific / entrenched cohort, Alternative Provision doesn't meet needs.
- Virtual School monitors Looked After Children.

Future shape:-

- Against encouraging greater use of Seabrook / Alternative Provision.
- Schools need to be more inclusive.
- Increased mentoring.
- One secondary school is very good at inclusive pathways and has Alternative provision in own school.
- For some schools academisation has meant that successful inclusive pathways have been removed.

Other comments:-

- Role of Ofsted – targets.
- Role of Regional Commissioner in new education landscape.
- Best practice elsewhere.
- Outcomes not great generally for Alternative Provision.
- Male dominated profile.

Pointers of what was discussed at session 2

Current provision:-

- School A – if students can't engage / disrupt learning of other students – offer different curriculum and work with LA – if use Alternative Provision, use YMCA. Like it because smaller / more personalised.
- School A – academisation is around raising standards of behaviour and students need to catch up – some can't cope in this environment and core who can't shift. Exclusions have increased due to changes in standards.
- School B – we have specialist pathways – Yrs 7 – 9 aim to re-engage; if doesn't happen, Yrs 10 – 11 Alternative Provision is possible. Have very few numbers in Alternative Provision. If use Alternative Provision, use YMCA. Only use Seabrook if 'nowhere else to go'.
- School B – relationships between secondary schools strained at moment.
- School B – historically Alternative Provision not been great (and is located in former factory currently!). Best provision is in the school the young person is at (pathways).
- School B – inclusion equals quality education for all.
- Frustration in delay for Seabrook becoming an Academy and move to its new site.

Meets needs / discharges responsibility effectively?:-

- School A – use home tuition services occasionally (emergency). Have personal curriculum rather than pathways.
- School A – if do use YMCA sell as a positive step. See the YMCA as 'classroom off site' – Seabrook as a failure to cater for their needs. "Everyone knows that".
- School B – the current Alternative Provision (environment and education) is not quality and does not meet needs of town.

- School B – by time of transition – behaviour is ingrained. Problems have been ‘managed’ at primary – isn’t sustainable at secondary. Hit ‘brick wall’ in Yr 7 pretty quickly.
- School B – ultimate aim is to reintegrate – need to work alongside schools earlier.
- School B – happy with outcomes of YMCA – does job, well. Seabrook – needs to re build reputation.
- School C – revolving door must happen.
- School D – primary schools use Alternative Provision – need to change behaviour – Does Alternative Provision need to be off site? Need to bring Alternative Provision into schools earlier ‘all about reintegration into mainstream education’. Outreach needed.

Future shape:-

- School B – need to make sure schools develop (aspirational) pathways as much as can working together with the community – use (our) limited resources to make a difference. Need long-term strategy / plan proposals. Need early intervention.
- School D – sharing good practice.

Other comments:-

- Southend situation – a factor? (4 single sex grammars, 2 faith schools) – means difficult children are concentrated in certain schools – also central and east of town has more socio economic problems than west.
- Seabrook has SLA around outreach resource, delivered to both primary and secondary schools.
- Discussion on mental health factors.
- Some pupils move around schools and move when difficulties occur.
- Inclusion teams at some schools better than others.
- Incentives to take difficult pupils not there – have a results driven system.
- Aspiration factors at different providers.

Pointers of what was discussed at session 3

Current provision:-

- Many pupils will be placed on the roll of the PRU via Fair Access Panel – specifically year 11 who have been out of education and therefore not GCSE ready.
- PRU is the ‘default provider’ and take most challenging and vulnerable.
- PRU does preventative work in schools.
- Some movement between PRU and YMCA.
- Funding position leads to competition – need to work together.
- KS4 – don’t go back to mainstream as best option is for pupils to remain settled and achieve.
- PRU – believe will be outstanding – MAT is way forward.

Meets needs / discharges responsibility effectively?:-

- Some schools don’t know how to manage students effectively and also have lost their inclusion units (or key staff moved on).
- Need prevention before get to exclusion point.
- Mainstream can focus on behaviour rather than other issues.
- Alternative Provision provider in partnership with schools outlined – assessed as a positive alternative.

- Mental health provision – single point of access.
- School medical provision at hospital an issue – provision needs to be developed.
- Outcomes by alternative providers at KS4.

Future shape:-

- Schools need to adopt corporate parent role rather than traditional ‘teacher’ role.

Other comments:-

- Role of school nursing service – utilised effectively by schools?
- Challenge back to schools – how meet needs (inclusion) – all around preventing children ending up in Alternative Provision.
- Alternative Provision needs to be positive – engage and inspire – add value and provide different perspective to child’s life and future.
- Seabrook has to take referrals as PRU; YMCA can decline pupils.
- PLT is commissioned to provide medical services, behaviour outreach and PRU.
- Key is don’t want young people to go to Alternative Provision.
- Risks associated with academisation.

Meeting with carer on 30th January 2017 and Alternative Provision provider on 16th March 2017

The project team met with Mr M, a carer at its meeting on 30th January 2017. He provided his candid and personal views on his experiences with Alternative Provision providers in the area.

The project team met on 16th March 2017 and met with representatives from ‘Figure of Eight Education’ who are an unregistered alternative provision provider based in the town. They outlined their positive experiences of reintegrating young people back into mainstream education and their plans moving forward.

Emotional wellbeing and mental health service

Since November 2015, North East London Foundation Trust (NELFT)³ have been operating a new contract to provide emotional wellbeing and mental health services that focus on more low intensity early interventions through a single point of access.

Councillors Boyd and Endersby were part of an Essex wide Task and Finish Group reviewing mental health services available for children and young people across Essex. The group focused on some of the issues around perception, signposting and accessibility to services aimed at children of school age. The group also looked at how the wider system worked and explored some of the issues around the level of co-ordination and ‘joined-up’ working between agencies.

As part of this review Councillors Boyd and Endersby also undertook site visits to 3 schools in the borough. This highlighted the best practice established by some schools using early intervention, access to pastoral support, mentoring, liaison with outside agencies, whole school training and supportive ethos. This Group made 9 recommendations and the report can be found by clicking on the following link – [Essex HOSC Task & Finish Group Report](#).

³ <http://www.nelft.nhs.uk/about-us>

4. Our Conclusions / Recommendations

Overall the project team concluded that mainstream school in the majority of cases is the best setting for pupils. Alternative Provision is the right place for some pupils who are disengaged from mainstream education, or who have reached the stage in their educational life where it is better for them to remain within Alternative Provision rather than move back into the mainstream.

There is evidence of good practice at both primary and secondary level, but it does not appear to be consistent across all schools. The focus should always be that the child is at the centre of what do.

With regard to the PRU, there was recognition that need to 'unstick the revolving door for all children and for the door to start revolving' i.e. as one child comes in another enters the PRU, another is successfully reintegrated back into mainstream.

The project team considered the delay in Seabrook College becoming an Academy was frustrating and has not helped the PRU move forward as quickly as wished.

At KS4 (i.e. school Years 10 and 11) the provision is different as it is recognised it is unlikely they will return to mainstream and the focus is about being settled and achieving the best outcomes for them at this stage in their education (qualifications, reducing likelihood of becoming NEETS).

The preventative support for pupils who are at risk of permanent exclusion / in Alternative Provision needs to be strengthened. The work undertaken by schools such as Shoeburyness High School was seen as good practice, which should be shared and should be emulated by other schools across the borough and by schools all working together. The issues of inclusion and accountability were also key themes during the review. Members felt that if schools invested in preventative work and had a more inclusive policy and 'bought into' fair access, then it should be encouraged.

The project team noted the extensive support the LEA is providing to the PRU.

The project team however heard that there is no longer a dedicated member of staff from the local authority who routinely visits other alternative providers, in particular the unregistered provision.

Overall, the picture which emerged during the review was that it feels fragmented. There are registered providers and numerous other alternative providers, some of whom work directly with families who have chosen to home educate their children. All Alternative Provision providers should be registered with the DfE to ensure they comply with the standards to be registered as well as routinely receive inspections through Ofsted and will raise this with the LGA for a change in policy. The project team feels that there must be greater clarity on the status and quality of the education being provided – often to our most vulnerable children and young people, facing many challenges and although schools remained responsible for commissioning placements (including assessing, monitoring and reviewing), children

should not be placed in any provision that does not fall under additional scrutiny and routine inspections from Ofsted.

The project team makes 12 recommendations – and these are around the current provision, minimizing the need for and use of Alternative Provision, future shape of Alternative Provision, to further improve the outcomes, attendance and accountability for those in Alternative Provision.⁴

Our recommendations:-

Inclusion

- 1. That in the changing school landscape around academisation etc. the Deputy Chief Executive (People) write to the Regional Schools Commissioner, Mr Tim Coulson around the need for all schools to be inclusive and intervene early to address any underlying causes of disruptive behaviour, involving multi-agency assessment and support for those that demonstrate persistent disruptive behaviours thus limiting use of Alternative Provision (with the exception of for medical reasons or other exceptional circumstances).**
- 2. That the Council contact Ofsted for there to be some appropriate recognition around how schools are supporting children who are at risk of exclusion.**
- 3. All schools should encourage early parental engagement to undertake preventative work to provide support for pupils at risk of referral to Alternative Provision and / or exclusion. The project team is keen that early interventions, including early help assessments, assessments for special educational needs including autism spectrum functions, assessments around the child's health and where appropriate adult service interventions, ensuring support focuses on the child and family. Where relevant these interventions should begin as early as possible within primary schools and early years providers and professionals. (The support needs to focus on the child and family).⁵**
- 4. Urge schools to work together to spread knowledge. Some schools are doing excellent work and need opportunities for shared learning to increase standards in mainstream / Alternative Provision settings across the board.**
- 5. Southend has the expectations that Alternative Provision should only be the 'last resort' and need to ensure that where all preventative measures have been exhausted and the young person remains at risk of permanent**

⁴ Note - the Department for Education (DfE) recently commissioned a report on Alternative Provision [Alternative provision: effective practice and post-16 transition](#) This is a literature review looking at research evidence, published articles and Ofsted reports for evidence of good practice.

⁵ The role of the school nursing service is also something that should be explored further.

exclusion, that schools look to meet their needs through registered Alternative Provision rather than permanently exclude.

6. Linking to the Recommendations above, there is a key role for the newly created Education Board to be an important, key driver for improvements.

Outcomes

7. Recognition that every learner should make good progress, regardless of the educational setting (link to Recommendation 1 above).
8. That the Deputy Chief Executive (People) lobby the LGA to raise with the DfE for a change in policy and clarification about the registration of Alternative Providers.
9. Consideration be given to explore the best way to look at creating an 'index of regulated Alternative Provision'.
10. To continue to review the emotional and mental health commissioning and consider whether it meets the increasing need of pupil mental health and emotional wellbeing needs, linking to the Essex HOSC review undertaken in 2016/17 (see [Essex HOSC Task & Finish Group Report](#)).
11. Have high aspirations for all young people in schools and need balanced, broad and appropriate curriculum (vocational qualifications at KS4 and do not want to increase demand for Alternative Provision) with the clear expectation for high attendance and for full time education.

Post 16

12. Consideration be given to improved pathways for the provision of post 16 education, training and employment, for those pupils who have accessed Alternative Provision and have not been able to return to mainstream schools (& development of appropriate KPI's).

Annex 1

Questions to witnesses at witness sessions

Aim of sessions - to understand the use of Alternative Provision for young people in Southend and how this has benefited children unable to succeed within mainstream education:-

Questions for Session 1 – 8th November 2016	
1	Does the current provision meet the needs of children and young people? (expectations, outcomes, benefits, challenges)
2	What do you see as the main challenges around use of Alternative Provision?
3	What is the role / duties of the LA?
4	What are the circumstances that would prompt a school to consider seeking Alternative Provision and what would you expect to have been done within mainstream prior to this happening? What guidelines and advice is available before decisions are taken to use Alternative Provision?
5	To your knowledge, are there any alternatives available other than Alternative Provision for children displaying these needs/concerns?
6	What do you see as the future shape of alternative provision in the changing educational landscape (improve outcomes, attendance, accountability)
Further questions from Members, general discussion from points raised.	

Questions for Session 2 – 16th November 2016	
1	What are the circumstances that would prompt a school to consider seeking an Alternative Provision for a young person?
2	What would you expect to have been done first within mainstream to meet their educational, social, emotional and behavioural needs before seeking an Alternative Provision?
3	What guidelines and advice is available before decisions are taken to use Alternative Provision?
4	To your knowledge, are there any alternatives available to schools other than Alternative Provision for children displaying these needs/concerns?
5	Once in Alternative Provision, what do you consider the schools responsibilities are to the young person?
6	Once a young person is placed within an Alternative Provision, what do you see to be the expectations for: the young person, the alternative provider and the school
7	What do you see to be as the main benefits of Alternative Provision to the young person and the school
8	What do you see as the main challenges (around use of Alternative Provision)?
9	Over the last 3 years, what have the outcomes for young people accessing Alternative Provision from your school been in relation to: Educational attainment Personal achievement

	Behaviour Attendance
10	What percentage of pupils left your school as NEET in 2015?
11	What percentage of these pupils had accessed Alternative Provision?
Further questions from Members, general discussion from points raised.	

Questions for Session 3 – 5th December 2016	
1	Does the current provision meet the needs of children and young people? (expectations, outcomes, benefits, challenges)
2	What do you see as the main challenges around use of Alternative Provision?
3	What do you see as the role / duties / responsibilities of the LA, mainstream schools and commissioners?
4	What are the circumstances that would prompt a school to consider seeking Alternative Provision and what would you expect to have been done within mainstream prior to this happening? What guidelines and advice is available before decisions are taken to use Alternative Provision?
5	To your knowledge, are there any alternatives available other than Alternative Provision for children displaying these needs/concerns?
6	Over the last 3 years, what have been the outcomes for young people accessing your Alternative Provision in relation to: Educational attainment Personal achievement Behaviour Attendance
7	What percentage of your children have a diagnosis of autism and are there any children awaiting autism diagnosis? To your knowledge have your staff had autism awareness training which recognise autistic behaviours, challenges and barriers?
8	What percentage of pupils left your provision as NEET in 2015?
9	What experience do you have of children returning full time to mainstream provision after accessing an Alternative Provision? Do you consider your provision as having a role in supporting children's success in achieving within mainstream school?
10	What do you see as the future shape of alterative provision in the changing educational landscape (improve outcomes, attendance, accountability)
Further questions from Members, general discussion from points raised.	

8

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Southend-on-Sea Education Board

on
11th Oct 2017

Report prepared by:
Brin Martin Director of Learning, SBC

9

Operational Review of Education Board and Sub Groups (including PwC recommendations)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 On the transition of the Schools Forum to Education Board in October 2016, the terms of reference agreed at the time required the new board to:

- Review effectiveness and impact after one year, to be completed by 31/7/17
- Election for Board from 1/10/17; subject to initial review and evaluation activity.
- Evaluation should include consultation and SBC Audit

1.2 In line with this requirement, this paper seeks the views of Board on how best to implement those proposals.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Board takes a view on the most appropriate and proportionate means to evaluate the effectiveness of its operations over the first year;
- 2.2 That Board commissions a review in order to meet the first recommendation.

3. Background/Context

- 3.1 Board has been operating for one year, and has achieved significant progress in a short period of time, notably the establishment of three sub groups, national recognition in an award and managing the business of Southend Education.
- 3.2 As part of its set up, it commissioned a pre audit from PwC of its likely effectiveness (appendix one, updated plan).
- 3.3 There could be a sense in the wider Southend education community that Board operates in isolation, and gives the impression of little connectivity to some schools.
- 3.4 We are currently behind the schedule established under the operational terms of reference. However, in view of a range of contextual aspects, including the time that a complete review might take, Board may wish to consider a more proportionate approach to a review.
- 3.5 Board should also have a view on the efficacy of arranging elections, either full or partial at a time when there remains vacancies on Board at present.
- 3.6 An element that Board may wish to consider is how best Board and Board members (including members of the various sub groups) can better “connect” with their wider constituencies.

4. Summary of benefits of the proposal]

- 4.1 Board would be fulfilling the terms of reference;
- 4.2 Board members would better understand the effectiveness of their work within the first year;
- 4.3 Board would meet the requirements of the PwC audit.

5. Implications of the report

5.1 Financial implications. None other than the time taken for the review/election.

5.2 Consultation. Will occur as part of the implementation of the recommendations.

5.3 Risk associated with the report. Board could be seen not to meet its obligations under the Terms of Reference. Already Board has been challenged for not being called “schools Forum”.

6. Background Papers

- 6.1 PwC updated Audit report.
- 6.2 Updated action plan

Appendix 2

Updated action plan

Ref	Action required	Progress
R1	Update TOR	TOR updated and agreed at the start of the process.
R2	Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board review membership every meeting. Elections advertised as required to fill vacancies. • Agendas, papers and minutes hosted on public website 5 working days in advance of the meeting. • Board features strongly in all communications, including Council, Cabinet and scrutiny minutes, Directors Briefings and in the local press.
R3	Preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An agenda setting meeting takes place with Officers, followed by a chairs briefing prior to Board. • Officers are required to prepare for papers in advance. Any matters that arise on the day that cannot be dealt with will be carried forwards. • KPI and dashboards are key features of all sub groups. Any performance issues that require escalating will be tabled at Board.
R4	R&R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be completed following Oct 17 Board
R5	Sub groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three sub groups established and functioning • TOR all agreed
R6	Induction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new elections have taken place. Should elections be required, then a full induction will take place.
R7	Website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papers published on Website 5 days in advance of every meeting, followed by agreed minutes.

This page is intentionally left blank

Internal Audit Services

Internal Management Report

Education Board

Reference Number: 16-AS 07

Date Issued: February 2017

Audit Team

Auditor	Dan Wills
Audit Manager	Katie Lynch

Distribution List

Director of Learning	Brin Martin
Deputy Chief Executive (People)	Simon Leftley
CC for information to:	
Director of Finance & Resources	Joe Chesterton
Chief Executive & Town Clerk	Rob Tinlin

No part of this document should be reproduced without the prior written permission of the Head of Internal Audit.

The information contained within this document is confidential and should not be provided to persons other than those authorised.

Education Board

Objective

To assess whether the initial governance and operating framework developed for the newly established Education Board, will enable it to deliver its objectives.

Scope

Internal Audit worked with the Director of Learning in a “critical friend” capacity to provide input on the design and where applicable operation of Education Board governance controls to help ensure it:

- is fit for purpose
- allows the Council to retain influence and leverage in education when the majority of schools are no longer maintained.

The work included reviewing documentation associated with the Education Board, including the Terms of Reference, interviews with key stakeholders and attending the Education Board meeting held on the 12th October 2016.

Recommendations have only been made where they are necessary to further strengthen the framework governing how the new Education Board is operating if deficiencies have been identified with the design of key controls. Therefore, they should be implemented within six months unless there is a good operational reason why this is not practical.

Key Themes

The Council has proactively established an Education Board to ensure that it can retain influence and leverage in education, when the majority of schools within the Borough are no longer maintained by the Council. This is a new and very innovative approach and the Council are one of the first Local Authorities to adopt this setup.

The governance structure for the Education Board has been established and high-level documentation is in place outlining its objectives as well as the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders. The Education Board aims to undertake the statutory functions currently discharged by the Southend Schools Forum, but in addition, make strategic recommendations on broader education policy and strategy for the Council to consider.

The wider structure and engagement of both Education Board members and stakeholders across the borough was still in its infancy, and as expected, there were opportunities for this to be developed further. Nevertheless:

- the dates of Board meetings are:
 - published in a timetable a year in advance
 - aligned to when key decisions are required, as was the approach adopted by the Schools Forum
- there is a documented operational procedure for the Education Board, which provides an initial outline of its role and responsibilities
- the process for electing Board members is clearly documented and transparent

Education Board

- the Board meeting observed in October 2016, was well chaired and the discussion was disciplined and included all members, with no single person or organisation dominating
- although the Board has met only once so far, there is a plan in place to review its effectiveness on an annual basis
- it was noted during the observation of the meeting, that:
 - voting arrangements were clear and unambiguous
 - there was no bias
 - members were able to effectively represent their organisations within the decision making process.

Policies, procedures and terms of reference

Policy documentation and terms of reference were in place. They would be enhanced, by including:

- a definition of the purpose and structure of the Board within the terms of reference.
- appointment procedures in the Education Board's terms of reference.
- appointment procedures outlined the role of the Board Chair however the Education Board terms of reference should be updated to be consistent.
- key details such as when the Board would be quorum or what procedure is required when decisions were tied, in the protocol documentation.

This would help ensure that Education Board and Board members adopt practices that promote and support a strong governance structure.

Engagement with key stakeholders

It was noted that not all interested parties were represented at the Education Board meeting on 12 October 2016.

Through review of Board minutes and papers, it was identified that a number of decisions were made which related to increasing the representation of the attendance at the Board to include representatives from across the education and health sector. We have made a number of suggestions in Appendix 1 which could assist in increasing representation at the Education Board meetings.

With regards to this meeting, Council officers were unable to answer specific questions posed relating to key figures and statistics presented. In all cases, these questions did not relate to items listed on the agenda.

Therefore, the Council should consider holding a pre-meeting prior to each Education Board to:

- identify and discuss potential questions or any issues
- maximise the chances of being able to respond appropriately to them.

Education Board

The supporting governance structure

The Council has developed a number of forums that feed into and support the Education Board. The roles and responsibilities of these forums now need to be formalised.

The Terms of Reference had been drafted for the School Performance Sub Group and the Vulnerable Children's Sub Group and include the key elements expected in line with good practice. These now need to be approved and arrangements made for the Groups to meet.

Training of members

It would be helpful for an induction pack and or training programme to be produced and made available to new or existing Education Board members. Members have been recruited from across the Education sector and their knowledge and experience may vary significantly.

In order to ensure that the Board can exercise effective scrutiny, an induction pack, regular briefings or other resources to transfer the knowledge and expertise of members, may ensure appropriate and informed decisions are taken.

Reporting

The report has been:

- discussed and agreed to be factually accurate with the Director of Learning
- finalised with the Deputy Chief Executive (People).

Senior management will monitor and sign off this action plan as part of the department's performance management process.

Corporate Links

Aim Prosperous **Priority** Ensure residents have access to high quality education to enable them to be lifelong learners and have fulfilling employment.

This report can be provided in alternative formats such as Braille, audiotape or in large print.

Translations of this document in alternative languages are also available.

Appendix 1: Education Board Action Plan

	Issues identified	Management action required	Lead officer	When
R1	<p>Governance, voting and decision making arrangements</p> <p>Policy documentation and terms of reference were in place. However, a number of areas were identified where these documents could be improved.</p>	<p>Update the terms of reference to define the purpose and structure of the Board and the roles of each Board member.</p> <p>Update protocol documentation to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when the Board would be quorum • the procedure required when decisions are tied • the manner in which things are done, regulations and etiquette • an organisational flow chart. 	Director of Learning	31 March 2017
R2	<p>Representation at Education Board meetings</p> <p>Internal Audit attended the October Education Board meeting and noted that a number of key representatives did not attend.</p>	<p>Review the approach taken to encouraging representatives and the public to attend the Education Board meetings. This could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • publicly issuing the agenda and meeting papers prior to the meeting; • including an article on the Education Board on the Council's website; or • including reminders on regular communications to stakeholders. 	Director of Learning	31 March 2017

Appendix 1: Education Board Action Plan

	Issues identified	Management action required	Lead officer	When
R3	<p>Preparation of Council officers</p> <p>Internal Audit attended the October Education Board meeting and noted that Council members were not fully prepared to answer questions from members.</p>	<p>Hold a pre-meeting prior to each Education Board meeting to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify and discuss any potential issues • ensure officers are sufficiently prepared. <p>Consider implementing a Key Performance Indicator dashboard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide an overview of the progress made by the Council • allow Board discussion to be focused on issues of greatest concern. 	Director of Learning	31 March 2017
			Director of Learning	31 March 2017
R4	<p>Roles and responsibilities</p> <p>The roles and responsibilities are not clearly documented for the Chair, Vice-Chair and Clerk in the Education Board terms of reference.</p> <p>There was no policy included which outlined how the Board would interact and communicate with the press.</p>	<p>Update the Education Board terms of reference to include clear roles and responsibilities for the Chair, Vice Chair and the Clerk.</p> <p>Update policy documents to include guidance for how the Board communicates with the press.</p>	Director of Learning	31 March 2017
R5	<p>Establishment of sub groups</p> <p>Terms of Reference are in draft for the School Performance Sub Group, Vulnerable Children's Sub Group and Resources, however, they had not been approved and the groups have not met.</p>	<p>Set up sub groups and begin meeting as soon as possible.</p> <p>Agree the sub group terms of references and present these to the Education Board for approval.</p>	Director of Learning	31 March 2017

Appendix 1: Education Board Action Plan

	Issues identified	Management action required	Lead officer	When
R6	<p>Training of members</p> <p>Internal Audit did not identify an induction pack or training programme available for new or existing members.</p>	<p>Prepare an induction pack for new Education Board members.</p> <p>Provide within it, information on key areas of the Board's activities, including finance and financial management.</p> <p>Share the pack with members and request their feedback.</p>	Director of Learning	31 March 2017
		Refresh the pack once a year to action any feedback comments from members.	Director of Learning	Annually
R7	<p>Transparency of Board activity</p> <p>Board papers should be distributed or made publically available at least five working days in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>Internal Audit was unable to locate any published papers for the Education Board meetings.</p>	Create a dedicated Education Board website or webpage, which is easy to locate on a search engine.	Director of Learning	31 March 2017
		Publish the meeting agenda and papers on the website at least five working days in advance of the meeting, in line with operational detail.	Director of Learning	31 March 2017

This page is intentionally left blank