



Rutland
County Council

**Education Provider Prioritisation
and Entitlement
2017-18**

Context

All early years providers and schools are assigned a priority level. This prioritisation is made by the Local Authority following an annual desk top review against criteria identified within this document. This is reviewed each term and the early years provider/Head Teacher is consulted if there are any proposed changes to their priority status.

This document outlines the prioritisation processes undertaken by Rutland County Council with the aim for all children and young people in Rutland to have access to good or better educational provision and to ensure that any potential vulnerability is identified and addressed swiftly.

This document should be read in conjunction with 'Rutland County Council Education Framework 2017-2020' which outlines the statutory responsibilities for which Rutland County Council's Learning and Skills Service is accountable, and describes the intention for future strategic education development activity for Rutland state-funded education provision from early years to post-16. Outcomes of activity as identified within this document, alongside end of academic year scrutiny of Rutland education performance data, contribute to the Learning and Skills Annual Review and the Education Improvement Plan 2017-18 produced in autumn 2017 in consultation with Rutland County Council Education Performance Board.

The processes described in this document reflect the statutory monitoring arrangements undertaken locally and have been agreed in consultation with Early Years providers and school leaders. These processes may be subject to amendment at any time to reflect national, regional or local educational statutory requirements.

Prioritisation of Early Years Providers

The Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) statutory framework is mandatory for all Early Years providers in England. The EYFS framework sets the standards that all Early Years providers must meet to ensure that children learn and develop well and are kept healthy and safe.

All Early Years providers are registered on the Ofsted Early Years Register and inspected through the Early Years inspection framework; provision offered within a state-funded school is included within the Ofsted common inspection framework.

The Local Authority must rely solely on the Ofsted inspection judgement of the provider or the childminder agency as the benchmark of quality and not make additional judgements. To minimise risk and maintain an accurate understanding in the performance of local provision more frequently than Ofsted inspection outcomes, regular quality assurance activity takes place to identify and address issues prior to them becoming major concerns. Appendix A: Rutland County Council - Individual Early Years Provider Priority Assessment 2017-18 identifies the criteria for the quality assurance process.

Rutland County Council has a key role in shaping the childcare market across the county and aims to maintain a strong, sustainable and diverse childcare sufficiency that meets the needs of parents and carers. To this end, regular monitoring and childcare sufficiency assessments are undertaken by the Learning and Skills Service to maintain an accurate understanding of the quality and capacity of Early Years provision in Rutland.

The Local Authority will:

- Not fund providers who do not actively promote fundamental British values or if they promote views or theories as fact which are contrary to established scientific or historical evidence and explanations;
- Only fund places for two-year-old children with providers judged as Requiring Improvement when there is insufficient accessible Good or Outstanding provision;
- Fund places for three and four year-old children at any provider judged as Requiring Improvement, Good or Outstanding by Ofsted.

Evidence shows that attending high quality early education has a lasting impact on social and behavioural outcomes. All three and four year-olds in England are entitled to 570 hours of free early education or childcare a year and some two year-olds are also eligible. It is recognised that this provision supports social, physical and cognitive development hence helping to prepare children for school. It is therefore essential that the Local Authority ensures providers deliver consistently high quality free entitlements so that all children accessing any of the free entitlements receive the same quality and access as they would within 'paid for' provision.

Actions taken following Prioritisation of Early Years' Providers

Green:

- Provider will be notified, and commended, if this is a change of prioritisation
- Providers will be encouraged, if not already doing so, to support other providers through the Early Years Leading Practitioner programme or informal peer support arrangements
- Routine monitoring will continue

Amber:

- Provider will be notified if this is a change of prioritisation
- The LA will offer a package of tailored support to enable the setting to meet the outcomes identified by Ofsted and monitored for evidence of improvement

Red:

- If prioritisation is as a result of a provider being judged inadequate by Ofsted, a post-Ofsted visit will be arranged. The Local Authority will offer a package of tailored support to enable the setting to meet the outcomes identified by Ofsted, and ensure the swift implementation of the subsequent development plan leads to rapid but sustainable improvement
- If the prioritisation is an outcome of LA identifying that the setting is not delivering the Learning and Development or Safeguarding and Welfare requirements, providers will be informed that this information will be shared with Ofsted.

Core Activity and Entitlement for Early Years Providers:

All Early Years providers delivering the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) will be entitled to an offer of Core Support from the Rutland County Council Early Years' Service. This will include an Annual Visit to each Early Years setting, access to three EYFS Networks, a Lead Early Years providers' training day and a programme of professional development. In addition, e-mail and telephone support will be available as appropriate.

A full programme of support will also be available for Newly Qualified Teachers and practitioners with support for the implementation of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and moderation of the Profile.

Settings judged by Ofsted as Good or Outstanding will access the package as outlined above. However, Early Years providers with a Requires Improvement or Inadequate Ofsted outcome will be offered a package of tailored support to meet individual needs and to bring about rapid improvement.

Providers of support/improvement for Early Years Providers

The Local Authority supports all Early Years providers but prioritises, on an inverse proportion to success, to ensure resources are focused on Early Years settings and schools which require most improvement.

To enhance this, the LA facilitates partnerships between providers who demonstrate excellence in their role and those who strive to become Outstanding through the Early Years Leading Practitioner programme. This arrangement promotes collaborative working and joint practice development and provides peer support across the authority for those wishing to further develop their practice.

Prioritisation of Schools

When delivering the school improvement function, all Local Authorities must have regard to the *Schools Causing Concern - Guidance for local authorities and Regional Schools Commissioners on how to work with schools to support improvements to educational performance, and on using their intervention powers (January 2018)* and Section 13A of the Education Act 1996, which states that a Local Authority must exercise its education functions with a view to promoting high standards. Local Authorities should act as champions of education excellence across their schools, and in doing so should:

- Understand the performance of maintained schools in their area, using data to identify those schools that require improvement and intervention;
- Work with the relevant Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) to ensure swift and effective action is taken when underperformance occurs in a maintained school, including and using their intervention powers, where this will improve leadership and standards;
- Encourage good and outstanding maintained schools to take responsibility for their own improvement and to support other schools;
- Enable schools that require support, to be able to access such support; this is central to Rutland's '2020 Vision' through which maturity in the sector-led approach between and within schools is achieved.

To ensure that Rutland Local Authority adheres to these duties, members of Rutland County Council Learning and Skills Service meet at least three times per year to undertake a desktop review of school effectiveness. At this meeting a range of evidence is considered and a prioritisation agreement made about each primary and secondary maintained school or academy.

Prioritisation is agreed using a 'best-fit' approach as identified in Appendix B: Rutland County Council Individual School Scorecard 2017-18. No further action will be taken until the school has been notified of any concerns raised. The relevant Diocesan Director of Education will also be informed, where appropriate, of any concerns regarding a Church school so a co-ordinated approach to support and challenge is assured.

Rutland school prioritisation will form the basis of routine 'Keep in Touch' discussions with Regional Schools Commissioner's Officers and the Regional Ofsted team.

Actions taken following prioritisation of schools

Green:

- School will be notified, and commended, if this is an improved prioritisation.
- School leaders will be encouraged, if not already doing so, to support other schools through formalised or informal school to school arrangements.
- Routine monitoring will continue as described above.

Amber:

- School will be notified if this is a change of prioritisation
- Rutland County Council maintained schools:
 - A meeting will be called with the Head Teacher and the Chair of the Governing Board to discuss identified concerns and whether the school's plan to bring about improvement is sufficient and has rigour and credibility;
 - A short-term review date will be arranged by which time the school will be expected to provide evidence of rapid improvement;
 - A Learning and Skills Officer will attend a Governing Board meeting as an observer; an external review of governance may be requested;

- If the school does not taking swift and effective action, regular formal Strategy Meetings with Head Teacher and Chair of Governors (or their representative) will be set up to enable the Learning and Skills Service to monitor progress towards addressing concerns; failure to demonstrate improvement will result in re-prioritisation.
- Academies or free schools
 - The Head of Service for Learning and Skills will offer to meet with the Academy CEO and/ or Head Teacher and Chair of the Governing Board to discuss concerns and consider options; however Academies are accountable to the Secretary of State. Therefore, Local Authorities are expected to raise any concerns they have about an academy's standards, leadership or governance directly with the relevant Regional Schools Commissioner.

Red:

If prioritisation is as a result of a maintained school being judged inadequate by Ofsted, the Secretary of State has a duty to make an academy order to enable it to become an academy. The LA will offer relevant support to the RSC's office to ensure transition to academy status does not further jeopardise the children or young people's education. The Regional Schools Commissioner should respond swiftly and robustly if an academy has been judged inadequate by Ofsted.

- If prioritisation is as a result of a judgement through RCC risk assessment:
 - Maintained schools:
 - A formal Learning and Skills Service Strategy Meeting will be instigated with the Head Teacher and Chair of Governing Board to set out the evidence of concern; school leaders need to demonstrate, at that meeting, that robust improvement plans have been completed and that planned actions will be rigorously monitored through in-school and external scrutiny arrangements. Further meetings will be arranged as required;
 - A Learning and Skills Officer will attend Governing Board meeting as an observer; an external review of governance will be requested;
 - If school cannot demonstrate swift and effective action and impact, Rutland County Council will work with the Regional Schools Commissioners' office, as stipulated in the DfE Schools Causing Concern Guidance, and utilise intervention powers where this will improve leadership and standards.
 - Academies or free schools:
 - The Head of Service for Learning and Skills will offer to meet with Academy CEO and/ or Head Teacher and Chair of Governing Board to discuss concerns and consider options; however Academies are accountable to the Secretary of State. Therefore, Local Authorities are expected to raise any concerns they have about an academy's standards, leadership or governance directly with the relevant RSC.

There may be schools which have not been judged by Ofsted to be inadequate or that have not met the coasting definition, but otherwise give cause for concern – for example, where the school's performance data are below floor standards, or where leadership and governance has broken down or safety is threatened. In these circumstances two types of warning notice can be issued to maintained schools:

- Section 60 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 sets out the provisions relating to a performance standards and safety warning notice. This section provides that either the Local Authority or the Secretary of State (and therefore Regional Schools Commissioners on behalf of the Secretary of State) may issue such a warning notice.
- Section 60A of the 2006 Act sets out the provisions relating to teachers' pay and conditions warning notice. This section provides that the Local Authority may issue such a warning notice.

It is expected that Local Authorities will use their powers to issue warning notices in the schools which they still maintain. When a maintained school becomes an academy then the intervention role will fall solely to the Regional Schools Commissioner as outlined in the DfE Schools Causing Concern Guidance.

Core Activity and Entitlement for Maintained Schools and Academies:

Core activity:

The following will apply to all schools:

- **Annual table-top review** of published standards with consideration to the Council's vision, policies, statutory powers and services;
- **Termly interim reviews** by the Learning and Skills Service in conjunction with colleagues from the SEND/ Early Help team;
- **Comparative review** by the Education Performance Board;
- **Access to Council services** described as under "Entitlement" (see below);
- **Services for children who have special educational needs and/ or disabilities** in line with statutory requirements and Rutland policy;
- **Overview by Lead Member/ Portfolio Holder** for Education.

Entitlement for schools and academies

The Council will provide, unless declined by schools:

- **Named Education Officer** assigned to each school/academy;
- **A minimum of two paired evaluation visits each academic year** to **maintained schools** made by the Education Officer to review learner achievement, impact on addressing school and partnership priorities and future development areas;
- Participation in **Rutland School Review Partnership Programme**;
- Participation in **termly LA and Education Leadership partnership events**
- **Remote education advice** from the Education Officer;
- **Access to advice on pupil admissions.**

The Education Performance Board

The remit of this Board is to review and evaluate standards of education and wider educational provision within the County. It may recommend to the Council action to be taken affecting policy, strategy provision and evaluation.

Rutland School Review Partnership Programme

This programme is a core element of the strategy for future education improvement in Rutland. It promotes and formalises effective peer review and challenge between education providers in the Rutland area to provide a robust approach to sector-led, sustained, school improvement. The programme promotes school leaders, staff and governors working together to maximise their whole system leadership and to create and sustain an environment of high achievement beyond the individual school. The core members are the schools in Rutland and their partners and in practical terms, this means a regular and developing programme of peer challenge and support within and across groups of schools. Details of the activities of this programme due to commence January 2018 are currently being finalised and will be shared when confirmed.

Provision for vulnerable maintained schools and schools causing concern

A sliding scale of support and challenge will be available to reflect the needs of schools which, through prioritisation, have been identified as causing concern to the Local Authority.

Additional support for schools and academies

Schools are encouraged to use the increasing range of school to school support available, including that offered through Teaching School Alliances, Multi Academy Trusts, National Leaders of Education, National Leaders of Governance and nationally funded initiatives.

The Local Authority works in partnership with Rutland and regional Teaching School Alliances to benefit from the Strategic School Improvement Fund (SSIF) which is a grant to support primary, secondary and special academies and maintained schools and to further build a school-led system. The SSIF aims to target resources at the schools most in need to improve school performance and pupil attainment; to help them use their resources most effectively, and to deliver more good school places. The fund will support medium to long term sustainable activities across groups of a minimum of four schools with a preference towards school-led provision which is support provided by schools for schools. At least 70% of the schools supported through any one application must meet at least one of the eligibility criteria (see Appendix C). Further information is available through <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-school-improvement-fund>

Providers of school support/improvement

Schools are best placed to source their own school improvement and, in Rutland, we will promote this through a range of partnership arrangements. This may be with external providers, a Teaching School Alliance (TSA), a Multi Academy Trust (MAT), a National Leader of Education (NLE), a Local Leader of Education (LLE) or a National Leader of Governance (NLG).

A collaborative, professional approach is required to achieve the best outcomes for the school and preserve the quality of the service. For this to be effective, a small number of conditions should be met:

- All school improvement parties should agree to work collaboratively to achieve the expected outcomes. This must require due diligence from all parties prior to agreement;
- A clear, agreed statement must be created regarding expected outcomes, timescale, responsibilities, resource allocation, evaluation method and exit criteria. This must be agreed by both parties;
- A code of practice applies to Rutland Learning and Skills education improvement service; an appropriate code or protocol should apply to all parties.
- Additional resource may be allocated by the Council to schools in the amber and red categories. The education improvement service will, under these circumstances, monitor the process and impact of improvement parties working with the school.

Appendix A
Rutland County Council - Individual Early Years Provider Priority Assessment 2017-18

EARLY YEARS SETTING/ PROVIDER	SETTING MANAGER	DATE OF COMPLETION:		
AREA	GREEN	AMBER	RED	NOTES
Type of Registration	Currently Registered on the Ofsted Early Years Register/ Registered with the DfE under the Governing Body of the School	In the process of a change to current Ofsted Registration e.g. venue move or change of Registered Person	No current registration of provision	
Most Recent Local Authority Contact (Date)	Annual Visit Pre or Post Ofsted visit Support visit Regular attendance at EYFS events.	No visit within the last year Infrequent attendance at EYFS events.	Complete disengagement with the LA No attendance at EYFS events.	
Current Ofsted Outcome; date of last inspection	Outstanding / Good	Requires Improvement	Inadequate	
Learning and Development Requirements	No concerns raised	Minor concerns noted	Serious concerns raised	
Implementation of EYFS Safeguarding and Welfare Requirements	No concerns raised	Some concerns raised, but no safeguarding concerns noted	Serious concerns raised	
Current Capacity %	High take up of places	Vacant Capacity	Low take up of places impacting on viability	

Leadership	Strong, experienced leadership demonstrated through sustained improvement; issues addressed swiftly	Change of leadership or interim absence Some concerns over speed of change/ improvement embedded	Poor leadership ; concerns not being addressed	
Complaints to Ofsted	LA not aware of complaints	LA aware of complaint. Complaint addressed with recommendations and, where relevant, provider has fully implemented an Action Plan	LA aware of complaint and provider has not responded to or addressed the concern.	
Local Authority Concerns/ feedback	No concerns raised or negative feedback given to LA	Concerns raised but reported to be addressed by provider	Concerns raised and not being addressed by provider; frequent negative feedback to LA	
Overall Prioritisation	Green: Low priority	Amber: Medium priority	Red: High priority	

INDIVIDUAL EARLY YEARS PROVIDER PRIORITY ASSESSMENT 2017-18 - AGREED NEXT STEPS:				
AREA:	ACTION REQUIRED:	PERSON RESPONSIBLE:	DATE TO BE COMPLETED BY:	REPORTED TO:
Overall Prioritisation	Early Years provider informed of prioritisation change			

Appendix B**Rutland County Council - Individual School Priority Assessment 2017-18**

SCHOOL	HEAD TEACHER		DATE:	
AREA	GREEN	AMBER	RED	NOTES
Safeguarding	No concerns have been raised regarding pupil behaviour and/ or safety	No concerns have been raised regarding pupil behaviour and/ or safety	Justifiable concerns have been raised regarding pupil behaviour and/ or safety	Automatic categorisation as Red if any safeguarding concerns
Capacity for sustained improvement	The school's capacity for further improvement is demonstrated through sustained improvement	The school's capacity for improvement is not yet impacting on sustained improvement	The school does not demonstrate capacity for sustained improvement	
Ofsted – actual and predicted Date of last inspection	Ofsted good or outstanding with no indication for change of judgement; RI with evidence of rapid improvement	The school is at risk of being judged as Requiring Improvement/ the school has had a recent inspection and has been judged as Requiring Improvement; no evidence of rapid improvement	The school is at risk of being judged inadequate/ the school has had a recent inspection and has been judged as inadequate	Automatic categorisation as Red if Ofsted category
Accurate self-evaluation	Peer/ paired review indicates school's self-evaluation is secure and monitoring processes are robust External moderation indicates assessment processes are rigorous; close correlation with outcomes at the end of each key stage	Peer/ paired review indicates school's self-evaluation is not always accurate and monitoring processes are not always robust External moderation indicates assessment processes are not consistently rigorous; generally teacher assessment is in line with outcomes at the end of each key stage	Peer/ paired review indicates school's self-evaluation is inaccurate and monitoring processes lack rigour External moderation indicates assessment processes are inaccurate and do not consistently match outcomes at the end of each key stage	

<p>Academic performance outcomes</p>	<p>Overall data shows consistent/improving trend across all areas</p> <p>Attainment at the end of each key stage is generally above national average; where it is average it represents good progress from starting points.</p> <p>Data indicates all groups of pupils are making expected and exceeding expected progress in reading, writing and mathematics (primary) and in English, mathematics and Best 8 measures (secondary)</p> <p>Pupils in receipt of pupil premium funding make better progress compared with similar pupils nationally; where attainment and progress gaps exist for vulnerable groups there is evidence that they are narrowing at a faster rate than they are nationally</p> <p>Post-16 attainment, value-added and retention measures are above national</p>	<p>Overall data trends are inconsistent but no evidence of declining trends</p> <p>Attainment at the end of each key stage is generally in line with national average; does not yet represent good progress from starting points</p> <p>Data indicates some groups of pupils are not making expected progress in reading, writing or mathematics (primary) or in English, mathematics and Best 8 measures (secondary)</p> <p>Pupils in receipt of pupil premium funding do not make as good progress compared with similar pupils nationally; gaps in attainment and progress of vulnerable groups of pupils are wider than seen nationally and show little sign of narrowing</p> <p>Post-16 attainment, value-added and retention measures are in line/just below national measures</p>	<p>Overall data trends are inconsistent; evidence of trends declining over time</p> <p>Attainment at the end of each key stage is generally below national average; does not represent expected progress from starting points</p> <p>Data indicates most groups of pupils are not making expected progress in reading, writing or mathematics (primary) or in English, mathematics and Best 8 measures (secondary)</p> <p>Pupils in receipt of pupil premium funding do not make sufficient progress compared with similar pupils nationally; gaps in attainment and progress of vulnerable groups of pupils are wider than seen nationally and not narrowing</p> <p>Post-16 attainment, value-added and retention measures are below national measures</p> <p>The school is defined as 'Coasting' or below floor</p>	
--------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Exclusions	Exclusion rates are well below that seen nationally	Exclusion rates in line with those seen nationally	Exclusion rates higher than those seen nationally	
Absence	Authorised and unauthorised absence is lower than national levels; no spikes or rising trend No concerns raised regarding processes for managing term-time absence	Authorised and unauthorised absence is in line with national levels; no spikes or rising trend Some concerns raised about processes for managing term-time absence	Authorised and unauthorised absence are higher than national levels; spikes or rising trend Concerns raised about processes for managing term-time absence	
Admissions	No concerns raised through admissions	No significant concerns raised through admissions	Concerns have been raised through admissions	
Number on roll/ mobility	Increasing or static roll/ no unexplained outward mobility	Increasing or static roll/ no outward unexplained mobility	Decreasing roll/ unexplained outward mobility	
Complaints	The Local Authority is not aware of any formal complaints that have been upheld; Parent View and other external review sites are highly favourable	The Local Authority is aware of formal complaints but these have been addressed; Parent View and other external review sites are favourable	The Local Authority is aware of formal complaints that have been upheld; Parent View and other external review sites are highly unfavourable	
Additional support	There is evidence of high quality support being provided to other schools/ providers	The school is able to improve without a programme of external support	The school is in need/ receipt of significant external support	
Overall Prioritisation	Green: Low priority; self-sustaining	Amber: Medium priority; vulnerable to Ofsted judgement Requiring Improvement or remaining as Requiring Improvement	Red: High priority; vulnerable to Ofsted inadequate or already judged inadequate by Ofsted	

AGREED NEXT STEPS:

INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL PRIORITISATION 2017-18 - AGREED NEXT STEPS:				
AREA:	ACTION REQUIRED:	PERSON RESPONSIBLE:	DATE TO BE COMPLETED BY	REPORTED TO:
Overall Prioritisation	Head Teacher informed of prioritisation change			

Appendix C
Strategic School Improvement Fund Eligibility Criteria 2017

Reference number	Eligibility criteria
E1	Schools in opportunity areas
E2	Schools rated inadequate in latest inspection
E3	Schools that meet the coasting definition or schools that are below the floor standard based on their published data
E4	Schools rated requires improvement in 2 consecutive Ofsted inspections
E5	Schools received a warning notice over the past 3 years
E6	Schools not meeting the KS5 minimum standards
E7	Progress 8 score overall less than -0.25
E8	Schools meet both of these criteria: 1) There are more than 35 disadvantaged pupils in the school, and 2) Progress 8 score for disadvantaged pupils in the school is less than -0.25 overall
E9	Schools meet both of these criteria: 1) There are more than 35 disadvantaged pupils in the school, and 2) The gap between disadvantaged pupils and non-disadvantaged pupils nationally for Progress 8 scores is less than -0.25
E10	Schools meet both of these criteria: 1) Less than 85% of pupils overall achieve expected standard in reading, writing and maths, and 2) At least one of the following is true: i) Reading progress is less than -2.5 , ii) Writing progress is less than -3.5, iii) Maths progress is less than -2.5
E11	Schools meet all of these criteria: 1) There are more than 10 disadvantaged pupils in the school, 2) Less than 85% of disadvantaged pupils in the school achieve the expected standard in reading, writing and maths, and 3) At least one of the following is true: i) Reading progress is less than -2.5, ii) Writing progress is less than -3.5, iii) Maths progress is less than -2.5
E12	Schools meet both of these criteria: 1) There are more than 10 disadvantaged pupils in the school, and 2) At least one of the following is true: i) The gap between disadvantaged pupils and other pupils nationally for reading is less than -2.5, ii) The gap between disadvantaged pupils and other pupils nationally for writing is less than -3.5, iii) The gap between disadvantaged pupils and other pupils nationally for maths is less than -2.5
E13	KS5 academic progress score is between 0 and -0.5
E14	KS5 applied general progress score is between 0 and -0.75