



Rutland County Council

Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 758307
DX 28340 Oakham

Record of a meeting of the **PEOPLE (CHILDREN) SCRUTINY PANEL** held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham at 7.00 pm on **Thursday 18 April 2013**

PRESENT: Miss G Waller (Chairman, in the Chair)
Mr M E Baines
Mrs C Cartwright
Mrs J K Figgis
Mr J M Lammie
Mr M A Oxley
Mrs L I Stephenson
Mrs C Vernon
Mr N M Wainwright
Mr A S Walters

CO-OPTED MEMBERS: Mr Goringe Diocesan, Church of England
Ms S Gullan – Whur Primary Schools

OFFICERS PRESENT: Ms C Chambers Strategic Director for People
Miss M Gamston Democratic Services Officer
Mr M Naylor Assistant Director – Services for People
Ms W Poynton Assistant Director – Services for People

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Mr K Bool Portfolio Holder for Education & Children's Services
Mr J T Dale

APOLOGIES: Ms P Rubinstein

912 RECORD OF MEETING

- i) The Chairman, Miss Waller, requested that it be noted that wording to minute no. 742 a) be altered to more accurately reflect the discussion point: the Chairman, Miss Waller, advised that the definition of EYFS was Early Years Foundation Stage.

For factual accuracy, the Chairman, Miss Waller, advised Members that St Mary & St John C of E VA Primary School took advice on Headteacher appointment from their Human Resources advisors.

Subject to the above, the Record of the Meeting of the People (Children) Scrutiny Panel held on 21 February 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the

Chairman.

- ii) Mr Walters requested that the wording to recommendation 2.4 be altered to reflect the discussion and decision taken to change the wording of the original recommendation. Recommendation 2.4 to read: That the Council reviews all home to secondary school transport so that it links villages to schools and, as far as possible, also provides a public service route.

Mr Walters requested that the wording to recommendation 2.12 be altered to reflect that the hopper service was separate from the rest of the recommendation. Recommendation 2.12 to read: That the Council maps usage on all bus routes to ascertain whether times can be amended/reduced to release funds; enable a hopper service to be provided in Uppingham to facilitate attendance at the new doctors surgery.

The Chairman, Miss Waller, stated that she believed recommendation 2.16 to be accurate as the Transport Task and Finish Group had been informed that the mileage rate paid to drivers was different, not the rate paid by the end user. She further advised that Mr Walters' question regarding this recommendation should be put to the Places Scrutiny Panel to allow Mr Baines the opportunity to respond.

Subject to the above amendments, the Record of the Special Joint Meeting of the Places and People (Children) Scrutiny Panels held on 21 March 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the Chairman for ratification at the meeting of the Places Scrutiny Panel on 25 April 2013.

913 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In respect of item no. 7, Ofsted Reports on the School Inspections Completed from January 2013 to March 2013, Mr Wainwright declared a disclosable interest as he is a governor at Catmose Primary School.

In respect of item no, 13, Update on School Admissions, Mrs Stephenson declared on the grounds of probity having received a primary school offer letter.

914 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

There were no petitions, deputations or questions received from members of the public.

915 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS

No Questions with Notice of Motion were received from Members.

916 NOTICES OF MOTION FROM MEMBERS

No Notices of Motion were received from Members.

917 CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE PANEL FOR A DECISION IN RELATION TO CALL IN OF A DECISION

No matter was referred to the Panel for a decision in relation to call-in of a decision in accordance with Procedure Rule 206.

---oOo---

7.25pm Mr Baines joined the meeting

---oOo---

SCRUTINY

918 OFSTED REPORTS ON THE SCHOOL INSPECTIONS COMPLETED FROM JANUARY 2013 TO MARCH 2013

Report No. 96/2013 from the Strategic Director for People was received.

The Assistant Director, Services for People, Mr Naylor introduced the report the purpose of which was to provide an overview of the Ofsted reports of the School inspections in Rutland carried out in the period January to March 2013.

The schools covered in the report were:

Ryhall C of E Primary School: 29-30 January 2013

- Ofsted grading outcome: Inadequate
- Previous inspection: Satisfactory

St Nicholas C of E VA Primary School: 19-20 February 2013

- Ofsted grading outcome: Good
- Previous inspection: Satisfactory

Catmose Primary School (Academy): 20-21 February 2013

- Ofsted grading outcome: Good
- Previous inspection: Satisfactory

It was noted that the full Ofsted report for Ryhall C of E Primary School was not circulated with the agenda. The report was distributed at the meeting.

The Scrutiny Panel was requested to consider the contents of the three reports noting the inspection judgements, and the plans to address the schools weaknesses in one school and plans for continued improvement regarding the other two schools.

During the discussion of Report No. 96/2013 the following points were noted:

- a) That the three schools had been inspected under the September 2012 Framework;
- b) The new Framework covered:
 - i) The achievement of pupils at the school
 - ii) The quality of teaching in the school
 - iii) The behaviour and safety of pupils at the school

- iv) The quality of leadership, and management of, the school
- c) That Grade 3 Requires Improvement replaced the former grading of Satisfactory;
- d) All categories should be graded as Good or Outstanding;
- e) That schools judged as Requires Improvement will normally be monitored and re-inspected within a period of two years;
- f) Significant weaknesses had been found at Ryhall C of E Primary School:
 - i) Achievement of pupils – Inadequate
 - ii) Quality of teaching – Inadequate
 - iii) Behaviour and safety of pupils – Requires Improvement
 - iv) Leadership and management – Inadequate
 - v) Overall effectiveness - Inadequate
- g) A school that was Inadequate overall and where leadership and management were also Inadequate was a school requiring special measures;
- h) Discussions on the way forward (for Ryhall) were taking place between the Local Authority, the Diocese of Peterborough (Diocese) and the Department of Education (DfE). Some support had been introduced with a Local Leader for Education having been put in place prior to the inspection. There was also partnership support from a school in Rutland. The DfE had an expectation that where a school had been judged by Ofsted to require special measures, conversion to an Academy with a strong sponsor would be the normal route to secure improvement;
- i) Work had been undertaken by the Local Authority with the Diocese to look at improving management and leadership as there were significant flaws;
- j) Any proposed action by the Local Authority would require the agreement of the Secretary of State for Education;
- k) The Chair of the Governors at Ryhall C of E Primary School had stepped down. An Interim Executive Board (IEB) had been proposed and parents were being consulted with. The consultation would last 14 school days. If the Local Authority decided to seek permission to appoint an IEB the decision would rest with the Secretary of State for Education;
- l) A meeting with parents had taken place on Monday 15 April. Miranda Richardson from the Diocese and Barbara o'Brien from the DfE attended together with the Assistant Director, Services for People, Mr Naylor. Parents were updated on the current position and actions that were expected to be taken. Parents were understandably upset at the situation and frustrated at the amount of time taken to find a solution;
- m) That the Local Authority Statement of Action had been submitted within ten days of the publication of the Ofsted Report (published 12 March 2013) and an HMI was expected within the next week or two, to look at the plan and take the school forward;
- n) That the Diocese was looking to work in partnership with the Local Authority to secure a swift but correct solution to the problem.

Discussion then took place on the three Ofsted school inspection reports.

During the discussion of the Ofsted report on Ryhall C of E Primary School the following points were noted:

- o) Disappointment voiced by Members that they had not had sight of the

- Ofsted inspection report prior to the meeting. That it was a critical piece of information as pupils who had been affected could take a long time to recover from the standard of teaching they had received;
- p) That the report stated that pupils made inadequate progress through Key Stage 2 because teaching was too weak over time to raise attainment. Standards had declined and were low in Year 6. That standards in writing were particularly low by the end of Year 6 because pupils did not write enough or at length. That teaching, including of English and mathematics, was too variable in quality;
 - q) That the Local Authority was keen to see rapid improvement. However, there limitations on its power to intervene, it was required to establish if the current governing body had the means to improve. The governing body was committed to the school but recognised its failings;
 - r) That senior leaders did not regularly and methodically check and analyse information about pupils' achievement and the quality of teaching;
 - s) When questioned whether teaching was inadequate because of the teachers or management, the Assistant Director, Services for People, Mr Naylor informed the Panel that it was difficult to answer the question regarding teachers until leadership had been looked at but his impression was that there were some good teachers not being led well. To teach to standard required monitoring and leadership that understood what 'Outstanding' looked like and understood how to teach to framework;
 - t) That there was a need to get an Interim Executive Board in place. That there was no extra funding available for a Board although it might be possible to pay some expenses to Board members.
 - u) That an IEB should have a minimum of 2 members but Rutland is looking for 3 or 4. . For this Board the Local Authority was looking for people who could look at the leadership team and whether it could deliver. This would be a temporary arrangement. Members of an IEB could remain as governors. An IEB would have to include a Diocesan representative with other representative being appointed for their knowledge and experience;
 - v) That this was not the first time a school in Rutland had been placed in special measures;
 - w) That there were some pupil places available in other schools and parents could apply to move their children. However, it was important to work together to understand what was happening. It was acknowledged that there was much parental anxiety concerning the issue of taking their child(ren) out of the school. If pupils were removed this would have an impact on the school's budget and its ability to retain teachers;
 - x) When asked to what extent teachers accepted the judgement, the Assistant Director, Services for People, Mr Naylor commented that he did not have any reason to believe that the judgement had not been accepted; that there was some frustration regarding the core issues;
 - y) That the Local Authority was aware at the end of 2012 that the situation was deteriorating, at which time the Authority started to work with the school. The Core Group at its January meeting had realised that the situation at the school was not good and Ofsted arrived two days after the meeting;
 - z) That sponsorship for a school in special measures had to be from an Academy although this could be a simultaneous conversion:
 - aa) That the Local Authority School Improvement Service had limited resources - two members of staff for the whole of the authority. The Core Group process was to identify target school. The alternative would be to

- use statutory powers more routinely;
- bb) That the Local Authority and Diocese could only advise. The Local Authority could appoint governors on to the governing body of a Voluntary Controlled school. The Diocese would appoint two governors. It was acknowledged that it was sometimes difficult to find people with the skill and inclination to become a governor;
- cc) Governor training for Local Authority governors was voluntary. The Authority did not make it a requirement for becoming a governor but it was able to review the training on offer. Diocesan governors had to undertake training during their first term to be appointed for a second term;
- dd) Mr Wainwright, a governor at Catmose Primary School, advised Members that the school was looking to expand the academy, wanting to bring on board schools with difficulties. The member requirement on the Board was a problem with Diocesan schools. Mr Goringe, the Diocesan co-opted member, commented that when a school commits there was an expectation that governance would remain balanced in the same way. For a non-church school this could be difficult to take on board;
- ee) That for the Core Group process to work in identifying schools where improvement had been achieved there was a need to issue formal notice where standards were not maintained. That children and their life chances, their ability to achieve 5 GCSEs, were being affected;
- ff) Regular progress updates requested until the situation was resolved.

During the discussion of the Ofsted report on St Nicholas C of E VA Primary School the following points were noted:

- gg) That this school was not yet an outstanding school as “pupil’s cultural understanding of the world is limited and some have misconceptions about life in other countries”. It was acknowledged by Members that it could be difficult for village schools in Rutland with regard to teaching about the diversity of different cultures given that the demographic was not culturally diverse. It was not clear what effect the establishment of Kendrew Barracks at Cottesmore would have demographically. Members were informed that a majority of schools in the county had formed partnerships with schools in Leicester or Peterborough;
- hh) Regret was expressed that the achievement in English and mathematics was given as a reason for not being judged as outstanding;
- ii) The Strategic Director for People, Ms Chambers, reminded Members that the Headteacher had been in post just over a year and has moved the school from Satisfactory to Good/Outstanding; that the other school in the Federation was judged as Outstanding and was judged as such in cultural awareness. St Nicholas areas had been prioritised and achieved

---oOo---

8.25 pm Mr Wainwright left the meeting

---oOo---

During the discussion of the Ofsted report on Catmose Primary School the following points were noted:

- jj) Was formerly known as Southfield CP School and had significant difficulties, in terms of outcomes it was Satisfactory. The Headteacher resigned resulting in a temporary leadership vacancy. The governing

body was not sure of direction to take so it proposed that a hard federation was formed with Catmose College and become an academy. Stuart Williams was the Head of the Federation. The School was judged to be Good;

- kk) This was the first Ofsted report since becoming an Academy;
- ll) There was one senior leadership team for the federation overseeing both schools; however each school had its own separate governing body;
- mm) That the number of pupils on roll had increased;

---oOo---

8.30 pm Mr Wainwright rejoined the meeting

---oOo---

AGREED:

- i) That the contents of Report No 96/2013 and the associated Ofsted inspections be noted.
- ii) That a report on the reflections of the Core Group be brought to a future meeting of this Panel.
- iii) That regular progress reports on Ryhall C of E Primary School be brought to this Panel.

919 THE INSPECTION OF LOCAL AUTHORITY SERVICES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Report No. 101/2013 from the Strategic Director for People was received.

The Strategic Director for People, Ms Chambers, introduced the report the purpose of which was to provide information for members on the new, proposed framework for the inspection of school improvement services by Ofsted.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- a) That Ofsted had decided as an organisation to reconsider its inspection framework for local authorities. Completely against previous line that the local authority would no longer play a role as schools would become academies. The Authority would now have responsibility for all standards including academies;
- b) Many schools in Rutland converting to academies therefore there was a need to review the Authority's strategy;
- c) The letters issued to the pilot sites of Derby City and Portsmouth local authorities were attached as Appendix A and Appendix B to Report No. 101/2013;
- d) Rutland had been in contact with Derby regarding the process;
- e) That the strategy needed to be brought in line with what the Authority expected Ofsted to inspect;
- f) There was no capacity to increase the school improvement budget;
- g) Following successful work undertaken with schools only three schools in Rutland were not judged to be either Good or Outstanding at present;
- h) Although one school was in special measures, and two were judged as Required Improvement, it was considered unlikely that Ofsted would

- inspect yet;
- i) The Authority was seeking to bring in interim cover for the Head of Service, Lifelong Learning, to work on the new approach to School Improvement.
 - j) The Portfolio Holder for Education and Children's Services, Mr Bool, informed Members that the Authority was looking to appoint a top specialist . It was a measure of driving this forward that the Authority would have to pay at specialist grade. This had been agreed at Cabinet level and needed to be implemented quickly;
 - k) Paragraph 3.3 of Report No. 101/2013 listed that the areas that Ofsted would evaluate. It was noted that local authorities would have new powers from 1 May 2013, some of these would be powers which already existed but had been strengthened where it was believed a school was underperforming. The criteria were being reduced considerably resulting in there being fewer restrictions on actions that local authorities could undertake. One concern was officer capacity; some authorities were considering the commissioning of external support and it was anticipated that some local authorities and private providers would offer a service (commissioning out). A further concern was success would be measured;
 - l) That irrespective of any trigger for Ofsted it would be useful to compare with local comparitors and those with a similar demographic;
 - m) The framework would have to be followed and Rutland already had two systems in place to monitor:
 - 1. National statistics
 - 2. Ofsted inspection – nationally applied, nationally understood measures
 - n) It was noted that the letter to Derby City (Appendix A of Report No. 101/2013) the inspectors commented that the quality of Human Resources support for schools from the local authority was variable. In Rutland a joint decision had been previously been taken to delegate funding for Payroll, Human Resources, Legal and Grounds Maintenance. These services and the associated funding had not been retained by the Local Authority with the exception of a small amount of legal work. This was the strategic direction and was kept under review. The Authority paid a small amount to the provider of payroll and human resources to ensure the provider maintained some contact.

AGREED:

- i) That the contents of Report No 39/2013 be noted.

920 STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

Report No. 98/2013 from the Strategic Director of Resources was received.

The Strategic Director for People, Ms Chambers, introduced the report the purpose of which was to update the Panel on the current status of the Risk Register.

During discussion of Appendix A, Section 2, to Report No. 98/2013 the following points were raised:

- a) Risk Ref. 14 – Safeguarding, shown on the risk matrix as critical impact. The question was asked why this was not listed as being of catastrophic impact. The Strategic Director for People, Ms Chambers, informed Members that this decision had been arrived at on the balance of probabilities. There was always children that were not known to the Authority that attention had not been drawn to. Mr Walters stated that he considered that the impact should be judged as catastrophic regardless of the likelihood of it happening. Mr Qxley queried that if a child death was to occur whether it would reflect badly on the Authority if classed as critical not catastrophic;
- b) That the Risk Register contained an explanation on how the categories had been arrived at.

AGREED:

- i) That the contents of the risk register and the actions underway to address the risks be noted.

---oOo---
 9.05 pm Mrs Vernon left the meeting and did not rejoin.
 ---oOo---

921 OFSTED CHILD PROTECTION ACTION PLAN

Report No. 106/2013 from the Strategic Director for People was received.

The Assistant Director, Services for People, Ms Poynton, introduced the report the purpose of which was to provide the Panel with the Action Plan setting out how the areas of improvement identified in the Ofsted inspection of local authority arrangements for the protection of children would be addressed.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- a) Members were reminded that the report had been considered at the previous meeting of this Panel (Report No. 48/2013 Ofsted Inspection of Child Protection/Safeguarding Assurance Visit);
- b) That the action plan was designed to enable the Authority to achieve the inspectors' recommendations;
- c) That at the meeting on 16 April 2013 Cabinet had approved an alteration from the six months recommended by Ofsted to four months implementation that meant that this report was no longer appropriate, as timescales would change. Consideration would need to be given to how expedite the improvements and alter some of the actions;
- d) The inspection had been positive regarding multi-agency and child protection work;
- e) Areas identified for improvement were Early Help and Children in Need; including to improve the interface between early help and social care. The inspection recognised that a good strategy was in place and wanted to see improvement in practice;
- f) The actions were set out to meet areas of improvements through guidance, staff training and the introduction of new processes: there were

also a range of auditing processes to ensure improvements were sustained in the longer term and these would fall outside the Ofsted timescales;

- g) That all immediate actions have been completed or are close to completion. Progress was being made on all actions;
- h) That none of the actions had been identified as being 'at risk of not achieving';
- i) Immediate Action 2 - Actions included quarterly audits of plans with findings to be fed back to ensure continuous improvement: the question was asked whether this should not be more frequent until satisfied. Officers would need to consider which actions this would be feasible for. Officers were requested to indicate the risk, where monitoring was less frequent;
- j) That area for improvement Immediate Action 3 – had been implemented;
- k) Within 3 Months Action 4 – Families First has been implemented, but has now been supplemented by detailed procedures for staff when they need to step a case up or down to or from children's social care. Strategy and process now operating.
- l) Update on Action Plan requested for the next meeting of this Panel.

AGREED:

- i) That the contents of Report No 52/2013 be noted.
- ii) That an update of the Action Plan be brought to the meeting of this Panel on 13 June 2013.

922 WORK PROGRAMME 2012/13 AND REVIEW OF FORWARD PLAN

To include:

- i) Update on Ryhall C of E Primary School
- ii) Update on Safeguarding Action Plan
- iii) Report on the Core Group
- iv) Admission Arrangements (new policy being drafted for 2014
- v) Next municipal year – invite to be issued to the Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children Board
- vi) Topics for the next municipal year to be discussed at the next meeting of this Panel

923 REVIEW OF RISK REGISTER

This item was covered under agenda item no.8.

924 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Update on School Admissions

The data information for school admissions in Rutland was distributed.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i) That there were different timescales for Primary and Secondary

- Schools;
- ii) Concern was expressed at the size of the waiting list (14) for Langham C of E Primary School. The Ward member for Langham being present was invited, by the Strategic Director for People, to discuss at any time;
 - iii) It was also noted that Langham highest number of offers out of county due to its geographical location;
 - iv) A small number of out of county offers had been made to Rutland residents related to families where the nearest school was in a neighbouring authority or families that were relocating;
 - v) That for Primary School Admissions the position changes rapidly after the first letter is issued;
 - vi) Waiting lists for Catmose College and Uppingham Community College;
 - vii) The number of Rutland residents on the waiting lists was requested. Members where admissions were carried out separately by Academies; this information could be requested;
 - viii) That there was an appeals mechanism; if the school was a Local Authority school then this was through the Local Authority, Voluntary Aided Diocese school was through the Diocese and for Academies the Academy;
 - ix) It was requested that this was an agenda item for the next meeting. To include updated admissions data.

AGREED:

- i) To be an agenda item for the next meeting
- ii) That the report to the next meeting would include updated admissions data

925 DATE AND PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 13 June 2013 at 7.00pm.

---oOo---

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.37pm.

---oOo---