



# 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 12 September 2013**

**PRESENT:** Miss G Waller (Chairman, in the Chair)  
Mrs C Cartwright  
Mrs J K Figgis  
Mr J M Lammie  
Mr J Munton  
Mr M A Oxley  
Mr G Plews

**CO-OPTED MEMBERS:** Ms S Gullan-Whur Primary Schools  
Miss A Loomes Representative of Young People in Rutland

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Miss M Gamston Democratic Services Officer  
Mr K Garcia Head of Service – Lifelong Learning  
Ms D Greaves Accountant (People)  
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

**APOLOGIES:** Mr M E Baines, Mr P Goringe, Ms P Rubinstein, Mrs Stephenson and Miss Taylor

## 362 RECORD OF MEETING

- i) The record of the People (Children) Scrutiny Panels held on 13 June 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

## 363 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

For the record:

In respect of item 12, Key Stage 2 Results:-

- Mrs Figgis stated that she teaches at Brooke Hill Academy.
- Mr Munton stated that he has children attending school.
- Miss Waller stated that she is a governor at one of the schools listed.

## 364 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

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

### **365 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS**

Mr Hollis, on behalf of ward members, had expressed concern about the vulnerability of young children travelling on buses, without an escort.

#### **AGREED:**

- i) That any complaint by parents will be dealt with confidentially within the Council's Complaints Procedures..
- ii) That officers will circulate information concerning the current arrangements for transporting children..

### **366 NOTICES OF MOTION FROM MEMBERS**

No Notices of Motion were received from Members.

### **367 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.

#### **SCRUTINY**

### **368 QUARTER 1 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT**

Report No. 169/2013 from the Chief Executive was received.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) PI063 – Stability of placements of looked after children length of placement – measures children in placement for two and a half years or more; measures the number of moves for each child. Of the 14 children who had been in care for two and half years or more, 9 had remained at the same placement for over two years and 5 had moved to permanent placements, these being positive moves. This was not a group of young people undergoing a period of turbulence; three moves plus remained at zero;
- b) That there is currently a shortage of Foster Carers for adolescents with complex needs. A recruitment campaign is ongoing. That consideration be given to making a presentation to the Parish Council Forum on Fostering.

#### **AGREED:**

- i) That the Parish Council Working Group would be contacted to request that Fostering be considered as an agenda item for the Parish Council Forum on 22 October 2013.

---oOo---

7.20 pm Mr Plews joined the meeting

---oOo---

## **369 QUARTER 1 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT**

Report No. 177/2013 from the Interim Strategic Director for Resources was received.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) Cost Centre 4207 – Disabled Children – the variance of £90,500 related to an individual out of county placement that would enable the young person, particularly around behaviour, to improve therefore the transition to adult place setting should be more cost effective. Members were advised that this budget was used for supporting care needs at outside of a Special Educational Needs (SEN) setting; that placements would not normally be paid for from this budget and that it was not usual for a placement with complex needs to cost £2,000 per week. That the Council had a responsibility to ensure that every child's needs were met. In response to a question on whether the Council was budgeting enough for disabled children and dealing with early enough Members were reminded that criticism had previously been levelled at the Council for budgeting for unknown situations; also for most young people with complex needs the Council started planning around the age of 14 years for the transition to adult social care. Officers were requested to bring two models to a future meeting:- 1. To tell what goes into the cost for care; 2. Hypothetical case studies young people to young adults. The Assistant Director, Services for People, Mr Naylor, undertook to provide more information on the particular placement in question outside the meeting;
- b) Cost Centre 5300 – Special Educational Needs & Recoupment – showed an overspend of £124,700. Officers explained that this budget could be affected by the number of children becoming adults and an increase in new assessments for statements; as well as the changes to health funding, the transition between health and social funding depending on needs. A statementing process had to be followed, co-ordinated by the Local Authority with different parties providing in-put in order to complete an assessment establishing needs. The Council's policy is to secure a place in mainstream schools wherever possible only looking at a special school place if mainstream is not suitable. Local Authority funded special provision was provided at Oaham C of E School and Catmose College;
- c) Cost Centre 5400 – Academy SEN – showed a nil budget as high needs funding was shown under Cost Centre 5300;
- d) Cost Centre 4252 – UASC Over 16 – nil budget as the Home Office Grant did not cover the full costs of placements for unaccompanied asylum seekers.

### **AGREED:**

- i) That the contents of Report No 177/2013 be noted.

### **370 STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER**

Report No. 197/2013 from the Strategic Director for Resources was received.

The purpose of this report was to update the People (Children) Scrutiny Panel on the current status of the Risk Register.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) Risk Ref. 15: Contracted Services – Officers advised that it was unlikely that any of the key services referred to would be children’s services;
- b) Risk Ref. 1: Impact of Schools Converting to Academy Status – more information would be available from quarter two. Officers advised Members that there was a possibility that in the next academic year half of the schools in Rutland were likely to be academies. The Chairman, Miss Waller, requested a report on the risks, potential impact and how the impacts was being limited. Report to be brought to the next meeting of this Panel;
- c) Risk Ref. 14: Safeguarding – item on the agenda, Ofsted Child Protection Action Plan, would impact on this. Actions were designed to protect and reduce likelihood by strengthening procedures and policies.

#### **AGREED:**

- i) That the contents of Report No. 197/2013 be noted.

### **371 PROGRESS REPORT – UPDATED OFSTED CHILD PROTECTION ACTION PLAN**

Report No. 207/2013 from the Strategic Director for People was received.

The purpose of this report was to provide Members with a comprehensive update of the Ofsted Child Protection Action Plan. It gives details of progress achieved in the areas identified for improvement within the Ofsted inspection and also what this means for children and families in Rutland.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) That Report No. 207/2013 was to be taken at Cabinet on 17 September 2013;
- b) That Report No. 207/2013 was an updated progress report against the areas identified in the Ofsted Inspection, January 2013 and provided to Scrutiny on 13 June 2013;
- c) That all actions to be completed within a 4 month timescale, as requested by Cabinet, had been achieved;
- d) That the significant progress made was detailed in Report No. 207/2013;
- e) That there was improved transition to and from Early Help. Quarterly audits had been instigated to ensure improvements were maintained;
- f) That the Local Safeguarding Children Board was scrutinising Early Help arrangements. The Independent Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children Board and Safeguarding Adult Board, Paul Burnett, was to

- attend a meeting of the People (Adult & Health) Scrutiny Panel, date to be confirmed. Members of this Panel were to be invited to that meeting;
- g) That the Young Inspectors, for the Rutland Youth Council, had undertaken a review of how the Council involved children and young people in the decision making process;
  - h) That a new Ofsted inspection framework was to be launched in November 2013. The judgement grade of 'requires improvement' will replace the 'adequate' judgement; standards would be more demanding;
  - i) That inspections under the new framework will be on a 3-year cycle;
  - j) That the new framework will include assessment of Looked After Children;
  - k) That improvements implemented by the Authority placed it in a good position to meet the new inspection framework;
  - l) That more robust procedures had been put in place;
  - m) That work undertaken with children and families needed to be well documented to lessen the opportunity for a breakdown in communication;
  - n) The Assistant Director – People, Ms Poynton, advised Members that one of actions contained in the Plan was to improve the quality of the Common Assessment Framework (CAF). Two training courses had been delivered and further training had been arranged. That management oversight was important to ensure that cases did not drift. 50 members of staff had undertaken Rickter Scale training; this was a nationally recognised tool for the assessment and evaluation of targeted interventions.
  - o) The 'Social Work 4oversight' pilot with children's centres was now complete. This had involved a social worker being placed in the children centre; the main centre being at Catmose College and also Visions at Casterton Business Enterprise Centre. Now moving towards a Hub and Spoke model with Visions being the Hub; services would move into the community resulting in services being delivered in a more cost effective manner, fitted in within needs of children and families/communities. The service was advertised on the web and in the local newsletter. The traditional Family Centre model was gradually being moved away from. Services were being provided to Army families. The Chief Executive, Mrs Briggs, was due to meet with the Colonel at St George's Barracks regarding the schools affected by the change of personnel at St George's;
  - p) In deciding which services to run Officers looked to try and identify needs in the community using local knowledge/people who work in that area; community based service found to be more effective. Transport had been provided in the past where required; this had been an expense to the Council, it was more cost effective and personalised for the service to be provided in local communities;
  - q) That it would be helpful for Members to receive a presentation on early interventions – the scope and cost of services. The Chairman, Miss Waller undertook to discuss the request with the Strategic Director for People, Ms Chambers.

**AGREED:**

- i) That the contents of Report No 207/2013 be noted.
- ii) That a presentation on early interventions would be brought to a future meeting.

## 372 OFSTED REPORTS ON THE INSPECTION OF UPPINGHAM C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL AND UPPINGHAM COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Report No. 210/2013 from the Strategic Director for People was received.

This purpose of this report was to provide an overview of the Ofsted reports about Uppingham C of E Primary School and Uppingham Community College

It was noted that neither result was a good as the previous inspections. The main difference was in teaching and learning.

### Uppingham C of E Primary School

Osted grading outcome was 'Requires Improvement' May 2013 (previously 'Good').

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) That concern was expressed by Members that another school was failing;
- b) That the inspection report stated that the governors had a good understanding of the school's strengths and how it needed to improve, yet there was a downgrading within the report;
- c) That under the quality of teaching the report states that teaching requires improvement because in too many lessons, work is not matched closely enough to pupils' needs and abilities to promote good progress. Sometimes all pupils have to just sit and listen to the start of the lesson, so they do not really begin learning until later in the lesson, and the later work is too easy or complicated for some of them. Occasionally teachers spend too long explaining tasks or organising the class. It was felt that these findings suggested the leadership and management required improvement; had there been a breakdown in communication?;
- d) Members were advised that Officers were now in strategy meetings with the school, this being the usual process. The overall impression of the school was that it was very caring but maybe not as focussed on teaching and requirements that Ofsted was looking for and the school needed to be;
- e) That to strengthen leadership and management the school needed to equip all senior leaders with the skills they need to analyse pupils' progress and identify areas for improvement in their areas of responsibility; use data effectively to check on the progress of different groups of pupils, so that any potential patterns of underachievement could be quickly identified and addressed;
- f) That training for governors was being considered;
- g) That Officers were not aware of any significant changes in staff since the previous inspection;
- h) Members acknowledged that the inspection showed that teaching was inconsistent, that there were teachers who were not doing a good enough job by not planning lessons, work being aimed at children of lower levels and the poor quality of marking and feedback to pupils; that the main goal was for children to have reading and writing and being able to add up. That the headteacher needed to help these teachers to improve otherwise the school could be in special measures;
- i) That it was the responsibility of the leadership to rectify the problems

- highlighted in the report;
- j) That the Local Authority had relatively limited resources and was limited as to what it could do. The Authority, in common with other authorities, tended to become involved when difficulties emerged. The power to take action was not with the Local Authority but with the governing body. Local authority powers had diminished over a long period of time but in certain circumstances, with the permission of the Secretary of State, could take action under its statutory powers. Powers of intervention were limited. However, the expectation from Ofsted was that local authorities would monitor all schools and encourage to perform to the highest standards. Local authorities had less powers in academies;
  - k) The Local Authority was working with Uppingham C of E Primary School to improve the situation. The school was buying in additional services and the Authority would be co-ordinating and would oversee the action plan;
  - l) Officers to forward data on how many male teachers are employed at the school, if it is available, to the Panel;
  - m) The Chairman, Miss Waller, requested that a paper on the response to the new Ofsted framework/requirements be brought to a future meeting.

#### Uppingham Community College

Ofsted graded as 'Good' June 2013 (previously 'Outstanding').

During discussion the following points were noted:

- n) Members were disappointed at the outcome of the inspection;
- o) The College was not classed as outstanding because the proportion of outstanding teaching was not high enough. At times, work was set at the right level of difficulty, particularly for the most able students, and teachers did not always check students' understanding during lessons. Systems for checking on the impact of the training provided for teachers were not fully developed. A minority of staff did not adopt the best practice recommended by leaders;
- p) In response to the suggestion that headteachers be invited, following an Ofsted inspection, to Panel to answer questions Members were reminded that there was a Core Group process where schools were challenged. The Chairman, Miss Waller, requested the Portfolio Holder, Mr Bool, to discuss this suggestion with senior officers prior to Miss Waller discussing it with the Strategic Director for People, Ms Chambers;
- q) Concern was expressed regarding possible career advice being given in secondary schools. It was suggested that secondary schools be invited to attend this Panel and advise Members of the service being provided;

#### **AGREED:**

- i) That the contents of Report No 210/2013, noting the inspection judgements, overall effectiveness, capacity for sustained improvement and what the schools need to do to improve further be noted.
- ii) That a report on the response to the new Ofsted framework/requirements be brought to the next meeting of this Panel.

---oOo---

9.30 pm Miss Loomes left the meeting and did not return

---oOo---

### **373 KEY STAGE 2 RESULTS**

Report No. 212/2013 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 advise Scrutiny of preliminary results for Key Stage 2 for Rutland and when further analysis and comparison will be available.

An updated version of the table published in paragraph 3.1 of Report No. 212/2013, Key Stage 2 Results, was distributed.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i) That the Department for Education had changed the measure, the Authority was waiting for the levels to come through, which would then be added to ascertain if the school made the floor levels. At this stage several schools potentially at risk of not meeting the floor standards.
- ii) The Chairman, Miss Waller, requested that a paper was brought to a future meeting, when full data would be available;
- iii) Concern was expressed at the number of schools below an average benchmark of approximately 74.5%;
- iv) The Chairman, Miss Waller, would raise with the Strategic Director for People, Ms Chambers, the possibility of inviting governors to a future meeting.

#### **AGREED:**

- i) That a further report would be brought to a future meeting.

---oOo---

9.40 pm Mr Munton left the meeting and did not return

---oOo---

### **374 SCHOOL ADMISSIONS**

Report No. 211/2013 from the Strategic Director for People was received.

The purpose of the report was to enable Scrutiny to have an overview of the Admission Arrangements for Rutland children of school age including the statutory requirements placed upon the Local Authority, Schools, Governing Bodies and Academy Trusts.

School admissions data was distributed separate to Report No. 211/2013.

During discussion the following points were noted:



- a) That 93% had received 1<sup>st</sup> preference;
- b) That of the schools that RCC was the admission authority for two appeals had been received for Great Casterton C of E Primary School;
- c) That Oakham C of E Primary School had increased its PAN, and made to 44 children;
- d) That an extra offer had been made for Exton & Greetham C of E Primary School;
- e) That 5 pupils had pulled out of Ryhall C of E Primary School;
- f) That 391 offers had been made against a PAN of 436;
- g) That non-Rutland children attended primary schools in the county;
- h) That if a parent was not successful in obtaining their 1<sup>st</sup> preference they were advised of the appeal process and offered a place at their second preference; there was a timescale for making an appeal.

**AGREED:**

- i) That the contents of Report No. 211/2013 be noted.

---oOo---

At 9.55 pm and in accordance with the provisions of Procedure Rule 58, Close of Meetings, it was

**AGREED**

That the meeting be extended to 10.15 pm to allow the remaining items of business to be concluded.

---oOo---

**375 RYHALL PRIMARY SCHOOL PROGRESS REPORT**

An verbal update was received from the Assistant Director - Services for People, Mr Naylor.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- a) That an Interim Executive Board was in place, comprising of Tor Clark, Michael Key and Neil Spencerley;
- b) That a strategy meeting had been held; considered the progress being made;
- c) That the headteacher had left the school;
- d) That the deputy headteacher was acting up. This was an interim position;
- e) That the governing body had been replaced;
- f) That HMI Ofsted had approved the improvement plan; due back at the school to monitor progress;
- g) That Officers believed that progress was being made and would be evident when inspected. A report on the visit would be brought to this Panel at the earliest opportunity;
- h) There was a requirement for the school to convert to an academy through sponsorship. The Authority had been working with the Diocese however it did not come to fruition;
- i) That the Diocese would require the ethos of the school to be maintained if the sponsor academy where to be a non-church school;

- j) That local options had to be explored before looking at schools in neighbouring authorities;
- k) That the Interim Executive Board was working extremely hard to ensure that the school had the confidence of the parents going forward.

---oOo---

10.04 pm Mr Oxley left the meeting and did not return

---oOo---

### **376 WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14 AND REVIEW OF FORWARD PLAN**

To include:

- i) Presentation on Early Interventions
- ii) New Ofsted Framework/Requirements
- iii) Key Stage 2 Results
- iv) Ryhall Primary School

Childcare Sufficiency Assessment report to Cabinet on 19 November 2013 to Panel on 14 November.

Post 16 and Denominational Transport – consultation taking place. Reports had been taken at Cabinet, not through Scrutiny and would again be taken at Cabinet following the consultation. The Chairman, Miss Waller, stated that it was disappointing that this Panel had not had the opportunity to discuss further. The Portfolio Holder, Mr Bool, was requested to pursue this matter and undertook to liaise with the Leader of the Council, Mr Begy.

### **377 REVIEW OF RISK REGISTER**

This item was covered under agenda item no. 9.

The removal of this agenda item to be discussed at Scrutiny Commission.

### **378 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no other items of urgent business which had been previously notified to the person presiding.

### **379 DATE AND PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 14 November 2013 at 7.00pm.

---oOo---

**The Chairman closed the meeting at 10.12 pm**

---oOo---

