

**CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES'
SERVICES**

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, ROTHERHAM.
S60 2TH**

Date: Wednesday, 21st May, 2014

Time: 9.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies for absence.
4. Declarations of Interest.
5. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 9th April, 2014. (Pages 1 - 5)
6. Minutes of a meeting of the Children, Young People and Families' Partnership held on 19th March, 2014. (Pages 6 - 15)
7. Receipt of letters regarding the proposed amalgamation of Thorpe Hesley Junior and Infant Schools.
8. Proposal to amalgamate Brampton the Ellis Junior and Infant Schools by the discontinuance of the Junior School and the change of age-range of the Infant School - final determination. (Pages 16 - 18)
9. Proposed expansion of Brampton the Ellis Junior School - final determination. (Pages 19 - 21)
10. Proposals to expand Cortonwood Infant School - final determination. (Pages 22 - 24)
11. Proposals to Amalgamate Thorpe Hesley Infant and Junior Schools - statutory consultation. (Pages 25 - 29)

12. Children and Young People's Services 2013-2014 Performance Indicator Outturn report. (Pages 30 - 44)
13. Local Governor Appointments.
14. Date and time of the next meeting: -
 - Wednesday 18th June, 2014, to start at 9.00 a.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES'
SERVICES
9th April, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillor Roche.

Councillor Pickering was also in attendance.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ahmed and Beaumont. Councillor Beaumont was absent as she was attending other Council business and representing Councillor Lakin at a CSE Forum in Barnsley.

D112. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

D113. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 5TH MARCH, 2014.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services held on 5th March, 2014, were considered.

Resolved: - That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record.

D114. RECOMMENDED PROVIDER FOR THE CONTRACT TO DELIVER ADVOCACY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE INVOLVED IN CHILD PROTECTION PROCESSES - RETROSPECTIVE APPROVAL.

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Strategic Commissioner (Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate) that outlined a tendering process that had taken place in relation to the contract to deliver Advocacy for children and young people involved in Child Protection processes.

The report outlined the commissioning history relating to the area. A commissioning exercise had been undertaken in preparation of the contract ending on 31st March, 2014. The contract offered was for one year from 1st April, 2014 – 31st March, 2015 with the option to extend for a further year if desirable.

An outline of the commissioning exercise had taken place and the responses were shared. Three bids had been received and were graded against the criteria.

Using a rigid application of the evaluation criteria, Barnardo's were confirmed as the successful bidder. A soft-challenge had been received from the Rights 2 Rights Service, which had led to a re-evaluation of the submissions. The same outcome was achieved and the bid submitted on

behalf of the Rights 2 Rights Service was found to contain insufficient detail and did not deliver against all of the criteria required.

The Strategic Commissioner confirmed that all contracts in place were subject to robust performance management and that this would continue.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content noted.

(2) That Barnardo's, the successful bidder for the contract, be endorsed to deliver Advocacy Services for children and young people involved in Child Protection processes.

D115. BUDGET MONITORING REPORT TO 28TH FEBRUARY, 2014.

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Finance Manager (Financial Services, Resources Directorate), which provided a financial forecast to 31st March, 2014, based on actual income and expenditure to 28th February, 2014.

Overall, the Directorate was estimating a £968,000 over-spend outturn position at the end of the 2013/2014 financial year. This now represented a reduction of £156,000 since the January budget monitoring report.

This over-spend position had increased since the time of writing the submitted report, when it was originally reported as £768,000 over-spent. This was due to continuing discussions relating to the Academisation of Rawmarsh Community School. When the report had been written it was estimated that the School's £100,000 deficit would be transferred to the Local Authority on the completion of their sponsored academisation. It was known at this point that the deficit was higher but it was thought likely that the deficit could be reduced. Following further discussions with the Headteacher and Business Managers of both Schools involved, it was now likely that the deficit would be approximately £300,000. Robust financial management would be in place following the School's academisation. The Local Authority would monitor the budget on a weekly basis and the School would only be allowed to undertake essential spend on staffing, utilities and health and safety items.

The forecast overspend was largely due to the continuing pressures in Safeguarding Children and Families' Services due to the needs-led nature of the budget, Disability Services and the Directorate-Wide budget.

The report provided an update on the main areas of variance and outlined the main pressures and areas of under-spend and/or over-spend for each Service.

A number of continuing budget management actions were being taken to avoid costs: -

- Proactive management concentrating on avoiding costs relating to placements for Looked After Children, the Fostering Framework and through block commissioning and negotiation of placements was taking place. These efforts had achieved savings of £714,000 to February, 2014;
- The Multi-Agency Support Panel was continuing to make efficient multi-agency management actions and decisions, and continuing to avoid costs wherever possible;
- The Invest to Save Programme in Fostering and Adoption Services was continuing to be effective and increase the number of in-house fostering placements and adopters;
- Agency costs had increased compared to the same period in the previous year primarily as a result of covering vacant posts within Safeguarding Children and Families' Service, and covering sickness absence and maternity leave to ensure that safe staffing ratios were maintained. Recruitment was underway in relation to vacant posts to save on agency costs;
- The recruitment of Social Workers and Team Managers was also considered. The timescales involved often meant that posts could not be filled as soon as they became vacant. However, the recruitment and retention of Social Workers was not currently uncontrolled or unpredictable in Rotherham. The Department for Education's data had shown that Rotherham's turnover of social care staff and use of agency was one of the lowest in the region;
- Non-contractual overtime for Children and Young People's Services had increased compared to the same period in the previous year as a result of the need for fully trained staff to maintain cover in residential homes. Agency staff could not cover these posts due to training requirements and service-users' need for consistency;
- Consultancy costs had decreased compared to the same period in the previous year.

Based on previous Budget Monitoring feedback from the Cabinet Member, the January 2014 report contained a breakdown of the different placement types that existed for the years 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14 to February, 2014. The breakdown noted the number of out-of-authority placements that existed, the average placement cost, independent fostering agencies and in-house fostering placements.

The report informed the Cabinet Member of current risks and uncertainties relating to the Service's budget: -

- The recruitment of in-house fosterers and adopters was a continuing focus for the Service, but these could only go forward if the quality of the placement was sufficient;
- It was intended that placement costs were reduced, however, the decisions around selecting a placement were always made in the best interest of the child/children.

The Cabinet Member was disappointed that Children and Young People's Services' estimated over-spend position had once again increased after continued work had reduced it to £768,000. He referred to the legislation that compelled local authorities to be responsible for the deficits of schools that were becoming sponsored academies and was mindful that the overall Children and Young People's Services' over-spend increase was due to Rawmarsh Community School not being able to reduce their budget deficit within the period agreed.

Resolved: - (1) That the latest financial projection against the budget for the year based on actual income and expenditure to 28th February, 2014, be noted.

(2) That a report be presented to a future meeting of the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services outlining individual school's budget monitoring reports.

D116. ADMISSIONS CONSULTATION OUTCOME IN RESPECT OF ENTRY IN THE 2015/2016 ACADEMIC YEAR.

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Principal School Admission, Organisation and Special Educational Needs Assessment Service Officer (Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services Directorate) that outlined the consultation that had taken place on the School Admission Policy/Co-ordinated Scheme for the admission year 2015/2016. The Policy had to be finalised by 15th April, 2014.

Minute No. D55 (Admissions Consultation in respect of entry in the 2015/16 academic year) of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services that took place on 16th October, 2013, refers.

The School Admission Policy/Co-ordinated Scheme for the admission year 2015/2016 included sections relating to: -

- Admission Criteria for Community Schools;
- Co-ordinated Admission Arrangements (including Admissions Criteria);
- Waiting Lists;
- Catchment Areas;
- Fair Access Protocol (FAP);
- Statutory Closing Dates;
- Report to the Schools Adjudicator.

An outline of the 2015/2016 Admissions Policy was provided: -

- No changes were planned to the Admissions Criteria for 2015/2016;
- The closing date for admission to Secondary School on 1st September, 2015, would be 31st October, 2014. The closing date for

admission to Primary School on 1st September, 2015, would be 15th January, 2015;

- No alterations to existing catchment areas were proposed, although it was noted that discussions would be taking place with stakeholders regarding the catchment area of the new central primary school. A report on this would follow to the Cabinet Member in due course;
- Consultation had already taken place by either prescribed alteration process or via the annual admissions consultation in relation to amendments and alterations to school admission numbers.

The Principal Officer requested that the draft 2015/2016 Admissions document be approved and published on the Council's website.

Resolved: - That the Admission Arrangements for the 2015/2016 school year, as included in the submitted report, be agreed following the end of the consultation process.

D117. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services take place on Wednesday 21st May, 2014, to start at 9.00 a.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND FAMILIES PARTNERSHIP
Wednesday, 19th March, 2014

Present:- Joyce Thacker (in the Chair); Councillor Roche, Steve Ashley, Karen Borthwick, Warren Carratt, Dr. David Clitheroe, Paul Dempsey, Karen Etheridge, Martin Kimber, Rachel Nicolls, Dr. David Polkinghorn, Dr. John Radford, Janet Wheatley, Sarah Whittle and Ian Wormsley.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lakin, Pickering, Sara Graham, Jason Harwin, Julie Mott, Clair Pyper and Dorothy Smith.

257. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th January, 2014, were considered and approved as a correct record.

It was noted that Jane Parfremment had been appointed to the post of Director of Safeguarding and Families. Jane would commence in post on 5th August, 2014.

Resolved:- That a report be submitted to the next meeting on Emergency Hormonal Contraception.

258. ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Looked After Council

- Was currently meeting for Voice and Influence training and development sessions weekly at MyPlace
- Up to 50 Looked After and Leaving Care young people had attended meetings at any 1 time
- Over the past 3 months they had worked on team building skills, self-awareness and self-esteem
- Attendance at the CICC Regional Conference in Nottingham on 17th February – they had delivered a presentation raising awareness around Rotherham LACC and engaged in action planning for the LAC Council's future
- Had engaged in the recruitment and selection process for the Director of Safeguarding post
- Visit by Corporate Parents
- Views sought on their involvement in the re-commissioning of Leaving Care Services
- Consultation on the C&YP Commissioning Strategy
- Engaged in activities specifically designed to raise their awareness around the geography and customs in view of their forthcoming visit to Portugal

Youth Cabinet

The following presentation was given of their work on the subject of self-harm:-

What is Self-Harm?

- "Hurting yourself to deal with difficult feelings. It can be through physical or emotional means, which may not be obvious to those around you."

Examples of Self-Harm

- Physical – cutting, burning yourself, overdosing, scratching
- Emotional – long periods of silence, bursts of anger, depression, stress

Self-Harm Awareness Day

- Self-Harm Awareness Day 1st March
- We are wearing orange ribbons to promote awareness of this campaign

Why Self-Harm?

- The Youth Cabinet feels strongly about this issue
- It is a growing issue within Rotherham
- To find out what is out there to help young people
- To try and reduce barriers for young people getting help and support

What have we done?

- Set up a Self-Harm Awareness Sub-Group which meets regularly
- Collected case studies on people who have self-harmed
- Taken part in a self-harm awareness training day
- Met on 16th January with health professionals, school and college staff, RMBC officers, Councillors etc.
- Met on 30th January to decide our key priorities
- Met on 12th February with Commissioners
- Taken part in Children's Commissioner's Takeover Day on 27th February

Recommendations

- Consistent, concise and simple messages for all organisations
- Clear, consistent referral routes for all organisations
- Involve young people in the development of user-friendly information online
- Ensure that young people are involved in Service design
- Ensure that advice to young people is available through drop-ins, one-to-one sessions as well as web-based material
- Improve and standardise the provision of information on self-harm to all schools
- Establish better links between schools and colleges and share best practice

- Examine ways in which access to School Nurses can be improved
- Availability of resources/training/support for schools, colleges, amongst parents, young people etc.

Next Steps

- Youth Cabinet Self-Harm Sub-Group will continue to meet to work on our priorities and recommendations
- Rotherham Youth Cabinet has been invited to speak at Suicide Prevention Conference on 3rd April to share our findings

Youth Cabinet members were also developing a presentation to deliver to the Suicide Prevention conference to be held on 3rd April at the New York Stadium

They had also submitted a question to the Health Select Commission with regard to School Nurses.

259. ADCS REPORT - "WHAT IS EDUCATION FOR"

Karen Borthwick, Head of School Effectiveness Services, submitted the Association of Directors of Children's Services Ltd.'s Educational Achievement Policy Committee Position Statement "What is Education For?"

The Statement articulated ADCS members' collective views on the current education system and their aspirations for the future. It considered the purpose of education and suggested the actions local authorities could take to ensure that their local education offer met the changing needs of their children and young people as well as the role of business, the community and the home in developing the local education offer.

Discussion ensued on what the Partnership thought education was for with the following comments made:-

- Good to see a move away from measuring but looking at fit for purpose and integrating young people into society
- A rounded individual that could reflect, think and be creative was far better than achieving outcomes
- Children were all different and would never meet the nationally agreed system/standard – it would be about getting a balance for every child
- For some a classroom setting did not work – prepare them for the next stage of their life
- Need to ensure equity of resources for all schools – no postcode lottery
- Essential that parents and young people were fully informed of the different options open to them
- Careers advice needed to reflect the sensitivity of areas in terms of economic regeneration needs

It was noted that the report would be discussed in various forums in order to get a view of the local position.

Resolved:- That the report be noted.

260. CSE UPDATE

Joyce Thacker, Strategic Director, Children's and Young Peoples Services, gave the following update:-

- The Rotherham Multi-Agency CSE Team had won the National Team Award for Unsung Heroes at the CSE National Working Group Awards under the criteria for the Longest Journey under Challenging Conditions. A presentation would be made at the next Council meeting
- A number of complex cases had come to light which brought their own set of challenging circumstances. An intensive piece of work would be undertaken
- The current year's performance was being reviewed together with the action plan, identifying priorities for next year and any emerging gaps

Resolved:- That the report be noted.

261. EARLY HELP OVERVIEW

Warren Carratt, Service Manager, Strategy, Standards & Early Help, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

What is "Early Help"?

- 'Intervening early and as soon as possible to tackle problems emerging for children, young people and their families or with a population most at risk of developing problems. Effective intervention may occur at any point in a child or young person's life'

Statutorily

- Working Together 2013 put requirement on Local Safeguarding Children Board to assure itself of the effectiveness of Early Help provision
- No duty on individual agencies (and taken away from schools) but expectation there and included in OfSTED framework

Health and Wellbeing Strategy

- Links to all priorities but specific strong links with Dependence to Independence, Aspirations and Expectations and Prevention and Early Intervention

Pathways to Whole Family Early Help

- Children's Centres working with 0-5 year olds
- Targeted Family Support working with primary aged children
- Integrated Youth Support Service working with teenagers/young adults
- Community Development Team Outreach working with SEN

Role of Early Help Assessment Team

- To provide co-ordination of step downed contacts from CART
- To be a central point of contact for families requiring Early Help
- To broker services where required
- Not to replace Localism but support where there is none in place

Early Help Challenges

- Predominantly unqualified workforce
- Many issues underpinned by adult mental health (mild to moderate)
- If it works, Social Care need never become involved
- Linked into broader societal context e.g. Welfare Reform
- Often about case management
- Not Social Care aftercare

Trends

- Schools disengaging from lead working but need is still there
- Interdependent with other provision e.g. CAMHS, EPS, CDC etc.
- Early Help is part of a wide ranging system where one or more areas of support are reduced the impact on the whole system needs to be assessed

Families for Change Provision

- Providing connectivity (not duplication) of existing provision or new provision where gaps are identified
- Evidence based
- Co-working where required with existing services
- Only for families with poor attendance and anti-social behaviour or worklessness
- Little overlap with Pupil Referral Units, Parenting etc.
- Subject to rigorous Payment by Results scrutiny and challenge from Audit and DCLG
- Family Recovery Programme focussed on most complex cases (Social Care)

Where's the Gap?

Causal Factors

- Reduction in Services and/or Service redesign
- Limitations of existing initiatives (e.g. Families for Change)
- History of chronic, long term neglect
- Insufficiency of planned, facilitated step down
- Where to go for challenge/support

Early Help Support Panel

A multi-agency forum where:-

- Services can be commissioned and where innovative, fast-track approaches can be tested
- The quality of multi-agency work can be assured and challenged where required
- Support for families can be brokered

What we value

- Localism and the capacity, trust and freedom of local services to provide effective early help within their own communities wherever this is possible

What we know

- We are not yet providing excellent integrated Early Help Services
- Some Services are commissioned and/or delivered by the "centre" and not community based
- We do not and will not unite Early Help provision under one management line or organisation umbrella (nor should we)
- The system is being pushed apart
- Practitioners want to succeed though they need help and better awareness of pathways to access this
- Social Care are a key partner and the way this interfaces with Early Help providers is in constant need of review and revision

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Attempts had been made to mitigate the impact of the proposed reduction of Children's Centres as much as possible by focussing on staff and services and providing outreach work. There was to be an event on 2nd April to discuss the way forward
- The voluntary and community sector was a resource that needed to be tapped into. Analysis of the work of the sector had shown the variety of work it did with children and young people providing an alternative service to families and individuals around Early Help
- 1 of the best ways of determining how well agencies were doing with their work on Early Help was to look at how many children became a Child in Need or subject to a Care Plan and work from that point. All agencies needed to work together and ascertain why Early Help had not had an influence. The Local Safeguarding Children Board would concentrate on Early Help's performance and look at why a child became the subject of a Care Plan
- Agencies had a tendency to work at crisis level rather than prevention and early intervention

- Essential that the voluntary and community sector were utilised more

Resolved:- That the presentation be noted.

262. LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN STRATEGY

Paul Dempsey, Service Manager, CYPS Provider Services, presented the above Strategy which was an ongoing initiative setting out the improved outcomes for all children and young people in the care of the Local Authority and what needed to be done by all those involved in the development and delivery of services to Looked After Children.

Whilst the Local Authority was the lead agency in developing and implementing the Strategy, it had and was being developed and implemented by a range of professionals working in the Local Authority and key partner agencies.

A Looked After Children Strategy Group had been established to develop and implement the Strategy. A smaller sub-project group took the lead on individual priority areas.

The work in developing and implementing the Strategy was essentially centred upon answering 4 key questions - as a Service where did we want to be, where were we now, how would we get from where we were now to where we wanted to be and how would we know we were there?

5 Priority objectives defined what key achievements and improvements the Service would be striving to make over the next 2 years in relation to Looked After Children's measures:-

- | | |
|------------|--|
| Priority 1 | to improve the degree and timeliness of placement stability and permanence and ensure children were able to enjoy continuity of relationships |
| Priority 2 | to improve the emotional wellbeing and physical health of Looked After Children |
| Priority 3 | to improve educational progress and attainment and narrow the gap between attainment of Looked After Children and their non-Looked After peers |
| Priority 4 | to improve the support for and opportunities open to care leavers sufficiently to increase the number and proportion of them who are in employment, educations or training (EET) |
| Priority 5 | to listen to children and young people so as to ensure that their views influence their own plans as well as wider service delivery and development |

The report had been submitted to the Improving Lives Select commission on 12th March and the Corporate Parenting Group on 21st January.

Discussion ensued on the report with the following comments/issues raised:-

- Suggestion that a representative from CAMHS, Tier 3 specialists, be invited to the Strategy Group
- There were approximately 390 Looked After Children in Rotherham of which 92 were placed with independent foster providers outside of Rotherham, 20 placed with Local Authority foster carers that lived outside of the Borough and 30 children in residential provision outside of the Borough
- It was 1 of the Strategy Priorities to try and get as many as possible of the above children back into the Borough
- Commissioners were working with the CCG to develop the CAMHS Strategy which would address Looked After Children's needs
- Rotherham College had discussed with the Authority what they could do to work with Looked After Children and support the change

Resolved:- That the report be noted.

263. YEAR END - PLAN ON A PAGE

Sue Wilson, Performance and Quality Manager, presented a report highlighting progress up until December, 2013, drawing particular attention to:-

Priority 1 – We will ensure children have the best start in life

- 91 schools now had a 'Food in Schools Policy' which incorporated all food provision including packed lunches
- New joint 2 year Health and Education Review successfully piloted at Aughton Early Years Children Centre
- 81 established breastfeeding friendly public places and 65 active breast buddies in Rotherham
- Launch of Ante-natal Pathway on 16th September with parents now being offered pre-birth and new birth visits

Priority 2 – We will engage with parents and families

- Development of Performance Management Framework for Early Help
- Young Carer's Card launched September, 2013
- Updated Family CAF now included the requirement for CYPS to systematically screen for drug and alcohol use
- Early Help Support Panel to provide a point of escalation for "stuck" families

Priority 3 – We will reduce the harm to children and young people who are exposed to domestic abuse, alcohol/substance misuse and neglect

- Agreed Child's Multi-Agency Assessment Protocol with proposed live date of April, 2014
- Recommissioning of Alcohol Services to deliver more preventative work and training/education opportunities
- Redevelopment of the transition plan for Know the Score into CAMHs

Priority 4 – We will work with parents to eradicate child sexual exploitation

- 3 independent reviews of Rotherham CSE Services now published
- Nurse practitioner had joined the CSE Team
- Completed review of Police intelligence and development and internal Police referral routes clarified
- Variety of intervention techniques successfully used to disrupt CSE activity as early as possible

Priority 5 – We will focus on all children and young people making good progress in their learning and development

- Take up of early education by 3/4 year olds for the 2013 Summer Term was 97% - increase of 6.5% on 2012/13
- 73% of schools judged to be good or outstanding for overall effectiveness compared to the national average of 78%
- KS2-KS4 progress by 3 levels in Mathematics had increased by 4.3% to 70.3% - English had increased by 3.3% to 75.3%

Priority 6 – We will target support to families in greatest need to help access learning/employment opportunities

- Pilot multi-agency EU Migrant/Roma 'family induction day' held on 17th September, 2013, at the Lifewise Centre
- EU Migrant Engagement Officer appointed in July, 2013
- Youth Support Workers were accompanying young people seeking work when they visited the Job Centre
- Partnership arrangements with Rotherham and Dearne Valley Colleges to provide targeted work for young people identified by the School Liaison officer and College Support Services as needing one-to-one support to overcome barriers to engagement

The Partnership felt this was an excellent piece of work and would like to see something similar for the priorities and challenges.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received.

(2) That an update be submitted twice a year.

264. LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD

The minutes of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board meeting held on 13th December, 2013, were noted.

265. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved: - That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Council)).

266. ROTHERHAM SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS SERVICE - SELF EVALUATION

Karen Borthwick, Head of School Effectiveness Service, reported that local authorities had statutory duties to promote high standards and fulfilment of potential in schools and other education and training providers in order that all children and young people benefitted from at least a good education. The Framework for the Inspection of Local Authority Arrangements for Supporting School Improvement had been published to assist local authorities in carrying out the statutory duties.

In preparation for the above, Rotherham was developing a self-assessment against the key areas for inspection (Appendix A of the report submitted refers). Rotherham was also working with authorities across Yorkshire and the Humber to develop effective self-assessment practice, peer assess the judgements made in the said assessments and share good practice in School Improvement delivery across the region.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That an update be submitted in 12 months.

267. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(1) Improvement Panel

It was reported that the Improvement Panel had now folded. The reports would now be submitted to the Partnership and the Safeguarding Board.

(2) Dr. David Polkinghorn

It was reported that it was David's last meeting. He had been a great champion in the health community for children particularly the safeguarding aspect. The Partnership had benefitted from his contributions and wished him well for the future.

268. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Wednesday, 21st May, 2014, commencing at 2.00 p.m. in Rotherham Town Hall.

| |
|--|
| ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS |
|--|

| | | |
|-----------|---------------------|---|
| 1. | Meeting: | Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services |
| 2. | Date: | 21st May, 2014 |
| 3. | Title: | Proposal to amalgamate Brampton the Ellis Junior and Infant Schools by the discontinuance of the Junior School and the change of age-range of the Infant School – final determination. |
| 4. | Directorate: | Children and Young Peoples Services |

5. Summary

This report seeks a final determination by the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Family Services in relation to the proposed amalgamation of Brampton the Ellis (CE Aided) Infant and Junior Schools.

6. Recommendations

In the absence of any representation that the proposal to amalgamate Brampton the Ellis (CE Aided) Infant and Junior Schools be approved by the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families Services with effect from 2nd June 2014.

7. Proposals and Details

Proposals to amalgamate the two schools by discontinuance of the Junior School and change of age range of the Infant School have stood since 15th January 2014 including the statutory notice period 14th March to 11th April 2014.

Previous reports on the proposals were submitted to Cabinet Member on 15th January 2014 and 5th March 2014 respectively.

The principal objectives of amalgamation are:

- 1) to provide a continuous primary entitlement across the key stages; and
- 2) to provide a unified management structure with a single school ethos which will be more efficient and make more effective use of resources.

8. Finance

The proposed amalgamation will allow the Headteacher and Governing Body to structure financial resources to best support a through school ethos across the Infant and Junior sites.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There are always risks and uncertainties when school place provision is considered since future pupil numbers are based on estimations. Over provision at one school could influence pupil numbers at other schools. Local Authorities are obliged, however, to provide sufficient places, promote diversity and increase parental preference. (CYD0015/018 - Corporate risk register).

A final decision should be determined by the decision maker within 2 months from the end of the representation period. If this fails to be done, then the matter is referred to the Schools Adjudicator for decision.

The advantages and disadvantages of the amalgamation were reported to Cabinet Member on 15th January and 5th March 2014.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The major theme supported by the proposal is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'.

Rotherham School Improvement Mission:

- ~ All children will make at least good progress
- ~ There will be no underperforming cohorts
- ~ All teachers will deliver at least good learning
- ~ All schools will move to the next level of successful performance

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The School Organisation (Establishment and Discontinuance of Schools) Regulations 2013

The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

School Organisation (Maintained Schools) guidance for proposers and decision makers (January 2014)

A full pre statutory and statutory consultation has been undertaken with relevant stakeholders.

Reports to Cabinet Member 15th January 2014 and 5th March 2014.

Public Notice period 14th March to 11th April 2014.

Contact Name :

Dean Fenton (Principal Officer - School Organisation and Risk Management)

Tel: 01709 254821

Email: dean.fenton@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

| | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--|
| 1. | Meeting: | Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services |
| 2. | Date: | 21st May, 2014 |
| 3. | Title: | Proposed expansion of Brampton the Ellis Junior School – final determination. |
| 4. | Directorate: | Children and Young People's Services |

5. Summary

This report seeks a final determination in relation to the proposed expansion of Brampton the Ellis Junior School.

6. Recommendations

It is recommended that in the absence of any objections, the proposal to expand the school on a permanent basis should be granted conditional approval (subject to planning permission being granted).

7. Proposals and Details

The proposal consulted on is:-

To expand the numbers on roll at Brampton the Ellis Junior School from September 2014 in Year 3 and subsequent year groups thereafter, from a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 70 to 80 initially. The school will be expanded in phases in order to accommodate an eventual 90 children per statutory year group ($90 \times 4 = 360$ places) rather than its current capacity of $70 \times 4 = 280$ places. The school would have an eventual published admission number (PAN) of 90 with effect from September 2020.

8. Finance

The capital cost of the building project is currently estimated at £500,000. This will provide additional teaching and learning spaces and other required spaces to be developed further in conjunction with the CYPS Capital Projects Team, Architects and the school. Funding for the project is from 'Basic Need funding' allocated to the Authority from the DfE. (Basic Need funding is provided for the provision of sufficient school places) and Section 106 developer contributions (subject to trigger points being met).

The school will need to plan for the expansion and appoint additional teaching and non teaching staff. Funding for the additional staffing will be generated from the additional pupils on roll and will be part of the school's annual budget. However, in the first year of operation, as the pupils will not be on roll in time for the school's budget to be allocated, additional funding will need to be requested from the Contingency for pupil growth fund to cover the 7/12 funding gap via Schools Forum.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There are always risks and uncertainties when school place provision is considered since future pupil numbers are based on estimations. Over provision at one school could influence pupil numbers at other schools. Local Authorities are obliged, however, to provide sufficient places, promote diversity and increase parental preference. (CYD0015/018 - Corporate risk register).

A final decision should be determined by the decision maker within 2 months from the end of the representation period. If this fails to be done, then the matter is referred to the Schools Adjudicator for decision.

The proposal is linked to the proposed expansion of Cortonwood Infant School and the outcome of one proposal will impact on the other, the 2 proposals have been consulted upon simultaneously.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The major theme supported by the proposal is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'. It is likely that the expansion would enable more parents to access their first preference school for their child and, therefore, increase that performance indicator.

Rotherham School Improvement Mission:

- ~ All children will make at least good progress
- ~ There will be no underperforming cohorts
- ~ All teachers will deliver at least good learning
- ~ All schools will move to the next level of successful performance

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

School Organisation (Maintained Schools) guidance for proposers and decision makers (January 2014)

A full pre statutory and statutory consultation has been undertaken with relevant stakeholders.

Reports to Cabinet Member 24th July 2013 and 5th March 2014.

Public Notice period 14th March to 11th April 2014.

Contact Name :

Dean Fenton (Principal Officer - School Organisation and Risk Management)

Tel: Extension – 54821

Email: dean.fenton@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

| | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--|
| 1. | Meeting: | Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services |
| 2. | Date: | 21st May, 2014 |
| 3. | Title: | Proposals to expand Cortonwood Infant School – final determination. |
| 4. | Directorate: | Children and Young People's Services |

5. Summary

This report seeks a final determination on proposals to expand the School.

6. Recommendations

It is recommended that in the absence of any objections to the proposal to expand Cortonwood Infant School, conditional approval should be granted (subject to a successful planning permission application).

7. Proposals and Details

It is proposed to expand the numbers on roll at Cortonwood Infant School from September 2017 in Foundation Stage 2 (Reception) and subsequent Foundation Stage 2 (Reception) cohorts thereafter. The school will be expanded in order to accommodate 50 children per statutory year group ($50 \times 3 = 150$ places) rather than its current capacity of $40 \times 3 = 120$ places. The school would have a phased published admission number (PAN) of 50.

As the proposal is linked to the proposed expansion of Brampton the Ellis Junior School the proposals have been consulted upon simultaneously.

8. Finance

The capital cost of the building project is currently estimated at £200,000. This will provide further teaching and learning spaces and other required spaces to be developed further in conjunction with the CYPS Capital Projects Team, Architects and the school. Funding for the project is from 'Basic Need funding' allocated to the Authority from the DfE (Basic Need funding is provided for the provision of sufficient school places) and Section 106 developer contributions (subject to trigger points).

The school will need to plan for the expansion and appoint additional teaching and non teaching staff. Funding for the additional staffing will be generated from the additional pupils on roll and will be part of the school's annual budget. However, in the first year of operation, as the pupils will not be on roll in time for the school's budget to be allocated, additional funding will need to be requested from the Contingency for pupil growth to cover the 7/12 funding gap via Schools Forum.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There are always risks and uncertainties when school place provision is considered since future pupil numbers are based on estimations. Over provision at one school could influence pupil numbers at other schools. Local Authorities are obliged, however, to provide sufficient places, promote diversity and increase parental preference. (CYD0015/018 - Corporate risk register).

A final decision should be determined by the decision maker within 2 months from the end of the representation period. If this fails to be done, then the matter is referred to the Schools Adjudicator for decision.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The major theme supported by the proposal is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'. It is likely that the expansion would enable more parents to access their first preference school for their child and, therefore, increase that performance indicator.

Rotherham School Improvement Mission:

- ~ All children will make at least good progress
- ~ There will be no underperforming cohorts
- ~ All teachers will deliver at least good learning
- ~ All schools will move to the next level of successful performance

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

School Organisation (Maintained Schools) guidance for proposers and decision makers (January 2014)

A full pre statutory and statutory consultation has been undertaken with relevant stakeholders.

Reports to Cabinet Member 24th July 2013 and 5th March 2014.

Public Notice period 14th March to 11th April 2014.

Contact Name :

Dean Fenton (Principal Officer - School Organisation and Risk Management)

Tel: 01709 254821

Email: dean.fenton@rotherham.gov.uk

| |
|--|
| ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS |
|--|

| | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--|
| 1. | Meeting: | Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services |
| 2. | Date: | 21st May, 2014 |
| 3. | Title: | Proposals to Amalgamate Thorpe Hesley Infant and Junior Schools – statutory consultation. |
| 4. | Directorate: | Children and Young People's Services |

5. Summary

This report seeks approval from the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Family Services to commence statutory consultation on the amalgamation proposals.

6. Recommendations

It is recommended that statutory consultation should commence on proposals to Amalgamate Thorpe Hesley Infant and Junior Schools and that a further report be brought to Members in due course.

7. Proposals and Details

It is proposed to amalgamate Thorpe Hesley Infant and Junior Schools by the discontinuance of the Infant School and change of age range of the Junior School from 7 - 11 to 3 - 11 to establish a 'through' primary school.

The proposed 'through' School would have 490 places (Reception(FS2) to Y6) with a Nursery (FS1) unit of up to 52 places (26 FTE). (This is the combined numbers of the current two schools). The 'through' school would have a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 70. There will be no changes to existing premises or site arrangements.

The principal objectives of amalgamation are:

- 1) to provide a continuous primary entitlement across the key stages; and
- 2) to provide a unified management structure with a single school ethos which will be more efficient and make more effective use of resources.

There will be a recruitment and selection process for the position of Head Teacher at the Primary School. This will ensure an open and transparent recruitment and selection process enabling the Governing Body to appoint the strongest possible candidate to the position of Headteacher for the new 'through' school.

8. Finance

The proposed amalgamation will allow the Headteacher and Governing Body to structure financial resources to best support a through school ethos across the Infant and Junior sites.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There are always risks and uncertainties when school place provision is considered since future pupil numbers are based on estimations. Over provision at one school could influence pupil numbers at other schools. Local Authorities are obliged, however, to provide sufficient places, promote diversity and increase parental preference. (CYD0015/018 - Corporate risk register).

If the Local Authority progresses to the statutory consultation phase, then formal objections may be lodged during the representation period following the publication of statutory notices. A final decision should be determined by the Cabinet Member as 'decision maker' within 2 months from the end of the representation period. If this fails to be done, then the matter is referred to the Schools Adjudicator for determination.

The risks and uncertainties associated with an amalgamation are detailed below:

The principal ADVANTAGES of amalgamation are:

- removal of the school transfer at the end of key stage 1;
- provision of a whole school curriculum across the primary age range;
- a unified management structure with a single school ethos;
- the potential to organise and arrange the staffing structure and to safeguard the staffing establishment when pupil numbers change across the key stages;
- a whole school approach to staff development across the primary phase;
- more efficient and effective use of resources, especially accommodation, when numbers fluctuate across the infant and junior phases.

The principal DISADVANTAGES of amalgamation are:

- the reduction to only one head teacher post which could impact upon accessibility to staff, parents and pupils (this may have particular relevance where schools serve areas of social and economic disadvantage);
- potential difficulties in bringing together two different sets of working practice;
- possible fear of and resistance to change amongst staff, governors and parents;
- in some (but by no means all) cases, a lack of staff expertise in teaching and management across the two key stages.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The major theme supported by the proposal is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'.

Rotherham School Improvement Mission:

- ~ All children will make at least good progress
- ~ There will be no underperforming cohorts
- ~ All teachers will deliver at least good learning
- ~ All schools will move to the next level of successful performance

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The School Organisation (Establishment and Discontinuance of Schools) Regulations 2013

The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013

School Organisation (Maintained Schools) guidance for proposers and decision makers (January 2014)

Summary of pre statutory consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Parent / carer and staff completed questionnaire forms on the proposals.

Report to Cabinet Member 5th March 2014.

Consultation timeline

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Cabinet Member to agree to consultation | 5 th March 2014 |
| Pre statutory consultation period With relevant stakeholders. | |
| Report to the Cabinet Member detailing the Outcome of pre statutory consultation and seeking approval to commence Statutory Consultation. | 21 st May 2014 |
| Publication of statutory notices and proposals (4 week period) | 30 th May 2014 |
| Report to Cabinet Member and final Determination of proposals and notification to the Department for Education | 16 th July 2014 |
| Implementation Date | 1 st September 2014 |

Consultation meetings / correspondence has been undertaken with the Governing Bodies of both Schools, Staff and Trade Union representatives, Parents / Carers of pupils at the schools, local Councillors, any local Parish Council and the local MP.

Additionally consultation has also been undertaken with the Governing bodies of any other school that may be affected plus the Diocese of any school likely to be affected and any other stakeholders.

Contact Name :

Dean Fenton (Principal Officer - School Organisation and Risk Management)

Tel: 01709 254821

Email: dean.fenton@rotherham.gov.uk

Christopher Stones (Senior Officer – School Organisation)

Tel: 01709 254821

Email: christopher.stones@rotherham.gov.uk

| |
|--|
| ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS |
|--|

| | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--|
| 1. | Meeting: | Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services |
| 2. | Date: | 21st May, 2014 |
| 3. | Title: | Children and Young People's Services Performance Indicator Report - Outturn 2013-14 Appendix A - Performance - Outturn 2013-14 Appendix B - CYPS Performance Measures - Outturn 2013-14 |
| 4. | Directorate: | Children and Young People's Services |

5. Summary

This report and accompanying appendices outline performance at the end of Qtr 4 2013/14 against targets, with direction of travel against previous year's performance and comparisons with statistical neighbors and national data where available.

6. Recommendations

- **That the Performance Report be received and performance noted**
 - **The report is submitted to the Children, Young People and Families' Partnership for their information.**
-

7. Proposals and Details

Members' attention is drawn to 'Appendix A – Performance – Outturn 2013-14' which provides details of performance by each Corporate Plan Priority relating to CYPS measures rated as red.

Full details of performance and commentary at indicator level are provided in the table within Appendix B which is referenced throughout the Performance Assessment (Appendix A). The table includes;

- Performance against targets (Comparing performance against set targets)
- Direction of travel analysis (Comparing 2013/14 outturn performance to 2012/13 outturn performance)
- Performance against Statistical Neighbours average
- Performance against National average

8. Finance

There are no financial implications to this report. The relevant Service Director and Budget Holder will address financial implications of the Action Plans. Members will be consulted where appropriate

9. Risks and Uncertainties

A category of risk is applied to each Performance Indicator using the PI managers' projection of year-end performance and takes into account any known internal or external influences with comparison against targets.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The OFSTED profile is no longer published by OFSTED, however locally this is reproduced in relation to the inspected settings and is used by Directors and Managers as a tool to drive up performance.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Children and Young People's Services Performance Indicator Reports.

Contact Name : Sue Wilson, Performance & Quality Manager , Ext. 22511

Rotherham Children and Young People's Services

Assessment of Performance by Corporate Plan Priorities

2013/14 Outturn Report

This report outlines outturn performance for 2013/14 against targets, with comparisons against previous performance and statistical neighbour and national data where possible. It should be read in conjunction with the 'Appendix B - CYPS Performance Monitoring Table 2013/14 – Outturn' as it includes references throughout the text to the numbering structure within the table.

Below are the criteria for RAG rating the indicators.

| Definition of new RAG Status | Target Met | Stat Neighbour Avg Met | National Avg Met | New RAG Status |
|--|------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Performance is achieving the local target and above Statistical Neighbours or National Average | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | GREEN |
| Performance is not achieving the local target and on or above Statistical Neighbours or National Average | x | ✓ | ✓ | AMBER |
| Performance is below local target and Statistical Neighbours or National Average | x | x | x | RED |

Comparative data relates to the latest available data and therefore date periods for some indicators may vary. It has been sourced via the DFE Local Area Interactive Tool.

Corporate Plan Exception Report (RAG rated Red)

Corporate Priority 1: Stimulating the local economy and helping local people into work

Outcome: We will focus on lifelong learning to improve the qualifications, skills and economic wellbeing of children, young people and their families

Measure (No.2 / NI 78): Reduction in number of schools where fewer than 40% of pupils achieve 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including GCSEs in English and Maths and below the median progress measures in both English and mathematics

The Department for Education (DfE) floor standard criteria is:

- Fewer than 40% of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 achieving five or more GCSEs A*– C (or equivalent), including English and mathematics.
- Below the average percentage of pupils at the end of KS4 making expected progress in English compared with the national median (73% in 2013); and
- Below the average percentage of pupils at the end of KS2 making expected progress compared with the national median (73% in 2013).

A school has to be below **all three** measures to be deemed below the floor standards.

In 2013 one secondary school was below the DfE KS4 floor standard. This school was also below the KS4 floor standard in 2012.

The challenging context of the school includes high levels of deprivation which are significantly above the national average, the percentage of pupils eligible for pupil premium funding is double the national average, the percentage of pupils from minority ethnic background and EAL is very high and well above the national average

Schools will be supported to sustain incremental improvements;

- Executive Headteacher system leadership arrangements are in place for the secondary school in an OFSTED category and the school below the DfE floor standards.
- Specialist Leaders in Education (SLE's) have been assigned by the Teaching School Alliance (TSA) and have expertise in a specific area to support individuals or teams in similar positions in other schools.
- NLE's / LLE's are working alongside other heads to drive forward improvements and build capacity to ensure that improvements can be sustained. NLE's / LLE's are working as and when appropriate, in supporting schools within or beyond their own Learning Community.

Measure (No.6 / NI 89): Reduction of number of schools judged as requiring special measures and improvement in time taken to come out of the category

The new OFSTED school inspection framework was introduced in January 2013, revised in September 2013 and also January 2014 with the introduction of no notice inspections. The satisfactory judgement was replaced with 'requires improvement' and with a tighter focus on the way in which headteachers are driving the quality of teaching in schools. The introduction of the new inspection framework has significantly increased the proportion of schools placed in an OFSTED category.

The Rotherham mission to support school improvement is:

- all students making at least good progress
- no underperforming cohorts
- all teachers delivering at least good learning and
- all schools moving to at least the next level of successful performance

To meet future targets we need to improve the quality of Teaching and Learning, attainment and progress as well as increase capacity of Leadership and Management. To do this the following delivery plan needs to be implemented for NI 89, No.18, 19 & 20 LPI's;

- The structures and processes have been reviewed and updated for implementation from September 2013. Meetings are held each half term and chaired by the Senior Director of Schools & Lifelong Learning. The HT and Chair of Governors attend the meetings to review outcomes, the evidence of progress and impact in the areas identified for improvement including the capacity of leadership. An external evaluator is appointed to ascertain the impact and progress of the development work.
- Rotherham School Effectiveness Service is proactive in approaching outstanding leaders to initiate the process of becoming Executive Headteachers for their present school and supporting the improvement of one or more schools of concern. The service will continue to broker federations, collaborations and sponsor-led academy partnerships in Rotherham schools.
- The Rotherham School Improvement Partnership (RoSIP) has combined with Wickersley Teaching School Alliance to form Learners First. The priorities of Learners First are School Improvement and Leadership Development. The focus is to build excellence and address underperformance through system led school improvement and leadership development.
- Most Learning Communities (LC's) have developed Strategic Performance Groups to drive and support school improvement. The SPG includes the Headteacher of each school within the LC and a Consultant Headteacher representative from the School Effectiveness Service. Part of the meeting cycle is regular and thorough analysis of data. Rotherham LA School Effectiveness Service have developed LC Audits (i.e. Thresholds and Progress Measures - DfE) and Termly APS Trackers (overall attainment and progress for all and sub-groups including FSM for each year group).
- LC HT peer evaluation groups were introduced in the Autumn Term 2013 to offer evaluation and challenge to help improve.
- Teaching and Learning Consultant support and challenge is allocated to targeted schools.

- Rotherham has four designated National Leaders of Governance (NLGs). NLGs are highly effective chairs of governors designated by the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) who will work with another chair or governing body to help them develop and to improve school performance.

Measure (No.10 / LPI): Looked after children reaching level 4+ in Writing at Key Stage 2

Although outcomes for reading and mathematics were above national averages for LAC, writing was 12% below. The local target of 45% was missed by 2% and the outcome was just over 16% below statistical neighbours.

The Virtual Headteacher now collects assessment data for reading, writing and maths every term and the progress of every pupil is monitored.

Where progress is not sufficient, the Virtual Head would expect to see the Pupil Premium Plus grant (allocated, managed and monitored by the Virtual Head from April 2014) being used to accelerate progress.

In addition, the Virtual School/Get Real Team provides additional one to one support for Year 6 pupils educated in Rotherham, or within travelling distance of Rotherham, who are at risk of underachieving. Support with writing has been targeted to some pupils.

Measure (No.17 / LPI): Level 4+ in reading, writing & mathematics combined

The direction of travel is up and performance has increased by 1.6% to 71.6%. The national averages have remained at 75%; the gap to the national average has reduced slightly by 1.6%.

There is insufficient Leadership and Management capacity within Rotherham primary schools to sustain rapid improvement in KS2 outcomes and too many of Rotherham schools with large pupil cohorts underachieve at the end of KS2, in particular junior schools. The increase in vulnerable groups of EU migrants and new arrivals, which families mainly reside around town centre schools that already have a high level of deprivation and high numbers of BME pupils with English as an Additional Language.

- A risk assessment of all Rotherham schools takes place early in the autumn term; this is discussed and monitored through consultant Headteacher meetings throughout the year.
- Rigorous targeting of support to identified schools.
- Local Authority Powers of Intervention have been established and continue to develop to work with schools that are vulnerable to falling below KS2 and KS4 floor standards or data indicates underperformance.
- Focussed monitoring and evaluation strategies.

Measure (No.18 / LPI): Progression by 2 levels in reading between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2

The direction of travel is down and performance has decreased by 3% to 83%. The national averages have also decreased by 2% to 88%; therefore the gap to the national average has increased by 1%.

Measure (No.19 / LPI): Progression by 2 levels in writing between key stage 1 and key stage 2

The direction of travel is up and performance has increased by 1% to 89%. The national averages have also increased by 2% to 92%; the gap to the national average is 3%.

Corporate Priority 2: Protecting our most vulnerable people and families, enabling them to maximise their independence

Outcome: We will intervene early to prevent problems developing and protect children, young people, families and vulnerable adults from all forms of abuse, violence and neglect

Measure (No.28 / NI 59): Percentage of initial assessments for children's social care carried out within 10 working days of referral

There were 1560 initial assessments completed in 2013/14, 56.1% (845) of these were completed within the 10 day timescale. It is worth noting that although this year end position is still significantly below target, it is an improvement on the year end performance projected at 3rd quarter which was 53%

As previously reported this indicator has been performing poorly for a number of months and a number of actions, system reviews and service developments have been undertaken to improve timeliness.

This includes the recruitment of permanent staff within the Contact and Referral Team (CART). These staff will screen new contacts into the service and will not carry a caseload. Previously this was staff with case holding Duty Social Workers on a rota basis and therefore impeded their ability to complete assessments and work with their cases.

In addition Duty Social Workers now have scheduled protected time to complete assessment write-ups and daily allocation meetings between team managers and social workers ensure that current caseload is fully considered before allocation of new work.

This measure will be deleted for 2014/15 as the service introduces a new local assessment framework. This will result in a single type of child's assessment and will increase the flexibility in completion timescales.

Measure (No.29 / NI 60): Percentage of core assessments for children's social care that were carried out within 35 working days of their commencement

There were 2405 Core Assessments completed in 2013/14, 61% (1468) of these were completed within the 35 day timescale. This measure is linked to the above measure on Initial Assessments and the same improvement work.

This measure will be deleted for 2014/15 as the service introduces a new local assessment framework. This will result in a single type of child's assessment and will increase the flexibility in completion timescales.

Measure (No.30 / NI 61): Timeliness of placements of looked after children for adoption following an agency decision that the child should be placed for adoption

This year 34 children were adopted, 23 of these were within timescales resulting in performance of 67.6% which is below benchmarking data but is in line with the previous year.

Other performance statistics, introduced recently nationally, show that performance in adoptions overall is improving. The average time between a child entering care and moving in with its adoptive family, has reduced from 659 days (2010-2013 3 year average) to 492 days (in the last six months of 2013/14)

The average time between a Placement Order being granted and the decision for a match for a child reduced by 25 days from 309 days in 2012/13 to 284 days in 2013/14.

While past performance has been lower than national benchmark this measure has significantly improved in 2013-14 and in a recent meeting with the DFE they made it clear that they were satisfied with Rotherham's progress.

Measure (No.33 / NI 64): Child protection plans lasting 2 years or more

Of the 351 child protection plans which ended in 2013/14, 24 (6.8%) had lasted 2 years or more.

There are a further 19 children currently on plans over 2 years, these represent future unavoidable performance drag.

Improvement work is focusing on children who have been on a plan for 18-23 months and ensuring, wherever possible review process are within threshold.

It is worth noting that any decisions regarding the continuation of a child protection plan will be in the best interests of the child regardless of performance targets

A study based on audit findings demonstrates that purposeful effective plans are in place for these children.

Measure (No.51 / NI 102): Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers achieving the expected level at Key Stage 2 & 4

The KS2 gap between FSM and non FSM pupils was reduced by 3.0% to 22% in 2013. The national average gap remained at 19%.

The KS4 gap between FSM and non FSM pupils was increased by 2.8% to 34.4% in 2013. This is 7.8% above the national gap.

Ofsted have also released a national report by HMI for Early Years which provides evidence that Rotherham are joint 33rd out of 149 LA's, regarding the percentage of children on FSM that achieved a good level of development in 2013.

Quality Assurance

Between January 14 and the end of March 2014 we have continued to embed quality assurance and the following audit activity has been undertaken;

- **Thematic qualitative case audit process;** 60 audits including, Children subject to a Child Protection Plan for 18 months or longer, LAC children placed out of authority, Child Sexual Exploitation.
- **Qualitative Audit Checklists for all Looked After Children Reviews;** 291 cases reviewed resulting in 41 informal concerns, 14 Stage 1 concerns and 12 stage 2 concerns being raised.
- **Qualitative Audit Checklists for all Initial and Review Child Protection Conferences;** 156 conferences (337 children) resulting in 48 concerns being raised through the escalation/challenge procedure.
- **Thematic practice reviews** involvement and contribution to the service wide review of CYPS locality teams.

Themes and issues identified within the audits have assisted in gaining a clearer understanding on the impact of the services we deliver. As a result;

- A new Quality Assurance framework has been developed to promote and support the continuous development of CYPS as a 'learning organisation'. including the introduction of Reflective Case Review Days, Team Manager case management audit tool and CP/CIN/LAC reflective case summaries
- Ongoing training on the use of the Graded Care Profile for use with cases where Neglect is a significant factor has been delivered to Locality Teams and will be completed by the beginning May 2014
- The new children in need/child protection care plan has been implemented across all locality teams (Jan 2014) with ongoing support and "1 month on" reviews. The impact of the new template will be the subject of the next planned thematic audits in June 2014.

Children & Young People's Service

Appendix B - CYPS Performance Monitoring Table 2013/14 - Outturn

| Ref | Definition | Good Perf is | Freq. | 12/13 Perf | 2013 / 2014 Performance | | | | 13/14 Target | Met Target | DOT Yr on Yr | Latest Comparative Data | | | | RAG Status | Comments |
|--|---|--------------|--------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--------------|------------|---|
| | | | | | Qtr 1 Perf (Apr - Jun) | Qtr 2 Perf (Jul-Aug) | Qtr 3 Perf (Sep - Dec) | Qtr 4 / Outturn Perf (Jan - Mar) | | | | Stat Neigh | Met Stat Neigh | National | Met National | | |
| Priority 1: Stimulating the local economy and helping local people into work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CYPS Action: We will focus on lifelong learning to improve the qualifications, skills and economic wellbeing of children, young people and their families | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 (NI 75) | Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths | HIGH | Annual | 60.0% (2012) | 63.6% (2013) | | | | 62.0% | ✓ | ↑ | 58.9% | ✓ | 59.2% state-funded 60.8% national av | ✓ | Green | S+A*-C inc E&M increased by 3.6% to 63.6% against an increase in the national av of 1.8% to 60.8% (state-funded schools) and a decrease of -0.2% to 59.2% in the national av (all schools). Rotherham LA av is 4.4% above the national av (all schools) and 2.8% above the national av (state-funded schools). This is the second year Rotherham averages have exceeded national averages for this threshold. |
| 2 (NI 78) | Reduction in number of schools where fewer than 40% of pupils achieve 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including GCSEs in English and Maths and below the median progress measures in both English and mathematics | LOW | Annual | 1 school (2012) | 1 school (2013) | | | | 0 schools | ✗ | → | n/a | | n/a | | Red | In 2013, one secondary school was below the Department for Education (DfE) KS4 floor standard. This school was also below the KS4 floor standard in 2012. |
| 3 (NI 79) | Achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19 | HIGH | Annual | 79.4% (2012) | 80.9% (2013) | | | | n/a | | ↑ | 82.37% | ✗ | 86.2% | ✗ | n/a | In 2013, L2 by 19 increased by 1.4% to 80.9% (the national average increased by 1.1% to 86.2%), this reduced the gap to the national average by 0.3% to 5.3%. |
| 4 (NI 80) | Achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19 | HIGH | Annual | 48.5% (2012) | 50.4% (2013) | | | | n/a | | ↑ | n/a | | 59.1% (2013) | ✗ | n/a | National Average increased by 1.1%, LA Average increased by 1.8% thereby reducing gap to National. LA increase equates to an additional 60 learners achieving this measure, which is a higher increase in number of learners than Barnsley, Doncaster or Sheffield. |
| 5 (NI 87) | Persistent absence rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | LOW | Annual | 4.2% | 4.00% | | | | 4.30% | ✓ | ↑ | 3.30% | ✗ | 3.00% | ✗ | Green | The Primary percentage continues to decrease despite being below the National Average of 3.0%. The Secondary percentage continues to decrease despite being below the National Average of 6.4%. The Education Welfare Service monitors the levels of Persistent Absence on a termly basis and Education Welfare Officers work closely with schools giving advice and guidance to reduce Persistent Absence. |
| | Secondary School | LOW | | 8.40% | 7.80% | | | | 8.60% | ✓ | ↑ | 7.20% | ✗ | 6.40% | ✗ | | |
| 6 (NI 89) | Reduction of number of schools judged as requiring special measures and improvement in time taken to come out of the category | LOW | Termly | 2 | 6 schools | 6 schools | 8 schools | 7 schools (2013) | 0 schools | ✗ | ↓ | n/a | | n/a | | Red | The introduction of the new inspection framework has significantly increased the proportion of schools placed in an OFSTED category. |
| 7 (NI 94) | Progression by 2 levels in maths between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 | HIGH | Annual | 84% (2012) | 88% (2013) | | | | 87.0% | ✓ | ↑ | 89.00% | ✗ | 88.0% | ✓ | Green | KS1-KS2 progress by 2 levels in mathematics increased by 4% to 88%. National averages increased by 1% to 88%, Rotherham met the national average for the first time in 2013. |
| 8 (NI 100) | Looked after children reaching level 4 in Maths at Key Stage 2 | HIGH | Annual | 56.0% | 64.00% | | | | 45.0% | ✓ | ↑ | 62.29% | ✓ | 59.0% | ✓ | Green | Target exceeded, outcomes above national for LAC and statistical neighbours |
| 9 (LPI) | Looked after children reaching level 4+ in Reading at Key Stage 2 | HIGH | Annual | 56.0% | 64.00% | | | | 45.0% | ✓ | ↑ | 66.86% | ✗ | 63.0% | ✓ | Amber | Exceeded target, outcomes were slightly above national but 2.86% below statistical neighbours |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|---|-----|--------|---|--------|---|-------|---|
| 10 (LPI) | Looked after children reaching level 4+ in Writing at Key Stage 2 | HIGH | Annual | 44.0% | 43.00% | | | | 45.0% | ✘ | ↑ | 59.17% | ✘ | 55.0% | ✘ | Red | Target was almost met, but outcomes were below national and statistical neighbour outcomes for LAC |
| 11 (NI 101) | Looked after children achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs (or equivalent) at Key Stage 4 (including English and Maths) | HIGH | Annual | 24.0% | 22.20% | | | | 19.0% | ✓ | ↓ | 15.60% | ✓ | 15.3% | ✓ | Green | Target exceeded, above national outcomes for LAC |
| 12 (NI 103) | Special Educational Needs – statements issued within 26 weeks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Excluding exceptions | HIGH | Quarterly | 100.0% | 100% (4 of 4) | 100% (12 of 12) | 100% (8 of 8) | 100% (7 of 7) | 95% | ✓ | → | 91.44% | ✓ | 90% | ✓ | Green | Figures show that all SEN statements have been issued within 26 weeks, year to date. This totals 31 excluding exceptions and 128 including exceptions. |
| | b) Including exceptions | HIGH | | 100.0% | 100% (38 of 38) | 100% (42 of 42) | 100% (30 of 30) | 100% (18 of 18) | 94% | ✓ | → | 84.50% | ✓ | 84% | ✓ | Green | |
| 13 (NI 105) | The Special Educational Needs (SEN)/non-SEN gap – achieving 5 A*-C GCSE inc. English and Maths | LOW | Annual | 52.4% (2012) | 54.2% (2013) | | | | n/a | | ↑ | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | |
| 14 (NI 117) | 16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, training or employment (NEET) | LOW | Quarterly | 7.4% | 7.70% | 7.40% | 6.30% | 6.40% | 7.10% | ✓ | ↓ | 6.30% | ✘ | 5.30% | ✘ | Green | Target measured as an average over Nov, Dec & Jan, so final outturn figure for 2013/14 is verified at 6.4% . Latest Stat Neigh and National data taken as at Feb 14. |
| 15 (LPI) | Academic Year 12 participation rates | HIGH | Quarterly | | 90.60% | 88.00% | 95.90% | 95.00% | 90.00% | ✓ | n/a | 94.40% | ✓ | 93.80% | ✓ | Green | Trend data unavailable as participation count changes came into force April 13. Latest Stat Neighbour and National data taken as at Feb 14. |
| 16 (NI 148) | Care leavers in employment, education or training | HIGH | Quarterly | 61.0% | Not Available | 53.60% | 60.70% | 78% | 67.00% | ✓ | ↑ | 58.40% | ✓ | 58.00% | ✓ | Green | Q4 figures show an increase in young people who are EET. All young people have active Pathway Plans which address EET. The figure relates to 18 young people, of which nine are EET, two are NEET (available), two are teenage parents, two are in custody and three are in receipt of disability benefit and unable to work at present. |
| 17 (LPI) | L4+ in reading, writing & mathematics combined | HIGH | Annual | | 71.6% (2013) | | | | 75.0% | ✘ | ↑ | 75.0% | ✘ | 75.0% | ✘ | Red | Key Stage 2 L4+ reading, writing and mathematics combined increased by 1.6% to 71.6%. National averages remained at 75%, the gap to the national average reduced slightly by 1.6% to 3.4%. |
| 18 (LPI) | Progression by 2 levels in reading between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 | HIGH | Annual | | 83.0% | | | | 88.0% | ✘ | ↓ | | | 88.0% | ✘ | Red | KS1-KS2 progress by 2 levels in reading decreased by 3% to 83%. National averages decreased by 2% to 88%, the gap to national averages increased by 1% to 5%. |
| 19 (LPI) | Progression by 2 levels in writing between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 | HIGH | Annual | | 89.0% | | | | 91.0% | ✘ | ↑ | | | 92.0% | ✘ | Red | KS1-KS2 progress by 2 levels in writing increased by 1% to 89%. National averages increased by 2% to 92%, the gap to national averages increased to 3%. |
| 20 (LPI) | % of all inspected schools having an overall effectiveness rating of good or better | HIGH | Quarterly | | 76.30% | 70.30% | 70.00% | 75.10% | n/a | | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | Qtr 1 figures were based on ratings where the nursery/EYFS Units were inspected separately from the primary school itself. Ofsted now inspect them as one, therefore moving forward from Q2 the figures dropped due to the number of settings dropping significantly. |
| 21 (LPI) | % of inspected schools within the authorities most deprived neighbourhoods having an overall effectiveness rating of good or better | HIGH | Quarterly | | 71.40% | 58.80% | 66.70% | 71.40% | n/a | | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | Qtr 2 was particularly low due to the schools which have changed to academies not having had inspections therefore were not included. Qtr 3 & 4 includes inspection results for some schools which have now been inspected as academies. |
| Priority 2: Protecting our most vulnerable people and families, enabling them to maximise their independence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CYPS Action: We will intervene early to prevent problems developing and protect children, young people, families and vulnerable adults from all forms of abuse, violence and neglect | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 (LPI) | Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders after 12 months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------|-----------|------------------|---|--|---|--------------------|--------|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------|--|--|
| | Frequency (number re-offending) | LOW | Quarterly | | 85 (Oct -10 - Sept 11 cohort) | 83 (Jan 11 - Dec 11 cohort) | 81 (Apr 11 - Mar 12 cohort) | Not Available | n/a | | | Ave of 161 (Apr 11 - Mar 12 cohort) | ✓ | Ave of 168 (Apr 11 - Mar 12 cohort) | ✓ | n/a | The new youth re-offending measure uses data from the Police National Computer. The cohort consists of all young people who received a pre-court or court disposal or released from custody between 1st January 2011 to 31st December 2011. The latest official figures released from the YJB are for the cohort period April 11 - March 2012. The frequency figures (number re-offending) showed a reduction in Rotherham figs of 0.08 and National Figs showed a reduction of 0.02. The Binary figures (Number of offences) showed a reduction in Rotherham figs of 1.1% and National figures showed a reduction of 0.5%. The expectation for a target is a combination of quarter on quarter improvement and comparison with national trends. |
| | Binary (Number of offences) | LOW | | | 34.8% (Oct 10 - Sept 11 cohort) | 34.1% (Jan 11 - Dec 11 cohort) | 32.9% (Apr 11 - Mar 12 cohort) | Not Available | n/a | | | 34.8% (Apr 11 - Mar 12 cohort) | ✓ | 35.4% (Apr 11 - Mar 12 cohort) | ✓ | | |
| 23 (LPI) | Custodial sentences given in court to young people aged 17 years or younger presented as a rate per 1,000 young people in the 10 to 17 local general populations | LOW | Quarterly | | 44 (Jul 12 - Jun 13 latest period) | 28 (Oct 11 - Sept 12 latest period) | 11 (Jan 13 - Dec 13 latest period) | Not Available | n/a | | | 25 (Jan 13 - Dec 13 latest period) | ✓ | 20 (Jan 13 - Dec 13 latest period) | ✓ | n/a | Previously this measure was the number of Young people within the Youth Justice System receiving a conviction in court who are sentenced to custody. The new indicator measures the number of custodial sentences given in court to young people aged 17 years or younger presented as a rate per 1,000 young people in the 10 to 17 local general populations. Latest official figures show a reduction in Rotherham figures of 0.12 and Nationally a reduction of 0.19. The expectation for a target is a combination of quarter on quarter improvement and comparison with national trends. |
| 24 (NI 52) | Take up of school lunches | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Primary | HIGH | Quarterly | 49.0% | 47.90% | 45.60% | 54.10% | 55.00% | 50.50% | ✓ | ↑ | 50.81% | ✗ | 46.30% | ✓ | Green | Q2 performance shows as particularly low due to seasonal provision. Annual performance showing at 50.6%. Meal take up continues to improve and reducing the gap to national and statistical neighbours. Annual performance showing at 38.2%. |
| | b) Secondary | HIGH | | 37.7% | 33.80% | 35.80% | 41.50% | 42.70% | 38.00% | ✓ | ↑ | 45.42% | ✗ | 39.80% | ✗ | | |
| 25 (NI 53) | Prevalence of breastfeeding at 6–8 weeks from birth | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Prevalence | HIGH | Quarterly | 29.7% (11-12) | Not Available | | | 28.3% (2012-13) | 33.50% | ✗ | ↓ | 26.4% (12-13) | ✓ | 46.6% (12-13) | ✗ | Amber | The fragmentation of the NHS has resulted in challenges with data collection, including 6-8 week breastfeeding data. We are working with our partners to develop new approaches that will more adequately meet our needs. RFT are developing data collection methods as part of their scorecard. This will be available from Q1 2014/15. *Rotherham's Statistical Neighbours = Doncaster, Redcar & Cleveland, Wigan, and Barnsley. |
| | b) Coverage | HIGH | | 97% (11-12) | Not Available | | | 97.2% 2012-13) | 97.0% | ✓ | ↑ | 98.4% (12-13) | ✗ | 95.4% (12-13) | ✓ | | |
| 26 (NI 55) | Obesity among primary school age children in Reception | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Prevalence | LOW | Annual | 8.3% (11-12) | 9.6% (2012-13) | | | n/a | | ↓ | 9.8% | ✓ | 9.3% | ✗ | Amber | The trend is fluctuating but currently down against 2006/07 (10.3%) *Rotherham's Statistical Neighbours = Doncaster, Redcar & Cleveland, Wigan, and Barnsley. | |
| | Coverage | HIGH | | 98% (11-12) | 95.5% 2012-13) | | | n/a | | ↓ | 95.2% | ✓ | 94.0% | ✓ | | | |
| 27 (NI 56) | Obesity among primary school age children in Year 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Prevalence | LOW | Annual | 21.6% (11-12) | 21.2% (2012-13) | | | n/a | | ↑ | 20.3% | ✗ | 18.9% | ✗ | Amber | The trend is fluctuating but currently up against 2006-07 (18.5%) | |

| | Coverage | HIGH | | 97% (11-12) | 92.8% (2012-13) | | | | n/a | ↓ | 91.3% | ✓ | 92.7% | ✓ | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|-----|-------|------------------|-------|------------------|-----|-------|---|
| 28 (NI 59) | Percentage of initial assessments for children's social care carried out within 10 working days of referral | HIGH | Quarterly | 77.20% | 66.2% (389/588) | 61.6% (575/933) | 59.0% (715/1211) | 56.1% (875/1560) | 86.0% | ✗ | ↓ | 71.2% | ✗ | 75.5% | ✗ | Red | *Rotherham's Statistical Neighbours = Doncaster, Redcar & Cleveland, Wigan, and Barnsley. This measure will be deleted for 2014/15 as the service introduces a new local assessment framework. Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012-13) |
| 29 (NI 60) | Percentage of core assessments for children's social care that were carried out within 35 working days of their commencement | HIGH | Quarterly | 71.10% | 74.5% (330/443) | 69.8% (669/958) | 65.5% (1026/1566) | 61.0% (1468/2405) | 75.1% | ✗ | ↓ | 76.8% | ✗ | 76.7% | ✗ | Red | This measure will be deleted for 2014/15 as the service introduces a new local assessment framework. Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012-13) |
| 30 (NI 61) | Timeliness of placements of looked after children for adoption following an agency decision that the child should be placed for adoption | HIGH | Quarterly | 67.60% | 50% (5/10) | 58.8% (10/17) | 59.3% (16/27) | 67.6% (20/34) | 74.0% | ✗ | ↓ | 75.1% | ✗ | 74.0% | ✗ | Red | While past performance has been lower than national benchmark this measure has significantly improved in 2013-14. Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2011) |
| 31 (NI 62) | Stability of placements of looked after children: number of placements | LOW | Quarterly | 11.00% | 0.8% (3/395) | 4.4% (17/387) | 7.9% (29/369) | 11.1% (44/397) | 9.5% | ✗ | → | 8.5% | ✗ | 11.0% | ✓ | Amber | Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012) |
| 32 (NI 63) | Stability of placements of looked after children: length of placement | HIGH | Quarterly | 64.00% | 65.3% (96/147) | 65.2% (101/155) | 69.9% (107/153) | 67.9% (108/159) | 68.6% | ✗ | ↑ | 68.0% | ✗ | 68.0% | ✗ | Amber | Improved since 'Red' status earlier in the year. Performance within 0.1% of national and stat neighbour averages as well as 3.9% above 12-13 performance. Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012) |
| 33 (NI 64) | Child protection plans lasting 2 years or more | LOW | Quarterly | 3.8% | 2.2% (2/89) | 4.8% (8/166) | 6.7% (18/270) | 6.8% (24/351) | 4.0% | ✗ | ↓ | 3.3% | ✗ | 3.2% | ✗ | Red | 19 children remain on CP Plans over 2 years, and 19 on Plans for 18-23 months. A study based on audit findings demonstrates that purposeful effective plans are in place for these children. Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012-12) |
| 34 (NI 65) | Percentage of children becoming the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time | LOW | Quarterly | 16.10% | 18.9% (20/106) | 14.9% (29/165) | 10.0% (30/301) | 11% (46/406) | 13.3% | ✓ | ↑ | 16.2% | ✓ | 14.9% | ✓ | Green | High number of children becoming subject to a CP Plan for second or subsequent time in March. Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012-12) |
| 35 (NI 66) | Looked After Children cases which were reviewed within required timescales | HIGH | Quarterly | 97.60% | 98.6% (206/209) | 99.4% (329/331) | 98.8% (325/329) | 98.6% (728/738) | 97.5% | ✓ | ↑ | 91.98% (2010) | ✓ | 90.45% (2010) | ✓ | Green | Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012-12) |
| 36 (NI 67) | Percentage of child protection cases which were reviewed within required timescales | HIGH | Quarterly | 88.70% | 90.5% (228/252) | 98.2% (270/275) | 99.6% (261/262) | 99.6% (276/277) | 90.5% | ✓ | ↑ | 95.1% | ✓ | 96.2% | ✓ | Green | Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012-12) |
| 37 (LPI) | Percentage of referrals to children's social care going on to initial assessment | HIGH | Quarterly | 91.90% | 67.5% (588/871) | 37.8% (933/2468) | 32.5% (1215/3735) | 34.2% (1560/4556) | 87.6% | n/a | n/a | 76.6% | n/a | 74.4% | n/a | n/a | Change in local process has removed the requirement to complete a IA before CA therefore the number completed has reduced significantly. This measure will be replaced. Performance is subject to validation following submission of statutory returns. (Comparative Data relates to 2012-12) |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|------|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----|--------------------------|--------|--------------------------|--------|-------|---|---|---|
| 38 (NI 111) | First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10 – 17 Per 100,000 10-17 Population | LOW | Quarterly | 461.00 | 463 (Apr 12 - Mar 13) | 473 (Jul 12 - Jun 13) | 517 (Oct 12 - Sep 13) | Not Available | n/a | | 455 (Oct 12 - Sep 13) | x | 460 (Oct 12 - Sep 13) | x | n/a | The data for this indicator now comes from the Police National Computer. The data is shown in rolling full-years for the 12 months to March, July, September, December of each year. The latest figures available are for the 12 months ending September 2013. Rotherham latest figures for Oct 2012 - Sep 2013 of 517 show an increase of 11.6% from July 2011 - June 2012 figures. Whilst national figures show a decrease for the same period this is to be offset against Rotherham's previous performance in which Rotherham's FTE actual numbers and rate per 100.000 have dropped faster than comparators and have now levelled out. The trajectory of decline has thus slowed and in the last quarter shows a plateau. Historically Rotherham have seen a massive improvement against the 2007/08 baseline and continued improvement in subsequent years. Good Performance is typified by a decrease. The expectation for a target is a combination of quarter on quarter improvement and comparison with national trends. | | |
| 39 (NI 112) | Under 18 conception rate | LOW | Annual | 40.9% (2011) | 30% (2012) | | | | n/a | ↑ | 36.6% | ✓ | 27.7% | x | Amber | The trend was fluctuating between 1998-2008 but is now down since 2008. *Rotherham's Statistical Neighbours = Doncaster, Redcar & Cleveland, Wigan, and Barnsley. | | |
| 40 (LPI) | Chlamydia Diagnosis Rate (15-24 year olds) | HIGH | Quarterly | 2698.5 | 3316 | Not Available | | | 2,400 > 3,000 | ✓ | ↑ | 2074 | ✓ | 1872 | ✓ | Green | Following the changes in Public Health Outcome Frameworks the reporting parameters for Chlamydia screening have been changed nationally to report on Diagnosis Rate (per 100,000 eligible population, 15-24 year olds) rather than coverage or positivity. Rotherham has an effective screening programme in place as we are performing well in relation to detecting Chlamydia infection. However, continuing high levels of unprotected sexual activity in our population mean that these high levels of detection are only just keeping pace with the disease. | |
| 41 (NI 147) | Care leavers in suitable accommodation | HIGH | Quarterly | 96.0% | Not Available | 96.40% | 96.40% | 89.00% | 95.00% | x | ↓ | 92.30% | x | 88.00% | ✓ | Amber | Two out of 18 young people are in unsuitable accommodation due to custodial sentences. | |
| 42 (LPI) | Number of reported incidences of children running away from home or care (Under 18's) | LOW | Annual | 338 | 416 | | | | n/a | ↓ | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | n/a | Stats provided are from the monthly South Yorkshire Police 'Found Children' reports. We have however been informed that these reports are not exhaustive, but they are currently the only source of data we have. Discussions with SYP & Safe@Last are taking place to resolve this matter. | |
| 43 (LPI) | Number of children the above runaway incidences relate to (Under 18's) | LOW | Annual | 121 | 131 | | | | n/a | ↓ | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | n/a | | |
| 44 (LPI) | Closed CME Referrals (Termly) | LOW | Quarterly | | 166 (Summer) | n/a | 178 (Autumn) | 577 (Spring) | n/a | ↑ | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | n/a | Outturn stats relate to the Spring Term (Jan - Apr). There is significant progress achieved as a result of the admin Support and this has reflected in the overall number of cases closed. The total CME is now 650 and likely to reduce further within the next term. | |
| 45 (LPI) | Number of children & young people currently open to Early Help Assessment Team (EHAT) | LOW | Quarterly | | Not Available | | | 75 (Dec 13) | 82 (Mar 14) | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | n/a | Reports have been created to enable this data to be collected, however data is only available from December 2013. |
| 46 (LPI) | Number of children & young people currently open to Early Help Assessment Team (EHAT) of which the Outcome is EH Intervention | LOW | Quarterly | | Not Available | | | 17 (Dec 13) | 59 (Mar 14) | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | n/a | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------|--------|-----|---------------|------------|--|---|--------------|
| 47 (LPI) | Number cases open to social care Child Sexual Exploitation Team - CSE | LOW | Quarterly | | Not Available | 52 (Dec 13) | 63 (Mar 14) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Reports have been created to enable this data to be collected, however data is only available from September 2013. | | |
| 48 (NI 81) | Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19 | Med | Annual | 28% (2012) | 27% (2013) | | | n/a | ↑ | n/a | 24% (2013) | ✘ | Amber | No change to National % (2013), but LA improved by 1%, thereby reducing the inequality gap. | |
| 49 (NI 82) | Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19 | Med | Annual | 24% (2012) | 23% (2013) | | | n/a | ↑ | n/a | 16% (2013) | ✘ | Amber | National Inequality gap reduced by 1 % (2013), but LA also reduced Inequality gap by 1%. | |
| 50 (NI 116) | Proportion of children in poverty | LOW | Annual | 22.6% (2010) | 22.6% (2011) | | | n/a | → | n/a | 20.10% | ✘ | n/a | Historical issues around the 2 year time lag in publication of this data means that we are trying to develop local measures which give a more timely picture and better reflect the impact of initiatives delivered by the council and our partners. The latest available data shows the position at summer 2011. | |
| 51 (NI 102) | Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers; | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | achieving the expected level at Key Stage 2 | LOW | Annual | 24% (2012) | 22% (2013) | | At the national average | ✘ | ↑ | n/a | 19.00% | ✘ | Red | At KS2 the gap between FSM and non FSM pupils was reduced by 3.0% to 22% in 2013 the national average gap remained at 19%. | |
| | achieving the expected level at Key Stage 4 | | | 31.6% (2012) | 34% (2013) | | At the national average | ✘ | ↓ | n/a | 26.60% | ✘ | | At KS4 the gap between FSM and non FSM pupils increased by 2.8% to 34.4% in 2013. This is 7.8% above the national gap. | |
| 52 (LPI) | Free School Meals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Eligibility | LOW | Quarterly | 14.4% | 17.97% | 17.97% | 17.97% | 17.97% | 15.00% | ✘ | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Green |
| | b) Take up | HIGH | | 76.4% | 77.20% | 75.68% | 80.43% | 80.72% / | 77.00% | ✓ | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | |