

CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION, CULTURE AND LEISURE SERVICES

**Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham.**

Date: Tuesday, 19 October 2004

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. Christmas Carnival Co-ordinating Group (Pages 1 - 3)
4. Rotherham Cultural Consortium (Pages 4 - 12)
5. Rotherham Learning Grid
6. The Education of Children Otherwise than at School (EOTAS) (Pages 13 - 21)
7. Schools in Ofsted and DfES Categories (Pages 22 - 24)
8. Date and Time of Next Meeting

CHRISTMAS CARNIVAL CO-ORDINATING GROUP
Thursday, 23rd September, 2004

Present: Peter Coulton (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor F. Wright); Councillor Jack; Dave Harris (RMBC), Stewart Lister (South Yorkshire Police), Julie Roberts, Town Centre & Markets Manager (RMBC), Marie Hayes, Commercial and Promotional Manager (RMBC), Colin Scott (Rotherham Chamber of Trade), Wendy Shepherd (Boots The Chemist) and Jane Sinclair (All Saints Church)

Apologies were received from Sarah Crossland (Rotherham Parish Church), Kevin Phillips (Building Works) and John Wadsworth (Chamber of Trade).

1. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15TH JULY, 2004

Agreed- That the minutes of the meeting of this Group held on 15th July, 2004 be received as a correct record.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(a) Carols from the Church

Julie Roberts reported that due to structural difficulties it was not possible to have a giant LED screen for the Christmas music this year.

Enquiries were to be made about the possibility of installing speakers on the Church columns, provided wiring to them could be satisfactorily provided.

Agreed:- That Julie Roberts liaise with Jane Sinclair on the possible provision of carols from the Church.

(b) Funding/Sponsorship

Julie Roberts was of the view that adequate funding for the occasion would be available, including a contribution from EDS.

(c) Hallam FM

Peter Coulton was to meet with Hallam FM to finalise the arrangements for their involvement on the evening.

(d) Town Centre Fair Carousel

The Group was informed that this idea would not be progressed due to the lack of space in the area concerned, All Saints Square, bearing in mind the other items being provided in the area.

(e) Christmas Trees

The location of borough-wide trees could not be finalised for the coming year, but that details would be available prior to Christmas 2005.

(f) Santa's Grotto

Agreed:- That the siting of Santa's Grotto be finalised at the next meeting.

3. CHRISTMAS LIGHTS

The Group was informed of the tender situation for the Christmas lights. Of five tenders returned, two were considered to be not up to the specification required. The remaining three were above the budget but the situation would be resolved to ensure that there will be new Christmas lights for 2004.

Reference was made to the programme for their installation and to the disposal or possible re-use of the existing lights.

Agreed:- That consideration be given to ways of disposing/re-using the existing lights.

4. PARADE ROUTE

Details of the route of the Electrical Christmas Parade were distributed along with an information pack.

The pack set out what was included in the parade, a suggested timetable for the parade along with the contractor's requirements.

Discussion took place on the route for the parade, possible problems and how many times it would go along the route.

The direction of the parade along the route was clarified as was its commencement having regard to the time for the switch on of the lights.

It was felt that there was insufficient room for the parade to go into All Saints Square but it would be looked at again.

Agreed:- That the information be received.

5. TOWN CENTRE EVENTS UPDATE

Julie Roberts informed the Group of how the Christmas events would be advertised/promoted. Particular reference was made to :-

- Frostie the Snowman for All Saints Square
- Santa's Grotto and its positioning
- Christmas Markets
- Entertainment (Bands & Choirs)
- Opening Times for the Market Hall

There was a need to work on a strong advertising campaign, bearing in mind the difficulties in competing with Meadowhall.

With regard to Market Hall late night opening, it was acknowledged that there needed to be sufficient interest from the traders, which would be dependent upon the cost involved for having a late night market. This was to be pursued, with a view to having the co-operation of the larger firms, agreeing opening times for a late night and on a regular basis, in order to encourage other traders.

It was noted that previous late night openings had not been continued with due, amongst other things, to transport difficulties later at night.

Jule Roberts mentioned that the Rotherham Partnership wished to be the sponsor to the Christmas Lights but in view of the contractual situation, this was not possible.

The Partnership would be given other possible options for sponsorship.

Agreed:- That the information be received.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Switch On Ceremony

The Mayor reported that he would be carrying out the "task" of switching on the Christmas lights.

(b) Christmas Post Card Design

Julie Roberts reported that the design of the postcard to promote all Christmas events was being progressed.

(c) Christmas Ideas

The Group was informed that plans were in hand to include for Christmas, Banners, ice sculptures and artificial snow.

7. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- That the next meeting of this Group take place on Thursday 28th October, 2004 at 2.00 p.m.

**ROTHERHAM CULTURAL CONSORTIUM
WEDNESDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 2004**

Present:- Councillor Boyes (in the Chair); Councillor Littleboy and Brian Beeley, Mr. R. Bye, Ms. C. Cox, Sarah Davey, Mr. D. Gayton, Mr. R. Newman, Mr. D. Rowley, Esme Temple and Mrs. J. Williams.

R.M.B.C. Officers:-

Tony Preston, Business Development Manager, Culture, Leisure & Lifelong Learning
Guy Kilminster, Manager, Libraries, Museums and Arts
Phil Gill, Green Spaces Manager, Culture, Leisure & Lifelong Learning
Steve Hallsworth, Business Manager, Leisure and Green Spaces, Culture, Leisure and Lifelong Learning
Richard Poundford, Head of Rotherham Investment and Development Office

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Austen and St. John, Tony Clabby, Steve Blackbourn, Marie Hayes, Michael Bishop, Stuart Lister and Phil Rogers.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH FEBRUARY, 2004

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a correct record.

3. MATTER ARISING

The Old Three Cranes, High Street

A question was raised regarding the current position on the usage and ownership of this building.

It was reported that discussions were presently taking place with the owner of the store regarding future opening hours and state of the building.

4. ROTHERHAM RENAISSANCE - YOUR VIEWS COUNT

Richard Poundford gave a presentation on the present situation with regard to Rotherham Town Centre Renaissance – a project funded and supported by Yorkshire Forward, involving a panel of internationally renowned architects and designers and which set in place a new way of regenerating the region's towns and cities.

The presentation covered the following issues:-

- What urban renaissance is and what it is about

- 10 goals – as identified in the vision document
- Emerging masterplan
- Timescales – both short and long-term
- Makeup of the Town Team

An aerial view of a Master Plan model was shown and examples given of the following artist's concept plans:-

- Westgate Basin – Rainbow Bridge
 - Homes, Offices and Shops
 - Redevelopment of Markets and College Area
 - New Civic Centre, Culture and Arts Facilities
 - Riverside Living - as compared to Leeds, York and Bristol
- Links to RCAT and Clifton Park
 - Use of green public spaces and boulevards
- Exchange Quarter – “College Green”
- New Swimming Pool – St. Ann's site – completion by 2007
- Forge Island development options
- Ownership/Lease issues/Private Sector Investment

The following two projects were under way:-

- Moorgate Crofts (Managed Business Centre)
- Development of Speeds Building, High Street

Consortium members were encouraged to give their views which would be fed into the consultation process.

Issues were raised and the following questions responded to:-

- parking strategy
- situation with Tesco – Guest and Chrimes site/planning issues
- Town Team – working together
- need for a good internal bus/railway system in order to maximize public access to shopping sites
- Supertram
- Need to encourage public to shop in town centre
- Projected costings
- Centenary Way – public access routes, including facilities for elderly and disabled - bridges/road lowering

It was emphasised that work within the planning stages was concentrating on the adoption of a Master Plan which had to be agreed by all parties.

Agreed:- That Richard Poundford be thanked for an interesting and informative presentation.

5. FUTURE PERFECT: ROTHERHAM'S CULTURAL STRATEGY

Quarterly update reports were given on the implementation of individual

elements of the Future Perfect Action Plan, as follows:-

Libraries - Three years ago the service had not met Library Standards. However, since the refurbishment of libraries the service was meeting 19 of the 26 public library standards – an improvement from 5 out of 28 in 2001. This was attributable to the hard work of staff, management and investment in the service.

In addition, the Service has been nominated by the Charter Mark Assessors for a quality standard. This is in recognition of a high quality of public service delivery and customer care. The Service would be the first to achieve this status in RMBC, which was again attributable to the hard work of staff and management.

Councillor Boyes added that Rotherham had been highlighted as the best of the nine Authorities inspected by the assessors.

Museum – Work on Clifton Park Museum’s refurbishment was in the last stage of completion. Exhibition fit out was well underway and staff will move back some time in October and be trained on new systems. A re-opening date of 29th January, 2005 was being publicised.

Archives and Local Studies – Sarah Wickham, new Principal Officer was to start this week . Sarah was looking forward to meeting people who wished to talk to her on matters concerning archives and local studies, knowledge from members of this consortium being particularly encouraged. It was hoped to fully open the section once Sarah was settled in due to there having been temporary closures due to staffing shortages.

A comment was made that archives staff had done a very good job, during the difficult period following Tony Munford’s sudden death.

Theatre and Community Arts – The Cultural Diversity Festival at the Rotherham Show had been very successful, with very positive feedback from participants and audiences.

Participation in the work of the Town Team would continue, particularly regarding the replacement of the Civic Theatre, Regimental Museum and Art Gallery.

Pantomime – The sale of tickets for this year’s pantomime was very good.

Leisure and Green Space – External funding used for staffing the Sports Development Team had ceased. However, a core team had been established which was now a permanent RMBC team. A number of key pieces of work had started to happen as a result. These included links with local ethnic minorities – All Pakistan Women’s Association - and the introduction of a community coach as a result of joint funding through

Sports Partnership/Sport England. This was a three year contract.

Space for Sport and Arts Facilities – All in place for Junior School sites. The feedback was very positive on the sports facilities which was being well used and accessed by all members of the community.

Green Space Audit – This was a key piece of work alongside the Green Space Strategy looking at the use of green space, identifying equity across the Borough and looking at current green space resources and how to target them more effectively. Work was presently being evaluated and the final document would be very useful in attracting both capital and external funding.

The Football Foundation in particular is keen to develop grass pitches as well as outdoor facilities.

A decision was still awaited on an application to the Football Foundation for a Football Development Officer to work in the community to raise participation for boys/girls and adults. The application had now been passed to the Football Foundation Panel prior to submission to the Board. This was a five year post funded by the Football Foundation.

In addition, the service had secured a post of PE and Sports Development Officer.

Councillor Boyes made the point that, as well as quantity, the audit was about the quality of provision.

Sports Colleges – Two Sports Colleges in Rotherham funded by DfES to develop a series of sports to all secondary schools. A person was being identified to develop School Club links. Strategy to (1) offer opportunities in exercise and fitness and (2) maximise links in the community to encourage young people to participate in sport - Active Mark and Sports Mark status which demonstrates that Schools are linking inside and out of the community. This was to be publicised in Rotherham Matters.

Urban Park Ranger Scheme – There had been positive feedback from several people about this service. A further year's funding had been secured.

Members of the Consortium raised the following questions with regard to the ranger service:-

- such a valuable service to the community it should be mainstream funded
- believed that the service was the way to encourage general public to use parks
- mis-use of skateboarding facilities – security issues demonstrating need for ranger service

Councillor Boyes gave an assurance that the important role of the rangers was acknowledged within the Council, that the matter was under constant review and was dependent on funding. Ways of delivering the service through funding opportunities was constantly being explored.

Heritage Parks – The preferred consultants have been selected for the work on Clifton and Boston Parks.

Herringthorpe Leisure Centre – It was confirmed that the Centre would be demolished and re-built, the timescale for which would depend on the whole programme of redevelopment. It was intended to sustain current facilities for as long as possible until the new facilities opened. Depending on proposals by builders, it may be possible to build around the old building whilst still being used.

Local Tourism Partnership – A background to the formation of the Partnership was given since the restructuring to National and Regional tourism. Yorkshire Forward have not been prescriptive about what the restructuring should look like but are concerned about a sub-regional approach to be able to put forward a joint bid for tourism. A sub-group had been established to determine the roles, functions and responsibilities of what such an organisation in South Yorkshire would represent.

It was not Rotherham's intention to give up the strength of the work already established through the tourism centre, and one which other Local Authorities are trying to model themselves on.

Consultants were being asked to submit an interim report in November and it was hoped to put work in place early next year on (1) a proposal for a vision for tourism for South Yorkshire, joining together the different projects and (2) to come together in terms of marketing to attract longer stay opportunities.

Reference was made to interesting tourism sites in the area such as – The Churches Tourism – Countryside and Walking Festival – Roche Abbey.

Commercial and Promotional Services – Achievements over recent months were highlighted. These included – 2nd Rotherham Cultural Conference. The theme was Marketing Culture and good presentations had been given from Magna, Sports Development, Friends of Clifton Park Museum, Get Sorted Crew and Youth Cabinet. Workshops had taken place in the afternoon, culminating in a Marketing Took Kit being issued to all delegates who attended.

The event had been poorly attended with only 20 organisations being represented compared to 45-50 the first year.

One member commented on how good the Conference had been, despite the poor attendance, and suggested the event be re-launched.

There had been a number of good high profile publications over the last few months – Theatre brochure, Annual Review of Culture and Swimming leaflet, Rotherham Show and Children’s Publicity.

A discussion ensued on the prices of food and drink at Rotherham Show.

Guy Kilminster explained how the charging system was calculated, part of which was towards supporting the cost of the free show, and suggested this could be addressed at the point of specifications for tenders being sent to caterers next year.

6. **CULTURAL CONSORTIUM ADVISORY PANELS**

Sport and Leisure – Steve Hallsworth thanked Members of the Consortium who had contributed to the work of the Panel.

As part of the consultation process, Sport and Leisure staff had been looking at broadening the vision.

A one year Sport and Development Plan would be submitted to the next meeting, one of the issues for consideration being whether to broaden the membership and remit of the sports forum.

The issue of children’s health and active leisure was raised. This would continue to be discussed with Health Partnership members.

A similar issue remains with elderly people.

Heritage, Archives & Tourism – The last meeting had been poorly attended and no business had been conducted. The two members present had discussed with officers how they could best be arranged to allow more people to attend. Consideration had been given to merging groups.

One member agreed with this suggestion.

An issue was raised regarding the use of blue heritage plaques to be displayed at well known pottery sites and which were a feature of major towns and cities. For example, Rockingham Pottery would be a good example of the excellent work in this area.

The Libraries, Museums and Arts Manager agreed to look into this suggestion and believed a previous Conservation Officer had concluded it was a case of a lack of funding for this initiative.

Green Spaces – Phil Gill thanked Members of the Consortium who had contributed to a series of stimulating and open discussions. Major themes have included:-

1. Review of the scope and organisation of Green Space related services in Rotherham

2. Consideration of progress on Playing Pitch Strategy and Green Space Strategy

It was felt the Green Space Advisory Panel had a key role to play in the development of these strategies.

3. Following and advising on the development of the Urban Park Ranger Service

The Panel has expressed concerns about future funding for this service, and it has offered useful views about the role the rangers already have and the potential they have to meet some of the needs of the service.

4. Individual sites or issues

The panel has looked into numerous site-specific issues also. These have included the future of Rother Valley Country Park, the YES Project and Bar Park.

The role and membership of the Panel was being reviewed, although it represents a good cross-section of interest groups.

A concern was expressed by a Panel member that the Trees and Woodlands Section was not part of the Education, Culture and Leisure Services Programme Area.

It was pointed out that despite this, efforts would be made to ensure that all parties ultimately sign up to agreeing the same objectives. This included working with other green space providers including CISWO and parish councils.

7. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ROTHERHAM PARTNERSHIP - CULTURAL STRATEGY ACTION PLAN AND COMMUNITY STRATEGY

Reference was made to a number of DCMS Cultural documents which all emphasised that culture had a central role to play in both economic and community regeneration.

It was also recognised very strongly that the local Strategic Partnership of the Rotherham Partnership should be representing culture within its makeup and for culture to be championed as part of that Partnership.

The issue of the most appropriate way for the Partnership to become engaged with culture was being progressed.

It was hoped to be in a position to report further on this matter at the next

meeting.

8. THE SOUTH YORKSHIRE CULTURAL PROSPECTUS

It was reported that South Yorkshire Culture met on a 6-8 weekly basis bringing together all senior officers from neighbouring Authorities, together with representation from Regional Agencies.

The meeting was chaired by an officer from Yorkshire Cultural and the work of the Committee was to draw up a cultural prospectus identifying issues/ongoing work for cultural activity across the sub-region.

The business was to consider a lengthy list of priorities and negotiation was taking place with officers in other Local Authorities.

This would be a useful document at the point of looking at funding opportunities.

9. LIFELONG LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL

This item was deferred pending further information from the Scrutiny Section on the issue of co-optees on to the Lifelong Learning Opportunities Scrutiny Panel.

10. 3RD ROTHERHAM CULTURAL CONFERENCE, 2005

The meeting discussed planning arrangements for the 3rd Cultural Conference to be held in 2005.

It was agreed it was a worthwhile event. Volunteers were sought to undertake the initial planning.

Issues included:-

- Who to invite – need to involve a wide range of specific groups
- Need for a major speaker to be invited
- Need for greater publicity/early programming

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Rotherham Show

Members of the Consortium asked for thanks to be extended to the staff involved in the organisation of Rotherham Show.

The event had been very successful, well attended and greatly enjoyed.

Sealed Knot – Battle in the Park

Praise was given for the organisation of the above spectacular outdoor

event. Approximately 25,000 visitors had attended over a two day period.

Participants had thoroughly enjoyed themselves and been very pleased with the venue and public interest.

Membership of the Consortium

The meeting discussed the membership of this Consortium.

A suggestion to explore links with diversity groups would be pursued.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- That the next meeting of this Consortium be held on 8th December, 2004.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Education and Advisers
2.	Date:	19th October 2004
3.	Title:	The Education of Children Otherwise than at School (EOTAS) Covers all wards in the borough
4.	Programme Area:	ECALS – Inclusion Services

- 5. Summary:** This is a new policy to demonstrate how the Council fulfils its statutory duty to make arrangements for the provision of suitable education otherwise than at school for children of compulsory school age who, by reason of illness, exclusion from school or otherwise, will not receive a suitable education without these arrangements.

6. Recommendations:

- **The Council adopts the policy.**
- **Council members note the current provision for pupils requiring education otherwise than at schools.**

- 7. Proposals and Details:** The policy recognises that for some young people there are periods in their lives when their medical needs prevent them from attending school or they are emotionally vulnerable, unable to cope with the structures and routines of school or experience exclusion from school as a result of exceptionally challenging and difficult behaviours. In such situations a period of time in an alternative education setting is appropriate to enable the child or young person to move forwards in their lives. Such settings include Pupils Referral Units, Maple House, Welcome Centre, Hospital Teaching and Home Tuition Service.
- 8. Finance:** Current provision for EOTAS is made within existing resources, however if proposed procedures for identifying Missing Pupils are implemented or numbers of permanently excluded pupils increase, additional funding may be required to ensure that these pupils have appropriate access to education.
- 9. Risks and Uncertainties:**
- If the Council does not have an EOTAS policy and appropriate provision it will be in breach of its statutory duty
 - EOTAS policy and provision is one element of the inspection of LEAs by Ofsted
 - EOTAS policy and provision contributes to D20/01 (Inclusion), D23/01 (Developing children and young people's services), 28/01 (Equalities), 29/01 (Human Rights) in the Education Culture and Leisure Services Programme Area Risk Register
 - Provision for pupils requiring EOTAS is essential in meeting targets for alternative provision for pupils in BVPI 159
- 10. Policy and Performance Implications:** This policy addresses the Council's priority to invest in people, to:
- “ Provide an excellent environment for people to fulfil their potential by enhancing people's skills, confidence, and aspirations to fully participate in and benefit from the regeneration”
- It focuses on ensuring that Rotherham pupils at risk of social exclusion for a variety of reasons are identified and systems in place to ensure that each is able to access and receive a suitable education. This will enhance the life chances of some of the vulnerable children and young people in the borough. Provision for pupils requiring EOTAS contributes to cross cutting priorities such as equalities, regeneration and health, crime and disorder, human rights.

One strand of the LEA Ofsted inspection will be a judgement on the LEA provision for pupils who, by reason of illness, exclusion or otherwise are educated other than in school (EOTAS). The Ofsted inspection judgement contributes to the Council's CPA. This policy establishes the LEA position with respect to EOTAS and contributes to priorities in the Education Development Plan 2002-7 and the draft Inclusion Strategic Plan 2004-7.

BVPI 159 includes the amount of provision made for excluded pupils who require EOTAS

11. Background papers and consultation:

DfES (2004) Guidance for LEAs – PRUs and Alternative Provision Ref LEA/0154/2004

DfES (2004) Commissioning Alternative Provision – The role of the LEA – Ref LEA/0155/2004

DfES (1999) Social Inclusion: the LEA role in Pupil Support (Circular 11/99)
Rotherham MBC, "The Education of pupils with medical needs unable to attend school" (Revised Feb 2004)

Contact: Ann Clegg: Acting Head of Inclusion Support Services, International Centre Tel. 01709 33(6611) E mail: ann.clegg@rotherham.gov.uk



INCLUSION SERVICES

The Education of Children Otherwise than at School

Rotherham MBC is committed to principles of Inclusion, which underpin all our work with children and young people:

:

- Inclusion in education involves increasing the participation of students in, and reducing their exclusion from, the cultures, curricula and communities of the school;
- Inclusion involves restructuring the cultures, policies and practices in schools so that they respond to the diversity of the pupils;
- Inclusion is concerned with the learning and participation of all students vulnerable to exclusionary processes, not only those with impairments or those categorised as “having special educational needs”.
- Inclusion is concerned with improving schools for staff as well as for students by bringing about the circumstances that need to prevail to enable and support teachers in including an increasing number of pupils;
- Inclusion means overcoming barriers to the access and participation of particular pupils;
- In an inclusive school diversity is not viewed as a problem to be overcome, but as a rich resource to support the learning of all.
- Inclusion is concerned with fostering mutual respect for all and building sustaining relationships within and between schools and their communities.
- Successful Inclusion in education is an important aspect of inclusion in society

At the same time we also recognise that for some children and young people there are times in their lives when

- their medical needs prevent them from attending school
- they are emotionally vulnerable, unable to cope with the structures and routines of school
- they experience exclusion from school as a result of exceptionally challenging and difficult behaviours.

There are a number of other situations where for a period of time education in an alternative setting is appropriate to enable the child or young person to move forwards in their lives.

Such provision comes under the terminology of “Education Otherwise than at School” and this is defined by DfES¹

“LEAs have a statutory duty ‘to make arrangements for the provision of suitable education at school (including pupil referral units), or otherwise than at school, for children of compulsory age who, by reason of illness, exclusion from school or otherwise, will not receive a suitable education without these arrangements” Suitable education is defined as ‘efficient education suitable to the age, ability and aptitude and to any special education needs’, the young person or child may have. LEAs must decide what is suitable education out of school for a particular child, in consultation with parents, in line with LEAs’ own policies, the efficient use of resources and having reference to DfES guidance.”

DfES include the following groups of pupils within the remit of EOTAS:

- Pupils permanently excluded from school and those receiving fixed term exclusions of more than 15 days
- Pregnant school girls and school aged mothers
- Anxious / vulnerable pupils
- School refusers, phobics, and young carers
- Pupils unable to attend school because of medical reasons
- Pupils moving into the LEA (casual admissions) who are unable to find another school place because of insufficiency of school places within the LEA
- Children who because of entering public care or moving placement, require a change of school place and are unable to access a school place
- Pupils with statements of special educational need (SEN) whose placements are not yet agreed; and pupils awaiting assessment of SEN
- Asylum seekers and refugees who have no school place.

In discharging their legal responsibilities for arranging education for pupils who cannot be educated in mainstream or special school, LEAs will need to:

- Assess pupils’ need
- Arrange suitable placements at PRUs or other alternative education centre
- Check that the provision is of acceptable quality
- Monitor pupils’ attendance and achievements
- Review the impact of local policies on admission and reintegration

It is essential that Education Otherwise is not confused with Home Based Education as set up under the 1944 Education Act. This is when parents withdraw their child from the state system and decide to educate the child at home. In such cases parents have no right of access to the provision made for the pupils referred to in this document. Further information on Home Based Learning is available from the Chief Education Welfare Officer in Norfolk House.

¹ Section 19, Education Act 1996

ROTHERHAM MBC

In line with the principles of inclusion and taking account of DfES guidance on Education Otherwise than at School, Rotherham is committed to using EOTAS prudently, ensuring that all pupils educated away from schools are regularly reviewed and that each child or young person has an individual plan which addresses their learning needs and establishes clear steps towards re-integration into school or into the post 16 world.

Rotherham schools receive major government funding which is intended to support and include pupils who are anxious, poor attenders or display challenging and difficult behaviours. These initiatives include:

- Excellence in Cities where secondary schools receive funding towards Learning Mentors and Learning Support Unit,
- the Behaviour Improvement Initiative 2003-06 involving 4 secondary schools, 21 primary schools and one special school.
- Objective One money which funds an extensive Re-engagement with Learning programme contributing to the 14-19 Curriculum Strategy within the borough.
- The Council has also maintained funding to secondary schools in relation to the Pupil Retention Grant which was removed as a specific Standards Fund Grant during 2002/2003.

Within Rotherham there is a range of provision and support for pupils with a diverse range of needs. There are 7 special schools and 11 LEA resourced units within the borough catering for statemented pupils with a wide range of Special Educational Needs, able to accommodate a total of 850 pupils. Inclusion Support Services work in the primary, secondary and special sectors providing consultancy, training and guidance to schools on the inclusion of both vulnerable pupils and pupils with SEN, and appropriate strategies to deploy when dealing with this group of pupils. The Education Welfare Service offers support to parents where attendance is an issue and provides advice and guidance to schools where exclusion is being considered and in Child Protection cases.

The Admissions Section actively seeks to ensure that pupils are placed as soon as transfer requests or information relating to a pupil newly arriving in the borough are received. The Rotherham Admissions forum monitors all aspects of pupil admissions and work is on going to ensure all known pupils are on a school roll.

There is a strong and improving LEA commitment and support to schools to encourage and develop an ethos of inclusion. However the Council also recognises that there are circumstances and times when it is in the best interests of the child and / or of the school community for the child to be educated away from school. The educational provision through EOTAS is carefully monitored and there are clear admission arrangements in place. Currently Rotherham maintains the following provision which comes within the category of Education Other than at School:

PUPIL REFERRAL UNITS (PRUs)

Currently there are three PRUs in the borough:

1. FENTON WOOD (DfES NO 372 / 1104) - For secondary aged pupils who are permanently excluded from school. Admission follows the decision of the discipline panel or appeal committee to uphold the exclusion. The Unit provides 25 hours education per week for 18FTE pupils. The progress of pupils is monitored through Pupil Inclusion Panel and plans for re-integration agreed and implemented through the Panel.

2. REDBARN-ROWAN (DfES No. 372 / 1101) - This is a split site PRU. Redbarn House provides for permanently excluded KS4 pupils. Admission is via Pupil Inclusion Panel and pupils complete their statutory education at the Unit. The Unit focuses on Post 16 progression routes for all pupils. This is a 20FTE place resource.

Rowan Centre provides education and support to pregnant school girls and school aged mothers. A small on site crèche caters for the babies whilst the young mothers are taught. The young mothers can complete their statutory education at the centre or if they choose can return to mainstream and make their own arrangements for the care of their baby. In agreement with schools, parents and young person admission can be at any time after 3 months pregnancy.

Redbarn Rowan is a partnership between Barnardo's and Rotherham MBC and details of the provision are given in the Service Level Agreements between the two partners.

3. HOSPITAL TEACHING AND HOME TUITION SERVICE (DfES No. 372 /1103) - This Unit is based at the Rotherham District General Hospital and provides tuition to school aged pupils admitted to the Children's Wards and also home tuition for pupils discharged from hospital or for where they are unable to attend school because of their medical needs. Home tuition is provided by qualified teachers for a minimum of 5 hours per week, 6 hours per week for KS4 examination candidates. There may be occasions when the child's medical condition is such that a reduced programme is more suitable. There must be medical evidence with all referrals to the service to indicate that the pupil cannot attend school for reason of illness, injury or mental health.

ADDITIONAL PROVISION

1. WELCOME CENTRE - this is a small unit, part of the LEA Ethnic and Cultural Diversity Service for newly arrived children with asylum or refugee status. It is run as an assessment centre and provides intensive support to those children who have little or no English. Integration to school is an essential part of the service and a school place is identified soon after admission. The maximum number of full time places is 12 . All admissions are via LEA Admissions section.

2. MAPLE HOUSE – this is a day provision under the Doncaster and South Humberstone Health Trust. Admission and discharge is the responsibility of the two Consultants in Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. It is a 12 place unit for 11-16 year olds who have mental health needs requiring Tier 3 intervention. This includes young people who present as seriously anorexic, phobic, depressed and / or emotionally anxious. It is a therapeutic unit with individual and group therapy sessions. All the young people access an appropriate educational programme for part of the week. There is a strong emphasis on a return to school within an agreed timescale and all young people remain on the roll of their home school.

Currently there are no voluntary or private providers of full time education in Rotherham, all pupils should be on the roll of a school or Pupil Referral Unit. The Get Real Team supports the education of children in public care and the manager of the team reports bi-monthly to the elected members of the Education and Social Services Cabinet. A standing item for each meeting is consideration of provision for any pupils off roll.

Any statemented pupils without provision are brought to the attention of SEN Panel and decisions made regarding the way forward.

The LEA policy on Young Carers considers the needs and support allocated to this group.

It is the policy of this Council that where pupils are fixed-term excluded for more than 15 days at any one time, then the provision of full time supervised education remains the school's responsibility. Where capacity permits then the two PRUs for excluded pupils will support the school in meeting this requirement.

REFERENCES

Rotherham MBC, "The Education of pupils with medical needs unable to attend school" revised February 2004

Rotherham MBC, "Pupil Inclusion Panel Guidance", 2002

Rotherham MBC, "Admission to Secondary School, 2004-05"

DfES (2004) Guidance for LEAs – PRUs and Alternative Provision. Ref LEA/0154/2004

DfES (2004) Commissioning Alternative Provision – The Role of the LEA. Ref LEA/0155/2004

DfES (2001) Access to Education for children and young people with Medical Needs. Ref LEA/0732/2001

DfES (2003) Improving Behaviour and Attendance: Guidance on Exclusion from Schools and Pupil Referral Units. (www.dfes.gov.uk/behaviourandattendance/)

DfES (1999) Social Inclusion: the LEA role in Pupil Support (Circular 11/99)

CONTACTS

Redbarn Rowan PRU - 36 Station Street, Swinton, S66 8PP Tel 01709 570344
E mail PRU.Redbarn@rotherham.gov.uk
Rowan Centre - 158 Broom Lane, Rotherham S60 3NW Tel 01709 703418
E mail rowancentre@rotherham.gov.uk

Fenton Wood – International Centre, Simmonite Road, Rotherham S66 3BL Tel
01709 515411
E mail PRU.FentonWood@rotherham.gov.uk

HTHTS – Rotherham District General Hospital, Moorgate Road, Rotherham Tel
01709 820000 Extn 6047
E mail: HTHTS@rotherham.gov.uk

Welcome Centre – Unity Centre, St Leonards Road, Rotherham S65 1PD Tel 01709
836680
E mail: steve.braysheer@rotherham.gov.uk

Maple House – 4 Chatham Street, Rotherham S65 1DJ Tel 01709 304814

Inclusion Support Services, Head of Service, International Centre, Simmonite Road,
Rotherham S66 3BL. E mail ann.clegg@rotherham.gov.uk

Get Real Team – Swinton District Offices, Charnwood Road, Swinton, S64 8LY
Tel. 01709 570384
E mail: kath.horner@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Education Cabinet Member and Advisers
2.	Date:	19th October, 2004
3.	Title:	Schools in Ofsted or DfES Categories
4.	Programme Area:	Education, Culture and Leisure Services

5. Summary:

The report *Performance Indicators – ECaLS 2004/05 – 1st Quarter Report*, presented to the Cabinet Member and Advisers for Education, Culture and Leisure Services, on 21st September 2004, highlighted concerns about the Local Performance Indicator (LPI) relating to the percentage of schools with Serious Weakness (SW). This indicator was reflecting an increase in the percentage of schools being placed in this Ofsted category.

The Cabinet Member for ECaLS requested a full report be prepared to provide more detail about each of these schools and the overall picture relating to Schools of Concern.

This report has been prepared in response to this request and covers all those schools having this designation together with any other schools in either an Ofsted category or identified by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) as being of concern.

6. Recommendations:

That the report be received

7. Proposals and Details

At the end of March 2004 there were two secondary schools, designated by Ofsted, as having Serious Weaknesses (1.4% of the total number of schools). No school was in Special Measures (SM).

By the end of July, the 1st Quarter, two primary schools had been designated as having SW and one of the SW secondary schools had been placed in SM. This meant that 3 schools (2.1%) had SW and 1 school (0.7%) had SM giving a total of 4 schools (2.8%) in these two Ofsted categories.

On 31st August 2004 one of the secondary SW schools closed. The end of the 2nd Quarter reporting, November 2004 will show that there will be 2 primary schools (1.4%) in SW and 1 secondary school (0.7%) in SM. This gives a total of 3 schools (2.1%) in any Ofsted category.

Additionally, there is a Government (DfES) "floor target" relating to secondary schools. This floor target is, that by 2004 no secondary school should have fewer than 20% of its pupils achieving 5+ GCSEs at grades A* - C.. On the basis of the 2003 GCSE results, one secondary school was identified as at risk of not meeting this floor target. The school was the focus of intensive support and, in 2004 the school's figure for 5+ A*-C was 29%, well in excess of the 2004 target and above the floor target for 2006.

8. Finance

All the above schools have received additional support to facilitate the implementation of their improvement action plans. This support would take the form of additional finance and/or additional, targeted support from a variety of central services and other schools.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The Council has a statutory responsibility to ensure the quality of education for all children. Schools identified by Ofsted as having concerns and those at risk of not meeting the DfES floor targets are schools that are at risk of not meeting this requirement. These schools require significant, rapid and effective intervention to ensure that the identified difficulties are addressed.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Intervention in schools of concern is consistent with the Community Strategy, Corporate Plan and Best Value performance indicators. The improvement actions specifically address the Corporate Priorities for:

Regeneration: - improving the image of Rotherham.

- providing sustainable neighbourhoods of quality, choice and aspiration.
- Equalities: - promoting equality.
- promoting good community relations.
- Sustainability: - improving the quality of life.
- increasing employment opportunities for local people.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- *Performance Indicators – ECaLS 2004/05 – 1st Quarter Report*
Cabinet Member and Advisers for ECaLS - 21st September 2004.
- *Ofsted Inspections of Rotherham Schools, Spring Term 2004.*
Cabinet 23rd June 2004.

Contact Name : *insert name, position, telephone extension and e-mail address*

Catharine Kinsella
Strategic Leader School Improvement

Ext: 2678

E-mail: catharine.kinsella@rotherham.gov.uk