CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL

Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham

Date: Friday, 4 April 2008

Time: 9.30 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.   Questions from the press and public

6.   Matters Referred from the Youth Cabinet (notes attached) (Pages 1 - 2)

7.   Communications

FOR MONITORING

8.   Local Area Agreement (report attached) (Pages 3 - 21)

9.   Annual Health Check 2007/2008 - Sheffield Children's Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (report attached) (Pages 22 - 28)

10. Foundation Stage Assessment Results 2007 (report attached) (Pages 29 - 34)

11. Key Stage 1 Assessment Results - Summer 2007 (report attached) (Pages 35 - 42)

12.   Key Stage 2 Assessment Results - Summer 2007 (report attached) (Pages 43 - 52)

   please note that the Key Stage 3 Results are not yet available

13.   Key Stage 4 Assessment Results (GCSE Examinations) - Summer 2007 (report attached) (Pages 53 - 66)

FOR DISCUSSION

14.   Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel - Work Programme 2008/2009 (report attached) (Pages 67 - 71)

MINUTES

15.   Minutes of a meeting of the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel held on 7th March, 2008 (copy attached) (Pages 72 - 76)

16.   Minutes of a meeting of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 29th February 2008 (copy attached) (Pages 77 - 86)

Date of Next Meeting:-
Date Not Specified

Membership:-
Chairman – Councillor G. A. Russell
Vice-Chairman – Councillor Burton
Councillors:- Ali, Barron, Currie, Dodson, Kaye, License, Sharp and Swift

Co-optees:-
Ms. J. Dearden, Mrs. M. Morton
and Taiba Yasseen, (REMA)
Ms. T. Guest,
M. Hall (Statutory Co-optee) and J. Blanch-Nicholson,

Rotherham Youth Cabinet
Summary of Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 11 March 2008
Badges and Mobile Phones: The Chair asked everyone to wear their badges at all
Rotherham Youth Cabinet Meetings and to switch mobile phones off before entering the
Council Chamber.
Introductions and Certificates: Everyone introduced themselves. The Chair gave out
letters of thanks from Sonia Sharp to members for attending the Challenge Event
Conference and a Youth Work Matters certificate.
Minutes of the previous meeting: The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a
true record.
Matters Arising: Unite Against Fascism are leafleting in the Thorpe Hesley area on
Sunday 30 March.
Website: Ray Globe gave a powerpoint presentation. The website is at the development
and design stage and the funding of the set-up cost is still to be finalised.
Meeting with the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council: The Chair and Support met
with the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council before the Youth Cabinet meeting.
They discussed:-

- the change of name from Plastic Bag Free Rotherham to Think Plastic Bag.
  It was agreed that a joint letter from the Chief Executive, the Leader and Rotherham Youth
  Cabinet be sent to the Store Managers of Asda, Tesco and Morrison Supermarkets asking
  if they have any suggestions for an alternative to plastic bags.
- It was suggested that schools design an environmental bag for Youth Cabinet to be
  promoted, these could then be sold at retail outlets.
- The FairTrade Fashion Show was discussed, next year the layout may be a stall style
  allowing different projects to showcase their work
- The Chief Executive and the Leader asked how the Respect at Rotherham project was
  progressing and offered help with publicity and contacts, Clare can speak to their
  Secretaries for further details.

Residential: Pictures and feedback was given from the last training day. This is where
everyone bonds, gets work done, sets the agenda, plays games and has fun.
International Work: Young people in Duisburg, Germany, would like to receive an official
letter of invitation to allow them make links with young people in Rotherham. Clare is waiting
for details of this from the Council.
Respect: There is £35,000 available, which will be divided equally between the 7 localities
and young people in these localities can apply for money to help fund their projects. A panel
of young people have set-up the application form and will look at future bids, to see if they fit
the criteria, the project will be called Respect at Rotherham.
Anti Fascism Project: New members have attended the first session, more members signed
up to join the group. The next meeting is 31 March 2008 1-4 pm at Thornhill.
UK Youth Parliament: The new members of UK Youth Parliament and their deputies
introduced themselves. Members are submitting 3 topics for consideration as national
campaigns for inclusion in the next UK Youth Parliament Manifesto; these are Anti Fascism,
FairTrade and Anti Bullying. Information is sent to schools so you will be able to vote. In
May the MYPs will be visiting the House of Lords. At local level the MYPs are preparing an
anti bullying leaflet, for which an ASDAN accreditation will be gained, and on Thursday past
and present MYPs, and recent candidates, will have a celebratory meal.

Young People's Conference 2008: On 11 and 12 February Rotherham Young People's Services held a 2 day Conference. On the first day young people delivered 4 workshops on Sex Education, Teenage Pregnancy, Homelessness and Plastic Bag Free Rotherham. On the second day an action plan for youth work for the forthcoming year was planned.

Quids In: All the monies have been distributed for this financial year. More bids can be looked at in April. In the meantime the group are redesigning leaflets, and rewriting packs and forms. Members signed up to join the group. The next meeting is Monday 7 April, 5.30-8pm at Thornhill.

FairTrade: The FairTrade Steering Group organised a fashion show held at The Carlton Park Hotel on 6 March 2008, it was attended by more than 120 people and more than £800 was raised. New members can join, please let Clare know if you are interested, the next meeting is 9 April 5.30-8pm at Thornhill.

Young Athenian Awards: Picture presentation given. 15 Young people who have made an exceptional contribution in the community were been nominated for the award this year. Five Youth Cabinet members were recognised, 1 recipient, 1 highly commended and 3 honourees.

14-19 Challenge Event: Picture presentation given. The group opened the conference, which was held to discuss what young people want from education. It was attended by Ed Balls, the Minister for Children, Schools and Families.

Recycling in Schools: Recycling was discussed at the last training meeting. Older schools get paper recycled free of charge but PFI schools don't offer a free collection for recycling. If yours is a PFI school ask your Head teacher to write to Haden and ask for free recycling.

Any Other Business:

Interviews:

A group of young people interviewed 19 candidates for the Locality Manager vacancies. The post holders have yet to be announced.

The Clerical Worker for Voice and Influence is leaving. Members signed up to join the short listing and interview panels. The short listing is on Wednesday 19 March, 5 pm at Thornhill and the interviews will take place on Thursday 3 April.

Dates of next meetings:

Training Meeting: Tuesday & Wednesday, 1 & 2 April 2008, Residential at Rotherham International Centre

Youth Cabinet Meeting: Tuesday 13 May 2008 at Rotherham Town Hall

		ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Children & Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel
2.	Date:	Friday 4th April 2008
3.	Title:	Local Area Agreement 2008-2011
4.	Directorate:	Children & Young People's Services Rotherham Partnership – Chief Executive's

5.   Summary

The report sets out the current position with regard to the development of the new 2008-2011 Local Area Agreement. As such this report presents for consideration by the Scrutiny Board:

- An emerging list of indicators taken from the National Outcome and Indicator set that could form the basis of our second Local Area Agreement 2008-2011 (Appendix 1).

6.   Recommendations

The Scrutiny Board is asked to:

1.   **Consider and comment on the emerging list of potential Indicators that can form the basis of the 2008-2011 Local Area Agreement.**

2.   **Confirm the direction in negotiating the Local Area Agreement 2008-2011 and the further steps to completing the work be agreed.**

7. Proposals and Details

Local Area Agreements have been part of the local government scene since 2004. In 2006, Rotherham entered into a voluntary Local Area Agreement covering the period 2006-2009. This agreement, centred around 13 'stretch targets' against which reward grant can be claimed in 2009.

Now, with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, there is a legal duty on Rotherham Council working with the Rotherham Partnership, to negotiate an additional Local Area Agreement with partners and Government. This agreement will cover the period June 2008 until April 2011 and will be based on the understanding of the needs of the borough.

The Local Authority is the 'accountable body' for the partnership which underpins the Local Area Agreement (in our case the partnership is the Rotherham Partnership) which means that the Council has ultimate accountability to Government for the achievement of the targets negotiated as part of the Agreement

In late November the Department for Communities and Local Government published the Operational Guidance for the 'Development of the new Local Area Agreement framework'. Though we have an existing Agreement that covers 2006-2009 and 13 stretch targets, the new Agreement will in theory bring some major changes with greater clarity about the relationship between local and national priorities, a reduction in national performance monitoring and greater financial flexibilities at a local level.

In essence, the new LAA is an agreement between Central Government and the Council and its partners about the priorities for Rotherham as described by the LAA targets. The 'language' of the agreement will be the 'up-to 35 indicators' chosen from a basket of 198 given to us by central Government and 17 Children and Early Years Indicators. It will be the result of a negotiation between Government Office and the Council and partners about the delivery of our Updated Community Strategy on the one hand and national priorities as expressed by the new National Indicator Set on the other.

Emerging Indicators from the National Indicator Set (Appendix 1):

Appendix 1 provides a potential list of Indicators divided between Theme that could form the basis of the 2008-2011 Local Area Agreement. Each has been identified following extensive work and negotiation between partners, the Council and Government. These are subject to additional work following discussions with the Chief Executive Officers Group, Government Office, Cabinet and members. It needs to be emphasised that this is 'work in progress' as there are a number of variables and unknowns, not least:

- The agreed technical definitions for the Indicators has only just been released
- For a large number of the Indicators we have no past performance information or clear understanding of what they mean in practice so it could be difficult to establish targets.
- A number are perception based, making it difficult to potentially agree targets.
- We are still not sure how the Indicators will be incentivised.

In considering the most appropriate Indicators for the Local Area Agreement the attached check list (Appendix 2) outlines the key questions that need to be asked. In addition, the Local Area Agreement for Rotherham will consist of three sets of Indicators:

- Those chosen from the national Indicator Set that reflect local priorities, can be measured and delivered in the timescale (important as reward grant can be earned)
- Local Indicators chosen that address the technical weaknesses with the National Indicator Set but reflect our local Strategic Priorities.
- The 13 Indicators within the existing Local Area Agreement (2006-2009)

Current progress and the involvement of elected members:

Time	LAA Activity	Member Involvement
2005	Development of Rotherham Community Strategy 2005-2010	Extensive including members sessions, involvement of Scrutiny Boards, Area Assemblies and community consultation
September to November 2007	Refresh of Community Strategy to refine slightly the 'story of place' for Rotherham. Visions, Themes and Strategic priorities	9th November, Community Strategy Refresh event for partners.
November 2007	Initial discussions between GO and Rotherham Partnership around potential indicators	Initial discussions with PSoC. Initial discussions with C&YP Board Members briefing session (1)
January to April 2008	Developing discussions around potential indicators and targets	9th January discussions with Cabinet 25th January Member Development session (1) 1st February discussions with PSoC. 11th February discussions with Area Assembly Chairs 20th February discussions with C&YP Board 28th February Area Plans to the LSP Members briefing session (2) 14th March Member Development session (2) 9th April Cabinet 9th April Member Development session (3) TBI All Scrutiny Boards 9th April Dedicated PSOC Session 11th April PSOC

8.   Finance:

There are considerable financial implications associated with achieving the 'Stretch Targets' within the Local Area Agreement. There are no additional resources associated with the Agreement, as such all resource implications will need to be contained within existing budgets.

9.   Risks and Uncertainties:

The key risks around the project are ensuring buy in to both the process and the refreshed strategy and plan across the Council and partners, given the tight timescale for delivery. Delays in information being made available from central Government for example in relation to Indicator definitions and the reward could impact on the ability to deliver the plans by the proposed date.

10.   Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

The Council and the Partnership have in place performance management frameworks to ensure that the refreshed plans are regularly and robustly monitored. Existing performance information will be key in ensuring that targets set within the plans are challenging but achievable. It will be critical to ensure that the refresh effectively ensures that both National and Regional policies are accurately and effectively reflected in the refresh and this has been built into the proposals

11.   Background Papers and Consultation:

Local Government and Public Involvement Bill (2007)
Community Strategy 2005-2010
Community Strategy 2005-2011 (Updated 2008)
How to win friends and influence partners, the centre for public scrutiny

Contact Name:

Vince Roberts, Partnership Manager, Chief Executives Department, Ext 2757;
E: vince.roberts@rotherham.gov.uk

Joyce Thacker, Senior Director, Children and Young People's Services, Ext 2677;
E: joyce.thacker@rotherham.gov.uk

DRAFT 'Up to 35' LAA Indicators

	Proposed Indicator	Comment	Strategic Priority
Achieving			
151	Overall employment rate	Existing measure. Current direction of travel is reducing, priority to tackle the decline this is currently showing. Issue related to economic activity and slow down. Currently below national average.	AC3. Maximise employment opportunities for all by supporting disadvantaged people into work. AC4. Improve access and remove barriers to employment.
152	Working age people on out of work benefits	New measure, data is available. Key priority for the Borough.	AC3. Maximise employment opportunities for all by supporting disadvantaged people into work. AC4. Improve access and remove barriers to employment. AL11. Support people on incapacity benefits to manage their condition and get back into employment where possible through the Condition Management Programme (CMP) and Pathways to Work.
167	Congestion - average journey time per mile during the morning peak	Existing indicator within the Local Transport Plan, need to use same targets. Most relevant of all the transport indicators. GOYH are very definite for this to be in.	AC4. Improve access and remove barriers to employment.
171	VAT registration rate	Existing measure, key priority for the Borough. Strong linkage to local PI around Business Start ups	AC1. Promote innovation, enterprising behaviour, competitiveness and sustainability. AC2. Promote business start ups, growth and inward investment.
	Local PI's	Town Centre Regeneration NI 166 - Average earnings of employees in the area	AC5. Encourage workforce development AC6. Revitalise the town centre. AC7. Ensure local town centres are attractive.

Learning			
79	Achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19	Good indicator of skill base for economy and employability. Achieving incremental improvement year on year. Issue about the measure, how it is collected, who it applies to and time lag in reporting. UPDATE Concerns re time lag raised with Government Office.	L1. Ensuring high quality of education for all children and young people. L5. To raise attainment across the Borough for all children and young people. L2. Increase the employability of working age adults, by reducing the number of adults lacking essential skills (reading, writing, numeracy and ICT).
117	16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, training or employment (NEET)	Existing stretch target until 2009. Key priority for the Borough. Issues related to Reward. Concern whether this includes those young people who volunteer.	L2. Increase the employability of working age adults, by reducing the number of adults lacking essential skills (reading, writing, numeracy and ICT). L4. Create specific initiatives to maximise the engagement and participation in learning of people living in the most deprived neighbourhoods. L6. Increase the number of young people in education, employment or training.
163	Working age population qualified to at least Level 2 or higher	Agreed but needs discussion between Learning and Achieving re ownership. Strong tie in with funding from the LSC. Need to ensure relationship with NI 164 & 79.	L2. Increase the employability of working age adults, by reducing the number of adults lacking essential skills (reading, writing, numeracy and ICT). L3. Maximise participation in adult learning, particularly in disadvantaged areas. AC5. Encourage workforce development.
164	Working age population qualified to at least Level 3 or higher	Agreed but needs discussion between Learning and Achieving re ownership. Strong tie in with funding from the LSC. Need to ensure relationship with NIs 163 & 79. UPDATE: Suggestion that 165 (Level 4) might be more appropriate for Rotherham's issues.	L2. Increase the employability of working age adults, by reducing the number of adults lacking essential skills (reading, writing, numeracy and ICT). L3. Maximise participation in adult learning, particularly in disadvantaged areas. AC5. Encourage workforce development.
	Local PI	Adults 19+ engaging in learning activities	L3. Maximise participation in adult learning, particularly in disadvantaged areas.

Alive

53	Prevalence of breastfeeding at 6-8 weeks	Important but baseline for this is insufficiently robust. Partnership approach vital for this. UPDATE: This has been re-included within the set due to the high priority of this issue	AL8. Improving Infant health and reducing infant mortality.
56	Obesity among primary school age children in Year 6	Key priority for the Borough and nationally. GOYH keen for us to have this in. Issue of whether performance can alter within time period.	AL4. Reduce obesity levels in Rotherham against current trends. AL10. Increase physical activity of children.
57	Children and young people's participation in high-quality PE and sport	Key measure of health, however concerns remain about data collection for part of the indicator and data quality.	AL4. Reduce obesity levels in Rotherham against current trends. AL10. Increase physical activity of children.
112	Under 18 Conception Rate	Very important issue for Rotherham but latest data for this measure has a two year reporting delay, three years for ward level and so is very inaccurate. UPDATE: This has been re-included within the set due to the high priority of this issue.	AL9. Improving Sexual health and reducing teenage pregnancy.
120	All-age all cause mortality rate	Existing measure collected by PCT. Key Priority for Partners, GOYH want this in. Long term measure, difficult to impact in the short term.	AL1. Increasing life expectancy by a reduction in mortality from major diseases such as CVD, COPD and cancers. AL2. Reduce alcohol consumption. AL8. Improving Infant health and reducing infant mortality. AL9. Improving sexual health and reducing teenage pregnancy.
135	Carers receiving needs assessment or review and a specific carer's service, or advice and information	Possible agreed. Baseline data is available for this but it does not include information and advice. UPDATE: Further work to be done on this indicator.	AL5. Increase in review of care packages.
141	Number of vulnerable people achieving independent living	Existing indicator. Key objective for Rotherham, GOYH keen for this to be included.	Move to safe?

			AL8. Improving Infant health and reducing infant mortality. AL11. Support people on incapacity benefits to manage their condition and get back into employment where possible through the Condition Management Programme (CMP) and Pathways to Work. AL12. Reduce the prevalence of mental illness and ensure appropriate support is given to those with mental health illnesses. AL13. Increase numbers of young people who report positive responses with regards to their emotional well-being. AL14. Encourage more widespread enjoyment of culture and sport.
	Local PI's	Adult participation in sport Smoking rates during Pregnancy Obesity – all age groups	
Safe			
16	Serious acquisitive crime rate	New measure but data is available. UPDATE: Concern about the number of crime indicators.	S7. Tackle and reduce the incidence of anti-social behaviour.
17	Perceptions of anti-social behaviour	Key priority for Rotherham to address but concern as it is a perception measure and regarding the baseline. Concerns about this being a perception measure.	S4. Build and support responsive and sustainable communities through neighbourhood management arrangements. S5. Ensure safety within the night time economy. S8. Reduce the level of drugs and alcohol related crime in the borough. S9. Reduce the fear and perception of crime.
18	Adult re-offending rates for those under probation supervision	New measure but data is available. Probation Service must be involved in target setting. UPDATE: Concern about the number of crime indicators.	S7. Tackle and reduce the incidence of anti-social behaviour.
20	Assault with injury crime rate	New measure but data is available. Strong priority from Area Assemblies. UPDATE: Concern about the number of crime indicators.	S7. Tackle and reduce the incidence of anti-social behaviour.

40	Drug users in effective treatment	New measure but data collected by PCT drug action team.	S7. Tackle and reduce the incidence of anti-social behaviour.
47	People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents	Existing indicator within the LTP, need to use same targets. UPDATE: GO continue to want this in.	
111	First time entrants to the Youth Justice System aged 10 - 17	Existing measure, key to prevention of offending and reducing crime.	S7. Tackle and reduce the incidence of anti-social behaviour.
144	Offenders under probation supervision in employment at the end of their order or license.	Under consideration. Social Exclusion Taskforce have said as Rotherham is in bottom quartile for this they would like to see it in.	S7. Tackle and reduce the incidence of anti-social behaviour.
154	Net additional homes provided	Existing measure, GOYH keen to have this in. Being examined - if too high risk it should be replaced by 159 (Supply of ready to develop housing sites). Risk assessment currently being undertaken.	S1. Improve quality of design, decency standard, supply and affordability of housing in the borough.
158	% decent council homes	Existing measure. Priority for the Borough.	S1. Improve quality of design, decency standard, supply and affordability of housing in the borough.
168	Proportion of principal roads where maintenance should be considered	Possible inclusion of this measure. High priority for residents. Key concerns around the measure that need to be assessed. UPDATE: put back following consultation.	S2. Improve the local environmental quality of our neighbourhoods.
185	CO2 reduction from Local Authority operations	Under consideration as we are able to report on this.	S3. Co-ordinate innovative partnerships in order to improve sustainable infrastructure, mitigate and adapt to climate change. S2. Improve the local environmental quality of our neighbourhoods.
	Local PI's	Alcohol related harm (further work to be done) CO2 emissions from all Partners	S8. Reduce the level of drugs and alcohol related crime in the borough. S6. Reduce the incidence of domestic violence throughout the borough.

Proud			
1	% of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area	Existing measure. Community cohesion is a key priority for the Borough and nationally. Perception measure. Big risk as perception measure.	P3. Celebrate the achievements of Rotherham, its people and organisations. P4. Promote understanding, respect and belonging within communities and the borough.
4	% of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality	Existing measure within the Quality of Life survey, to be measure through the new Place Survey. Currently low performing but should increase due to work being undertaken. Work required by partners to increase perception rates. GOYH keen for this to be in. Big risk as Perception measure.	P1. Provide the means for citizens, the voluntary and community sector and businesses to influence decisions making.
7	Environment for a thriving third sector	Priority for the Borough, but new measure and currently unclear regarding how this will be measured. Possible change in measures following National consultation, further consideration on this needed.	P2. Support a thriving, sustainable and diverse Voluntary and Community Sector.
110	Young people's participation in positive activities	Important area to address for Rotherham, but unclear how this will be measured. GOYH keen for this to be in. Need clarity on which Theme would lead on this.	L4. Create specific initiatives to maximise the engagement and participation in learning of people living in the most deprived neighbourhoods?

Total = 31

Indicators proposed by GOYH 28th Feb

136	People supported to live independently through social Services (All Ages)	Proposed at event on 28th Feb, by GOYH. Under discussion.	

Statutory Education and Early Years Indicators

72	Achievement of at least 78 points across the Early Years Foundation Stage with at least 6 in each of the scales in Personal Social and Emotional Development and Communication, Language and Literacy
73	Achievement at level 4 or above in both English and Maths at Key Stage 2 (Threshold)
74	Achievement at level 5 or above in both English and Maths at Key Stage 3 (Threshold)
75	Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths (Threshold)
83	Achievement at level 5 or above in Science at Key Stage 3
87	Secondary school persistent absence rate
92	Narrowing the gap between the lowest achieving 20% in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and the rest
93	Progression by 2 levels in English between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2
94	Progression by 2 levels in Maths between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2
95	Progression by 2 levels in English between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3
96	Progression by 2 levels in Maths between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3
97	Progression by 2 levels in English between Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4
98	Progression by 2 levels in Maths between Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4
99	Children in care reaching level 4 in English at Key Stage 2
100	Children in care reaching level 4 in Maths at Key Stage 2
101	Children in care achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs (or equivalent) at Key Stage 4 (including English and Maths)

Remaining National Indicator Set – not currently in LAA, but still performance managed

2	% of people who feel that they belong in their neighbourhood
3	Civic participation in the local area
5	Overall/general satisfaction with local area
6	Participation in regular volunteering
8	Adult Participation in sport
9	Use of public libraries
10	Visits to museums or galleries
11	Engagement in the arts
12	Refused and deferred Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) license applications leading to immigration enforcement activity
13	Migrants English language skills and knowledge
14	Avoidable contact: The average number, of customer contacts per received customer request
15	Serious violent crime rate (moved here from proposed only by Rotherham following LAA core group on 12.12.07)
19	Rate of proven re-offending by young offenders
21	Dealing with local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and police
22	Perceptions of parents taking responsibility for the behaviour of their children in the area
23	Perceptions that people in the area treat one another with respect and dignity
24	Satisfaction with the way the police and local council dealt with antisocial behaviour
25	Satisfaction of different groups with the way the police and local council dealt with anti-social behaviour
26	Specialist support to victims of a serious sexual offence
27	Understanding of local concerns about anti-social behaviour and crime by the local council and police
28	Serious knife crime rate
29	Gun crime rate
30	Re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders
31	Re-offending rate of registered sex offenders
32	Repeat incidents of domestic violence
33	Arson incidents
34	Domestic violence - murder
35	Building resilience to violent extremism
36	Protection against terrorist attack
37	Awareness of civil protection arrangements in the local area

38	Drug-related (Class A) offending rate
39	Alcohol-harm related hospital admission rates
41	Perceptions of drunk or rowdy behaviour as a problem
42	Perceptions of drug use or drug dealing as a problem
43	Young people within the Youth Justice System receiving a conviction in court who are sentenced to custody
44	Ethnic composition of offenders on Youth Justice System disposals
45	Young offenders engagement in suitable education, employment or training
46	Young offenders access to suitable accommodation
48	Children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents
49	Number of primary fires and related fatalities and non-fatal casualties, excluding precautionary checks
50	Emotional health of children
51	Effectiveness of child and adolescent mental health (CAMHs) services
52	Take up of school lunches
54	Services for disabled children
55	Obesity among primary school age children in reception year
58	Emotional and behavioural health of children in care
59	Initial assessments for children's social care carried out within 7 working days of referral
60	Core assessments for children's social care that were carried out within 35 working days of their commencement
61	Stability of looked after children adopted following an agency decision that the child should be placed for adoption
62	Stability of placements of looked after children: number of moves
63	Stability of placements of looked after children: length of placement
64	Child protection plans lasting 2 years or more
65	Children becoming the subject of a Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time
66	Looked after children cases which were reviewed within required timescales
67	Child protection cases which were reviewed within required timescales
68	Referrals to children's social care going on to initial assessment
69	Children who have experienced bullying
70	Hospital admissions caused by unintentional and deliberate injuries to children and young people
71	Children who have run away from home/care overnight
76	Achievement at level 4 or above in both English and Maths at KS2 (Floor)
77	Achievement at level 5 or above in both English and Maths at KS3 (Floor)
78	Achievement of 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE and equivalent including GCSEs in English and Maths (Floor)

80	Achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19
81	Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 3 qualification by the age of 19
82	Inequality gap in the achievement of a Level 2 qualification by the age of 19
84	Achievement of 2 or more A*-C grades in Science GCSEs or equivalent
85	Post-16 participation in physical sciences (A Level Physics, Chemistry and Maths)
86	Secondary schools judged as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour
88	Number of Extended Schools
89	Number of schools in special measures
90	Take up of 14-19 learning diplomas
91	Participation of 17 year-olds in education or training
102	Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers achieving the expected level at Key Stages 2 and 4
103	Special Educational Needs - statements issued within 26 weeks
104	The Special Educational Needs (SEN)/non-SEN gap - achieving Key Stage 2 English and Maths threshold
105	The Special Educational Needs (SEN)/non-SEN gap - achieving 5 A*-C GCSE inc. English and Maths
106	Young people from low income backgrounds progressing to higher education
107	Key Stage 2 attainment for Black and minority ethnic groups
108	Key Stage 4 attainment for Black and minority ethnic groups
109	Number of Sure Start Children Centres
113	Prevalence of Chlamydia in under 20 year olds
114	Rate of permanent exclusions from school
115	Substance misuse by young people
116	Proportion of children in poverty
118	Take up of formal childcare by low-income working families
119	Self-reported measure of people's overall health and wellbeing
121	Mortality rate from all circulatory diseases at ages under 75
122	Mortality from all cancers at ages under 75
123	16+ current smoking rate prevalence
124	People with a long-term condition supported to be independent and in control of their condition
125	Achieving independence for older people through rehabilitation/intermediate care
126	Early access for women to maternity services
127	Self reported experience of social care users
128	User reported measure of respect and dignity in their treatment

129	End of life access to palliative care enabling people to choose to die at home
130	Social Care clients receiving Self Directed Support (Direct Payments and Individual Budgets)
131	Delayed transfers of care from hospitals
132	Timeliness of social care assessment
133	Timeliness of social care packages
134	The number of emergency bed days per head of weighted population
137	Healthy life expectancy at age 65
138	Satisfaction of people over 65 with both home and neighbourhood
139	People over 65 who say that they receive the information, assistance and support needed to exercise choice and control to live independently
140	Fair treatment by local services
142	Number of vulnerable people who are supported to maintain independent living
143	Offenders under probation supervision living in settled and suitable accommodation at the end of their order or license
145	Adults with learning disabilities in settled accommodation
146	Adults with learning disabilities in employment
147	Care leavers in suitable accommodation
148	Care leavers in employment, education or training
149	Adults in contact with secondary mental health services in settled accommodation
150	Adults in contact with secondary mental health services in employment
153	Working age people claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods
155	Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)
156	Number of households living in Temporary Accommodation
157	Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for 'major', 'minor' and 'other' application types
159	Supply of ready to develop housing sites
160	Local Authority tenants' satisfaction with landlord services
161	Learners achieving a Level 1 qualification in literacy
162	Learners achieving an Entry Level 3 qualification in numeracy
165	Working age population qualified to at least Level 4 or higher
166	Average earnings of employees in the area
169	Non-principal roads where maintenance should be considered
170	Previously developed land that has been vacant or derelict for more than 5 years
172	VAT registered businesses in the area showing growth

173	People falling out of work and on to incapacity benefits
174	Skills gaps in the current workforce reported by employers
175	Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling
176	Working age people with access to employment by public transport (and other specified modes)
177	Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area
178	Bus services running on time
179	Value for money - total net value of on-going cash-releasing value for money gains that have impacted since the start of the 2008-9 financial year
180	Changes in Housing Benefit/ Council Tax Benefit entitlements within the year
181	Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events
182	Satisfaction of businesses with local authority regulation services
183	Impact of local authority regulatory services on the fair trading environment
184	Food establishments in the area which are broadly compliant with food hygiene law
186	Per capita CO2 emissions in the LA area
187	Tackling fuel poverty – people receiving income based benefits living in homes with a low energy efficiency rating
188	Adapting to climate change
189	Flood and coastal erosion risk management
190	Achievement in meeting standards for the control system for animal health
191	Residual household waste per head
192	Household waste recycled and composted
193	Municipal waste land filled
194	Level of air quality - reduction in NOx and primary PM10 emissions through local authority's estate and operations.
196	Improved street and environmental cleanliness - fly tipping
197	Improved local biodiversity – active management of local sites
198	Children travelling to school - mode of travel usually used

Assessing the Indicators - Quality Assurance Check List (Draft 1 – 7.01.08)

<u>Definitions</u>

Term	Meaning
Outcome and Indicator set	The list of 198 Indicators that we can choose up-to 35 from.
Indicator	A measurement that can show change. Can be qualitative or quantitative, In come cases this may involve a number of measures to support the one indicator
Outcome	The change that can be seen or counted. Normally uses a number of indicators to evidence the change
Measure	The thing that is measured
Strategic Priority	What needs to change to improve things for local people. Normally relates to a number of linked outcomes
Baseline	The current position
Direction of travel	Whether a measure is improving, getting worse or staying the same
Target	Where we anticipate the measure being by a given date

<u>Instructions</u>

In choosing the most appropriate Indicators for Rotherham from the National Indicator set, we must be confident that we have chosen it wisely and that it is linked to the achievement of a strategic priority/ies. The following check list needs to be completed for each short-listed measure and a recommendation made as to whether it should go forward for final consideration.

Measure/Indicators

No.	Full Description

Strategic Assessment

	Q & A	Comment
1.	Does the measure or indicator link to a Strategic Priority if so which?	
2.	Does achieving improvement require action by more than one Partner or agency	
3.	Will improving the measure improve the lives of local people, communities and business	
4.	Can improvement be achieved within 36 months?	

Technical Assessment

	Q & A	Comment
5.	Does the technical definition of the measure relate to the outcome of the Indicator?	
6.	What is the data source for the measure and can we monitor it from the start of the Local Area Agreement (1st April 2008)?	
7.	Do we have any historical information relating to the measure?	
8.	Do we have a baseline for the measure, if so what is the direction of travel over the past 12 months?	
9.	Can the measure be tracked over time and at what frequency?	
10.	Is it a perception measure?	
11.	Do we have a clear lead and target holder for the measure?	
12.	Can a target be confidently established for the measure for each of the next three years?	
13	How will delivery against the indicator be resourced?	
14	Does the improvement of performance against the indicator have any detrimental impacts on other indicators or incur significant costs?	

Cross Cutting Assessment

	Q & A	Comment
15.	Can the measure be collected by neighbourhood/area?	
16.	Can the measure be collected by Community of Interest?	
17.	Is the measure simple and understandable by partners (including local people)?	
18.	Can the measure be compared nationally or regionally?	
19.	Does the measure link to more than one Strategic Priority across Themes?	
20.	Is the measure already performance managed and reported on? If the answer is yes who is it reported to?	

Assessment undertaken by:
Title:
Date
Recommendation (Yes/No/Possibly):
Justification:

ANNUAL HEALTH CHECK 2007/08

**Submission of the South Yorkshire Joint Health Scrutiny Committee –
The Sheffield Children's Hospital NHS Foundation Trust**

1.0   Background: South Yorkshire Joint Health Scrutiny Committee

1.1   The following Health Check Submission (2007/2008) is made on behalf of the South Yorkshire Joint Health Scrutiny Committee. The Joint Committee comprises locally Elected Members from the Health and Children's/Adult Scrutiny Commissions of the four South Yorkshire districts – Barnsley MBC, Doncaster MBC, Rotherham MBC and Sheffield City Council. The Joint Committee's remit is to scrutinise issues and service delivery for health which have cross-boundary implications for the South Yorkshire districts.

1.2   As part of the Annual Health Check for 2007/2008, the Joint Committee has undertaken to carry out scrutiny of the various trusts representing the Sheffield Children's Hospital and Sheffield Teaching Hospitals. Scrutiny is to be evidence based, from documenting services and verbal evidence to be given at meetings of the Committee. Evidence gathering is centred on the Healthcare Commission's Core Healthcare Standards.

1.3   The Joint Scrutiny Committee met on 14th March 2008 to consider the performance of the Children's Hospital against selected Core Standards. These were chosen to reflect key issues of Strategic Direction, Patient/Cater interface and Service Delivery. These were:-

        C4 – Infection Control
        C6 – Co-operation to Meet Patients' Individual Needs
        C7 – Governance
        C14A – Complaints Procedures
        C14B – Discrimination
        C14C – Appropriate Service Improvements
        C15 – Food
        C22 – Reducing Health Inequalities.

1.4   The meeting was attended by senior members of the Trust, Chris Sharratt (Chief Executive) and John Reid (Director of Clinical Operations and Nursing. The witnesses provided a short presentation in relation to

the organisation of the Trust and their position in relation to all identified Core Standards. The Trust representatives were then questioned.

1.5   The following brings together key aspects of evidence from the Trust which were considered by the Joint Committee. The main conclusions of the Committee regarding compliance with Core Standards are highlighted in bold italics.

2.0   <u>Sheffield Children's Hospital foundation Trust: Outcomes of Joint Scrutiny</u>

Core Standard C4: Infection Control

2.1   The Joint Committee questioned the Trust's compliance with this Core Standard in depth. The Trust view infection control as one of their key priorities, with fundamental implications for patient safety and the need to maintain confidence in the Hospital's reputation. The Trust's aim is to ensure that it anticipates change and "stays ahead of the game". Infection control is viewed particularly seriously due to the medical vulnerability of many of the Trust's patients.

2.2   Key aspects of evidence included:-

- The Trust has an excellent record of MRSA control – no cases within the last two years.

- "Deep clean" teams are employed. These comprise in-house staff with specialist understanding and training.

- The Trust has a consultant microbiologist. This post forms part of a dedicated Infection control Team and specialist nurses. The role of the Team is to anticipate outbreaks of infection, eg pandemic flue. All nurses receive specialist training.

- An audit process is in place to track routes of infection, reporting back to an Audit body.

- Staff cleanliness is monitored. A recent survey indicated that 80% wash hands as required; the Trust is aiming for higher standards. A blood intrusion policy is in place for staff.

- Multi-lingual leaflets are available on how visitors can assist in infection control. There are restrictions on visitor numbers, which are now enforced, ie three per bed.

- Changing facilities for nurses have been upgraded. The policy aim is to prevent staff going in and out of the premises in uniform.

2.3   In addition, the Trust outlined proposals to concentrate instrument cleansing and preparation in a new, purpose built unit. A business case has been prepared for this, which will replace the existing contracting

arrangements. A preferred bidder is now in place, and discussions are ongoing with regard to the site. The new processing centre facility will be available on a shared basis with the Hallamshire and Northern General, and potentially with GP practices.

Core Standard C7: Conclusions of the Joint Committee

2.4 *The Joint Committee is impressed with the Trust's record for infection control. The Trust has a range of processes and initiatives in place to control infection from both staff and visitor perspectives. There are mechanisms to deal with, monitor and learn from instances of infection outbreak.*

2.5 *The Committee expresses some reservations over certain aspects of policy for staff cleanliness, as noted above, ie hand washing, use of uniforms.*

2.6 *The Committee is encouraged by the Trust's strategy to create a dedicated surgical cleansing unit. As the Trust noted, there are potentially significant improvements in standards, speed and costs of cleansing, together with benefits for other local health providers to be made. The Trust's commitment to keep the Committee informed on progress is welcomed.*

2.7 *The Committee concludes that the Trust is compliant generally with Core Standard C4, subject to the comments expressed in paragraph 2.5.*

Core Standard C6: Healthcare organisations co-operate with each other and social care organisations to ensure that patients' individual needs are properly managed and met.

2.8 The Trust outlined partnership arrangements with other health and social care agencies including, for example:-

- 0 – 19 Partnership Board
- Sheffield Safeguarding Children Board
- Police
- Social Care
- Education
- Public health
- CAHMS Strategy Group
- MAPS/MIT/Forensic Service
- Other Acute Trusts
- Primary Care Trusts.

2.9 The Trust highlighted a new initiative to establish an interdisciplinary panel to assess cot deaths. This may form the basis of a national model.

2.10 Support systems are in place for Looked After Children, including interventions in multi-placement breakdowns.

2.11 The Trust is conscious of the problems faced by the siblings of patients. Structures are in place for this, including the handling of children who spend time at the Hospital during their siblings' stay.

Core Standard C6: Conclusions of the Joint Committee

2.12 *The Committee shares the Trust's philosophy that there is no one aspect of a child that does not influence his or her's well being. The Committee has not had the opportunity to investigate the effectiveness of the Trust's joint working from the perspective of partner organisations. However, within the evidence offered, the Committee is satisfied that the Trust is compliant with Core Standard C6. The Committee wishes to draw attention to the innovative work being undertaken by the Trust in relation to cot deaths.*

Core Standard C7: Sound Clinical and Corporate Governance

2.13 A key issue for the Trust has been managing services in the context of Government efficiency targets and "Cost Improvement" reductions in funding. The Trust, however, expects to make a surplus within this financial year, and to manage service provision within budgetary limits for the coming year. The Trust has previously highlighted the constraints imposed by the NHS Tariff system which does not favour specialist paediatric treatment of the kind provided by the Hospital. Indications are that the settlement for the coming year is more fair. The Trust operates within the prescribed "payment by results" regime.

2.14 Management Structures are in place to manage both clinical and corporate governance of the Trust. The Trust is open to internal and external audit, including MONITOR. Foundation Trust status has brought with it significant benefits, and the Trust's governance arrangements reflect the transparency and probity expectations that go with this status. Mechanisms are in place to ensure that Governors are kept up-to-date at the level of the Board, and associated sub-committees. These cover the roles of both Executive and Non-Executive Directors. A Non-Executive Director sits on the Audit Committee. There is a compliance framework in place.

2.15 Governance structures include provision for Risk Management. Arrangements include a Risk Management Committee, and a Clinical Governance Committee.

2.16 Service delivery is being managed by the Trust within a context of increasing demand. There has been a significant rise in referrals over the past year of 23%. The Trust believes that this is down to the Hospital's reputation and service reconfiguration reforms.

2.17 Managing these increasing demands is seen as a major challenge. The Trust is also looking to how it will position itself in elation to national reconfiguration strategy, in particular the increased emphasis on regionally focused specialist care. There are also major challenges of new waiting time requirements. The Trust also referred to challenges of immigration freedoms, eg specialist needs of East Europeans. Chickenpox, measles, mumps and rubella remain as key health problems.

2.18 The Trust outlined infrastructure improvements which have taken place over the last year. These have included increases in intensive care provision.

2.19 In the longer term the Trust envisages a target of 80% of care provision in single en suite accommodation. Serious consideration is being given to future options to either redevelop on site or to relocate to new purpose built premises elsewhere. The Trust made a commitment to keep the Joint Committee informed of progress on this during the coming year.

2.20 There are short term plans to help meet current problems of parking at the Hospital, which it is acknowledged creates significant problems for service users and staff.

Core Standard C7: Conclusions of the Joint Committee

2.21 *The Joint Committee notes the impressive history of clinical paediatric care provided by the Children's Hospital. In evidence the Trust outlined the key challenges for governance, and future service delivery. The Committee is satisfied that the Trust has a strong vision to meet these challenges. Financial pressures are being met and monitored through established risk management and audit structures. These are being met in the context of increased demand for referrals. Partnership arrangements are in place. The Trust's commitment not to impair front line service delivery and to maintain standards of quality and safety are welcomed.*

2.22 The Committee is satisfied that the Trust is taking a medium to longer term view of how it will provide service in the future, in particular reconfiguration proposals which will need to take into account the roles of complementary health providers within the sub-region. The Committee will take a strong interest in how this evolves over the next year. The Trust's commitments to keep Committee Members informed of deliberations over options to either redevelop or relocate are welcomed.

Core Standard C14A: Complaints Procedures

2.23 The Trust note that their complaints policy is compliant with DHS regulations. Responses to complaints are required within a set time. If

complainants are unhappy, independent arbitration is available, or reference to the Ombudsman. The Chief Executive personally oversees all responses to complaints.

2.24   The Trust has clear complaints leaflets available, including the internet. Leaflets are published in different formats covering six languages. Training for staff in dealing with complaints is provided. Suggestion forms are available in all departments.

2.25   An 800 respondent questionnaire has recently been undertaken of ex patients. This elicited a number of frank responses.

2.26   The Trust drew attention to the complexity of most complaints involving parents and children. Often parents feel lost in dealing with different agencies. Steps have been taken to improve inter agency working on this. There has not been an increase in the number of complaints.

2.27   In addition to formal procedures, a Patient Advice and Liaison Officer is located in the main entrance, offering a less formal path for complaints.

Core Standard C14A: Conclusions of the Joint Committee

*2.28   **The Joint Committee is satisfied with the Trust's compliance with the Core Standard. The Committee note the implications for establishment of the New Local Involvement Network (LINK) in this context, and will look for positive outcomes for the Trust's relationship with the new body, given the current PPI arrangements, which the Trust acknowledge as weak.***

Core Standard C14B: Discrimination

2.29   The Trust have a clear communications policy to deal with discrimination issue. The Safeguarding Board has set objectives. Staff receive regular counselling.

Core Standard C14B: Conclusion of the Joint Committee

2.30   ***Within the scope of evidence, the Committee concludes that the Trust is compliant with the Core Standard.***

Core Standard C14C: Appropriate Actions to ensure that patients, their relatives and carers are assured that the organisation acts appropriately on concerns and makes charges where appropriate to ensure improvements in service delivery.

2.31   The Trust provided an example for responding to requests to provide "bed head" entertainment facilities for children, on initiative which is being rolled out across the Trust this year.

Core Standard C14C: Conclusions of the Joint Committee

2.32 ***The Committee noted the example given above as a positive indication of the Trust's compliance with the Core Standard.***

Core Standard C15: Food

2.33 The Trust make "Health Eating" options available to patients. However, promotion of this is not a prime objective, as children's own needs at a difficult time are often different and should be catered for. There are options always available as children's appetites vary quickly. Specialist dietary advice is available.

2.34 There are plans to refurbish the hospital restaurant, and to extend the range of healthy options on offer.

Core Standard C15: Conclusions of the Committee

2.35 ***The Joint Committee is satisfied with the Trust's compliance with the Core Standard. The individualised approach to meeting children's eating needs is appreciated.***

Date: 20 March 2008

	ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel
2.	Date:	4th April 2008
3.	Title:	Foundation Stage Assessment results: Summer 2007
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5.   Summary:

The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the performance of Rotherham children in Foundation Stage, in 2007.

6.   Recommendations:

- **That the report be received.**
- **That Members note the lower outcomes in the Foundation Stage profile**
- **That Members endorse the drive to encourage all schools to continue to improve their results, and strive to reflect outcomes more in line with national averages.**
- **That Members endorse the drive to improve standards, particularly in Communication, Language and Literacy, (CLLD) throughout Foundation Stage together with the attainment of boys and other vulnerable and underachieving groups.**

7.   Proposals and Details:

All schools must conduct a form of statutory assessment at the end of each Key Stage (ages 5, 7, 11, 14 and 16). The Foundation Stage Profile is assessed when children reach the end of Foundation Stage (age 5).

a) Overall Foundation Stage Results

Table 1, below, shows the average level of attainment of boys, the average level of attainment of girls and the overall, combined average level of attainment for all pupils, in each curriculum area, since 2005. The expected level of attainment for Foundation Stage children is a score of 6.

Table 1: Foundation Stage Assessment Summary 2005 - 2007:

LA Assessment	Boys average score			Girls average score			Overall average score		
	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007
Personal, Social & Emotional (PSE) – Disposition and Attitude	6.6	6.6	6.5	7.1	7.0	6.9	6.9	6.8	6.7
PSE – Social Development	5.9	6.0	5.8	6.6	6.5	6.3	6.2	6.2	6.0
PSE – Emotional Development	5.9	6.0	5.8	6.6	6.6	6.4	6.2	6.3	6.1
PSE - Area of Learning	6.1	6.2	6.0	6.8	6.7	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.3
Communication, Language & Literacy (CLL) – Language for Communicating & Thinking	5.8	5.9	5.6	6.4	6.4	6.2	6.0	6.1	5.9
CLL – Linking Sounds & Letters	5.0	5.3	5.1	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.4	5.6	5.5
CLL - Reading	5.5	5.6	5.5	6.1	6.1	6.0	5.7	5.9	5.8
CLL - Writing	4.7	4.9	4.7	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.1	5.2	5.2
CLL - Area of Learning	5.2	5.4	5.3	6.0	6.0	5.9	5.6	5.7	5.5
Maths – Numbers as Labels & for Counting	6.8	6.7	6.6	7.1	6.9	6.8	6.9	6.8	6.7
Maths - Calculating	5.7	5.7	5.3	6.1	5.9	5.6	5.8	5.8	5.4
Maths – Shape, Space & Measures	6.2	6.1	5.8	6.5	6.3	6.1	6.3	6.2	6.0
Maths - Area of Learning	6.2	6.1	5.9	6.6	6.4	6.1	6.3	6.3	6.0
Knowledge and Understanding of the World (KUW)	5.9	6.0	5.7	6.2	6.2	6.0	6.0	6.1	5.8
Physical Development (PD)	6.6	6.6	6.4	7.0	7.0	6.8	6.8	6.8	6.6
Creative Development (CD)	5.6	5.8	5.5	6.5	6.6	6.3	6.0	6.2	5.9

The national assessment profile for pupils at the end of the Foundation Stage (Foundation Stage Profile [FSP]) has been in place for five years. Increased security in the assessments made over recent years are judged to be a more valid and reliable indicator than those collected in 2003 and 2004. This has been achieved by extensive moderation activities undertaken by the majority of schools across Rotherham and led by members of the School Effectiveness Consultant workforce.

2007 outcomes were disappointing, most particularly following the improvements made in 2006. The average score for each assessment scale reported declines, except in writing where this maintained the standard reported in 2006. The most significant declines were reported in "Calculations" (Maths Area of Learning [AoL]), Knowledge and Understanding of the World and Creative Development. Assessment outcomes continue to show the weakest areas of capability are within Communication, Language and Literacy (CLLD) with an ongoing weakness in writing (average score 5.2).

The specific aspects of Numbers as Labels & for Counting (in Mathematical Development) and Dispositions & Attitude (within the Personal, Social and Emotional Development [PSED]) have maintained the stronger outcomes previously reported.

Boys continue to perform below girls in all assessment outcomes and most particularly in CLLD and Creative Development (CD). Declines from 2006 were more extensive and marked for boys than for girls.

Table 2, below, shows the new national measures that have been introduced, in relation to the Foundation Stage Profile outcomes. These are now key indicators and Local Authorities are required to set targets against each of these and submit them, for approval, to the DCSF.

Table 2: LA Level Foundation Stage Summary for 2005 - 07

	2005	**2006**	**2007**
% achieving 6+ in Personal, Social & Emotional Development	62.1%	62.8%	60.5%
% achieving 6+ in Communication, Language & Literacy	38.3%	42.5%	40.0%
% achieving 6+ in PSE & CLL	36.1%	39.5%	36.7%
Number of pupils in cohort	2,987	2,772	2,836
% achieving at least 78 points across the FSP	60.2%	61.6%	57.6%
% achieving at least 78 points and 6+ in PSE & CLL	36.0%	39.4%	36.6%

2007 outcomes reported declines against each of these measures, most particularly when compared to the improvements made in 2006. The ongoing low proportion of pupils reaching at least point 6 in CLLD continues to impact negatively on the majority of these indicators.

Foundation Stage Summary for 2005 to 2007 compared to the national profile

Table 3, shows the Foundation Stage summary from 2005 to 2007 comparing the percentage of children working below the Early Learning Goals (ELG), the percentage working at the Early Learning Goals and the percentage working above the Early Learning Goals for each year compared with the national profile.

Rotherham continues to report an overall profile of a greater proportion of pupils working below the Early Learning Goals and a lower proportion of pupils working above the Early Learning Goals than nationally. This picture reflects the profile of disadvantage in Rotherham as measured by the Index of Multiple Deprivation and using those factors that affect children. However, the national profile in 2007 reported declines in the proportion of pupils working above the Early Learning Goals in the majority of areas, often exceeding the declines reported by Rotherham, but the gap remains marked. This continuing lower profile in Rotherham presents significant challenges for Key Stage 1 provision in the drive to demonstrate overall performance, comparable with that nationally, by the end of this key stage.

Table 3: Foundation Stage Summary for 2005-07

Area of learning		LA 2005	National 2005	LA 2006	National 2006	LA 2007	National 2007
Personal, Social & Emotional Development							
PSE - DA	Working below ELGs	2	2	3	2	4	2
	Working at ELGs	91	76	91	81	90	84
	Working above ELGs	6	23	6	17	5	15
PSE - SD	Working below ELGs	6	4	7	4	8	4
	Working at ELGs	88	75	89	81	88	83
	Working above ELGs	5	21	4	15	4	13
PSE - ED	Working below ELGs	9	6	9	6	9	6
	Working at ELGs	87	74	87	80	87	82
	Working above ELGs	4	19	4	14	4	12
Communication, Language and Literacy							
CLL - LCT	Working below ELGs	10	6	10	6	13	6
	Working at ELGs	84	77	85	80	83	82
	Working above ELGs	5	18	4	13	3	11
CLL - LSL	Working below ELGs	23	16	20	17	20	14
	Working at ELGs	71	67	74	69	75	72
	Working above ELGs	5	17	5	14	5	13
CLL - Reading	Working below ELGs	11	7	10	8	12	8
	Working at ELGs	84	80	85	83	83	84
	Working above ELGs	4	12	4	9	4	9
CLL - Writing	Working below ELGs	22	15	22	17	22	15
	Working at ELGs	75	76	75	77	75	78
	Working above ELGs	2	9	2	6	2	6
Mathematical Development							
Maths - NLC	Working below ELGs	5	3	5	4	6	3
	Working at ELGs	82	72	86	78	85	78
	Working above ELGs	13	24	9	19	8	18
Maths - Cal	Working below ELGs	15	10	13	11	17	10
	Working at ELGs	81	77	82	80	77	82
	Working above ELGs	3	11	3	8	2	7
Maths - SSM	Working below ELGs	8	5	8	6	12	6
	Working at ELGs	85	79	86	83	83	84
	Working above ELGs	6	16	4	11	4	10
KUW	Working below ELGs	11	6	10	6	11	6
	Working at ELGs	87	85	88	88	87	90
	Working above ELGs	1	8	1	5	1	4
PD	Working below ELGs	4	3	5	3	6	3
	Working at ELGs	90	79	91	85	91	87
	Working above ELGs	5	18	4	12	3	10
CD	Working below ELGs	7	3	6	4	9	4
	Working at ELGs	92	85	91	89	89	91
	Working above ELGs	1	11	2	7	1	5

N.B. The total percentage may not be exactly 100 due to the rounding of figures

4

Actions taken

- A rigorous analysis of each school's results, considering natural context, gender balance, organisational features within the Foundation Stage and cohort size, has been undertaken
- On Entry Assessments to Foundation Stage have been formalised and collected by the Local Authority (LA) to establish an average level of capability, locally, for children as they enter formal education
- Concerns related to the declines reported have been shared with all Headteachers
- An extensive programme of central training in the teaching of phonics has been provided to all Foundation Stage providers
- Consultant and Lead Teacher support has been targeted to those schools reporting the greatest declines, most particularly in PSED and CLLD
- New staff to Foundation Stage have been linked to a mentor
- Increased involvement of Family Learning Team to strengthen parents' support for children prior to entering and during Foundation Stage
- Ongoing support for high quality provision within Early Years and Foundation Stage
- A Headteacher task group has been established to promote improved standards across all maintained sectors

Actions to be taken

- The appointment of an additional consultant for CLLD, funded by the National Primary Strategy, to be made
- Launch of "Imagination Library" will raise the status of reading across Rotherham and will support an increased level of involvement and interaction with high quality books from a very early age
- An external joint review of Foundation Stage provision is to be undertaken by the National Primary Strategy (NPS) and the School Effectiveness Service
- Visits to be made to high performing LAs, recommended by NPS
- Further cross LA moderation in Foundation Stage, most particularly with LAs with similar contexts to those of Rotherham that are reporting more positive results than Rotherham

8.   Finance:

Funding for the identification of, intervention in and support for schools that are underachieving is a key focus for the core budget of the School Effectiveness Service.

9.   Risks and Uncertainties:

Should Rotherham's schools continue to show low and declining outcomes at the end of Foundation Stage this could result in:

- Declining and lower standards at the end of KS1 and KS2
- Significant numbers of children underachieving and reduces their opportunities post statutory education
- The Council's rating, in relation to the quality of services and its statutory responsibility to raise standards will be affected through the CPA and APA systems
- The Council's intervention rating with DCSF could be increased.

5

10.   Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:
Pupil achievement is a key performance indicator (Learning), in the Community Strategy, the Corporate Plan, the Children and Young People's Single Plan and Local Area Agreement.

11.   Background Papers and Consultation:
Foundation Stage Assessment results: Summer 2006

Contact Name:
Helen Rogers,
Assistant Head of School Effectiveness
T: ext 2591
E: helen.rogers@rotherham.gov.uk:

Agenda Item 11

	ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS	

1.	Meeting:	Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel
2.	Date:	4th April 2008
3.	Title:	Key Stage 1 Assessment Results: Summer 2007
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5.   Summary:

The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the performance of Rotherham children at the end of Key Stage 1, in 2007.

6.   Recommendations:

- **That the report be received.**
- **That Members note the improvements in the Key stage 1 profile and also the declines, when compared to the national trend**
- **That Members endorse the drive to encourage all schools to continue to improve their results, and strive to reflect outcomes at least in line with national averages.**
- **That Members endorse the drive to improve standards, particularly in Reading, throughout this key stage together with the attainment of boys and other vulnerable and underachieving groups.**

7.   Proposals and Details:

All schools must conduct a form of statutory assessment at the end of each Key Stage (ages 5, 7, 11, 14 and 16). At the end of Key Stage 1 (age 7) children undertake a formal assessment, informed by Statutory Assessment Tasks (SATs) which, from 2005, have been reported as teacher assessment.

a) Overall Results for Key Stage 1

Table 1 below shows the percentage of pupils achieving the nationally reported level of Level 2 and above from 2004 to 2007. However, it is valuable to focus on Level 2B and above as this is considered to be the critical level for on-going, average achievement in other key stages. From 2005 the results were based on Teacher Assessment

Table 1:

Subject	2004	2005 TA	2006 TA	2007 TA	Diff 06-07	2007 National (% change)	Diff between Rotherham and National
En2: L2+	81%	82%	80%	80%	0%	84% (0%)	-4%
En2: L2B+	67%	70%	66%	67%	+1%	71% (0%)	-4%
En2: L3+	27%	26%	24%	25%	+1%	26% (0%)	-1%
En3: L2+	79%	81%	80%	78%	-2%	80% (-1%)	-2%
En3: L2B+	60%	62%	60%	57%	-3%	59% (-1%)	-2%
En3: L3+	15%	16%	13%	13%	0%	14% (-1%)	-1%
Ma: L2+	89%	89%	88%	88%	0%	90% (0%)	-2%
Ma: L2B+	75%	74%	70%	72%	+2%	74% (+1%)	-2%
Ma: L3+	28%	23%	21%	23%	+2%	22% (+1%)	+1%
Sc: L2+	88%	88%	87%	87%	0%	89% (0%)	-2%
Sc: L3+	26%	27%	26%	24%	-2%	23% (-1%)	+1%

Attainment at the end of KS1 has remained broadly static over the last 4 years, reporting standards below the national averages in all aspects except L3+ mathematics and science, which are slightly above. There has been some variability between subjects and levels over the period 2004 to 2007, however gains and declines have, in the majority of instances, followed the national trend. The exception has been in reading, which remains the furthest distance from the national (Average Point Score [APS]), but 2007 results at L2B+ were slightly above the national (+1%).

From a closer comparison with national averages at L2B+ in writing and mathematics in 2004, Rotherham standards are now below, although improvements in 2007 in mathematics at this level exceeded the national trend by 1%.

L3+ standards compare most positively with the national profile and that of statistical neighbours. The proportion of pupils working below L2+ is of concern to the LA, most particularly relating to boys' attainment at level 1.

Both Rotherham's and the national results showed a varying trend of improvement in 2007. Rotherham reported greater gains than the national at L2B+ and L3+ in both reading and mathematics. However the declines in Rotherham were more marked at L2+ and L2B+ in writing and L3+ in science than nationally.

Results for Vulnerable Groups
Appendix 1 and 2 show the Key Stage 1 results for those groups of pupils identified, in Rotherham as being vulnerable and/or likely to underachieve.

Gender
In reading and writing the difference in performance between girls and boys remains a significant issue both locally and nationally. The reduced gap between girls and boys performance in 2006 has not been maintained and in 2007 gender differences returned to being more in line with those reported in previous years. Girls attained more strongly in 2007 than in 2006 in all areas except L2B+ writing, while boys reported slight declines from 2006 in all areas except L2B+ mathematics where a slight improvement was noted. The gender differences in Rotherham exceed those nationally in both reading and writing at all levels while mathematics is more in line with the national and does not reflect the same significance.

Ethnicity
White British (WB) pupils continue to perform higher than pupils from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds (BME).
The improvement in reading at L2+, reported for BME pupils in 2006 has not been maintained in 2007, while WB pupils made slight gains. However, further improvements were made at L3+ by both groups in reading and that made by BME pupils (+3.7%) exceeded that of WB pupils (+0.5%) and therefore continued to reduce the difference in performance between the two groups at this higher level (8%). Improvements by girls contributed to this more positive profile.

Both groups reported further declines in writing at L2+, and although BME boys did report gains (+2.4%) in 2007, the overall decline for BME pupils overall was more marked than that of WB pupils. However good improvements were made by BME pupils (+2.8%) at the higher level of 3+ compared to a slight decline by WB pupils. The gains, made by BME girls (+8%), were significant and contributed to performance that exceeded that of WB girls for the first time. The overall performance of both groups in 2007 at L3+ in writing was similar.

The overall performance of BME pupils in mathematics at both levels declined in 2007, compared to slight improvements by WB pupils.

Actions taken
- Rigorous analysis of each school's results, considering natural context, gender balance, organisational features and cohort size, has been undertaken
- Progress measures from the FSP to end of Key Stage 1 have been provided to all schools
- All Headteachers have been informed of the ongoing low profile in reading and the high proportion of pupils failing to reach L2+ in reading, writing and mathematics
- A rigorous programme of training for all KS1 providers was undertaken in the summer term 2007, in the teaching of phonics, following the recommendations from the Rose Review
- The inclusion of a focus on Key Stage 1 standards and achievement in schools involved in the Intensifying Support Programme

Further actions to be taken
- Primary School Improvement Partners (SIPs) have been alerted to the above priorities for KS1 and will challenge instances of underperformance in each of the areas where appropriate.
- The School Effectiveness Service (SES) will use an unprecedented evidence base to broker and commission support across the school system.
- A rigorous and extensive programme of centrally led training in the National Primary Strategy Renewed Frameworks is being undertaken
- 2 of the 10 Lead Partner Schools are highly effective Infant Schools and are linked to 4 Primary Schools that cater for the 3 to 11 age range.
- 3 highly effective Infant Schools with high standards in reading have linked to create Lead Learning Centres for Reading at KS1.
- SES has developed an electronic programme on "Target Getting", drawing together locally and nationally developed materials to support teaching and learning across all key stages in the primary phase.
- A new Adviser for Assessment has been appointed. She has a strong background in securing effective Assessment for Learning (AfL) practices at school and LA level. AfL will be a key element of all training and support provided.
- A programme of inspirational speakers has been confirmed for Headteacher Meetings during 2007/08 with a specific focus on "The Leadership of Learning"

8.   Finance:
Funding for the identification of, intervention in and support for schools that are underachieving is a key focus for the core budget of the School Effectiveness Service.

9.   Risks and Uncertainties:
Should Rotherham's schools show insufficient progress this could result in:
- Declining and lower standards at the end of KS2
- Significant numbers of children underachieving and reduces their opportunities post statutory education
- The Council's rating, in relation to the quality of services and its statutory responsibility to raise standards will be affected through the CPA and APA systems
- The Council's intervention rating with DCSF could be increased.

10.   Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:
Pupil achievement is a key performance indicator (Learning), in the Community Strategy, the Corporate Plan, the Children and Young People's Single Plan and the Local Area Agreement.

11.   Background Papers and Consultation:
Key Stage 1 Assessment results: Summer 2005 – Report to Cabinet – 2006
Key Stage 1 Assessment results: Summer 2006 – Report to Cabinet – 2007

Contact Name:
Helen Rogers,
Assistant Head of School Effectiveness
T: ext 2591
E: helen.rogers@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1
Performance of Boys and Girls 2004 - 2007 (Gender)

Reading L2+	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	76.1%	76.0%	75.8%	74.2%
Rotherham Girls	85.3%	88.8%	84.5%	85.3%
National Boys	81.0%	81.0%	80.0%	80.0%
National Girls	89.0%	89.0%	89.0%	88.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	9.2%	12.8%	8.7%	11.1%
G-B Diff National	8.0%	8.0%	9.0%	8.0%

Reading LB+	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	61.1%	62.7%	61.2%	60.3%
Rotherham Girls	74.1%	77.1%	70.9%	74.0%
National Boys	65.0%	67.0%	66.0%	66.0%
National Girls	76.0%	78.0%	77.0%	77.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	13.0%	14.4%	9.7%	13.7%
G-B Diff National	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%

Reading L3	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	22.0%	20.2%	20.4%	19.8%
Rotherham Girls	32.1%	31.7%	27.9%	30.9%
National Boys	24.0%	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%
National Girls	33.0%	32.0%	30.0%	30.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	10.1%	11.5%	7.5%	11.1%
G-B Diff National	9.0%	10.0%	9.0%	8.0%

Writing L2+	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	72.8%	75.3%	74.7%	71.0%
Rotherham Girls	85.9%	87.5%	84.7%	85.1%
National Boys	76.0%	77.0%	76.0%	75.0%
National Girls	87.0%	88.0%	87.0%	86.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	13.1%	12.2%	10.0%	14.1%
G-B Diff National	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%

Writing L2B+	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	51.3%	51.9%	51.5%	48.2%
Rotherham Girls	70.0%	72.6%	67.2%	66.1%
National Boys	53.0%	54.0%	52.0%	51.0%
National Girls	70.0%	70.0%	69.0%	67.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	18.7%	20.7%	15.7%	17.9%
G-B Diff National	17.0%	16.0%	17.0%	16.0%

Writing L3	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	10.1%	10.7%	8.9%	7.5%
Rotherham Girls	20.8%	20.8%	17.3%	17.7%
National Boys	11.0%	10.0%	9.0%	9.0%
National Girls	21.0%	20.0%	19.0%	17.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	10.7%	10.1%	8.4%	10.2%
G-B Diff National	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	8.0%

Maths L2+	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	87.0%	87.6%	87.0%	86.0%
Rotherham Girls	90.8%	91.2%	88.7%	89.8%
National Boys	89.0%	90.0%	89.0%	88.0%
National Girls	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	91.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	3.8%	3.6%	1.7%	3.8%
G-B Diff National	3.0%	2.0%	3.0%	3.0%

Maths LB+	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	71.8%	71.3%	69.6%	70.1%
Rotherham Girls	77.4%	75.8%	69.4%	74.1%
National Boys	74.0%	73.0%	72.0%	73.0%
National Girls	76.0%	75.0%	74.0%	75.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	5.6%	4.5%	-0.2%	4.0%
G-B Diff National	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Maths L3	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham Boys	29.3%	23.5%	24.1%	23.0%
Rotherham Girls	26.3%	21.4%	18.8%	22.5%
National Boys	31.0%	25.0%	24.0%	24.0%
National Girls	25.0%	20.0%	19.0%	20.0%
G-B Diff Rotherham	-3.0%	-2.1%	-5.3%	-0.5%
G-B Diff National	-6.0%	-5.0%	-5.0%	-4.0%

Appendix 2
Ethnicity 2005 - 2007
(i) Reading

Boys	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	65.9	8.5	67.9	14.3	63.8	10.1
White British	76.9	21.2	76.6	21.0	75.4	21
Difference	11	12.7	8.7	6.7	11.6	10.9

Girls	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	81.4	18.0	81.9	15	72.1	25.6
White British	89.6	33.3	84.8	29.4	87.1	31.7
Difference	8.2	15.3	2.9	14.4	15	6.1

Overall	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	74.5	13.8	75.6	14.7	68.2	18.4
White British	83.1	27.1	80.8	25.3	81.3	26.4
Difference	8.6	13.3	5.2	10.6	13.1	8

(ii) Writing

Boys	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	67.4	6.2	64.7	6.5	69.1	3.4
White British	76	11	75.7	9.2	71.5	8
Difference	8.6	4.8	11	2.7	2.4	4.6

Girls	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	80.1	11.8	80.7	10.6	72.2	18.6
White British	88.4	21.9	85.2	18.1	86.8	17.6
Difference	8.3	10.1	4.5	7.5	14.6	-1

Overall	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	74.5	9.3	73.6	8.7	70.4	11.5
White British	82	16.3	80.6	13.7	79.2	12.9
Difference	7.5	7	7	5	8.8	1.4

(iii) Maths

Boys	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	86	14.7	81.3	15.1	81.9	14.8
White British	87.7	24.2	87.7	25	86.6	24
Difference	1.7	9.5	6.4	9.9	4.7	9.2

Girls	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	84.5	9.9	86.9	13.1	77.3	11
White British	92	22.8	88.9	19.4	91.5	24.1
Difference	7.5	12.9	2	6.3	14.2	13.1

Overall	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3	Level 2+	Level 3
BME *	85.2	12.1	84.3	14	79.4	12.8
White British	89.8	23.5	88.3	22.2	89.1	24
Difference	4.6	11.4	4	8.2	9.7	11.2

* Black and Minority Ethnic background

	ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS	

1.	Meeting:	Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel
2.	Date:	4th April 2008
3.	Title:	Summer 2007 Key Stage 2 Assessment Results
4.	Directorate:	Children & Young People's Services

5.   Summary:

The purpose of this report is to inform Members of performance in Rotherham primary schools, at the end of Key Stage 2, in 2007.

6.   Recommendations:

- That the report be received.
- That Members note the improvements in performance in Key Stage 2, most particularly when compared to those reported nationally
- That Members support the drive to encourage all schools to continue to improve their results, and strive to reflect outcomes at least in line with national averages.
- That Members endorse the drive to reduce the number of schools below DfES floor target of 65%, improve boys' attainment and that of BME pupils and Looked After Children.

7.   Proposals and Details:
All schools must conduct a form of statutory assessment at the end of each Key Stage (ages 5, 7, 11, 14 and 16). At the end of Key Stage 2 (age 11) pupils undertake the externally marked Statutory Assessment Tests (SATs).

a) Overall Key Stage 2 Results
Table 1, below, shows the percentage of pupils achieving the average level of attainment (Level 4) and above, in each curriculum area, since 2002.

Table 1:

SUBJECT	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Diff 06-07	2007 National (%change)	Diff in R'ham and National
PERCENTAGE L4+									
English SAT	70%	70%	73%	77%	73%	76.0%	3.0%	80% (+1%)	-4%
Reading SAT	76%	76%	79%	82%	78%	80.0%	2.0%	84% (+1%)	-4%
Writing SAT	55%	57%	59%	62%	61%	63.0%	2.0%	67% (0%)	-4%
Mathematics SAT	73%	69%	71%	74%	71%	72.0%	1.0%	77% (+1%)	-5%
Science SAT	86%	85%	84%	86%	82%	84.0%	2.0%	88% (+1%)	-4%
PERCENTAGE L5									
English SAT	22%	21%	21%	24%	25%	26.0%	1.0%	34% (+2%)	-8%
Reading SAT	31%	34%	34%	37%	39%	39.0%	0.0%	48% (+1%)	-9%
Writing SAT	14%	13%	13%	14%	13%	15.0%	2.0%	19% (+1%)	-4%
Mathematics SAT	25%	25%	27%	29%	28%	26.0%	-2.0%	32% (-1%)	-6%
Science SAT	36%	37%	41%	44%	39%	40.0%	1.0%	46% (0%)	-6%

Rotherham's improvements at L4+ in 2007 exceeded those nationally in all areas, except mathematics which was in line, and regained some of the ground lost in 2006. This improvement was most significant in English. The gains made at L5+ were less successful, with only writing and science at this higher level reporting improvements above the national.

The 2007 Key Stage 2 Level 4+ results were encouraging, most particularly following the declines reported in 2006, but they did not match the school's aggregated target of 79% for both English and mathematics at this level, for this cohort. While only writing matched the high performance reported in 2005, all L4+ outcomes were above those reported in 2004. The gap in performance between Rotherham and those nationally was 4% in all subjects/aspects except mathematics, which reported a distance of 5%. Matching at least national averages at this level remains a priority for Rotherham.

The higher performance at Level 5+ did reflect some gains from 2006 (English, writing and science), but mathematics at this level once again reported a decline. All aspects of English at L5+ present an improving trend over the last 4 years, with 2007 results reflecting the highest outcomes to date. L5+ attainment remains some distance from those reported nationally. (English -8%, Reading -9%, Writing -4%, Mathematics -6% and Science -6%). Improving performance at this higher level is a particular focus for 2007/08.

The tables below (2a, 2b and 2c) show the performance of vulnerable and underachieving groups across English, mathematics and science since 2003.

b) Vulnerable Groups

Table 2a: Performance of Boys and Girls (Gender)

English L4+	2004	2005	2006	2007
LA Boys	67.3%	71.3%	67.3%	70.0%
LA Girls	78.3%	81.1%	80.1%	82.0%
National Boys	72.0%	74.0%	74.0%	76.0%
National Girls	83.0%	84.0%	85.0%	85.0%
G-B LA	11.0%	9.8%	12.8%	12.0%
G-B National	11.0%	10.0%	11.0%	9.0%

Maths L4+	2004	2005	2006	2007
LA Boys	71.4%	73.9%	70.8%	73.0%
LA Girls	70.2%	73.5%	70.8%	71.0%
National Boys	74.0%	76.0%	77.0%	78.0%
National Girls	74.0%	75.0%	75.0%	76.0%
G-B LA	-1.2%	-0.4%	0.0%	-2.0%
G-B National	0.0%	-1.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%

Science L4+	2004	2005	2006	2007
LA Boys	84.8%	86.1%	80.9%	83.0%
LA Girls	83.3%	85.3%	82.8%	85.0%
National Boys	86.0%	86.0%	86.0%	87.0%
National Girls	86.0%	87.0%	87.0%	88.0%
G-B LA	-1.5%	-0.8%	1.9%	2.0%
G-B National	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%

English L5	2004	2005	2006	2007
LA Boys	16.8%	18.3%	19.3%	20.0%
LA Girls	26.4%	29.7%	31.4%	32.0%
National Boys	21.0%	21.0%	26.0%	28.0%
National Girls	33.0%	33.0%	39.0%	39.0%
G-B LA	9.6%	11.4%	12.1%	12.0%
G-B National	12.0%	12.0%	13.0%	11.0%

Maths L5	2004	2005	2006	2007
LA Boys	28.4%	31.5%	29.9%	28.0%
LA Girls	26.3%	26.5%	25.4%	24.0%
National Boys	33.0%	33.0%	36.0%	35.0%
National Girls	29.0%	28.0%	31.0%	30.0%
G-B LA	-2.1%	-5.0%	-4.5%	-4.0%

G-B National	-4.0%	-5.0%	-5.0%	-5.0%

Science L5	2004	2005	2006	2007
LA Boys	40.7%	44.5%	38.5%	39.0%
LA Girls	41.0%	44.1%	39.8%	40.0%
National Boys	43.0%	48.0%	45.0%	46.0%
National Girls	42.0%	46.0%	46.0%	46.0%
G-B LA	0.3%	-0.4%	1.3%	1.0%
G-B National	-1.0%	-2.0%	1.0%	0.0%

The performance of boys and girls continued to show differences in the attainment between each group, most particularly in English. However, these differences were broadly in line with those reported nationally, although L4+ English was more marked. Girls outperformed boys in English and science at both L4+ and L5+, while boys' performance was stronger than that of girls in mathematics. Both boys and girls performed below the national averages for each group in all subjects in 2007 and at both Levels 4+ and 5+. However boys' improvement rate from 2006 exceeded that of girls in the majority of L4+ areas, only Writing and Science were comparable. This more positive improvement rate for boys was also evident at L5+ in Reading and Science, while only Writing and Mathematics favoured girls. The more marked gender differences reported in 2006 have been narrowed in 2007, most particularly in Reading.

Table 2b: Ethnicity

English

Boys	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	67.3	12.7	57.1	12.5	61.2	11.5
White British	71.7	18.8	68.4	20.1	70.2	21.0
Difference	4.4	6.1	11.2	7.6	9.0	9.5

Girls	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	78.0	23.6	72.3	21.8	73.2	23.3
White British	82.1	30.2	80.7	32.2	83.2	33.0
Difference	4.1	6.6	8.4	10.3	10.0	9.7

Overall	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	72.2	17.7	63.6	16.4	67.3	17.4
White British	76.9	24.5	74.3	25.9	77.0	27.0
Difference	4.7	6.8	10.7	9.5	9.7	9.6

Maths

Boys	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	69.3	29.3	56.0	23.8	64.0	18.7
White British	74.3	31.7	72.5	30.5	74.4	29.1

Difference	5	2.4	16.5	6.7	10.4	10.4

Girls	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	65.4	23.6	56.3	18.5	62.7	24.6
White British	74.2	26.7	71.9	26.0	72.4	24.2
Difference	8.8	3.1	15.6	7.5	9.7	-0.4

Overall	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	67.5	27.1	56.3	21.7	63.3	21.7
White British	74.3	29.2	72.2	28.4	73.4	26.7
Difference	6.8	2.1	15.9	6.7	10.1	5.0

Science

Boys	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	76	34	70.8	20.8	70.7	29.3
White British	87.1	45.5	82.0	40.4	84.3	40.1
Difference	11.1	11.5	11.2	19.6	13.6	10.8

Girls	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	81.1	32.3	65.5	24.4	69.7	28.2
White British	85.6	45.1	84.2	41.1	87.1	41.4
Difference	4.5	12.8	18.7	16.7	17.4	13.2

Overall	2005		2006		2007	
	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5	Level 4+	Level 5
BME*	78.3	33.2	68.9	22.4	70.2	28.7
White British	86.4	45.3	83.1	40.7	85.7	40.7
Difference	8.1	12.1	14.2	18.3	15.5	12.0

Black and Minority Ethnic background

The proportion of pupils from backgrounds, other than White British, was broadly similar to the 2006 cohort, although the proportion of pupils from Asian/Pakistani (APKN) background was marginally lower and those from MWBC was slightly higher. Improvements for these minority groups were above those for White British pupils in the majority of subjects at L4+, although more variable at L5+. Pupils from Mixed/ White/ Black Caribbean (MWBC) backgrounds significantly exceeded the LA averages at L4+, while the gap was narrowed for pupils from APKN at L4+ in English and Mathematics and most significantly at L5+ Mathematics and Science.

APKN girls continued to outperform APKN boys at L4+ and L5+ English and Mathematics while attainment remained similar in Science at this level. MWBC girls outperformed boys in English at both levels, reversing the previous trend in this subject. Girls and boys attainment profile at L4+ in Mathematics was more comparable than in 2006. Boys' attainment at L5+ was higher than that of girls in Mathematics and Science, reporting significant gains for boys at this level.

Table 2c: Comparative Data for Looked After Children

Percentage of looked after children achieving L4+ at KS2 in **English** 2004–2007

	2004	2005	2006	2007
% achieving L4+	21.0	62	36.4	29.0
Rotherham LAC Cohort	15	15	22	24
ENGLAND	39.9	42.1	*	*

Percentage of looked after children achieving L4+ at KS2 in **Maths** 2004- 2007

	2004	2005	2006	2007
% achieving L4+	31.0	62	50.0	33.3
Rotherham LAC Cohort	15	15	22	24
ENGLAND	37.2	37.6	*	*

Percentage of looked after children achieving L4+ at KS2 in **Science** 2004- 2007

	2004	2005	2006	2007
% achieving L4+	35.3	69	68.2	41.7
Rotherham LAC Cohort	15	15	22	24
ENGLAND	53.0	53.4	*	*

* National Data for KS2 achievement hasn't been published since 2005

2007 reported the highest number of Looked After Children within a Year 6 cohort over the last 4 years. The proportion of pupils attaining level 4+ fell once again in 2007 in all subjects at L4+.

c) 1998 - 2007 KEY STAGE 2 COMPARISONS
Table 3 gives the results from 1998 -2006 showing the percentage of pupils achieving Level 4 and above together with the number of school where the overall percentage of children achieving Level 4+ is 90% and above, below 50% and the number of schools below the DfES floor target of 65%.

Table 3:

SCHOOLS ACHIEVING:	% of pupils achieving L4+ overall	Number of schools achieving 90%+ at L4+	Number of schools achieving <50% at L4+	Number of schools achieving <65% at L4+ (DfES Floor Target)
ENGLISH SAT 2007	76%	18	5	16
ENGLISH SAT 2006	73%	14	7	19
ENGLISH SAT 2005	77%	16	3	14
ENGLISH SAT 2004	73%	14	5	19
ENGLISH SAT 2003	70%	6	7	26
ENGLISH SAT 2002	70%	6	12	33
ENGLISH SAT 2001	72%	8	6	23
ENGLISH SAT 2000	71%	9	7	23
ENGLISH SAT 1999	64%	6	12	39
ENGLISH SAT 1998	55%	1	26	54

SCHOOLS ACHIEVING:	% of pupils achieving L4+ overall	Number of schools achieving 90%+ at L4+	Number of schools achieving <50% at L4+	Number of schools achieving <65% at L4+ (DfES Floor Target)
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 2007	80%	21	4	11
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 2006	78%	18	3	13
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 2005	82%	25	1	3
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 2004	79%	25	3	9
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 2003	76%	14	5	14
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 2002	74%	14	5	19
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 2001	78%	19	5	13
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 2000	79%	23	2	11
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 1999	74%	12	3	21
ENGLISH (READING) SAT 1998	60%	2	18	46
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 2007	63%	5	19	41
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 2006	61%	4	19	45
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 2005	62%	4	18	44
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 2004	59%	3	21	45
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 2003	57%	0	25	57
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 2002	55%	1	32	63
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 2001	55%	1	26	58
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 2000	53%	2	27	67
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 1999	48%	1	43	65
ENGLISH (WRITING) SAT 1998	47%	0	46	71
MATHEMATICS SAT 2007	72%	10	6	19
MATHEMATICS SAT 2006	71%	11	10	27
MATHEMATICS SAT 2005	74%	13	4	15
MATHEMATICS SAT 2004	72%	7	6	21
MATHEMATICS SAT 2003	69%	3	7	29
MATHEMATICS SAT 2002	73%	12	10	27
MATHEMATICS SAT 2001	71%	13	9	26
MATHEMATICS SAT 2000	71%	14	8	24
MATHEMATICS SAT 1999	63%	9	14	42
MATHEMATICS SAT 1998	49%	0	39	65
SCIENCE SAT 2007	84%	41	1	8
SCIENCE SAT 2006	82%	32	3	13
SCIENCE SAT 2005	86%	40	0	3
SCIENCE SAT 2004	84%	43	3	7
SCIENCE SAT 2003	85%	34	2	7
SCIENCE SAT 2002	86%	41	1	7
SCIENCE SAT 2001	88%	48	0	1
SCIENCE SAT 2000	83%	37	2	8
SCIENCE SAT 1999	74%	22	6	22
SCIENCE SAT 1998	60%	7	35	46

Floor Targets apply to English, mathematics and science

Another indicator to consider when evaluating performance is the number of schools with Key Stage 2 pupils (84 in all) attaining within specific attainment bands. The table above shows that the proportion of schools below floor targets of 65% was reduced in 2007 following the increases reported in 2006. The greatest reduction was reported in Mathematics (-8 schools) with 19 schools below this critical measure and 16 schools below in English. The number of schools with standards below 65% in both English and Mathematics remained significant, exceeding 10% of schools across Rotherham. There will be a continuing focus on reducing the number of schools below this measure, enhanced by the commitment to the nationally developed Intensifying Support Programme for schools.

Contextual Value Added (CVA) Summary
In 2005, OFSTED introduced a new Performance and Assessment measure. Previously progress was assessed by placing schools into groups according to the similarity of their prior attainment. Schools were given benchmark grades according to their performance compared with the other schools in their group. However, it was recognised that there are many other possible factors that affect pupils' progress that are not taken into account by this method.

In order to examine the progress attributable to the school from that due to other factors, Contextual Value Added (CVA) was introduced. This measure is now a key factor in judging school performance and has replaced the previous value added measure. It involves looking at the progress made by all pupils nationally in each year according to a wide range of contextual characteristics. The following factors contribute to this measure:
- Prior attainment
- SEN status
- Free school meals entitlement
- Whether English is an additional language
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Age
- Mobility
- Economic deprivation

Each pupil's expected progress from Key Stage 1 is calculated, taking account of the national data for all the above factors. Then each pupil's actual progress is compared to their expected progress. The difference indicates whether a pupil has progressed more or less than expected and by how much. These differences are then combined for all pupils to provide a contextual value added score for each school and compared against a national average of 100. Rotherham reported a collective CVA measure of 99.5, which was below the national average. However, 26 schools reported CVA above the national average of 100, and 9 of these were significantly above with scores exceeding 101.

Statutory Targets
Statutory targets for 2008 remain at 83% for both English and Mathematics. Targets for 2009 will be in line with the new regulations and will give due regard to (i) estimates according to Fisher Family Trust estimates - level D and (ii) improving individual school's quartile ranking as informed by RAISEonline.

Targets will exceed the current performance at L4+ in both English and Mathematics (65%). Primary School Improvement Partners have been trained in target setting in line with the new regulations and in the use of Rotherham's target setting processes.

Areas for Development
- Further improve standards in English and most particularly in Mathematics so that they are more closely aligned to statutory targets for 2008 (83%)
- Further reduce the number of schools below floor targets in English and Mathematics
- Improve conversion rates in both English and Mathematics so that a higher proportion of pupils make at least 2 National Curriculum levels progress during key stage 2
- Improve the performance of more able pupils therefore increasing the proportion of pupils that reach L5+ in all subjects
- Improve boys' achievement and standards
- Improve the achievement and standards of ethnic minority groups

8. Finance:

Resources, within the Council, to drive the school improvement agenda are a combination of core budget, DfES grant through the Standards Fund and income generation.

Schools also receive additional funding, through Standards Fund to address the national strategies for raising standards.

9. Risks and Uncertainties:

Should Rotherham's schools continue to show insufficient progress this could result in:
- Significant numbers of children underachieving and reduces their opportunities post statutory education
- The Council's rating, in relation to the quality of services and its statutory responsibility to raise standards will be affected through the CPA and APA systems
- The Council's intervention rating with DCSF could be increased.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

Pupil achievement is a key performance indicator (Learning), in the Community Strategy, the Corporate Plan, the Children and Young People's Single Plan and Local Area Agreement.

11. Background Papers and Consultation:

Summer 2004 Key Stage 2 Assessment Results – Report to Cabinet – 2004/05
Summer 2005 Key Stage 2 Assessment Results – Report to Cabinet – 2005/06
Summer 2006 Key Stage 2 Assessment Results – Report to Cabinet – 2006/07

Contact Name:
Helen Rogers
Assistant Head of School Effectiveness
Tel: Extension 2591
Email: helen.rogers@rotherham.gov.uk

	ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS	

1.	Meeting:	Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel
2.	Date:	4th April 2008
3.	Title:	GCSE Examination Results, 2007
4.	Directorate:	Children and Young People's Services

5.   Summary:

The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the GCSE examination results for 2007 and how they compare to previous years, to the national average and to the results of our statistical neighbours.

6.   Recommendations:

That:
- **The report be received.**
- **The Members note the improved levels of performance at the end of Key Stage 4.**
- **All schools are encouraged to continue to improve their results, and strive to achieve outcomes at least in line with the national rate of improvement.**
- **The Members endorse the drive to:**
  - **reduce the gap between Rotherham's performance and the national average performance;**
  - **improve boys' attainment,**
  - **improve the attainment of black, minority ethnic (BME) pupils and**
  - **improve the attainment of Looked After Children (LAC)**

7. Key Aspects of Performance

A. Overview

i. Performance at GCSE 5+A*-C across the LA rose for the fifth consecutive year.

ii. Although the overall LA improvement was constrained by the unusually large number of students in Special schools, the average GCSE profile across the 16 comprehensive cohorts rose 3.3% on 2006

iii. On the now critical 5+A*-C including English and Maths indicator, the LA average rose 1.5% against a national average increase of 0.9%.

iv. Performance at 5+A*-G including English and Maths also rose 1.5% against a national average improvement of 0.2%

v. 10 of the 16 schools matched Fischer Family Trust "D" measures for progress from KS2-4 and/or KS3-4, ie progress equal to that of the top 25% of students nationally.

vi. Progress and achievement at 16+ by ethnic minority students is increasingly positive for both boys and girls

vii. There was important improvement in key core subject departments in the Borough's most vulnerable schools, notably in English

B. Priority areas for action 2007/8

i. The collaborative programme focussed on 5+A*-G performance led by the Headteacher of Wingfield CS has been sustained for a second year. In 2006/7 it produced significant improvement in the 4 lowest – performing schools

ii. A parallel initiative focussed on 5+A*-C incl English and Maths led by a Consultant Headteacher is promising significant impact in 2008

iii. The culture of high expectations now pervasive across the secondary phase is exemplified in the aspirational targets set by schools for 2008 and 2009

iv. Both schools under Notice to Improve have received positive monitoring visits from HMI and are on track to remove the Notice in the current year

C. Strategic focus of School Effectiveness Service

i. Targetted support for underachievement is coordinated across the School Effectiveness Service, Consultant Headteachers and the nominated three lead consultancy schools

ii. The School Improvement Partner (SIP) programme has sharpened school self-evaluation, increased school leadership capacity and toughened the focus on Standards and Achievement. Rotherham's practice is judged to be Outstanding by the National Strategies

iii. Programmes promoting the development of senior leadership capacity in the secondary Phase are an area of excellence receiving regional and national recognition

iv. Core subject consultancy demonstrated significant impact in underperforming departments in 2007 and has been further reinforced

v. Partnership between schools and SES is close, responsive and productive

2

The reporting of GCSE results is often complicated by the different ways in which the results are expressed. Local Authority (LA) results are sometimes published, by different Government departments, to include all the pupils in the cohort (i.e. all the pupils in secondary and special schools), on other occasions the results only represent pupils in mainstream secondary schools.

The results used to compare schools and LA's nationally are the DCFS validated results that cover all pupils in secondary and special schools at the end of Key Stage 4. These figures are used in this report.

A new system for calculating the average point score of pupil's attainment was introduced in 2004. This now includes a wider range of GCSE equivalent qualifications. Comparisons, therefore, can only be made for 2004-2007 and not against performance in previous years.

In 2007 a new statistical neighbour model was introduced to replace the models previously used by Ofsted and the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI). The old models both had limitations as they were not designed to meet the needs of the new national and local structures for delivering children's services.

The rationale for the development of a new model was that there should be one set of statistical neighbours for children's services which everyone would use. The LA's designated to have similar characteristics to Rotherham has now changed; therefore, comparisons can not be made to previous years. The current SN group provides a more challenging set of comparators for Rotherham.

A.   Overall GCSE Results

Table A1: Overall 5+ A* - C GCSE Results 2003 - 2007

GCSE results	Rotherham (R) %	National (N) %	% Diff between R and N	Statistical Neighbours (SN) %	% Diff between R and SN
5+ A*-C					
2003	44.4	52.9	8.5	46.4	2.0
2004	45.9	53.7	7.8	47.0	1.1
2005	49.5	57.1	7.6	50.9	1.4
2006	52.2	59.2	7.0	53.8	1.6
2007	54.6	62.0	7.4	57.9	3.3

- The percentage of pupils attending special schools in the 2007 cohort was 2.3% -the largest recent percentage of the total school population.
- The percentage of pupils achieving 5+ GCSEs at the higher grade A*-C has increased from 52.2% in 2006 to 54.6% in 2007, against a national average of 59.2% in 2006 to 62.0% in 2007.
- This is an improvement of 2.4% for Rotherham schools (2006 to 2007), against a national improvement of 2.8%.

Table A2: Performance at 5+ A* - C (including English and Mathematics)

GCSE results	Rotherham (R) %	National (N) %	% Diff between R and N	Statistical Neighbours (SN) %	% Diff between R and SN
5+A*-C (including English and maths)					
2006	37.5	45.8	8.3	38.8	1.3
2007	39.0	46.7	7.7	40.3	1.3

- In 2006 a new performance indicator was included in the performance tables showing the proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more A*-C grades at GCSE **including** English and mathematics. This is a "harder test" and part of the Government's drive to improve literacy and numeracy skills.
- In 2007 39.0% of Rotherham pupils achieved 5+A*-C (including English and maths), against a national average of 46.7% and a statistical neighbour average of 40.3%.
- In 2007 Rotherham reduced the gap to national averages and sustained the difference to SNs despite the change in composition of that group
- In 2007:
  - 50.6% of pupils gained A* - C in English (60.0% nationally)
  - 48.1% gained A*-C in mathematics (55.0% nationally) and
  - 39.6% gained A*-C in English **and** mathematics combined (48.0% nationally).

Table A3: Performance at 5+ A* - G

GCSE results	Rotherham (R) %	National (N) %	% Diff between R and N	Statistical Neighbours (SN) %	% Diff between R and SN
5+ A*-G					
2003	88.3	88.8	0.5	90.0	1.7
2004	88.1	88.8	0.4	90.0	1.9
2005	88.2	90.2	2.0	89.0	0.8
2006	88.6	90.5	1.9	89.6	1.0
2007	89.4	91.7	2.3	91.1	1.7

- The percentage of pupils achieving 5+A*-G grades has increased by 0.8% with a improvement in the national average of 1.2%
- The gap between Rotherham's 5+A*-G performance and the national performance is 2.3%
- The gap between Rotherham's 5+A*-G performance and the performance of statistical neighbours is 1.7%

Table A4: Performance at 5+ A* - G (including English and mathematics)

GCSE results	Rotherham (R) %	National (N) %	% Diff between R and N	Statistical Neighbours (SN) %	% Diff between R and SN
5+A*-G (including English and maths)					
2003	85.4	86.3	0.9	N/A	N/A
2004	84.5	86.7	2.2	N/A	N/A
2005	86.5	88.0	1.5	86.9	0.4
2006	86.0	87.8	1.8	87.4	1.4
2007	87.5	87.9	0.4	88.8	1.3

- 87.5% of Rotherham pupils gained 5+A*-G (including English and mathematics), an increase of 1.5% from 2006.
- This is against a national average of 87.9% which increased by 0.1% from 2006 and the statistical neighbour average of 88.8%.

Table A5: Performance at 1+ A* - G

GCSE results	Rotherham (R) %	National (N) %	% Diff between R and N	Statistical Neighbours (SN) %	% Diff between R and SN
1+ A*-G					
2003	94.6	94.8	0.2	95.9	1.3
2004	95.0	95.9	0.9	95.9	0.9
2005	96.3	97.4	0.9	96.2	+0.1
2006	96.6	97.8	1.2	96.8	0.8
2007	97.0	98.9	1.9	97.6	0.6

- Only 3% of ex pupils in Rotherham left school in 2007 with no GCSE equivalent passes. The majority of these (2.3%) children were in special schools.

Table A6: Average Point Score (uncapped i.e all subjects taken))

GCSE results	Rotherham (R) %	National (N) %	% Diff between R and N	Statistical Neighbours (SN) %	% Diff between R and SN
APS (Uncapped)					
2004	310.1	325.0	14.9	340.6	30.5
2005	328.0	355.1	27.1	336.1	8.1
2006	337.8	365.0	27.2	351.8	14.0
2007	348.4	378.1	29.7	375.2	26.8

- The system for calculating the average point score of pupil's attainment was changed in 2004. Comparisons, therefore, can only be made for 2004-2007 and not against performance in previous years.
- The average (uncapped) point score for pupils in Rotherham is 348.4, an increase of 10.6 in 2007. This is 29.7 points below the national average and 26.8 points below the average for our statistical neighbours.

Table A7: Average Point Score (capped – i.e. results of the best 8 subjects taken)

GCSE results	Rotherham (R) %	National (N) %	% Diff between R and N	Statistical Neighbours (SN) %	% Diff between R and SN
APS (capped)					
2004	263.0	282.3	19.3	266.4	3.4
2005	270.6	291.8	21.2	273.9	3.3
2006	274.4	296.0	21.6	279.3	4.9
2007	281.5	303.1	21.6	290.2	8.7

The capped average points score is calculated, at the best 8 GCSEs or equivalent.
The average (capped) point score for pupils in Rotherham is 281.5, an increase of 7.1 in 2007. This is 21.6 points below the national average and 8.7 points below the average for our statistical neighbours.

B.   Progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 and Key Stage 3 to 4 (GCSE)

The system used by most schools, LAs and the DCSF to judge the progress of pupils is based on information provided by the Fischer Family Trust (FFT). This information shows the performance of pupils at the end of their previous Key Stage(s) and allows schools to predict how each pupil should perform at the next Key Stage. The FFT information gives two key pieces of information based on each pupil's prior performance:

– FFT B estimates - estimate the future performance of each pupil, and from this each school, <u>if they make as much progress as similar pupils in similar schools</u>
– FFT D estimates - estimate the future performance of each pupil, and from this each school, <u>if they make as much progress as the progress made by pupils in the top 25% of schools in terms of value-added</u>

- In 2007, 10 of the 16 secondary schools showed progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 in line with or better than the 5+A*-C FFT D estimates.
- In 2007, 10 of the 16 secondary schools showed progress from Key Stage 3 to Key Stage 4 in line with or better than the 5+A*-C FFT D estimates.

C.   Progress across Rotherham Schools

The Council, through its Single Plan for Children and Young People's Services, is striving to raise the attainment of pupils in all Rotherham schools. 10 secondary schools improved their 5+A*-C results in 2007 with three schools showing significantly improved results of 11% and over. 10 secondary schools improved their 5+A*-C (including English and Mathematics) results in 2007 with two schools showing significantly improved results of 12% and over. The focus for support in 2007/08 is on those schools where the progress of pupils from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 is less than that which would be expected in similar schools nationally using the estimates provided by the Fischer Family Trust data information system.

D.   Local Authority Results (against number of entries)

The entries for the range of courses that were available within Rotherham schools in 2007 are as follows:

– 24,999 entries for 50 GCSE full courses
– 2,716 entries for 7 GCSE short courses
– 393 entries for GNVQ foundation and intermediate courses
– 1250 entries for Vocational GCSE courses
– 2622 entries for Basic Skills, ELQ Bands, Key Skills and VRQ Levels

Table D1: The number of entries per pupil (GCSE full courses)

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Cohort	3294	3566	3548	3620	3666	3599	3735	3803
Entries	27,144	30,205	28,738	28,989	28,739	27,626	27,715	27,122
Entries per pupil	7.6	8.4	8.0	8.0	7.8	8.0	7.4	7.1

- In 2007 the pass rate, against entries was:
  - 97.9% for full courses
  - 94.3% for short courses
  - 91.1% for GNVQ courses
  - 98.4% for Vocational GCSEs.
- The average number of entries per pupil was 7.1.

E. Vulnerable Groups

(i)Gender

Table E1: Gap between Girls' and Boys' Performance at 5+A*-C from 2004 - 2007

5+A*-C	Boys		Girls		Difference	
	LA	Nat	LA	Nat	LA	Nat
2004	42.1	46.2	49.7	56.7	7.6	10.5
2005	43.0	52.2	56.1	62.0	13.1	9.8
2006	44.3	54.6	60.3	64.0	16.0	9.4
2007	48.8	57.7	60.5	66.4	11.7	8.7

- The gap between the performance of girls and boys at 5+A*-C has decreased in 2007 by 4.3%; this is due to an increase in boys' performance by 4.5% sustaining the improvement at GCSE over 4 years. Girls' performance improved only slightly between 2006/2007
- The gap in national performance between girls and boys is 8.7%, with a slight decrease of 0.7% from 2006.
- The gap nationally has reduced slightly each year.

Table E2: Analysis of Performance by Gender - 5+A*-C grades (including English and mathematics) (against cohort)

5+A*-C	Boys		Girls		Difference	
	LA	Nat	LA	Nat	LA	Nat
2005	30.7	40.7	42.3	49.1	11.6	8.4
2006	31.1	41.6	44.2	50.2	13.1	8.6
2007	32.7	42.4	45.5	51.2	12.8	8.8

- The gap between the performance of girls and boys at 5+A*-C (including English and maths) is 12.8% with a slight decrease of 0.3%.
- The gap in national performance between girls and boys is 8.8%, with a slight increase of 0.2%.

Table E3: Gap between Girls' and Boys' Performance in English from 2004 - 2007

English A*-C	Boys		Girls		Boy / Girl difference	
	LA	Nat	LA	Nat	LA	Nat
2004	37.9	45.7	53.8	62.2	15.9	16.5
2005	39.3	50.0	57.7	65.0	18.4	15.0
2006	38.0	51.0	62.0	67.0	24.0	16.0
2007	40.9	53.0	60.6	68.0	19.7	15.0

- The improvement in the performance of boys in English A*-C, is 2.9% from 2006 to 2007
- The increase in the percentage of Rotherham girls achieving A*-C in English from 2004 to 2006, is higher than the national rate of increase over this period.
- The gap between the performance of girls and boys at A*-C, in English, has decreased by 4.3% in 2007.
- The gap in the performance of boys and girls nationally, in English, has remained relatively static.

Table E4: **Gap between Girls' and Boys' Performance in <u>Mathematics</u> from 2004 - 2007**

Maths A*-C	Boys		Girls		Boy / Girl difference	
	LA	Nat	LA	Nat	LA	Nat
2004	40.9	45.7	42.3	48.5	1.4	2.8
2005	45.0	50.0	47.7	53.0	2.7	3.0
2006	45.0	52.0	50.0	55.0	5.0	3.0
2007	46.9	53.0	49.6	56.0	2.7	3.0

- The increase in the percentage of Rotherham boys achieving A*-C in mathematics, from 2004 to 2007, is 6.0% compared with a national boys increase of 7.3%.
- The increase in the percentage of Rotherham girls achieving A*-C in mathematics, from 2004 to 2007, is 7.3% compared with a national girls increase of 7.5%.
- The gap between the performance of girls and boys at A*-C, in mathematics, has decreased by 2.3% in 2007.
- The gap in performance of boys and girls nationally, in mathematics, has remained relatively static.

(ii)   Looked After Children

Table E5:   Percentage of Looked After Children (LAC) achieving 5+ GCSEs (or equivalent) at grade A*-G (2003- 2007)

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham %	52	28	29	50	26
Rotherham LAC Cohort No.	25	25	30	30	23
National %	36.8	39.4	40.7	NA	NA

Table E6:   Percentage of Looked After Children achieving 1+ GCSEs (or equivalent) at grade A*-G 2003-2007

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Rotherham %	72	40	65	70	61
Rotherham LAC Cohort No.	25	25	30	30	23
National %	52.9	56.1	60.2	43	44

- 8 LAC pupils attended special schools in the 2007 cohort.
- Care should be taken in comparing small numbers of pupils year on year.

iii) Performance by Ethnicity (mainstream schools)
Table E7: Performance by Ethnicity 2004 – 2007 (All pupils)

		Number in Group	3+ A* to A	5+ A* to C Inc Eng & Maths	5+ A* to C	5+ A* to G
2004	**BME**	238	10.4%	31.7%	47.1%	91.3%
	WBRI	3397	12.3%	33.6%	46.0%	89.5%
	ALL	3635	12.2%	33.5%	46.1%	89.6%
2005	**BME**	210	11.9%	31.9%	48.1%	90.5%
	WBRI	3355	13.3%	37.2%	50.1%	89.0%
	ALL	3565	13.2%	36.9%	50.0%	89.1%
2006	**BME**	250	15.5%	36.1%	51.2%	88.1%
	WBRI	3480	14.8%	38.3%	52.9%	89.7%
	ALL	3730	14.9%	38.1%	52.8%	89.6%
2007	**BME**	273	16.8%	39.9%	55.3%	93.0%
	WBRI	3427	14.5%	39.8%	55.4%	90.4%
	ALL	3700	14.7%	39.8%	55.4%	90.6%

(BME) Black and Minority Ethnic background
(WBRI) White British background

- The percentage of BME pupils has increased slightly from 2004 (6.5%) to 2007 (7.3%).
- The percentage of BME pupils achieving 3 or more GCSEs at grades A* or A, in 2006 and 2007, was higher than the percentage of WBR pupils. This is due largely to the marked improvement in the achievement of BME boys.
- The percentage of BME pupils achieving 5+A*-G BME was higher than the percentage of WBRI pupils by 2.6% in 2007.
- There was little difference between the performance of BME pupils and WBRI pupils in the percentage achieving 5+A*-C and 5+ A*-C (inc English and maths) in 2007.

Table E8: Performance by Ethnicity 2004 – 2007 (Girls)

		Number in Group	3+ A* to A	5+ A* to C Inc Eng & Maths	5+ A* to C	5+ A* to G
2004	**BME**	117	15.4%	38.5%	52.1%	94.9%
	WBRI	1701	13.6%	37.3%	49.7%	91.8%
	ALL	1818	13.8%	37.3%	49.9%	92.0%
2005	**BME**	104	12.5%	35.6%	48.1%	93.3%
	WBRI	1670	16.6%	43.0%	56.8%	92.0%
	ALL	1774	16.4%	42.6%	56.3%	92.1%

		Number in Group	3+ A* to A	5+ A* to C Inc Eng & Maths	5+ A* to C	5+ A* to G
2006	**BME**	121	14.9%	43.8%	62.0%	95.9%
	WBRI	1736	18.5%	44.6%	60.7%	93.4%
	ALL	1857	18.3%	44.5%	60.7%	93.5%
2007	**BME**	133	17.3%	47.4%	62.4%	95.5%
	WBRI	1712	18.9%	46.0%	60.9%	92.9%
	ALL	1845	18.8%	46.1%	61.0%	93.1%

- The performance of BME girls achieving 3+A* or A, is still slightly below WBRI girls, although the gap has narrowed from 2006.
- In 2007 BME girls out-performed WBRI girls achieving 5+A*-C including English and maths, 5+ A* - C and 5+ A* - G achievement

Table E9: Performance by Ethnicity 2004 – 2007 (Boys)

		Number in Group	3+ A* to A	5+ A* to C Inc Eng & Maths	5+ A* to C	5+ A* to G
2004	**BME**	121	5.8%	25.6%	43.0%	89.3%
	WBRI	1696	10.9%	30.0%	42.3%	87.1%
	ALL	1817	10.6%	29.7%	42.3%	87.3%
2005	**BME**	106	11.3%	28.3%	48.1%	87.7%
	WBRI	1685	10.0%	31.3%	43.3%	85.8%
	ALL	1791	10.1%	31.2%	43.6%	85.9%
2006	**BME**	129	16.3%	29.5%	41.9%	82.2%
	WBRI	1744	11.2%	32.2%	45.5%	86.5%
	ALL	1873	11.5%	32.0%	45.3%	86.2%
2007	**BME**	140	16.4%	32.9%	48.6%	90.7%
	WBRI	1716	10.1%	33.6%	49.9%	87.8%
	ALL	1856	10.6%	33.6%	49.8%	88.0%

- In 2006 and 2007 BME boys significantly outperformed WBRI boys achieving 3+A* or A
- At 5+A*-C (including English and maths) the gap between BME boys and WBRI boys has narrowed from 4.4% in 2004 to 0.7% in 2007

F.   Contextual Value Added (CVA)

In the autumn term of 2005, OFSTED introduced a new Performance and Assessment (PANDA) report, this has recently been replaced by RAISEonline (Reporting and Analysis for Improvement through School Self-Evaluation) a web-based interactive tool. Previously progress was assessed by placing schools into groups according to their similarity in prior attainment. Schools were given benchmark grades according to their performance compared with the other schools in their group. However it was recognised that there are many other possible factors that affect pupils' progress that are not taken into account by these methods.

The RAISE report uses a CVA model that OFSTED and the DCSF have worked together to derive. This involves looking at the progress observed amongst all pupils nationally in each year according to a wide range of contextual characteristics. The main factors in the models include:

- Prior attainment
- SEN status
- Free school meals entitlement
- Whether English is an additional language
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Age
- Mobility
- Economic deprivation

Each pupil's expected progress from an earlier Key Stage is calculated, taking into account the national data for all factors in the model. Then their actual progress is compared to their expected progress. The difference indicates whether a pupil has progressed more or less than expected and by how much. These differences are then combined for all pupils to provide a contextual value added score for each school.

The following tables provide a summary of the performance in Rotherham Key Stage 2-4 and Key Stage 3-4. This includes the overall CVA measure for each school, and core subject CVA scores relative to the national mean of 1000. Where the school value differs significantly from corresponding national value, sig+ or sig- is shown.

a) Key Stage 2-4
The total number of secondary schools in 2005 was 17. This reduced to 16 in 2006

Table F1:   Overall CVA – Number of schools designated in each category

	2005	2006	2007
Significance -	6	4	2
Significance - and declining	0	0	2
Significance - and improving	0	0	2
Significance +	3	5	1
Significance + and improving	1	0	0
Significance + and declining	0	0	0
No significance	6	7	9

Minus sign (-) means below national average
Plus sign (+) means above national average

- The overall profile of Rotherham schools from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 has moved closer to the national CVA profile with the majority of schools in 2007 (9) being in line with the national profile.
- 6 schools were significantly below the national profile
- 1 school was significantly above the national profile

Table F2:   Number of schools designated in each category for English CVA

	2005	2006	2007
Significance -	4	4	1
Significance - and declining	7	2	1
Significance - and improving	0	1	1
Significance +	1	2	2
Significance + and improving	1	1	0
Significance + and declining	0	0	0
No significance	3	6	11

Minus sign (-) means below national average
Plus sign (+) means above national average

- The English profile of Rotherham secondary schools has also moved closer to the national profile in 2007 with 11 schools being in line with the national profile.
- 3 schools were significantly below the national profile
- 2 school were above the national profile

Table F3: Number of schools designated in each category for Mathematics CVA

	2005	2006	2007
Significance -	2	2	1
Significance - and declining	3	3	3
Significance - and improving	0	1	1
Significance +	3	4	2
Significance + and improving	0	1	1
Significance + and declining	0	0	0
No significance	8	5	8

Minus sign (-) means below national average
Plus sign (+) means above national average

- The mathematics profile of Rotherham secondary schools has improved slightly on 2005 figures with 8 out of 16 schools in 2007 being in line with the national profile compared with 8 out of 17 in 2005
- 5 schools were sig. below and 3 school were sig. above the national profile

b)   Key Stage 3 - 4

Table F4:   Overall CVA – Number of schools designated in each category

	2005	2006	2007
Significance -	4	1	1
Significance - and declining	1	0	3
Significance - and improving	0	0	0
Significance +	4	5	2
Significance + and improving	2	2	1
Significance + and declining	0	0	0
No significance	5	8	9

Minus sign (-) means below national average
Plus sign (+) means above national average

- The overall profile of Rotherham schools from Key Stage 3 to Key Stage 4 has moved closer to the national CVA profile with the majority of schools in 2007 (9) being in line with the national profile.
- 4 schools were significantly below the national profile
- 2 school was significantly above the national profile

Table F5:   Number of schools designated in each category for English CVA

	2005	2006	2007
Significance -	4	5	1
Significance - and declining	4	1	1
Significance - and improving	2	0	0
Significance +	1	1	2
Significance + and improving	0	4	3
Significance + and declining	0	0	0
No significance	5	5	9

Minus sign (-) means below national average
Plus sign (+) means above national average

- The English profile of Rotherham secondary schools has also moved closer to the national profile in 2007 with 9 schools being in line with the national profile.
- 2 schools were significantly below the national profile
- 5 school were above the national profile

Table F6:   Number of schools designated in each category for mathematics CVA

	2005	2006	2007
Significance -	2	1	1
Significance - and declining	2	3	1
Significance - and improving	0	0	0
Significance +	3	3	3
Significance + and improving	2	2	2
Significance + and declining	0	1	0
No significance	7	6	9

Minus sign (-) means below national average
Plus sign (+) means above national average

- The mathematics profile of Rotherham secondary schools has also moved closer to the national profile in 2007 with 9 schools being in line with the national profile.
- 2 schools were significantly below the national profile
- 5 school were above the national profile

G.   LA Statistics for Individual Schools (against the year cohort)

Appendix A: **Rotherham's results compared with National and Statistical Neighbour (SN) averages**

A (i)   Rotherham LA, National and Statistical Neighbour averages 2007

A (ii)   Rotherham 5+A*-C results compared with Statistical Neighbour and National averages 2004-2007

A (iii)   Rotherham 5+A*-C progress compared with Statistical Neighbour and National averages over 4 years

Appendix B   **Schools Results**

B (i)   Percentage of pupils achieving 5+A*-C 2004-2007 and 5+A*-C including English and mathematics 2007 calculated against the Year 11 Cohort

B (ii)   Progress from 2004-2007 in the percentage of pupils achieving 5+A*-C calculated against the Year 11 Cohort

8.   Finance:

Resources, within the Council, to drive the school improvement agenda are a combination of core budget, DCFS grant through the Standards Fund and income.

Schools also receive additional funding, through Standards Fund, to address the national strategies agenda to raising standards.

9.   Risks and Uncertainties:

The level of achievement of Rotherham pupils on leaving statutory education will have a major impact on the re-generation of the area. Schools, working with the LA, are setting challenging targets and are striving to drive up the standards of attainment for all pupils.

The coherent implementation of a range of nationally funded projects will be instrumental in achieving this improvement. Failure to achieve the targets will limit the ecomomic prospects of the young people and could put this additional funding at risk.

10.   Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

Any plans arising from an analysis of this report should be consistent with the Community Strategy, the Corporate Plan, the Children and Young People's Single Plan and Local Area Agreement. The improvement actions should 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 quality of life;
	- increasing employment opportunities for local people.

11.   Background Papers and Consultation:

GCSE and 'A' Level Examination Results 2004 - Report to Education Cabinet 2005.
GCSE Examination Results 2005 - Report to Education Cabinet 2006.
GCSE Examination Results 2006 - Report to Education Cabinet 2007.

Contact Name:
David Light
Head of School Effectiveness

T: 01709 82555
E: david.light@rotherham.gov.uk

Agenda Item 14

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	**Meeting:**	**Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel**
2.	**Date:**	**4th April, 2008**
3.	**Title:**	**Work Programme 2008/09**
4.	**Directorate:**	**Chief Executive's** **All wards**

5.   **Summary**

To discuss the work programme for the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel for the 2008/09 municipal year.

6.   **Recommendations**

That

a. **The Panel identifies areas for future consideration to be fed into the draft work programme;**

b. **A planning session is organised to prioritise items for the year ahead;**

c. **Following the planning session, a work programme is submitted to the Panel for its approval**

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 Each scrutiny panel must plan its forward work programme on an annual basis structured in line with the Panel's terms of reference. This includes scrutiny of:

- Integrated Children and Young People's Service and their governance arrangements;
- Strategic partnerships related to the integrated services;
- Educational and training opportunities for children and young people;
- Children and Young People's Social Care and Health, including improving services to vulnerable children and young people

In addition, Members are reminded that the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel has specific responsibility for health scrutiny in relation to children and young people.

7.2 Over the previous three years, Members agreed that the work programme should be structured around the five themes of 'Every Child Matters'. These are as follows:

- Being safe
- Being healthy
- Enjoying and achieving
- Making a positive contribution
- Achieving economic well-being

Reports and presentations have been structured around these themes for example, the meeting on 'safe' examined the issue of domestic violence. In addition, monitoring meetings have been organised to examine performance and budgetary issues relevant to the service areas on a quarterly basis.

Issued addressed to date include:
- Children and Young People's Mental Health Services and update on Childhood Obesity ('Being Healthy' and 'Rotherham Alive')
- Young people 'Not in Education, Employment and Training' ('Achieving Economic Well-being' and 'Rotherham Achieving')
- Imagination Library ('Enjoying and Achieving' and 'Rotherham Learning')
- Readiness for Children's Trust Arrangement

An overview of the work covered by the panel over the 2007/08 municipal year is attached as Appendix A. A detailed review of the Panel's activities and achievements will be submitted to the next meeting of this Panel. This review will be included as part of the Scrutiny's Annual Report, which will be submitted in turn to full Council.

7.3 In June 2007, the Panel held a half day session "scrutinising the children and young people's agenda effectively" to identify priorities. From this session, several pieces of work were scheduled into the work programme. The feedback from the session was positive and it is suggested that a similar session is run with members to identify and prioritise issues for the forthcoming municipal year. The panel has already indicated that it wishes to consider how support is given to newly arrived children in more depth as part of the work programme for 2008/09.

8.   Finance

There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. However, recommendations arising from the panel may have financial implications should they be implemented.

9.   Risks and Uncertainties

9.1   The work programme is flexible and issues may be referred to the Panel which are not known about at this stage. The work programme therefore, must be realistic in terms of the Panel's capacity to properly examine issues that come before it. If additional items are added, the panel may have to re-prioritise which issues it wishes to scrutinise.

10.   Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Scrutiny panels have a key role in scrutinising the effectiveness of services. The areas identified for future scrutiny should complement the priorities identified in the Community Strategy, Corporate Plan, Local Area Agreement and the Every Child Matters agenda.

11.   Background Papers and Consultation

This report has been brought at the request of Cllr Ann Russell

Contact Name: Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Adviser Tel: (82)2765
caroline.webb@rotherham.gov.uk

Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Panel   **APPENDIX A**

Work Programme 2007/08

Month/	Theme	Other Reports	Monitoring
June 1st	• Draft work programme and panel remit		
July 6th	• Readiness for children's trust arrangements	• Children and young people's single plan	• 2006/07 Budget out-turn • 2006/07 Performance out-turn
August recess			
September 7th	*'Enjoying and Achieving'* • Key Stage Action Plans • Young Runaways Protocol	• 14-19 education	• Complaints
October 5th	*'Healthy'* • 2008/09 BUDGET PRESENTATION • Breast feeding rates • Infant mortality • Childhood obesity (including update on Childhood Obesity scrutiny review) • Maternity Services	• access times for non-urgent paediatric occupational therapy cases	• 2007/08 Performance Outturn Q1 • Revenue Budget Q1
November 2nd	*Safe* • Update on scrutiny review – impact of domestic violence on children and young people	• Equality impact assessment • Safeguarding arrangements • Special Schools – inclusive education	

March 2008

Month/	Theme	Other Reports	Monitoring
November 30th	**_Making a positive contribution_** • Young Carer's Strategy – one year on • Transition from children and young people's services to adult services for disabled children		• Performance information Q2 • Budget Q2 • Forward Plan of Key Decisions
January 11th 2008	2007/08 Budget • Budget presentation	• Readiness for children's trust arrangements – _update_	
February 8th	**_'Achieving economic well-being'_** • NEETS • Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services		
March 7th	**_Making a positive contribution and Enjoying and Achieving_** • The Directory of Services and Activities for Children, Young People and their families in Rotherham • Imagination Library • Support for newly arrived children and young people in schools		• Performance information update Q3 • Budget Monitoring
April 4th	**_Enjoying and Achieving_** • Key Stage Results	• Local Area Agreement 2008-11	

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL
Friday, 7th March, 2008

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Ali, Barron, Burton, Currie, Dodson, Kaye, License and Swift.

Also in attendance were:- Councillor Rushforth and Father A. Hayne (Diocese of Hallam) and Mr. M. Hall (Parent Governor), Ms. T. Guest, Ms. J. Dearden, Mrs. A. Britland and Mrs. M. Morton.

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs. J. Blanch-Nicholson.

86. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

87. **QUESTIONS FROM THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

88. **MATTERS REFERRED FROM THE YOUTH CABINET**

The Scrutiny Panel noted that there would be feedback to a future meeting from the recent conferences attended by members of the Youth Cabinet and the Black and Minority Ethnic Young People's Forum.

89. **COMMUNICATIONS**

The following items were noted:-

(a) the Chair and the Scrutiny Adviser had attended an IDeA seminar at Warwick to give a presentation about ways of preventing Bullying in Schools;

(b) the South Yorkshire Local Authorities' Joint Annual Scrutiny of local health services was taking place during March, 2008;

(c) the Chair had attended the 'children's championship' event, organised by Sure Start and held at the Hellaby Hall Hotel, Hellaby, where awards had been presented to childminders.

90. **THE DIRECTORY OF SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES FOR CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND THEIR FAMILIES IN ROTHERHAM**

The Scrutiny Panel received a presentation from Alison Lilburn and Kerry Hurst (Children and Young People's Services) about the establishment of an Internet web site containing the Directory of Services and Activities for Children, Young People and their Families in Rotherham. The Scrutiny Panel viewed a demonstration of the web site and its various ways of facilitating searches for the information.

The following salient issues were discussed:-

- the web site was expected to be in full operation at the beginning of April, 2008;

- the web site will include links to other appropriate organisations (eg: the Connexions Service);

- management of the information on the web site, to ensure that inappropriate information would not be published;

- alternative ways of communication with young people (eg: pod casts; blogs);

- display of information on the web site, to ensure its availability for visually impaired people;

- ensuring that 'quality' mark accreditation for organisations, demonstrating that standards are met, can be displayed;

- regular updating of the web site information;

- the placing of this web site within the priority rankings of Google Internet search engine.

Resolved:- (1) That Alison Lilburn and Kerry Hurst be thanked for their interesting and informative presentation.

(2) That the arrangements for the seminar for all members of the Council, to be held on Tuesday, 8th April, 2008, be noted.

91.   **CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES - PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2007/08 - QUARTER 3 REPORT**

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Performance Manager outlining performance at the end of the third quarter 2007/08 against targets, with comparisons against previous performance in 2007/08 and All England top quartile authorities. The appendix to the report contained the recovery plans regarding action to be taken to address performance in areas where performance is projected not to meet its target and also showed a decline on the previous quarter. There was also information about the action plans from the performance clinics.

Resolved:- (1) That the third quarter performance report be received

(2) That the Recovery Action Plan to be approved

(3) That the recommendations regarding performance clinics, as detailed in the report submitted, be approved.

92.   **CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES - REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING 2007/2008**

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Service Accountant providing details of expenditure, income and the net budget position for the Children and Young People's Services Directorate compared to the phased budgets for the period ending on 31st December 2007 and the projected year end outturn position. The current report shows a balanced projected revenue outturn position for 2007/08.

Resolved:- That the current forecast outturn for a balanced budget for the Children and Young People's Services Directorate, which is based on actual costs and income to 31st December 2007 and forecast costs and income to 31st March 2008, be noted.

93.   **CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES - CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING 2007/2008**

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Service Accountant stating that capital expenditure for the Children and Young People's Services Directorate is estimated to be £17.1 millions in 2007/08. The report shows the approved capital programme and subsequent revisions, actual expenditure to 15th December 2007 and projected expenditure to 31st March 2008.

Resolved:- That this Scrutiny Panel notes that:-

(a) the 2007/2008 Capital Programme for Children and Young People's Services is forecast at £17.1 millions, with current expenditure to date being £7.6 millions; and

(b) this Capital Programme is expected to spend £14.5 millions by 31st March 2008.

94.   **CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES - FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS**

The Scrutiny Panel noted the contents of the Forward Plan of Key Decisions for Children and Young People's Services, for the four months' period 31st March 2008 to 30th June 2008.

95.   **IMAGINATION LIBRARY**

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services the Imagination Library, a literacy scheme for under fives through which children receive one high quality age appropriate book each month, delivered to them personally through the post. The report stated that advice for parents/carers on how to read with children is included and the programme can be supported by a range

of family learning programmes and events. By the age of five, each child will have built a library of 60 books. The report described how the scheme will work in Rotherham. The Scrutiny Panel's debate of this item included the following salient issues:-

- raising literacy levels in the Borough and improving the Foundation Key Stage performance;

- fund raising in support of the scheme (a thank you to the Broom Valley Infant School);

- registration of children, both to the Imagination Library and to the Borough Council's library service;

- targeting of specific areas, using analysis by post code, where children may not have been registered;

- recycling / re-use of books;

- scrutiny of the scheme.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and the details of the Imagination Library be noted.

(2) That it be noted that all Members of the Council are to receive a list of 'frequently asked questions' (and responses), prepared by the Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services, about the Imagination Library.

(3) That, in order to facilitate regular scrutiny of the scheme, further progress reports about the Imagination Library be submitted to meetings of this Scrutiny Panel, initially after twelve months' operation of the scheme and thereafter at intervals of six months.

(4) That the Corporate Management team be asked to consider the operation of a payroll giving scheme, in respect of possible donations to the Imagination Library, similar to the 'Pennies from Heaven' payroll giving scheme.

96.   **SUPPORT FOR NEWLY ARRIVED CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IN SCHOOLS**

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Senior Director, Children and Young People's Services, providing details of the funding for the support of the education of children for who have English as an additional language. The report included details of:-

- the specific grant funding provided from the Standards Fund, the rationale for distribution of this grant and the funding that was distributed in 2007/08.;

- information on Newly Arrived Children during 2006/07 and where these children were placed on a school roll;

- the role of the Service for Ethnic Minority Children, including financial and staffing information, as well as information on the children who were supported during 2006/07.

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

(2) That a scrutiny review be undertaken of Support for Newly Arrived Children and Young People and the members of the review panel shall be Councillors Dodson, Kaye and License (Chair) and Co-opted Member Mr. M. Hall.

97.   MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON 8TH FEBRUARY, 2008

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel, held on 8th February, 2008, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

98.   MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF THE PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE HELD ON 1ST FEBRUARY 2008 AND 15TH FEBRUARY 2008

Resolved:- That the contents of the minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 1st February, 2008 and 15th February, 2008, be noted.

Agenda Item 16

PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
29th February, 2008

Present:- Councillor Stonebridge (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar, Austen, Boyes, Burton, Clarke, Jack, McNeely, G. A. Russell and Whelbourn.

Also in attendance was Councillor Wardle (Chair of the Audit Committee)

In attendance for Item 159 below were:-

Nick Best	Government Office Yorkshire and the Humber
Peter Holmes	Environment Agency
Steve Maggs	National Grid
Nick Gill	C.E. Electrical
John Hunter	C.E. Electrical
Anna Trippel	C.E. Electrical
Wendy Kimpton	Yorkshire Water
Michelle Lewis	Yorkshire Water
Laurence Morgan	British Waterways
Martin Pollard	British Waterways

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Doyle and P. A. Russell and also from John Healey, M.P. and Tony Rae (Severn Trent Water).

157.   DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Akhtar declared a personal interest in item 160 below (RBT – Performance Update) being the Council's representative on the RBT Board.

158.   QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

159.   INTEGRATING EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Chairman welcomed organisation representatives to the meeting and introductions were made. Brief reference was made to the submitted report summarising the overview and scrutiny work undertaken since the flooding in June, 2007.

The Chairman outlined the format of the discussions and referred to the report considered by Cabinet this week relating to the summary of both the independent review by Sir Michael Pitt of the 2007 floods and the Environment Agency review of 2007 summer floods, including the possible impact on the Council.

Graham Kaye, Engineer and Ian Smith, Director of Asset Management elaborated on the report to Cabinet and highlighted some of the issues as

follows:

- investment work
- responsibilities of the Council and partners
- river levels and overland flooding
- internal flooding Whiston/Catcliffe and apparatus problems
- creation of unforeseen drainage channels e.g. railway lines enabling water to flow and cause damage

The findings of the Pitt report and Environment Agency review indicated a need to work more closely with partners/agencies and to establish stronger communication links for the future.

An action plan was being prepared and a way forward needed to be agreed.

Nick Best, Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber, elaborated on:

- the role of Government Office : making reference to the Resilience Team and the setting up of communications and also being the command link back to Central Government

- preparedness for an emergency: indicating systems and processes in place. Close working relations had been established with the Pitt review team and Local Resilience Forums had been notified of recommendations from the Pitt report

- execution : - at national level category 2 responders (utilities) some worked well some didn't
  - an understanding of critical national infrastructure was vital
  - need for stockpiling of equipment was being assessed
  - need for better understanding of surface water flooding
  - consideration of mutual aid arrangements between local authorities

  - at regional level
    - Local Resilience Forums (LRF) were carrying out their own reviews
    - aims to bring LRF's together to move forward collectively

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- representation on LRF's

- clarification of a Category 2 responder

- numbers of Category 2 responders attending at Gold Command (space availability issues) and need for clarity regarding presence of responders

- travel access to Gold Command

- experiences of Category 2 responders in the June floods

- Category 2 responders attendance at LRF's

- implications for gas and electricity supplies should Ulley Reservoir have burst and awareness of those implications

- need for the sharing of installations information at regional and national level with partners including local planners

- distributive command structures

- clarification regarding roles of Gold Command (Strategic), Silver Command (tactical) and Bronze Command (operational)

- sharing of information at community level

- rationale for moving to Gold Command and hierarchy e.g. most senior people not necessarily at Gold Command

- need to develop intelligence at local level utilising local community, parish councils, local emergency plans etc.

- need for a review of critical infrastructures and better utilisation of such information

- need for clarification of the element of risk associated with Brinsworth Sub-Station

- need to build risks modelling of critical society infrastructures into local and regional risk registers

- maintaining a clean water supply

- checking dams/reservoirs

- managing surface water

- understanding reservoirs and the need for inundation maps was essential

- responsibility for production of inundation maps

- need for better communication links with partners

- need for more proactive working between partners/agencies and a shared agreed set of risks around flooding issues

Following a brief adjournment, a discussion and question and answer session continued focusing on drainage, land and water matters and the following issues were covered:-

- action plans from the floods in 2000

- planning guidance re flood plains

- sandbag allocations and potential alternatives to sandbags

- overview of issues from the 2007 floods from an Environment Agency (EA) responsibility regarding:

  - flood warnings : E.A. lead organisation but can only provide where detection feasible. Cannot detect through surface water/drains etc. Pre-registration was required for flood warning notification but take up was poor. Awareness raising was ongoing

  - liaison/communication : network of gauges on rivers. EA shared information with other organisations but stretched to limit in June, 2007. Lessons learnt from June, 2007 to enable more media information during January, 2008 flood

- recommendation from Pitt report that Environment Agency lead on surface water and need for help/ information from partner organisations regarding surface water/sewers/drains

- 'hawkeye' monitoring of sewers/manholes

- costs and siting of monitoring equipment

- local authority/undertakers' inventories could help Environment Agency and build up a shared knowledge base

- need for proper mechanisms/terms of reference to assess information provided and make practical sense of it

- 'private' drainage issues and need to clarify private/public ownership

- LRF's and numbers of flood plans/governance arrangements

- reporting line/ accountability of LRF's

- need to be able to hold to account locally those with responsibilities

- national capability surveys every two yeas to assess performance of LRF's

- leadership of LRF's

- work of LRF's driven by national, regional and local risks

Discussion and a question and answer session then continued on specific local matters and the following issues were covered:-

- Canklow regulators

- River Rother regulators

- considerations to reduce risks further in the River Don/River Rother area but time consuming and costly: options to be considered regarding national priority and funding

- public health issues .e.g. sewage in gardens and kitchens

- equipment issues e.g. lack of sandbags, pumping not adequate

- temporary and demountable defences

- lessons learnt from other countries

In concluding the discussions, the Chairman summarised the issues highlighted which needed further attention as follows:-

1) Need to continue to develop better communications and information exchange
2) Need to clarify roles/responsibilities of Gold/Silver/Bronze Command
3) Need for Local Resilience Forum to look again regarding its own leadership in blue light scenarios
4) Sharing of inundation plans would be helpful
5) Brinsworth Substation position in need of clarification and further work required on the level of risk
6) Integrated Risk Management and Assessment – need for safe setting to share information and that those risks can be challenged

Community Risk Management – risk forums to look for opportunity to challenge

7) Need for an integrated monitoring system

8) Need for clarification of laws relating to sewers/drains (public lack of understanding who is responsible) single contact needed

9) Consideration needed as to whether LRF focus of work should be sub regional as now or needs to be more local

10) Although not possible to deliver all action plans from 2000, the need to be able to deliver 2007 action plans was vital.

11) Any further views to be forwarded to the scrutiny office.

In concluding, the Chairman made reference to views expressed by John Healey, M.P., which would be built into the reports going forward for further consideration.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and contribution.

160. RBT PERFORMANCE UPDATE

The Chairman welcomed Paul Hamblett, Business and Improvement Manager and Paul Briddock, Head of Service Operations, RBT Connect Ltd., together with Mark Gannon, Transformation and Strategic Partnerships Manager.

Paul Hamblett presented, with the aid of powerpoint, the submitted report detailing the progress and performance of RBT for the period 1st September to 31st December, 2007.

The presentation covered:-

- SLA Performance

- Rotherham Connect Contact Centre Update

- Rotherham Connect Call Volumes

- Human Resources and Payroll

- ICT

- Procurement

- Revenues and Benefits

- Revenues and Benefits : Council Tax Collection

- RBT complaints by Ward

Highlights for the period included :

- Rotherham MBC was successful in the British Computer Society Awards, 2007, winning the Public Sector Organisation of the year award

- two members of RBT Connect staff were awarded HEART employee of the month for September and December

- alternate weekly collection scheme impact on Connect performance

- Rotherham Registrars selected by Central Government as a pilot site for the "Tell Us Once" project, one of only three sites nationwide

- Rotherham Registrars features in a national publication

- excellent work continues for Rotherham citizens in Welfare Rights and Money Advice Service

- positive results from the Human Resources and Payroll customer satisfaction survey

- pay awards received and implemented

- Advice and Guidance Service provided support to Rotherham 2010 Ltd.

- All ICT service level agreements reported on or above target

- planning alert service went live

- progress continues with Procurement Card process

- improvements in BVPI 8 performance

- positive Procurement Satisfaction Survey results

- implementation of Local Housing Allowance remained on schedule

- quarterly reported service level agreements in Revenues and Benefits all reported on target

The report set out :-

- Service by service overview covering :

  - Customer Services/Public Access
  - HR and Payroll

- ICT
- Procurement
- Revenues and Benefits

- Progress Against Corporate Initiatives:

- Equalities and Diversity
- Investors in People
- Consultation/Complaints

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- use of single telephone number
- broadband provision
- role of schools in procurement savings
- impact of opportunity to pay direct debits in twelve monthly payments
- need for future reports to breakdown complaints figures by ward and client

Resolved:- That the information be noted.

(Councillor Akhtar declared a personal interest in the above item being this Council's representative on the RBT Board)

161. QUARTER 3 PERFORMANCE 2007/08

Matt Gladstone, Assistant Chief Executive, presented the submitted reported relating to the above and gave a brief presentation which covered:-

- update on progress of Corporate Plan measures

- Corporate Plan key performance indicators

- Corporate Plan exceptional improvement

- CPA Direction of Travel 2008

- Performance Clinics

- Local Area Agreement

- CPA Framework 2008

- Overall key issues relating to :

- Environment and Development Services
- Neighbourhoods and Adult Services
- Children and Young People's Services
- Finance/RBT

The report indicated that, at the end of Quarter 3, 73% of the Corporate Plan indicators had hit their target with 72% showing improvement or maintaining their best score in the Audit Commission's Direction of Travel.

Last year's CPA Direction of Travel improvement rate was 55%. Currently, Quarter 3 results indicated an improvement rate of 53% with a projected year end improvement rate of 62%.

Discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- BV 212   average time to re-let properties

- PAF C28 households receiving intensive home care per 1000 population aged 65+

- PAF C29 adults with physical difficulties helped to live at home

- PAF C72 number of admissions of supported residents aged 65+ to residential and nursing care

- Base Budget Review discussions

- impact of lifting the moratorium on development of Greenfield sites
- Ombudsman: average number of days to respond to complaints

- breastfeeding facilities : need for information from partner organisations/women's strategy

Resolved:- (1) That the information be noted, including the overall position and direction of travel in relation to performance.

(2) That the Direction of Travel performance measures at risk be noted.

(3) That scrutiny panels look at the respective indicators along with the relevant Cabinet Member.

162.   COOPTION ONTO SCRUTINY PANELS

Resolved:- (1) That consideration of this matter be deferred until the next meeting.

(2) That, prior to the next meeting, the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of scrutiny panels and scrutiny advisers give initial consideration to the position.

163.   MINUTES

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meetings held on 15th February, 2008 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

164.   WORK IN PROGRESS

Members of the Committee reported as follows:-

(a) Councillor Jack reminded Members that the launch of the Women's Strategy was taking place next Wednesday, 5th March, 2008 from 10.00 a.m. to 3.00 p.m.

(b) Councillor Boyes reported that an extra 'themed' meeting of the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel had been scheduled for Wednesday, 2nd April, 2008 with regard to the Town Centre Renaissance.

(c) Councillor Stonebridge informed Members that :-

-     the Advice Centres review report was now in draft
-     the review of the Use of Consultants was now complete
-     the Councillor Call for Action Working Group had reported to Cabinet

-     the Complaints review was nearing its completion

165.   CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call in requests.