

Decision Maker: **Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee**

Date: **2<sup>nd</sup> July 2014**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent                      Non-Executive                      Non-Key

**TITLE: UPDATE ON UNDER PERFORMING SCHOOLS**

Contact Officer: Nina Newell, Head of Schools and Early Years Commissioning and Quality Assurance

Chief Officer: Terry Parkin, Executive Director, Education and Care Services

Ward: Boroughwide

---

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 To provide an update on the schools identified as underperforming in the last report dated March 2014.
- 1.2 To provide an updated list of Ofsted outcomes and details from recent Ofsted visits. Plus any recent inspection activity if relevant.
- 1.3 To provide an overview of Local Authority Support and challenge to those schools considered to be underperforming.
- 1.4 To provide a RAG rating of risk

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **The Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the updated information provided in this report**

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy:
  2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
  2. Ongoing costs: N/A
  3. Budget head/performance centre: School Standards
  4. Total current budget for this head: £445,350
  5. Source of funding: The approved service budget is funded from Council Revenue and Dedicated Schools Grant.
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional) -
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours - N/A
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory requirement: The LA has a number of statutory duties to secure school improvement and to meet the statutory targets with respect to attainment of children and young people a duty of care to all children and young people in all Bromley schools
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable: No Executive Decision
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected) - 47,000 children and young people in 95 schools and other education settings (e.g. PRS).
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

### 3. COMMENTARY

#### Ofsted Inspections

3.1 Since the last report in March 2014 there have been five further Ofsted Inspections and no Ofsted monitoring inspection visits (as at May 2014). The judgements are as follows:-

6 March 2014	St Olave's and St Saviour's – Outstanding
12 March 2014	Oaklands Primary School – Requires Improvement
19 March 2014	Bickley Primary School – Good
28 March 2014	Southborough Primary School – Requires Improvement
14 May 2014	Edgebury Primary School – Good

#### Ofsted Outcomes

3.2 A list of Ofsted outcomes for Bromley Academies is attached at **Appendix 1**.

### OVERVIEW

#### LA Categorisation and Support

3.3 **Appendix 2** details all current outcomes in Bromley maintained schools, detailing any subsequent visits. It also provides information in respect of the challenge and support provided to all maintained schools by the Local Authority. Risk has been assessed in line with the categorisation process outlined in a previous reports together with recent inspection reports and HMI follow up visits plus local school intelligence.

3.4 The support and challenge provided to schools is co-ordinated using a combination of the Local Authority staff team, externally commissioned consultants and brokered school to school support. Where head teachers are reluctant to engage with the support available from the Local Authority, challenge is provided by the Head of Schools and Early Years, and where necessary the Assistant Director Education or Director of Education Health and Care Services.

3.5 The detailed process of categorisation will be undertaken again In August 2014, when updated data will be available from this year's tests and assessments.

3.6 A detailed analysis of the categorisation of schools, outlining the process used, the support to be provided and detailed risk analysis will subsequently be reported to the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee.

### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The Education Portfolio Plan highlights as a main aim promoting educational opportunity in the borough, ensuring all families have a choice of good and outstanding schools.

### 5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The Council has a statutory duty to provide support and challenge to schools (Education and Inspection Act 2006) in order to raise attainment and to intervene in schools causing concern.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Personnel Implications, Financial Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Education Portfolio Plan