



OFFICE FOR STANDARDS  
IN EDUCATION

**INSPECTION OF  
KENT  
LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY**

**JANUARY 1999**

**OFFICE OF HER MAJESTY'S CHIEF INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS  
in conjunction with the  
AUDIT COMMISSION**

## CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Commentary and Recommendations	4
I The Context of the LEA	8
2. The Performance of Kent Schools	11
3 LEA Strategy	13
Roles, Priorities and Strategies for School Improvement	13
Statutory Responsibilities	15
Funding	15
School places and admissions	16
Liaison with other services, voluntary groups and agencies	17
4. The Organisation and Management of Services	19
Inspection advice and curriculum support	19
Other services which improve access and achievement	20
Management services	23
5 LEA support for improving standards	26
Support for the use of performance data and target-setting	26
Support for improving literacy	27
Support for improving numeracy	29
Support for schools requiring special measures and those with serious weaknesses	31
6 LEA support for improving the quality of education	32
Support for improving teaching	32
Support for School Self Review (SSSR)	33
Support for post 16 education	35
Support for implementing the SEN code of practice	36
7. LEA support to improve the management and efficiency of schools	38
Appendix 1a/1b: Education & Libraries Structure	41
Appendix 2: Statistical data	43
Appendix 3: School survey	48

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. This inspection was carried out by OFSTED in conjunction with the Audit Commission under Section 38 of the Education Act 1997. The inspection used the Framework for Inspection of Local Education Authorities, which focuses on the effectiveness of Local Education Authority (LEA) work to support school improvement.

2. The inspection was in two stages. An initial review, carried out in June 1998, established a picture of the LEA's context, the performance of its schools, its strategy and its management of services. The initial review was based on data, some of which was provided by the LEA, on school inspection and audit reports, on documentation and on discussions with elected members, staff in the education department and in other council departments and representatives of the LEA's partners. The review also included a survey which was sent to 103 schools and achieved a 78 per cent response rate. The second stage of the inspection, carried out in October and November 1998, involved studies of the effectiveness of particular aspects of the LEA's work through visits to 54 schools. The visits tested the views of governors, headteachers and other staff on aspects of the LEA strategy. The visits also considered whether the support provided by the LEA contributed to the discharge of the LEA's statutory duties, was effective in contributing to the improvements in the school and provided value for money.

3. The report draws on material from the initial review and from the school visits, together with the relevant evidence to the themes drawn from recent HMI visits to Kent LEA schools.

## COMMENTARY

4. Kent is the largest LEA in England. In its variety of schools, it is also among the most diverse. The education Directorate until recently, because of the size of the LEA, worked in largely autonomous administrative areas, with the result that there was some variability in LEA support. In recent years the department has undergone a series of reorganisations, the most recent of which has not settled down sufficiently for this inspection to judge its full effectiveness.

5. The County of Kent contains some areas of severe deprivation, but overall (particularly since the loss of the Medway Towns), it scores rather above the national average on most socio-economic indicators. Performance at GCSE, similarly, is above national figures. At other stages of education, the standards attained match the national norm quite closely. However, the county has both some of the most successful schools in the country and some of the least, as well as many which are coasting.

6. There are strengths in the LEA, and also signs of continuing improvement. The LEA's contribution to improvement, for example, in the 42 schools visited, was rarely crucial, but there was some evidence of its effectiveness in about three schools out of four. Support for literacy, numeracy and the use of performance data is beginning to bring about improvement. The LEA meets its statutory duties to schools in special measures. Headteacher appraisal and support for teacher appraisal are good, and governor support is well regarded.

7. The task of managing such an LEA, and of providing support to schools of widely varying character, is a difficult one. The evidence of this inspection is, nevertheless, that in some significant respects this task has not been performed satisfactorily. The new strategic director has - and knows that he has - a difficult legacy with which to deal.

8. Under new leadership, the LEA is beginning to substitute coherent strategic planning and implementation for expedient reaction to immediate exigencies, as it implements national policies. Priorities are now clear, and appropriately focused on raising standards. The LEA consults well with its schools, who generally welcome the new sense of direction and purpose in the senior management of the LEA.

9. However, the LEA itself would not dispute that much remains to be done, and that there are some areas in which, despite recent progress, it continues to perform key functions inadequately. This is particularly true in the area of provision for Special Educational Needs (SEN). The LEA has not adequately costed or resourced its policy for inclusion. It takes too long to issue statements, lacks clearly prioritised objectives for SEN and does not consistently monitor how schools target SEN resources. Pupils with SEN and their parents are not consistently well served.

10. There are other weaknesses, for example:

- there remain inconsistencies in the quality and level of service delivery across the LEA;
- the implementation of post-OFSTED action plans is not consistently monitored;
- the level and quality of support to middle management in schools is variable;
- fifty-six schools have more than 25% surplus places;
- a large backlog of poor school accommodation has not been addressed;
- seventeen per cent of schools are running deficit budgets;
- there is no strategic plan for post-16 education;
- there are inconsistencies and delays in the application of selection procedures at eleven-plus;
- the payroll function is not always efficiently performed

11. Overall, this is an LEA, like many others, emerging from a period of turmoil. The effects of that persist in a degree of inconsistency of performance of basic functions that is unacceptable to the LEA itself. There are two major reasons for optimism to set beside this: one is the quality of the current senior management of the LEA; the second is its clear acknowledgement, supported by elected members, of the weaknesses that exist and its determination to tackle them.

12. a. **In order to achieve greater consistency in the quality and level of service delivery, the LEA should:**
- ensure that services have a common approach to planning, target setting, monitoring and evaluation;
- b. **In order to ensure that the LEA's school improvement priorities are effectively implemented, the LEA should:**
- monitor the implementation by schools of OFSTED action plans on a more consistent basis;
  - intensify its drive to raise standards in schools which are under-performing, focusing particularly on assisting schools to improve teaching quality;
  - clarify the operational arrangements for supporting them so that they do not slide into a serious weakness category.
- c. **In order to improve further the quality of support for schools, the LEA should:**
- strengthen support to middle managers and staff with other responsibility posts in schools;
  - work with all schools to establish common practice in the transfer of information on pupils between phases in education, particularly between KS2 and KS3;
  - evaluate the effectiveness of support for the Schools Self Review programme so that good practice can be replicated accros schools and that School Self Review can become an integral part of the LEA's school improvement strategy.
- d. **In order to improve the quality of support to pupils with special education needs (SEN), the LEA should:**
- prioritise objectives and set a timescale for the implementation of the various SEN developments and projects;
  - monitor how schools target resources to support SEN provision;
  - ensure that the use of resources is aligned with the priorities of the inclusion and preventative work;
  - eradicate delays in the statementing process to achieve statutory requirements.

e. **In order to improve the quality of school accommodation, the LEA should:**

- set explicit targets for improving school buildings and monitor the progress made.

f. In order to improve the quality of post 16 provision, the LEA should:

- devise a strategic plan based on a clear rationale;
- aim to reduce the number of sixth forms which are uneconomic, or unable to offer an appropriate range of provision.

g. **In order to improve the management of school budgets, the LEA should:**

- work proactively with schools to reduce the number of deficits and excessive roll-overs.

h. **Within the context of selection at 11+ the LEA should:**

- ensure that the process for selection is consistently applied in all LEA maintained schools and that it is transparent, and fair to all pupils;
- aim to give parents and schools early information on the allocation of pupils to secondary schools;
- further develop the process of cross moderation of area selection panels.

## **SECTION 1: THE CONTEXT OF THE LEA**

### ***Socio Economic Context***

13. Kent is the largest Local Education Authority in England, with a population of around 1.3 million people, following the creation of the new Unitary Authority in the Medway Towns in April 1998. Areas of considerable affluence in the west of the county contrast with the very high levels of deprivation, unemployment and low economic growth in some of the coastal regions in the north and east, particularly around the Thanet area.

14. The overall proportion of pupils from ethnic minority groups is below the national average but there are higher concentrations in some areas, for example in the northwest of the county.

### ***The Pupil Population***

15. In April 1998 there were 113,917 pupils in maintained primary schools and 87,327 pupils in maintained secondary schools. The LEA makes provision in maintained schools for 38 per cent of children under five. This is a significantly lower percentage than is the case nationally. Thirty-two per cent of secondary pupils attended grammar schools. Thirty-six per cent of secondary pupils attended single-sex schools. There were 2,763 pupils in special schools, and 330 pupils attending pupil referral units (PRUs).

16. The number of pupils who were educated at home or under other arrangements outside the schools was 638. Eight per cent of primary pupils and 60 per cent of secondary pupils were educated in grant maintained (GM) schools.

17. In 1997 2.6 per cent of primary pupils and 4.2 per cent of secondary pupils had statements of special educational need.

18. The percentage of pupils continuing into full-time education in schools' sixth forms was 51.2 per cent. The overall participation rate in full-time further education was approximately 77 per cent, compared to 70 per cent nationally.

19. Pupil numbers have increased between 1994 and 1998 by 6.4 per cent in primary schools and 5.5 per cent in secondary schools. They are expected to increase by the year 2000 by a further 0.8 per cent in primary and 2.5 per cent in secondary schools.

### ***Organisation of Schools***

20. Educational provision in Kent is quite complex and very diverse. Kent maintains one nursery school and 34 nursery units attached to infant or primary schools, catering for about 2,100 pupils aged three or four attending on a part-time basis. The percentage of three and four-year-olds in council nursery education is slightly below the county council average of 44 per cent.



21. Primary schools in the local education authority fall into one of four categories: infant (4-7 years); first (4-9 years); junior (7-11 years); or primary (4-11 years). Over one-third are denominational. The percentage of primary school classes at KSI with more than 30 pupils is slightly above the national average, and below for KS2.

22. The predominant system for secondary education in Kent is based on grammar, high, and wide ability schools. The 33 grammar schools cater for the 11-18 age range. High schools now have formal approval for the 11-17 or 11-18 age range. In addition, seven secondary schools have been awarded technology college designation and one has acquired language college status. Pupils transfer to secondary schools at 11+, apart from those in the Isle of Sheppey where a three-tier system operates, and at Cranbrook School which takes pupils at 13+. Pupils on the Isle of Sheppey transfer to middle schools at age 9 and to secondary schools at age 13.

23. Kent has 31 special schools serving children who have specific educational needs. Nine of these schools are residential. Sixty-seven schools in the local authority have special units for children with particular disabilities and special educational needs. There are also 11 pupil referral units (PRUs) not attached to schools.

**Resources Available to the LEA**

24. Kent LEA's expenditure on education has been very close to the Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) over the past four years. The 1998/99 figure includes both a reduction resulting from Local Government Reorganisation and a general increase of £31 .2m.

	SSA for Education £m	Net expenditure on education £m	Expenditure compared with SSA
1995/96	559.1	563.2	+ 0.73%
1996/97	581.7	587.2	+ 0.94%
1997/98	588.1	583.5	- 0.78%
1998/99	525.6	524.3	-0.24%

25. The table below shows that Kent's expenditure per pupil in LEA schools is generally close to that of similar authorities (referred to as statistical neighbours) and other English counties. The main difference is that Kent's spending on under-fives is some five per cent lower than the average for English counties.

Expenditure per pupil in LEA schools – 1996/97	Kent	Statistical neighbours average	English counties average
Pupils under five	£1,774	£1,816	£1,865
Primary pupils 5 and over	£1,676	£1,669	£1,653
Secondary pupils under 16	£2,232	£2,196	£2,188
Secondary pupils 16 and over	£3,158	£3,142	£3,139

*Source. Local Authorities Performance Indicators, Audit Commission 1998.*

26. In 1997/98 the LEA delegated 89.6% of the potential schools' budget (PS B) to the schools. This is slightly less than the average level of delegation for English counties (91.0%). For 1998/99, the figure for Kent has been increased marginally to 90.1%. The amount held back for central services is not out of line with similar LEAs.

### ***The Structure of the LEA and the Education Department***

27. **Kent LEA has been reorganised and restructured several times during the last decade. The previous structure, which was based on a central office in Maidstone and five largely autonomous area offices, led to inconsistencies in many practices across the LEA and as a consequence some weaknesses in the way the LEA fulfilled its role and carried out its responsibilities. The current structure addresses this problem in a number of ways and is already demonstrating greater consistency in practice and in the LEA'S approach to school improvement.**

28. The Education and Libraries Committee was created from two separate committees by the most recent restructuring in 1997. Kent LEA policy is made by this committee in response to advice from the Strategic Director of Education and Libraries, the Chief Executive's Corporate Board, elected members' wishes and the Education and Libraries management team. (The Education & Libraries Directorate structure is illustrated at Appendix Ia).

29. The Directorate is organised under six second tier officers (Appendix Ib). This group, together with the finance manager, the strategic human resource adviser, and the head of the Kent Curriculum Services Agency, is the senior decision-making group. Second tier officers work closely on planning and monitoring the LEA's effectiveness. An example of this is the collaborative work of the School Effectiveness Division and the Schools Planning and Organisation Division on school monitoring and support by the new district teams. This new structure is already showing greater consistency in its approach to strategic planning, and in developing mechanisms for delivering the LEA's priorities.

## SECTION 2: THE PERFORMANCE OF KENT SCHOOLS

### *The Performance of LEA Maintained Schools*

30. The following summary refers to all maintained schools in Kent including GM schools. Further details on the performance of Kent schools are contained in Appendix 1.
31. **Results from the LEA's piloted baseline assessment in 1997 indicate that most children were well on course to achieve or exceed the national Desirable Learning Outcomes.**
32. **Attainment in Kent schools according to national performance measures is close to national averages across all Key Stages over the period 1994-1997.**
33. In 1997 Kent ranked 77th out of 132 LEAs for the performance of its schools in the Key Stage 2 English tests.
34. In 1998 the proportion of pupils achieving five or more A\*-C grades was 49.2 per cent which is above the national average by 3.9 per cent. Kent ranked 34th out of 150 LEAs (unverified).
35. **There are some very good, and some very poor schools in the LEA compared to national standards. There is considerable variation between the performance of schools with similar intakes across all phases.**
36. The proportion of pupils gaining five or more GCSE grades A\*-C in grammar schools ranges from 87 per cent to 100 per cent.
37. In six of the non-selective schools less than 10 per cent of pupils attained five or more subjects with grades A\*-C. In contrast, more than 50 per cent of pupils in five other non-selective schools attained five or more subjects at grades A\*-C.
38. **There are considerable differences in the rates of improvement across primary and secondary schools.**
39. Overall, the rates of improvement from 1994-1997 in English and mathematics tests in each key stage have been slightly below national figures, except in mathematics at Key Stage 3 which improved more than the national average.
40. At GCSE the rate of improvement between 1994 and 1998 in the proportion of pupils gaining five or more grades A\*-C was above the national average.
41. **As at November 1998 there are 16 schools in Kent which have been judged to require special measures. These comprise 13 primary schools, two secondary schools and a special school. Since September 1997, nine primary and three secondary schools have been officially designated as having serious weaknesses.**
42. In his annual report, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector (HMCI) identified a number

of secondary schools which, as well as achieving high examination performance, were providing a good quality of education. In 1995/96 there were five Kent schools amongst the 63 schools identified, and in 1996/97, two out of the 50 identified nationally. HMCI also identified for 1995/96 two particularly successful primary schools in Kent in a national list of 82, and in 1996/97 four Kent schools in a list of 85. In 1996/97 he identified one Kent special school out of 19 nationally which were judged by OFSTED inspectors to be highly effective.

**43. Rates of attendance in both primary and secondary schools overall are higher than the national averages. Exclusion rates are broadly in line with statistical neighbours and the national average.**

## **SECTION 3: THE LEA STRATEGY**

### **ROLES, PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**

44. The LEA has identified and defined its new role and priorities in relation to its statutory duties and its responsibility for school improvement. It has determined these after comprehensive consultation with schools and other bodies. The LEA has rightly aligned its own objectives with those of its schools, taking account of national initiatives. It has a well conceived strategy for school improvement. It has established clearly defined mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of the majority of its services.

45. The Directorate Plan for the current year is based on the County Council's strategic statement. This plan, and the draft Educational Development Plan (EDP), bring together local and national priorities. The plans' principal themes are:

- improving the quality of teaching and learning;
- improving the quality of leadership and management within schools;
- developing the key skills of literacy, numeracy and ICT;
- identifying, supporting and challenging under-achieving schools;
- establishing the target setting process in all schools;
- improving the planning and overall effectiveness and efficiency of the service;
- developing effective approaches to inclusion.

46. Priorities in the Directorate Plan, and in the draft EDP, are based securely on the LEA's own analysis of school performance. In addition, the LEA consulted with schools, parents and others in the community on the draft EDP. On their visits to schools, HM Inspectors found that headteachers felt well consulted on the EDP and other strategic statements. They felt that the LEA's objectives were generally congruent with those in their own school development plans and reflected their agenda on school improvement.

#### ***The LEA Strategy For School Improvement***

47. The LEA's strategy for promoting school improvement has necessitated some clarification of its relationship with its schools, especially the GM sector. The Directorate has put into place a structure which will allow it to maintain sufficient knowledge of its schools to enable it to identify under-achievement and to act decisively where necessary. When schools are in difficulty, the LEA aims to intervene. It also has a mechanism to facilitate the sharing of good practice and to work with schools on raising achievement. In general, the LEA intends to intervene only in those schools which are causing concern.

48. The school improvement strategy is well conceived and based on the following components:

maintaining a light-touch system of monitoring and support for the majority of schools;

agreeing realistic and challenging annual performance targets;

working with schools on the Kent School Self Review Programme;

providing schools with high-quality comparative data, benchmarks and analysis of OFSTED reports to help self-review;

monitoring the LEA's own effectiveness and contribution to school improvement regularly;

intervening when performance is deteriorating rapidly, or a school is coasting or where effectiveness is unacceptably low;

providing high quality leadership.

49. The LEA aims to identify schools experiencing difficulties at an early stage and put into place remedial support to prevent such establishments sliding into the serious weakness category or, worse, special measures. From September 1998 support and monitoring of special measures schools has become the prime concern of the Special Support Team. The LEA has developed an exit strategy for such schools in line with the Secretary of State's requirements. It has not yet finalised the operational arrangements for supporting schools causing concern but this has been identified as a need in the draft EDP.

### ***Communicating and Consulting With Schools***

50. The LEA's communications involve regular meetings between senior officers in the LEA and headteachers, chairs of governors, and clerks to governing bodies. It also uses newsletters, bulletins and the circulation of committee papers. The current consultation on the formulation of the draft EDP is an example of the time and effort put into this process to ensure that strategic planning in the LEA is aligned with school development planning priorities. In the main, headteachers and chairs of governors rightly feel that this approach is worthwhile and has resulted in beneficial changes. HMI found that the LEA listened to the views of schools and had established clear principles for consultation.

51. Headteachers and governors feel, however, that they are sometimes overwhelmed by the paperwork arriving at school and that time is insufficient to give a consolidated response where questionnaires are sent from several parts of the service at the same time.

### ***Evaluating Its Own Effectiveness***

52. The LEA is aware of the need to evaluate its work. It has supplemented the usual range of external evaluation measures, such as Audit Commission indicators and value for money studies with a number of useful procedures. All of these are used to review the LEA's performance and to make changes which facilitate a higher quality of service provision.

53. The Directorate has a well-defined strategy for monitoring and evaluation. Service units report to service boards; the Directorate reports to Strategic Committee; and the Corporate Board reports to senior elected members. In addition, service units are now taking part in Best Value reviews. An annual report on Kent education has been produced for the past nine years. The most recent report focuses schools' attention on improvement, by highlighting areas for development. The report analyses the performance of Kent schools against national statistical data and recent OFSTED inspection reports. It is a very valuable tool for the LEA and schools with which to review their performance over the preceding year.

54. Overall the LEA has a comprehensive approach to evaluating its own effectiveness at one level, through its surveys of services and reports to the service boards in relation to performance against targets, but there are other aspects of work, including several curriculum development projects, which are not systematically monitored for quality or their impact on school improvement.

### **STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES**

55. The LEA is taking reasonable steps to meet its statutory duties and responsibilities, except in relation to the time taken to complete statements of special educational need.

### **FUNDING**

**56. The LEA's mechanisms for the use of resources are clear and have been developed in consultation with schools and other stakeholders. Kent County Council is responding to the government's Best Value policy with its own 'Best Practice' approach. The LEA provides accurate budgetary information to schools and monitors spending carefully, but there has been a steady increase in the number of schools with deficit budgets. The LEA aligns resources to priorities.**

57. Historically, Kent County Council has had a policy of protecting the education budget as far as possible. In the six years to 1998/99, education spending grew in cash terms by 29 per cent, compared with nine per cent for other services. In particular, schools' delegated budgets have been supported, and show a cash increase of 34 per cent over the same period.

58. Overall spending on education has remained within one per cent of the Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) level for the last three years. In 1998/99 the LEA received an increase of £31 .2m from the government, of which £24.5m was passed on directly to schools. This represented a growth in school budgets of eight per cent. The remainder was used by the LEA to support its Standards Fund and School Effectiveness projects.

59. The Council's procedure for allocating resources includes extensive consultation with schools and other stakeholders. The funding formula takes into account assessment of need through factors such as the incidence of SEN. In response to demand from most schools, some services such as finance and personnel are not delegated, but provided centrally. This arrangement will be reviewed in the light of the government's new policy on education funding.

60. The LEA provides schools with detailed information about their budgets in a useful format. However, in some schools visited it was reported that this was not received in a sufficiently timely manner.

61. Arrangements have been put in place for monitoring budgets. Each school is supported by a dedicated finance officer. Most schools value this link highly, but the Authority has not been able to prevent a steady increase in the number of schools with deficit budgets. The collective school budget is, however, not in deficit.

62. The LEA has now identified its priorities for school improvement and allocated resources accordingly. For example, for 1998/99, an additional £2.2m has been allocated to school effectiveness projects, and £2.5m to support the Standards Fund. Similarly, extra resources are being allocated to building maintenance. The LEA has also participated in successful Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) partnership bids worth £773,000 in Ashford and £14.6m in Thanet. This will support priorities such as nursery provision, homework clubs, combating crime and volunteer reading help.

63. Value for money is promoted through competitive tendering in services such as cleaning and catering. For other services, customer response, price comparisons and benchmarking clubs are used to varying degrees. Although not a pilot for Best Value, the Council has adopted its own cyclical review programme called Best Practice. All education services will be subjected to review over the next two years. Priority will be given to areas such as school transport where the LEA sees scope for improvement in the value for money achieved.

## **SCHOOL PLACES AND ADMISSIONS**

64. **Kent LEA, in liaison with the Funding Agency for Schools and other interested parties, meets its statutory duties in relation to the supply of school places and admissions. The provision for excluded pupils and pupils not in schools is generally satisfactory overall. Admission procedures meet Audit Commission minimum standards but the complex 11+ selection procedures result in unacceptable delays and some inconsistencies in the allocation of selective places.**

65. There are 11.2 per cent surplus places in secondary schools and 7.8 per cent in primary



## 58. Overall spending on education

Schools. These figures are slightly above national figures for secondary schools and below those for primary schools. The LEA has taken appropriate steps since 1990 to reduce the level of surplus places but 35 primary schools and 21 secondary schools in 1997 had in excess of 25 per cent surplus places. A District Audit report of 1997 confirmed that the LEA achieved a high level of accuracy in forecasting pupil numbers.

66. Admission procedures meet statutory requirements, and timescales are in line with Audit Commission guidelines. Selection procedures at 11+ are complex. Selection for LEA grammar schools is through tests and panels which consider borderline pupils. There is limited moderation between selection panels and the LEA cannot be sure there is equity in the process. The majority of GM schools have adopted their own admission procedures and this has led to further inconsistencies between areas. The admission and appeal arrangements have also led to unacceptable delays in the allocation of places for some pupils and cause planning difficulties for schools, particularly high schools.

67. The LEA makes satisfactory provision overall for pupils who are excluded from school or who are unable to attend school because of illness. The LEA is working towards limiting placements of pupils in PRUs to a maximum of two terms. It is reviewing the placement of statemented pupils in PRUs.

### **LIAISON WITH OTHER SERVICES, VOLUNTARY GROUPS AND AGENCIES**

68. The LEA works successfully in collaboration with a range of council services and other agencies. The LEA has been successful in obtaining funding from European projects and in forming close working relationships with educational establishments in other European countries.

69. There are a number of successful joint working projects between the Education and Libraries Directorate and various other parts of the County Council. These include multi-agency work with the Social Services Directorate to produce the Early Years Plan, and a project on behaviour management in West Kent. A schools' drug education programme in Thanet involves the police and the Youth and Community Service. There are also various joint initiatives to tackle disaffection. A collaborative partnership exists between the Kent Economic Forum, Kent Training and Enterprise Council (TEC) and the County Council. Close working links exist with the diocesan authorities at all levels of the administration. The convening of the Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education and the preparation of an agreed religious education syllabus have been undertaken in liaison with the local dioceses, the Church Board and the Free Church representatives. The 1992 agreed syllabus is currently being reviewed.

70. Kent successfully exploits its geographical location to bring a European dimension to the school curriculum. Services in the Education and Libraries Directorate are encouraged to participate in European projects. There is evidence that this is enriching the curriculum in the schools involved. Significant levels of external funding, mainly relating to European Union programmes have been obtained in recent years. This funding has been used, for example, to support teacher placement and exchanges.

## **SECTION 4: THE MANAGEMENT OF LEA SERVICES**

### **INSPECTION, ADVICE AND CURRICULUM SUPPORT**

71. **Prior to restructuring, the Inspection and Advisory Service operated in different ways across the LEA. There was a lack of consistency in the approach to school improvement and the efficiency and effectiveness of this part of the service were not sufficiently monitored. The LEA has taken account of these deficiencies and the new structure looks set to address the issues of under-performance by some schools. It is too early to evaluate fully the impact of the School Effectiveness Division's arrangements for monitoring by district teams, but initial indications are positive. This approach should enable the LEA to know schools well enough to be able to provide support where and when it is needed before situations become serious, and to challenge schools which are coasting.**

72. The School Effectiveness Division and Special Support Team are led by the County School Effectiveness Officer. The contribution of this division is delivered through two main arms: the school effectiveness team of District Advisers; and the Kent Curriculum Service Agency (KCSA) under the Head of the Advisory Service. This agency operates with two assistant heads of service, 12 District Consultants, 34 Curriculum Consultants, and eight staff in the Key Skills Unit. There are five staff in the Special Support Team. Schools get information on their entitlement. Services from KCSA are chargeable. Other than support for the headteacher appraisal programme, schools are charged for the support from District Consultants.

73. The School Planning and Organisation Division also contributes to school improvement through 12 District Schools Officers. The Policy Unit contributes to school improvement mainly through advice on policy formulation, development planning and support for specific initiatives. The Management Information Service produces and analyses data on schools' performance. Kent has increased spending on its budget for school effectiveness from £1.676m in 1997/98 to £2.665m in 1998/99 by re-targeting resources largely to support weak schools and to enable a consistent level of support and monitoring to take place.

74. These three groups contribute specifically to five of the seven priorities in the LEA's current school improvement plan: improving the quality of teaching and learning; improving the quality of leadership and management; developing skills in literacy and numeracy, and ICT; identifying, challenging and supporting under-achieving schools; and setting and achieving targets.

75. Service plans reflect the LEA's priorities in their objectives and performance targets. They are well managed. All have well-established and clearly defined approaches to school improvement, which are complementary and co-ordinated through each head of division or unit.

76. Schools are now monitored in a more consistent and systematic way than was previously the case, through the new operational structure at district level. Each district team consists of an adviser, a schools officer and a schools consultant. The approach is well managed and co-ordinated. District Officers and Advisers are deployed effectively. District Consultants are responsible for headteacher appraisal and offer other support to schools on a traded basis. Three are SEN specialists. District Advisers now use OFSTED inspection reports in order to make a careful analysis of schools' performance as an agenda for discussion on visits. The practice of writing records of visits for headteachers and chairs of governors has not yet been consistently established across all district teams.

77. KCSA provides a comprehensive county-wide in-service training programme for staff. It produces good practice publications, resource packs for the LEA support services, and conducts subject and aspect reviews. Well over three-quarters of schools surveyed considered that the contribution of KCSA to teachers' subject knowledge is helpful. However, the provision of regular network meetings for heads of department and co-ordinators is very patchy across the LEA, and some staff feel isolated from curriculum developments by this.

78. Schools have been informed about their entitlements and the way in which the system will operate to support school improvement. These include access to the Supported School Self Review programme; the support from District Officers and Advisers; support for newly appointed headteachers; headteacher appraisal; support for newly qualified teachers and mentors training for headteachers; the provision of performance data and training on target setting; and the provision of various reports and surveys, including the annual report. The Directorate intends to evaluate the new structure's effectiveness against EDP priorities and other plans, through measuring improvements in its schools, and by reductions in the number of special measures and seriously weak schools.

## **OTHER SERVICES WHICH IMPROVE ACCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT**

### ***Services Which Support Pupils With Special Educational Needs (SEN)***

79. The special educational needs service has been reorganised a number of times over recent years. Despite this, there are still some deficiencies. The LEA has a clear set of aims for the development of support for pupils with special educational needs but these are not translated into a detailed plan of action. It generally fulfils its statutory responsibilities for Special Educational Needs, but there are unacceptable delays in the statementing process which cause frustrations for schools and parents. In general, services which support pupils with special educational needs are well managed, but there are inconsistencies in the quality of support by the Educational Psychology Service. The LEA's procedures for evaluating its Special Educational Needs services need to be more rigorous.

### ***The Special Educational Needs Service***

80. The LEA's Special Educational Needs policy dates from March 1993 and will require some updating to reflect recent government initiatives. The LEA has devised a statement of principles and objectives entitled "Including All Children". This document sets out the LEA's expectations in broad terms and provides clear guidance for schools on implementing the requirements of the SEN Code of Practice outlining the contribution made by the LEA's services.

81. The Special Educational Needs development plan and regional supplements set out priorities for development from 1996-1999. Schools, parents' groups, other agencies and voluntary organisations were consulted about the proposed developments. The themes of the plan are broadly compatible with the policy and statement of principles and objectives, but the plan does not state how the objectives will be implemented, how they will be prioritised, what resources will be allocated, who will be responsible, and what the timescales are.

82. The service performance indicator shows that 78 per cent of draft statements are completed in 26 weeks, and 43 per cent in 18 weeks. The percentage of draft statements issued within timescales has improved from 13 per cent in 1995/96 to 43 per cent in 1997/98. This places Kent among the poorer performers in the statistical neighbour group. The target for 1998/99 is 75 per cent.

### ***Learning Support Service (LSS)***

83. The aims of this service are clearly specified and are well understood by schools. The Service Development Plan is well conceived and shows how the service intends to meet its priorities. All of the schools visited were well supported by the service. The service undertakes some surveys of customer satisfaction. The results of the school survey for this inspection show that schools rate this support as satisfactory, and sometimes good.

### ***Behaviour Support Service***

84. The aims of the service are clearly specified and it has appropriate short and medium term objectives. The three-year behaviour plan is being developed in line with DfEE guidelines. The service is sensibly aiming to reduce the need for exclusion by promoting more preventative work. The service now has to plan how to prioritise more in-school support. The service uses several effective ways to evaluate its performance. In the inspection survey over two-thirds of schools considered that LEA support for behaviour management was satisfactory or better. In two schools visited the service has been effective in helping them to devise ways of supporting pupils and managing disruptive behaviour.

### ***BIThe Education Psychology Service***

85. The business plan of the service is closely aligned with the LEA's strategic priorities, It aims to meet pupils' needs at the earliest point possible in line with the Special Educational Needs Code of Practice. The service analyses the needs of schools on the basis of the Special Educational Needs audit.

86. Educational psychologists are deployed flexibly to support mainstream and special schools, rather than giving each school an allocation of time. This puts a particular onus on individual psychologists to prioritise competing demands. HMI found on visits to schools that some were receiving very low levels of support for pupils outside the statutory assessment process. This indicates that there is a major challenge for the service to find time for preventative work against the overwhelming demands of statutory work. If the service cannot do this it will not be able to fulfil its key objectives. There is also considerable variation in the speed and quality of the service's response to individual schools.

87. Feedback and evaluation have to date been through appraisal and regular sampling of headteachers' opinion by area business managers. Some headteachers do not feel that their views are represented by this sampling and by the current arrangements where prioritisation is left entirely in the hands of service staff. Almost half of schools surveyed reported that the quality of the support was often insufficient to meet their requirements. This often caused an unnecessary delay in the assessment of pupils and the provision of support for them.

### ***Education Welfare Service***

88. This service fulfils the statutory duties of the LEA in relation to the Children Act 1989 and the 1996 Education Act. It has clear operational objectives which support the strategic objectives of the LEA. Quality assurance mechanisms are undertaken on a sampling basis but need to be more consistently applied. The HMI survey of schools' views revealed that levels of satisfaction with the quality of service provided were variable.

### ***Traveller Support Service***

89. The aims of the service are clear. Priorities are established in line with the requirement to enhance traveller children's access to education and to support them as they transfer between schools. Recent developments include substantial work with asylum seekers. The service is working closely with headteachers to develop an inclusive policy on traveller education. The service undertakes very rigorous monitoring of the traveller population's access to schools. The service has identified a clear range of likely performance indicators and it makes good use of audit trails which detail the history of pupils. A recent survey in Kent LEA was conducted by HMI to see what provision was being made for Roma refugees and asylum seekers from Eastern Europe. The inter-agency structure and strategy for dealing with this issue were impressive and the role of the Traveller education support service had been a catalyst in a good deal of commendable development.

### ***Language Support Service***

90. The aims of the service are clear and are in line with the requirements of Section 11 funding. The service has also identified the need to support recent government initiatives, such as homework and literacy support. The uncertainty over future funding affects the extent to which the service can take a long-term view of developments. Nevertheless, the service has effectively contributed to work with asylum seekers. The service is monitored in line with requirements of Section 11 funding.

### ***Early Years Provision***

91. A multi-agency Kent Early Years development partnership has produced a realistic and challenging development plan for the period April 1998 to March 2001. It was based on very wide consultation with all interested organisations. This will be reviewed annually. It is based on the findings of a previous review of provision of services for under-fives in 1996 and was approved by the Secretary of State in February 1998. The LEA has established good links with other agencies in this field and with voluntary associations. Since 1993 the Kent Child Care Network has expanded significantly.

92. The County Council has established an Early Years Unit and some staff are now in place. The unit's objectives are clearly defined and well conceived in order to support delivery of the Early Years Development Plan. During the period 1994-1997 the LEA established 13 new nursery units in schools. These are appropriately situated in areas of socio-economic deprivation in line with the LEA's original aim for expanding provision.

93. Early Years provision is evaluated through scrutiny of OFSTED reports and checks on staff qualifications and accreditation. The quality of education in newly-established nursery units has been evaluated by the LEA. The LEA has worked with teachers over the past two years to develop an accredited scheme for baseline assessment. Most of the LEA's providers are now using this scheme.

## **MANAGEMENT SERVICES**

### ***Financial Services***

94. **Finance, personnel and property services are targeted towards the schools with the greatest needs. They are relatively low cost, compared with other authorities. Most services are well regarded by schools. However, resource constraints and the effect of reorganisations have had a negative impact on service delivery. In particular, a substantial backlog of building maintenance remains. Some routine functions such as payroll are not delivered effectively. The quality of support to schools with deficit budgets is inconsistent across the county. The LEA has rightly given priority in its EDP to improving its building stock and to reducing the number of schools with deficit budgets.**

95. Finance support to schools is retained centrally rather than included in the delegated budget. The cost of the function is low: 40 per cent below the average in an Audit Commission sample. Finance officer time is allocated to schools not through a formula, but by officers' perception of relative need. In practice this means that finance support is concentrated on schools with budgetary problems, leaving relatively little time for proactive work with other schools. However, most of the schools visited reported that the financial support and advice they received were good and met most of their needs. The inspection survey showed a similar picture. In particular, training workshops, the LEA's guidance material, and the self-assessment format were appreciated and widely used.

96. Eighty-eight Kent schools (17 per cent of total) have deficit budgets, while others carry substantial reserves. The number of deficits has increased by 66 per cent since 1995/96. At the time of inspection 37 of the schools with deficits had agreed recovery plans with the Authority, and another 20 were expected to clear their deficit in the current year. This leaves another 31 with no such plans. Evidence from visits suggested that one-third of schools with actual or projected deficits were not satisfied with the help received from the LEA.

### ***Schools' Personnel and Payroll Services***

97. The core personnel and payroll functions are again retained centrally, rather than being included in the delegated budget. This is done at the request of schools. Support is allocated according to officers' assessment of need, rather than through a fixed entitlement. Schools are satisfied with this arrangement. The cost of the core personnel function is close to the national average in an Audit Commission sample. Schools can also buy in additional consultancy support, but this is rarely done.

98. Evidence from visits to schools and from the inspection survey suggests that the service is very highly regarded for advice on policy and on complex casework. However, both Local Government Reorganisation and local restructuring have had a negative impact on some routine services. In particular, there have been major problems over payroll. For example, in one of the schools visited, 25 per cent of staff had been paid incorrectly, or, in two cases, not at all. This situation was not helped by the fact that communications between personnel and payroll can be poor.

### ***Property Services***

99. The LEA's buildings services were rated by schools in the inspection survey as adequate, while grounds maintenance was regarded slightly more favourably.

100. Officers and elected members acknowledge that there has been a long-term lack of investment in the building stock. Their estimates on the resources needed to clear the backlog of maintenance vary between almost £50m and £150m. This is not an issue which the LEA can resolve quickly. However, action is being taken. Condition surveys of school buildings are now undertaken on a three year rolling programme. Detailed feedback is provided to schools. 'Serious' (ie hazardous) work is completed as quickly as possible, while work categorised as 'poor' (ie important, but not emergency) is prioritised and done when funding is identified. Improving school buildings has also been identified as a priority in the draft EDP, with targets set for reducing the backlog of maintenance.



101. As a result of its bids for New Deal funding, the Authority received £1.1m in 1997 and £6.9m in 1998.

102. Evidence from school visits confirmed that most schools were satisfied that 'serious' maintenance issues were addressed promptly. In particular, emergencies were dealt with more quickly since a new helpdesk had been established. However, at a significant minority of schools visited (11 per cent), major issues still remained unresolved. Examples included toilets condemned by the District Council, leaking roofs and unsafe pipe work, even though some of these issues had already been highlighted in OFSTED reports.

## **SECTION 5: LEA SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING STANDARDS**

### ***Introduction***

103. Of the 42 schools visited by HM Inspectors, five are judged to have made substantial improvements since their first OFSTED inspections. A further 21 schools have made good progress in identifying and addressing areas where improvement was considered necessary. Thirteen schools have made some improvements. Three schools have made unsatisfactory or no progress. One secondary school has been identified in its second OFSTED inspection as having serious weaknesses. The LEA'S contribution to the improvements has been variable. LEA support and guidance on improvement was good in eight schools and satisfactory, or not required, in a further 23. In the remaining 11 the LEA has not met the schools' needs. In these schools advice from advisers was frequently too late, or lacked sufficient focus to deal with long-standing difficulties.

### **SUPPORT FOR THE USE OF PERFORMANCE DATA AND TARGET SETTING**

104. The LEA provides good quality comparative data and its support for interpreting and using data is generally effective. Schools are making good progress in setting targets but there is confusion in a minority of schools between predicting performance and setting challenging targets. The transfer of data between primary and secondary schools is a weakness.

105. The LEA provides all schools with a comprehensive range of data to help them analyse their performance and set targets. The data is of good quality and enables schools to compare their performance with schools which have similar levels of free school meals and Special Educational Needs. The data is helpfully analysed separately for grammar schools and high schools. This provides better comparative information than that available nationally. The data is supported by useful advice on how they might be interpreted and used. There has also been specific support for target setting in literacy and numeracy through written guidance, courses and support to individual schools. The LEA has also worked with schools to develop an analysis of the progress pupils make between GCSE and GCE A level. The LEA has an approved system of baseline assessment and provides clear and helpful guidance on its use.

106. The inspection team judged progress in using performance data and setting targets to be good in 15 primary schools, sound in eight schools and unsatisfactory in two. LEA support was very effective in nine primary schools and satisfactory in a further eight schools. It was found to have little or no effect in eight schools, including the two schools making unsatisfactory progress. The best practice was seen in schools that devised their own systems based on the LEA data, and that provided by OFSTED.

107. The data provided by the LEA was found helpful by nearly all schools, but they did not always make effective use of it to analyse performance and set targets. LEA support in interpreting and using the data was generally well received. It was most effective where courses had been followed up by support in individual primary schools by the District Adviser. Primary schools were generally making good progress on setting targets in literacy and numeracy. The guidance provided for numeracy was often found to be more effective than that for literacy. A small number of schools had confused predicting pupil performance with setting challenging targets. Schools with very small cohorts, or where there were substantial changes in the pupil population between Key Stages, were often in need of more individual advice and support in setting targets.

108. Progress in using performance data and setting targets was judged to be good in seven secondary schools and sound in the other six. The LEA made a substantial contribution to improvement in six schools and had some impact in five schools. The other two secondary schools had made little use of LEA services but were nevertheless making good progress.

109. Secondary schools found the comparative data provided by the LEA helpful and were generally making good use of it. Several schools had benefited from an initial input by the LEA and had gone on to develop their own highly effective systems of analysing performance. In one school, the LEA recognised potentially good practice and had funded further developments. In this school, and in others, practice was in advance of LEA thinking and would benefit from wider dissemination. While some schools had developed sophisticated methods of setting targets, others were at an early stage of development. As in primary schools, a minority of secondary schools were uncertain about how target setting differed from making predictions.

110. The transfer of data between primary and secondary schools was a common weakness. Schools are not using the standardised format provided by the LEA for this purpose. This adds to the work in secondary schools and sometimes leads to incomplete or late data being provided.

## **SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING LITERACY**

**111. Standards of literacy in Kent primary schools are in line with national averages. In secondary schools they are slightly higher. Support by the LEA for the National Literacy Strategy is well managed and appropriately targeted. Three-quarters of primary schools visited have benefited from LEA support and are making improvements. Pupils from the catchment of four secondary schools visited by HMI have benefited from literacy Summer Schools supported by the LEA. However, the secondary schools visited had made little overall use of LEA support to raise attainment in KS3 and K54, although there is evidence of need.**

112. The National Curriculum test results for English show that pupils in Kent primary schools at the end of Key Stages 1 and 2 achieve broadly in line with statistical neighbours and national averages. Although the statistics for the past three years indicate that, though improvements are taking place, the rate of improvement has been slightly below the national level. The literacy target for Kent for the year 2002 is 85 per cent of eleven-year-olds achieving Level 4 or above compared to 65.9 per cent currently.

113. Standards of literacy in Kent secondary schools, as measured by Key Stage 3 National Curriculum assessments in English, have been at least in line with statistical neighbours and above national averages for the last three years. When compared with national averages, the percentage of pupils achieving grades A<sup>+</sup> - C GCSE English Language in Kent secondary schools in 1998 was higher than the national average. These standards have been maintained with minor fluctuations over the last three years.

114. The authority recently commissioned a review of its literacy strategy from the Basic Skills Agency. The Agency also worked with the LEA to encourage all secondary schools to undertake their own developments in literacy.

115. The LEA has recently appointed eight Literacy Consultants to support primary schools in the delivery of the National Literacy Strategy (NLS). Conferences have been held for headteachers, literacy co-ordinators and one member from each governing body. These conferences have been followed by a series of INSET opportunities for all schools. The LEA has also appointed an additional English and Literacy Consultant to work with secondary schools, with the strategic role of developing and disseminating good practice within the authority. The approach is well managed and providing effective support in the first stages of the NLS. Four schools visited had participated in the LEA's Summer Literacy programme for 11-year-old pupils who failed to reach Level 4 in national tests.

116. During the current term the Literacy Consultants are providing 42 schools with a programme of intensive support which will be extended, in phases, to more schools. The schools involved in the first tranche have been selected because literacy standards have been perceived to be poor. The well-established 'Reading Support' programme in primary schools, provided through the Kent Early Literacy Intervention, is continuing to make a valuable contribution to the NLS. A literacy resource centre has been organised within the Key Skills Unit and the Kent Schools' Library Service is co-operating in the provision of book loans and is leading on the National Year of Reading.

117. The effectiveness of the LEA's support for literacy was a theme in 16 of the primary and two secondary schools visited by HMI. Evidence of improvement in English was also collected in two other secondary schools.

118. All of the primary schools showed at least satisfactory signs of improvement in standards or quality of provision; in five of these, good levels of improvement have taken place. Two secondary schools are maintaining standards, while two others have improved over the last four years.

119. In the best examples of improvements in the primary schools, schools focus on approaches combining reading, writing and comprehension whilst encouraging the development of oracy as a way to help pupils appreciate the texts they are studying and to communicate their ideas. The schools are, in the main, following the NLS guidance and achieving considerable success in implementing it, while continuing to provide full coverage of the National Curriculum in English. HMI observed some literacy hours. The quality of teaching was satisfactory or better in the majority of lessons.

120. The LEA has made a beneficial and valued contribution to the work in 12 of the 16 primary schools. The training for key members of staff has been generally effective. Schools' use of the Schools' Library Service is varied. The service is having a limited impact on literacy in secondary schools, either because schools are opting not to buy services which do not provide the type, quality or number of resources they need, or because they choose to target funding on supplementing existing school materials.

121. There are two primary schools where standards are fluctuating and where staff have a shallow understanding of the NLS. These schools are weak in monitoring and evaluating their work and lack rigour in analysing and interpreting performance data. Five of the primary schools need support in monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the provision they make. Headteachers and co-ordinators have not yet received sufficient training in monitoring and evaluating classroom practice through direct observation.

122. The LEA has contributed, indirectly, to improvements in one of the secondary schools visited. The Supported School Self Review initiative provided the stimulus. This consisted of funding and training which helped the department to focus on the key factors leading to improvement and to buy in specialist expertise which the authority could not provide. However, the LEA has not monitored the impact of this initiative in raising standards and cannot, therefore, disseminate effective practice to other schools. Although it is receiving valuable help from the LSS and Special Educational Needs support services, one of the secondary schools with low literacy standards has not received sufficient specialist subject support to address its problems.

## **SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING NUMERACY**

123. **Results in national tests in mathematics in primary and secondary schools are in line with those found nationally but, starting from a higher base, have increased at a slightly slower rate than the national trend. Overall, the LEA has been more effective in supporting primary schools than secondaries. This is not surprising given the thrust of its work and the national agenda. This inspection recognises that the LEA is at an early stage in implementing the National Numeracy Strategy. The effectiveness of advisory support in mathematics has varied dramatically between schools and there is evidence, particularly in secondary schools, of it making insufficient impact where standards are poor.**

124. The LEA was not a pilot authority for the National Numeracy Strategy (NNS) and developments in relation to this are still at a comparatively early stage. The LEA has a long-established history of development work in mathematics and has identified numeracy at Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3 as a priority in its education development plan. A numeracy consultant is now in place and additional appointments in numeracy are being made to support the work of the mathematics adviser. The LEA has not yet produced its own numeracy strategy but has provided guidance and training on setting numeracy targets. The LEA has focused recent support on a group of underachieving primary schools and has also been attempting to identify good practice in teaching numeracy. The LEA supported five Summer Schools for Numeracy in 1998.

125. Evidence in this inspection on numeracy or mathematics was drawn from eight primary schools and six secondary schools. Improvements in standards or provision were sound in three primary schools and good in a further four schools. In one school, there was little evidence of improvement. In secondary schools, progress was sound in one case and good in three others, but there was little evidence of improvement in two schools.

126. The LEA made a substantial contribution to improvement in half of the primary schools and had some impact in a further two schools. The LEA input was not effective in two schools. Where the input was judged to be effective, the support for setting targets for numeracy was a particular strength. Schools welcomed introductory courses on implementing the NNS and were trialling aspects of the strategy with beneficial effects on teaching and learning. Two of the schools had received effective support in analysing their strengths and weaknesses, auditing needs in relation to resources and teaching skills, and developing strategic planning. The work in one of these schools resulted directly from its involvement with the Supported School Self Review programme. Where the support was less effective it was because the LEA input did not meet the specific needs identified by the schools.

127. The picture was less satisfactory in the secondary schools. The LEA had made a significant impact in two schools but had not been effective in three. One school had made very little use of LEA support but was nevertheless making good progress. In the two schools where the LEA impact had been most significant, effective work had been undertaken in developing continuity between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3 and in developing teaching skills. Advisory support was valued in some schools but did not address the needs of other schools. In some areas, heads of mathematics benefit from regular meetings with colleagues from other schools and the Curriculum Consultant but this was not taken up in all areas and as a result networks have lapsed. Support in the past from the LEA for planning in mathematics had proved ineffective in one school visited and help was being sought outside of the LEA. In two schools, the LEA had not intervened adequately, despite poor or falling standards.

## **SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS REQUIRING SPECIAL MEASURES AND THOSE WITH SERIOUS WEAKNESSES**

128. **The LEA meets its statutory duties in relation to schools in special measures. Recently, it has strengthened its arrangements for monitoring and supporting these schools. Such support is now more focused and effectively deployed to help schools improve their performance. The LEA uses enhanced performance data to identify schools causing concern but has yet to clarify the operational arrangements for supporting them.**

129. The LEA has in the past provided a variety of different types of support to schools in special measures. For example, experienced headteachers have been seconded to these schools and in some cases LEA advisers have monitored the schools' progress or provided additional funds for particular initiatives. Monitoring inspections by HMI indicate that in general sound support is provided by the LEA. This support, together with the efforts of the schools themselves, has enabled them to make satisfactory progress in implementing their action plans. Two schools so far have been removed from special measures. HMI monitoring letters, however, identify a number of unmet needs such as the provision of advice in the teaching of reading and writing.

130. From September 1998 the LEA's arrangements for supporting and maintaining schools in special measures have been strengthened in line with its declared priorities. The Special Support Team's main responsibility is for the systematic monitoring of, and support for, schools in special measures. It is too early for judgements to be made on the full impact of this in schools.

131. Monitoring and support for schools with serious weaknesses is also now the responsibility of the Special Support Team. There is already evidence that this is providing these schools with the substantial help they need that the LEA had previously failed to supply. Furthermore, the LEA is developing its use of performance data to identify weak and coasting schools, though it lacks, as yet, clearly defined operational arrangements for supporting them. This is an objective in the draft EDP.

## **SECTION 6: LEA SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION**

### **SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING TEACHING**

**132. LEA support for improving the quality of teaching in English and mathematics has been variable across all phases. Some support is very good, whereas some is of a quality and quantity unlikely to secure improvements. The LEA now includes support for the quality of teaching as a priority in its current plans. The provision of advice on teacher competence issues is good. Appraisal training is comprehensive and of high quality. Arrangements for sharing good practice between schools are variable.**

133. OFSTED inspection evidence shows that in primary and secondary schools the percentage of satisfactory or better teaching is comparable to the national picture. However, in primary schools, teachers' expectations and their knowledge and understanding at both Key Stages 1 and 2 are slightly lower than is the case nationally. The quality of teaching at KS3 and KS4 is broadly similar to other comparable authorities except that at KS3 planning, methods and organisation were poor in a higher proportion of lessons. Other aspects of teaching were judged to be of a similar quality to other LEAs.

134. The LEA's first priority in its draft EDP is to improve further the quality of teaching. The approach rightly focuses on working with schools to monitor, review and improve the quality of teaching by identifying and disseminating good practice, and addressing the deficiencies of weak teaching. The LEA already produces a substantial number of curriculum publications which illustrate good practice in a variety of subjects and aspects.

135. During this inspection HMI made judgements on the quality of teaching in English and mathematics lessons in primary and secondary schools. In eight of the 13 secondary schools visited improvements have been made to the quality of teaching since their OFSTED inspections. In each school there was evidence of some LEA contribution. Improvements had been substantially influenced in two schools by LEA support. Evidence of the effectiveness of the LEA's contribution to improvements in teaching quality has been seen in a number of ways: through whole department evaluation of performance, including lesson observations by subject specialists; provision of pedagogical advice to whole departments by specialist advisers; participation in LEA curriculum projects and professional development opportunities; the school's involvement in Supported School Self Review; provision of LEA advice on behaviour management; support for the use of IT, and support for newly qualified teachers.



136. In primary schools the picture of improvement was more varied. In five schools, the quality of some aspects of teaching had improved since the last OFSTED inspection, whereas in four schools there was evidence of more weak teaching than was previously the case. In only three schools was there substantial evidence that the LEA contribution had been effective. In each of the special schools visited, HMI noted improvements in the quality of teaching, but the LEA's contribution to this was judged to be generally low-level and patchy. The HMI inspection survey of schools' views on the contribution made by the LEA services to improvement in teaching quality showed that approximately 80 per cent of schools felt that it had been helpful overall, but that across specialisms the quality of advice and support was variable.

137. The LEA has provided expert and timely advice to headteachers who have been involved in staff competency procedures. The programme of support provided to newly qualified teachers is generally considered to be satisfactory. There is, however, little evidence from schools that beyond the provision of an induction course and some support for release during their first year of teaching, the LEA monitors the progress of these staff in a consistent way. Headteachers feel that the LEA does not pay sufficient attention to attracting teachers to Kent and retaining good teachers and potential senior managers. The LEA has recognised this in the draft EDP priorities.

138. Teacher appraisal in Kent was introduced in 1990 in advance of statutory requirements. The organisation and training for appraisal of both teachers and headteachers are generally recognised as being thorough and of good quality. In a substantial number of schools, the scheme has been established effectively. This is mainly due to the momentum maintained by the LEA.

### **SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL SELF REVIEW (SSSR)**

139. The principles underpinning this initiative are soundly based, focusing on raising teaching quality and training staff in the skills necessary for self review. Improvements were observed in nearly three-quarters of schools visited. A positive attitude to self review has been stimulated in those schools where SSSR has resulted in obvious progress and developments. However, too few schools have taken the experiences forward as a whole school improvement strategy. The inconsistency of appropriate levels of monitoring is the weakest aspect of the LEA contribution. The LEA is planning to incorporate this initiative into its strategy for monitoring and promoting school effectiveness.

140. The LEA's programme of Supported School Self Review (SSSR) was devised in 1996 in order to help schools strengthen their own approach to self evaluation. Its prime purpose was to challenge schools to raise standards and to support them in doing this. In addition, an intended outcome was that schools would be enabled to continue to undertake their own review activity across the curriculum. The objectives of the programme are very sound in that they place the main onus for improvement on the schools themselves.

141. Any school can apply to participate in the programme. The focus of the activity is negotiated with an LEA adviser, now District Adviser, who provides support and guidance throughout the project. Any required additional support or input can be organised by the LEA, and funding for supply cover is provided for teachers who

engage in action research or developmental work. At the end of the programme the school is required to write a report against an agreed format so that the advantages of self review, and the school's experiences, can be shared with other schools.

142. HMI visited 14 primary and secondary schools where the Supported Schools Self Review process had taken place. In eight schools the benefits and developments emanating from engaging in the self review programme were wider than the original focus. For example, teachers' expectations had been raised and the process of using performance data, and target setting had now spread to other parts of the curriculum. Classroom observation was being used more extensively to improve the consistency of teaching quality and teachers were beginning to undertake their own review activity.

143. The organisational framework for the programme is well-conceived. Documentary support and the content of the induction programme are felt by the majority of headteachers to be a useful introduction to the process of self review and the skills involved.

144. The quality and availability of subsequent support from various advisers has, however, been very variable. In the best examples, advisers acted as catalysts and ensured that the focus was relevant and that time management was incorporated in planning. They challenged schools' thinking, provided additional advice in classroom observation techniques, maintained the momentum of the initiative and brought in external sources of advice where necessary. In these examples the adviser monitored the process at regular intervals, on a light touch basis.

145. Where LEA support was not effective, the schools felt let down. In three examples the contact adviser provided little support for the developments and failed to monitor the programme as it evolved. In two of the schools the process developed into a mini-inspection and resulted in increased dependence on the LEA for support, rather than greater responsibility on the school for self review. In four schools, improvements were made and the project concluded, despite an absence of LEA support and encouragement. Headteachers' main criticism of supported self review was that the LEA has not monitored the programme sufficiently rigorously since its inception to see what lessons could be learned. The advantages from successful projects have not always been used to stimulate good practice in other schools. All schools felt that the additional funding provided by the LEA to enable staff to be released for training in the various processes of self review, and to allow staff development time, was a substantial influence on ensuring that the original objectives were met. In this respect, they felt the programme provided good value for money.

## **SUPPORT FOR POST-16 EDUCATION**

146. GCE advanced level point scores are similar to national averages, pass rates at GNVQ advanced are currently below the national rate, but at about the national average at the intermediate level. There is some expensive post-16 provision and some unsatisfactory curriculum provision in small sixth forms. The LEA is providing useful support in non-selective schools. The use of value added analysis is not yet established in many sixth forms. The LEA does not have a strategic plan for post-16 education but this is a feature in the draft EDP.

147. Nearly all secondary schools provide some form of post-16 education and just over half of Year 11 pupils continue in full-time education in school sixth forms. There is a high proportion of small sixth forms; almost 40 per cent of sixth forms have fewer than 100 students and 20 per cent have fewer than 50 students. Nearly all of the small sixth forms are in high schools, and a substantial proportion of these cater mainly for one year students.

148. Points scores in GCE advanced courses are in line with those found nationally and have shown a relative improvement in the past three years. The pass rate at GNVQ advanced is below the national rate, but the gap has reduced in the past two years. Intermediate GNVQ passes are in line with the national average.

149. The LEA does not have a clear rationale or strategic plan for post-16 education currently, but this is an identified need in the draft EDP. In the past, the LEA allowed a substantial number of sixth forms to operate without official approval. This situation has now been resolved but some of these sixth forms are being subsidised by the rest of the school. Some provide too limited a range of courses and are unable to provide appropriate guidance programmes. Three out of four schools with deficit budgets had fewer than 50 students in their sixth form. Standards in advanced GCE and GNVQ courses also tend to be lower in the smaller sixth forms. The LEA is well aware of these shortcomings and is currently reviewing provision. Schools with small sixth forms are being encouraged to combine with other schools or work in co-operation with colleges of further education, but this is still at an early stage of development.

150. The inspection evaluated the LEA's support for post-16 education in seven schools, including three selective schools. The sixth forms ranged in size from 31 to 256 students. Standards were sound or better in five of the schools and had also shown improvement in recent years. In the other two schools, standards were below average and had not shown improvement. The quality of provision was satisfactory or better in all but one school where the range of courses offered was not appropriate to the needs of the students. There was evidence of improved provision or the maintenance of good provision in five schools.

151. The support provided by the LEA was sound in six schools and ineffective in one school. The non-selective schools made the greatest use of LEA support, for instance in relation to GNVQ courses. Only a minority of the schools had developed effective approaches to post 16 value added analysis. Several schools found the LEA's value added formula was too complex and others needed more help with developing such an analysis for vocational courses. The selective schools made less use of LEA support and tended to turn mainly to examination boards for training pertinent to specific GCE advanced courses. There was little evidence of these schools requiring LEA support. The LEA had helped 'kick start' some sixth form initiatives, such as European links and key skills, and these had often been successfully built on by schools. There was an identified need in at least two schools for advice on planning and reviewing the whole of the post-16 curriculum.

### **SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTING THE SEN CODE OF PRACTICE**

**152. The LEA gives high priority to supporting pupils with special educational needs. The policy on special needs encourages and supports the principle of inclusion. At school level, individual services collaborate well. The LEA does not systematically check that resources are being appropriately targeted by schools. Schools often do not provide sufficient information for parents about their role in the statementing process. Bureaucratic procedures in the statementing process sometimes result in delays in getting the necessary support for pupils.**

153. The level of resourcing for SEN is high: it is currently 18% of the general schools budget (GSB), which is higher than the national average of 15%. The SEN budget allocated to schools is distributed according to the findings of the SEN audit carried out by each school. The proportion of statements issued is in line with national averages in primary schools but higher than national levels in the secondary sector. The percentage of pupils attending special schools is in line with national levels. The time taken to complete statements is frequently unacceptably long.

154. The LEA ensures that through training and support for key members of school staff, the Code of Practice is effectively implemented. Statements are reviewed annually as required. Schools involve parents in annual reviews but often do not provide sufficient information for them about their role in the process.

155. Ten schools and one pupil referral unit (PRU) were visited by HMI for the specific purpose of evaluating the LEA's support for implementing the SEN Code of Practice. Ten of the establishments are making satisfactory and often good progress in developing provision for pupils with special educational needs. The LEA has provided good support in five of the eleven schools and satisfactory support in a further three. The LEA's support has been ineffective in two of the special schools and one primary.

156. The policy on special educational needs encourages and supports the principle of inclusion. Its key objectives are to match provision to needs and transfer decision making to a local level whilst securing an efficient and cost-effective use of resources.

157. Although good progress has been made on these priorities and mainstream schools are well supported, there is still much to do to secure the support for special schools. Schools do not always distribute resources against clear criteria. There are insufficient checks by the LEA to ensure that the resources provided are appropriately targeted.

158. Schools are fully informed about the LEA's strategy and, with the generally effective support of the Special Education Service (SES), are able to make relevant provision for pupils in all of the mainstream schools visited. Early identification of pupils' needs and intervention in providing appropriate support are effective. The individual services collaborate well at the school level to ensure effective in-school provision for pupils.

159. In one of the special schools and in the pupil referral unit visited, although staff and pupils have benefited from SES support, specialised provision which some pupils require is not available. This results in the PRU and special school accommodating pupils whose needs cannot be provided for by these institutions. Several schools have unmet needs relating to speech and language provision, support for speech therapy and communication problems.

160. The audit arrangements for special educational needs work effectively but, in two of the schools surveyed, are too time-consuming and bureaucratic, which results in services being diverted from supporting the pupils in need. In a further two schools, difficulties were encountered getting statements amended when necessary.

161. Several pilot projects for managing and deploying staff, and using SEN budgets more effectively to meet the needs identified within schools have been developed in line with the principles of the SEN development plan. These have been well received by headteachers who feel that the pupils have benefited by the schools having had the flexibility to provide support in the way the specialist support staff feel is most appropriate. This has, in two of the eleven schools surveyed, resulted in pupils being provided with necessary, timely support which has resulted in their making good progress and consequently requiring more limited future support.



162. The LEA provides a range of effective support to headteachers but for staff with middle management responsibilities it is more variable. The headteacher appraisal scheme is well managed, rigorous and highly valued by schools. The support by personnel, legal and financial services is considered to be effective and helpful by headteachers. Schools generally feel that the level of support and monitoring provided by the new district teams is appropriate and fair to all. It is an improvement on previous arrangements and makes a useful contribution to school improvement. Prior to restructuring, the LEA did not have a consistent approach to monitoring schools' implementation of their OFS TED action plans, but this is being addressed by the new district teams.

163. There is evidence of substantial improvement, or of the maintenance of existing high standards of management, in about one half of the schools visited during this inspection. In the remainder some improvements have been made. In two schools there is little or no evidence of improvement to weaknesses identified in the inspection. Evidence from OFSTED reports about the quality of management in primary schools indicates that there are fewer well managed schools than is the case nationally and compared to statistical neighbours, but about the same number of poor schools. For secondary schools the percentage of schools where management is good is higher than is the case nationally.

164. Where there are persistent weaknesses in school management, these commonly include: a lack of strategic vision and sense of direction on the part of senior management; weak whole-school planning; little or no use of performance data to analyse strengths and weaknesses and to set targets; lack of a monitoring strategy for the curriculum and for teaching and learning; and an absence of appropriate skills in the senior management team to deal with the problems identified. Additionally in some schools, budgetary problems have not been resolved.

165. The LEA's contribution to better school management was judged to have had most impact in the following areas. The new Special Support Team is taking rapid, concentrated action to deal with problems in schools identified as having serious

supported by their District Adviser and a mentoring scheme has been set up. The LEA provides a comprehensive range of management documents and advice which stimulate action by headteachers and provide the right climate for change.

166. The contribution of specialist subject advice was more variable. There were several examples of effective support for departmental management from individual advisers and Curriculum Consultants, but there were also examples where co-ordinators and heads of department were not getting good quality advice and guidance.

167. The effectiveness of adviser support across the authority was very variable, prior to restructuring. The effects of the new district teams are difficult to evaluate at this early stage in their deployment but HMI saw indications of more consistent and accessible support for management in schools through the visiting arrangements. Headteachers view the entitlement to two visits per year in a positive light, especially in primary schools.

168. Whereas the information and guidance provided by the authority before Section 10 inspections was considered by the majority of schools to be at least satisfactory, and frequently good and useful, support for development planning and post-inspection planning was often weak. The inspection team found that in only 22 schools visited was LEA support for development planning adequate for meeting the school's needs, and likely to secure improvement.

169. By 1994 all headteachers had been included in the LEA's headteacher appraisal scheme and subsequently the two-year statutory cycle has been maintained. There is unanimous praise for the appraisal scheme by headteachers who consider it to be rigorous and well organised.

### ***Support for Governors***

170. The LEA meets its statutory duties with regard to governing bodies. Support to governors is widely valued by the schools and was found to be effective in many of the schools visited. Governors felt well supported through documentation and from advice obtained through a range of management services. Training courses for new governors are particularly highly regarded. Those for experienced governors are most appropriate when tailored to the specific needs of an individual governing body. Governors are being given an opportunity to express views to the LEA on educational developments even if the time limit for consultation is often short.



of communication and a means of consultation.

172. Quality assurance for governing bodies is available through the NAGM sponsored pilot Governor Appraisal Programme but also through recently developed self-review mechanisms. In the 1998 Annual Report the Strategic Director reported that, whilst governing bodies were making significant contributions to decisions on accommodation and overall budget planning, they were less frequently involved in aspects of strategic planning or evaluating the effectiveness and outcomes of financial decisions. These weaknesses, plus those regarding a general lack of objective setting and self review by governing bodies have also been identified in inspection reports and are now beginning to be addressed through governor support and training.

173. Of the 54 schools surveyed by HMI, 51 considered that the LEA's contribution through support to the governing body had been helpful to the improvement of management and the efficiency of the school. However, HMI considered that only in about half of the schools visited had there been improvement in the work of the governing body since the time of the OFSTED Inspection. This was due to a lack of awareness in many cases of what needed to be or could be done.

174. However, there was considerable evidence to show that the advice, training, consultation meetings, guidance documents and briefing notes provided by the LEA were beneficial in many schools. The quality of the induction training for new governors was almost universally praised. Training and support for clerks was generally held in high esteem. The pattern of meetings with the LEA, including the recent innovation of bringing together headteachers, chairpersons, and clerks, was considered useful. Various strategies recently adopted for consultation were similarly welcomed, although the short time allowed for some responses has prevented every member of a governing body from making a contribution. The quality of the LEA documentation for governors was frequently praised although it was also commonly criticised for being unnecessarily lengthy, complicated and full of jargon. The support provided for governors by the LEA's personnel service is highly valued.

175. The LEA generally meets its statutory duties with regard to governing bodies and seeks to ensure that governors meet their obligations.

1. Number of pupils in LEA area of 1997 compulsory school age	1999			
Primary			113,917	
Secondary			87,327	
Special			2,763	
2. Percentage of pupils entitled to 1997 DEE free school meals	1997	DfEE		
i. primary			18.0	22.8
ii. secondary			13.6	18.2
3. Percentage of pupils living in households with parents/carers	1991	ONS Census		
(i) with Higher Educational qualifications			12.7	13.5
(ii) in Social Class 1 and 2			35.1	31.0
4. Ethnic Minorities in population aged 5-15.	1991	ONS Census		
Percentage of ethnicgroup:				
Asian			0.2	0.5
Bangladesh			0.1	0.8
Black African			0.1	0.6
Black Caribbean			0.1	1.1
Black Other			0.2	0.8
Chinese			0.3	0.4
Indian			1.3	2.7
Other			0.6	1.1
Pakistani			0.1	2.1
White			97.0	89.9
5. Percentage of pupils:				
(i) with a statement of SEN				
primary	1997	DfEE	2.1	2.6
secondary	1997	DfEE	4.4	3.9
(ii) attending special school				
primary	1997	DfEE	0.9	1.1
secondary	1997	DfEE	1.9	1.6
6. Participation in education:				
(i) % pupils under 5 on the roll of a maintained school	1996	DfEE	38	56
(ii) % pupils aged 16 remaining in full time education.	1996	DfEE	77	70

Infant schools	60
Junior schools	57
First schools	7
Junior and infant schools	353
Middle schools	3
Secondary schools 11-16	6
11-18	99
Special schools	31
Pupil Referral Units	11

Primary	1997	7.8%	4.6%
Secondary	1997	11.2%	11.3%

### Pupil/teacher ratio

	Year	LEA	National
All	0/98	N/A	18.9
Nursery	0/98	21.5	18.6
Primary	01/98	24.1	23.7
Secondary	01/98	16.6	16.9
Special	01/98	N/A	6.2

Source: DfEE

### Class size

Size of class	Year	LEA	National
31 or more KS1	0/98	26.9%	24.2%
KS2	0/98	39.9%	1.8%
36 or more KS2	0/98	0.3%	34.4%
32 or more KS2	0/98	0.9%	3.0%

Source: DfEE

assessment				
Funding per pupil: £ per pupil Primary 0-4 5-6 7-10	CIPFA	1996 .97	1124 1241 1110	1279 1180 1149
£ per pupil Secondary 11-13 14-15 16+	CIPFA	1996 -97	1693 1936 2554	1567 1931 2440
Aggregated schools budget: £ per pupil Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996 .97	1473 2157 7408	1486 2053 7945
General schools budget: £ per pupil Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996 .97	1975 2849 10917	2022 2694 12595
Potential schools budget: Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996 .97	1659 2409 8419	1665 2233 8819
Capital expenditure: £ per pupil	CIPFA	1996 .97	188 *	122 *

\* These figures are from CIPFA but only approximate.

	Year	% of pupils achieving Level 2 or above					
		Teacher Assessment			Tasks/tests		
		LEA	National	Difference	LEA	National	Difference
English	1996	79.3	79.5	0.2			
	1997	80.4	80.1	-0.4			
English (reading)	1996	78.6	78.6	0	78.0	77.9	-0.1
	1997	80.1	79.5	-0.5	80.1	79.6	-0.5
English (writing)	1996	76.6	77.3	0.6	79.7	80.4	0.7
	1997	77.5	76.9	-0.6	80.4	80.0	-0.4
Mathematics	1996	82.2	77.3	0.0	82.1	81.9	-0.2
	1997	84.2	76.9	-0.3	83.7	83.1	-0.7
Science	1996	84.1	82.1	1.6			
	1997	85.5	83.9	0.5			

Source: DfEE

## 2. Attainment at age 11                      KS2 tests/tasks

	Year	% Pupils achieving Level 4 or above					
		Teacher assessment			Task tests		
		LEA	National	Difference	LEA	National	Difference
English	1996	63.2	60.1	3.1	61.3	57.1	4.2
	1997	65.9	63.4	2.6	64.1	63.2	0.9
Mathematics	1996	62.9	59.9	2.6	57.4	53.9	3.5
	1997	66.5	64.1	2.4	62.7	62.0	0.7
Science	1996	66.1	65.1	1.0	62.7	62.0	0.7
	1997	70.0	69.5	0.5	65.4	68.8	-3.4

Source :DfEE

	1997	65.0	60.2	4.8	60.3	56.6	3.7
Mathematics	1996	66.1	61.5	4.5	62.0	56.7	5.3
	1997	69.8	64.0	5.8	66.2	60.7	5.5
Science	1996	66.3	59.7	6.6	63.2	56.4	6.7
	1997	68.0	62.2	5.8	66.8	60.8	6.0

Source :DfEE

#### 4. Attainment at age 16 GCSE results in maintained schools

Level achieved	Year	LEA	National	Difference
1 A*-G	1995	95.1	93.5	1.6
	1996	95.1	93.9	1.2
	1997	95.3	94.0	1.3
5 A*-C	1995	43.9	41.2	2.7
	1996	45.4	42.6	2.8
	1997	47.5	43.3	4.3
5 A*-G	1995	89.7	87.5	2.2
	1996	89.9	88.1	1.8
	1997	90.5	88.5	2.0

Pupils aged 15 at the beginning of the school year and on the roll in January of that year Source: DfEE

#### 5. Attainment at age 18 A level results Average point score per pupil

Number entered	Year	LEA	National	Difference
2 or more	1995	16.6	15.9	0.7
	1996	17.0	16.8	0.2
	1997	17.3	17.1	0.2
Less than 2	1995	2.9	2.7	0.1
	1996	2.6	2.7	-0.1
	1997	2.8	2.7	0.1

Source: DfEE

#### 6. Vocational qualifications of 16 to 18 year olds in maintained schools

Level achieved	Year	LEA	National	Difference
Pass entries	1995	70.5	80.2	-9.8
Pass entries (Advanced)	1996	68.4	92.2	-11.0
	1997	66.8	67.8	-8.6
Pass entries (Intermediate)	1996	64.3	78.9	-4.8
	1997	67.5	77.1	-1.5

Source: DfEE

The percentage of students who were in the final year of a course leading to approved vocational qualifications who achieved

schools	1997	94.7	93.9	0.8
Attendance in secondary schools	1996	91.2	90.5	0.8
	1997	91.4	90.9	0.6

Source: DfEE

### Services maintained by the LEA

Service	£ Service Budget 1996/97 (1)	% budget from external grants and other sources	% budget delegated/devol ved to schools	If appropriate % buy back of service
<b>A INSPECTION ADVICE CURRICULUM SUPPORT SERVICES</b>				
Resource Centres	460,000	0	88	78
Governor training and support	311,000	55%	18	18
<b>B SERVICES WHICH PROMOTE ACCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT</b>				
Learning Support Service	2,078,000	11%	0	0
Educational Psychology Service	1,674,000	0	0	0
Educational welfare service	1,082,500	12%	0	0
Behaviour support service	4,444,000	3%	0	15%
Language support service	2,035,000	93%	0	0
Services for visual, hearing , language impaired	1,134,000	0	0	0
Central administration of statements	1,526,000	0	0	0
<b>C MANAGEMENT SERVICES</b>				
Personnel services	8,675,000	0	0	0
Property related services	786,000	0	0	0
Information and computer technology	1,750,000	11%	0	0
Financial services	3,100,000	0	0	0
<b>OTHER SERVICES –please specify</b>				
Catering and Cleaning	355,426	0	0	0
Awards	600,000	0	0	0





**Crown copyright 1999**

**Office for Standards in Education  
33 Kingsway  
London WC2B 6SE**

**Tel. 0171 421 6800**

This report may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-commercial educational purposes, provided that all extracts quoted are reproduced verbatim without adaptation and on condition that the source and date thereof are stated.

A further copy of this report can be obtained from the Local Education Authority concerned:

Education Department  
Kent County Council  
Sessions House  
County Hall  
Maidstone  
Kent ME14 1XQ