



OFFICE FOR STANDARDS  
IN EDUCATION

**LEA SUPPORT FOR  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT**

**INSPECTION REVISIT TO  
CALDERDALE  
LOCAL EDUCATION  
AUTHORITY**

**JULY 1998**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>Page</b>
Background	1
Commentary	2
Changes in the context of the LEA in 1997/98	3
Changes in the performance of schools in 1997/98	3
The performance of schools inspected in 1997-98	3
<b>Progress on the 10 recommendations:</b>	4
1. Establish a comprehensive database	4
2. Analyse and distribute comparative information to schools on pupil performance	5
3. Review and revise powers delegated to the Authority's officers	6
4. Review number, composition and terms of reference of its sub-committees	7
5. Ensure that reasons for decisions are made known to those whom they affect	7
6. Define with greater precision the extent of the schools' entitlement to services	9
7. Focus support for individual schools that need it	10
8. Strengthen primary expertise within Curriculum Support Team	11
9. Devise measures designed to raise educational standards in schools in Halifax	12
10. Devise and implement a comprehensive behaviour support strategy	13
Appendix - Statistical evidence	

## **Background**

1. This report details the findings of an inspection conducted by Her Majesty's Inspectors (Schools) (HMI) under Section 38 of the Education Act 1997. The purpose of the inspection, which was made at the request of the Secretary of State for Education and Employment, was to inform him about the progress which had been made in responding to the ten recommendations of the inspection which took place in January 1997. Following the HMI inspection of The Ridings School, the then Secretary of State for Education and Employment suggested to the LEA, and they agreed, that OFSTED should conduct a review of the services it provides, with particular reference to support to schools and its provision of education for children otherwise than at school.

2. The LEA provided documentary evidence on the progress on each recommendation. Discussions were held with the Chair of Education and spokespersons of the major political parties, the Chief Executive, the Director of Education and members of the Senior Management Team, the Chief Adviser, senior advisers and advisers for English, mathematics and special educational needs (SEN). Representatives from the major consultative groups were also interviewed, including headteachers of primary and secondary schools, teachers' associations and governors' forum. Discussions were held with headteachers of all LEA maintained secondary schools, special schools and the pupil referral unit (PRU); headteachers of grant maintained (GM) schools; all heads of schools where special measures are applied and, where possible, their Chairs of Governors. Headteachers and chairs of governing bodies of 16 primary schools met HMI in small groups.

## **Commentary**

3. Calderdale LEA has undertaken a great deal of activity, some of it beneficial, in order to implement the ten recommendations contained in the OFSTED report which followed the inspection of January 1997. It drew up a detailed action plan, which was approved by the then Secretary of State. Schools, also, regarded the agenda set by the inspection as an opportunity for a new start and demonstrated an eagerness to work in a new partnership with the LEA. Despite this, overall, progress has been insufficient to tackle some of the major difficulties which face Calderdale LEA. Some of the progress made is fragile.

4. Nevertheless, the LEA has taken a number of useful actions. Good progress has been made in relation to the two recommendations which are within the remit of the Curriculum Support Team (CST). Satisfactory progress has been made in relation to three others but progress on the remaining five is unsatisfactory because developments are not sufficiently radical, sustained or co-ordinated to secure the changes which are required.

5. The report called for a change in the corporate culture of the LEA, with clearer and more appropriate working relationships between members and officers, more

transparent decision-making and a more consultative approach to schools. The LEA has not made this shift and because of this has not dispelled the mistrust and hostility some schools still feel towards it.

6. The LEA informs schools better than it did previously but it continues to make major decisions which affect schools without sufficient consultation. The lack of consultation has hindered progress on many of the recommendations but was most acutely felt over the handling of difficult issues such as the budget and rationalising school places. This has further undermined schools' confidence in the LEA. The new Chair of Education's recent attempt to express a commitment to develop more positive relationships with schools has met with some scepticism.

7. The senior officers' capacity for strategic management and leadership is poor. This is most evident in the hesitant development of a behaviour strategy, the lack of clarity over the future use of the database and, until recently, slow progress in devising the school improvement project for Halifax. The acknowledgement of the difficulties which the LEA will face in responding to the requirements of the new national agenda has prompted the secondment of the Chief Adviser, one year prior to his retirement, to contribute to and lead these developments.

8. Urgent action needs to be taken to avert a breakdown in communications with schools. In the current circumstances HMI do not believe that the LEA is capable of responding effectively to the government's new agenda for local education authorities. As a minimum, and with the utmost urgency:

- the original recommendations about the relationships and working arrangements between councillors, officers and schools should be implemented in spirit as well as in the letter to ensure a better understanding between the LEA and its schools;
- appropriate consultation procedures should be established and made to work.

9. Above all, steps should be taken to establish an effective senior management team which can respond in the long term to emerging national and local priorities.

### **Changes in the context of the LEA since February 1997**

10. During the last year there have been no significant changes to the socio-economic context of the LEA and very few changes in the organisation of schools. Admissions to secondary schools continue to be difficult because of the relative unpopularity of some schools, although first choice parental applications for one of these secondary schools are rising. Successful applications have been made by the LEA and the Funding Agency for Schools to increase secondary school places in two areas of Calderdale.

11. Following the May 1998 elections, the composition of the Council has changed and the Labour majority has been reduced. There are now 27 members from the Labour party, 13 members each from the Conservative and the Liberal Democratic parties and one Independent. There is a new Chair of the Education Committee.

12. Setting the budget has been particularly difficult and has resulted in projected and controversial cuts to the music and physical education services. Nevertheless, despite this, reductions and savings to the education budget have been significantly less than those made to other departments. There has also been some growth in expenditure.

### **Changes in the performance of schools since February 1997**

13. In teacher assessments at Key Stage 1, pupils attain marginally better than national averages. However, from Key Stage 2 in National Curriculum tests, pupils attain below the national averages and as they progress through schooling this gap continues. Results in Calderdale showed little significant change in 1997 although the results nationally rose.

14. Rates of improvement in secondary schools are not consistent. The percentage of pupils gaining five or more GCSEs at grade A\*-C has decreased in five of the nine GM schools and two out of the five LEA maintained schools where comparable results exist over the last three years. Sharp differences in the percentage of pupils gaining five or more A\*-C grades between schools continue. However, two LEA maintained schools with a low percentage of pupils achieving five or more A\*-C grades have improved their results although they still attain significantly below national levels. Of continuing concern are the low percentages of pupils who achieve five or more grades A\*-G in the three secondary schools in Halifax. Attainment at 18 remains in line with national averages.

### **The performance of schools since February 1997**

15. A scrutiny of a sample of 25 OFSTED inspection reports on primary schools and three reports on secondary schools over the past year indicates a reasonably sound picture but with some wide variations between schools in the Borough. In the large majority of primary schools, pupils' attainments in the core subjects are at or around the average for pupils of the same age nationally, although there is more variation in standards in the foundation subjects, particularly at Key Stage 2. Standards are most variable in Design and Technology. Management is mostly at least sound and the value for money provided by the LEA's schools generally satisfactory. Pupils' behaviour is nearly always considered a positive feature. Attendance is mostly satisfactory.

16. Three secondary schools, including two schools in Halifax, were recently inspected as part of the second cycle of OFSTED school inspections. Attainment was below national averages. Teaching was considered a strength in two schools and satisfactory in the other. Management was sound. Behaviour was good in two schools

but more variable in the other, where the rate of exclusion was high. Progress in relation to the key issues identified during the first inspection was satisfactory.

### **Progress on the ten recommendations**

**Recommendation 1. To establish a comprehensive database so as to ensure that the Authority's policies (and their implementation) are based on full and accurate information. The database should include evidence on the performance of schools, such as National Curriculum and examination results, and on variations in attainment against national norms and within Calderdale itself.**

**A database has been set up, but the strategic significance and detail of its use have not been established by the LEA and are not understood by schools.**

17. The LEA has set up a database but it has not been successful in establishing its strategic significance with schools. Nearly all schools have received the necessary equipment and software, and training in its use, and the rest will have done so by the end of the academic year. The project is on track for hitting its target date for implementation of September 1998, but the impact will be much reduced if, as appears to be the case, the schools have no clear idea what the database is for.

18. When functional the database will contain basic pupil-level data including admission details, contacts, special educational needs, free school meals, assessment information, attendance data, and Educational Welfare Officer involvement. Amongst other uses, the database will allow the tracking of individual pupils throughout their school career as well as various analyses of attainment.

19. The LEA has produced a draft list of proposed functions of the database and it intends to analyse retrospectively the use to which the data has been put, but there has been no detailed exploration of the ways in which the data might be used strategically to improve decision-making.

20. Schools are not convinced about the purposes and usefulness of the database. They do not fully understand the overall strategy and they have expressed concern that there was insufficient consultation in the early stages of the process to ensure that their needs were taken fully into account. No clear policy has emerged about the strategic use to be made of the data by the LEA. There is some confusion about the way in which the schools and the LEA will be able to use the database to improve their work. The LEA has worked hard on this, without fully communicating the purpose of its work, much of the point of which is therefore lost.

**Recommendation 2. To analyse and distribute relevant comparative information so as to enable the Authority's schools to measure their progress against that of others, locally and nationally. This analysis would include variations across subjects and between significant groups, such as ethnic groups.**

**The LEA has distributed relevant comparative data, but makes little use of its own analyses to identify weakness across the schools, or to formulate policy.**

21. Progress has been made on the analysis and distribution of comparative information. An Assessment Working Group including elected representatives from primary and secondary schools maintains oversight of the analysis and distribution of a range of pupil attainment data. A baseline assessment pilot involving most schools began in Autumn 1997. Key Stage (KS)1 and KS2 National Curriculum (NC) assessment results are analysed by school in relation to the Calderdale average and against the percentage of free school meals. There has also been an analysis of the performance of minority ethnic pupils' attainment at KS1. The LEA has continued to work with Calderdale Secondary Heads Association (CASH) to determine cognitive ability scores for its Y7 pupils as part of a value added measure for KS3 and KS4, although the schools themselves have taken the lead in this instance. No analysis of KS3 NC assessment results took place in 1997. The LEA receives an analysis of GCSE and A-Level results through the National Consortium for Examination Results (NCER). This included a detailed cross-subject comparative examination of results by gender and against the proportion of free school meals. The A-Level analysis measured value added based on the GCSE scores for the same cohort.

22. Schools are beginning to make effective use of the data, for example in relation to target-setting in KS1. The various analyses have produced usefully detailed data which has been distributed to the appropriate schools broadly to the timescale set out in the Action Plan. Training has been provided for primary school headteachers and to some governors to assist in their understanding and interpretation of the statutory assessment data. Primary schools have been visited by members of the CST to relate the data to the context of the school and to use this to discuss appropriate targets for literacy. The shortage of staff which reduced the capacity of the LEA to do a full analysis of the 1997 KS3 data has now been addressed.

23. Most schools have expressed satisfaction with the data. Some have described how they have used the information on comparable schools to set challenging targets across all core subjects to raise attainment at least to that demonstrated by the most successful school in their group, but some schools still lack confidence in their understanding and use of the data. CST has used the data appropriately to help target and co-ordinate support more effectively to schools where attainment is poor. There is, as yet, little evidence that these analyses have been used to their full potential to identify weaknesses across the schools or to influence the policy of the LEA. The LEA's strategic incapacity has undermined what would otherwise have been useful work.

**Recommendation 3. To review and revise the powers delegated to the Authority's officers so as to achieve a more effective use of professional staff and to avoid Education Committee members being unnecessarily involved in administrative detail.**

**Insufficient action has been taken to ensure appropriate and consistent roles for Education Committee members and officers.**

24. Although delayed, some action has been taken to implement this recommendation, but it has not been sufficiently comprehensive to ensure appropriate and consistent roles and responsibilities for members and professional staff. Recommendations to members for increasing delegation of responsibility to the Director of Education were made in October 1997 - later than the expected date of August 1997. Proposals included the delegation of admission arrangements, and proposed changes to the work of the Exclusions Sub-Committee, with the delegation of much of its work to the Director of Education. In addition, the October Report took the opportunity to redefine the range of responsibilities delegated to bring them into line with recent education legislation. Since October, members have agreed to the delegation of admissions, but the work of the Exclusion Sub-Committee continues much as before, and continues to be a source of offence to some secondary headteachers.

25. The delegation of powers for school admissions is said by officers to have speeded up the process of getting pupils into schools. Nevertheless, the Admissions Sub-Committee still sits to provide parents with the right of appeal against the decision of the Director of Education. The OFSTED report identified a particular concern about the work of the Exclusion Sub-Committee and the perception that its approach to schools impairs the LEA's ability to achieve effective consultation. In this respect, despite only two occasions when pupils have been returned to schools, little has changed. The continuing reluctance of members to relinquish this responsibility has engendered in officers and schools a sense that they are not to be trusted, and, amongst secondary schools in particular, has resulted in continued dissatisfaction.

26. The Director of Education, Chief Executive and new Chair of Education are clear in principle that members make policy and officers develop strategy and implement it. However, the practice, and schools' perception of the practice, is rather different. The evidence of interviews and the Committee minutes demonstrate that members are too much involved in the minutiae of decision-making.



**Recommendation 4. To review the number, composition and terms of reference of its sub-committees so as to ensure that the authority's committee structure is effective, economic in its operation and appropriately related to its statutory functions and its declared priorities.**

**Action has been taken to implement this recommendation, but sub-committees still meet too frequently and work at a high level of detail.**

27. At the time of the OFSTED inspection the LEA had 11 sub-committees, three consultative committees and nine working parties. A review of the Education Committee structure was presented to, and agreed by, the Education Committee on 13 October 1997. This suggested a rationalisation of the sub-committees and their structure. The Report recommended the reduction of sub-committees to seven, and, through amalgamation, the consultative groups to two. Some sub-committees were deemed to have served their purpose; others which had similar functions were brought together. Many of the working parties dealt with issues which more properly fell within the remit of officers, and the Director of Education asked whether members needed to be on these groups. Working groups have now been reduced to three, and the size of the Education Committee has been reduced from 23 elected members to 12, along with co-opted representatives.

28. In general, members and officers welcome the reduction in sub-committees and working parties. Officers report a reduction in the time spent preparing for committee meetings. However, some sub-committees still meet too frequently, and deal with relatively trivial matters. The number of committee reports produced remains large and they are often of poor quality. For example, within the period from January 1997 to April 1998 there were 30 meetings of the Education (Special) Sub-Committee. On four occasions it met three times, on one occasion four times and on another five times between successive Education Committee meetings. However, there is some evidence within committee minutes that the Education Committee and the Education Performance Review Sub-Committee are playing a more strategic role. On the other hand, the work of the Evaluation Panel has not featured on the agenda of the Education Committee, and there has only been one report on the progress being made on the LEA's Action Plan over the last year.

**Recommendation 5. To ensure that the reasons for decisions made by the Committee are known to those whom they affect and take due account of the schools' needs and priorities so as to achieve a better understanding between Education Committee members and schools.**

**The LEA now informs its schools better, but has made no progress in dispelling the mistrust of the LEA evident in schools.**

29. The LEA has met the first part of this recommendation but has still not been able to convey through its recent actions that it is operating in partnership with schools. It

has not, therefore, been able to dispel the mutual mistrust which exists between schools, officers and members. This inhibits effective consultation and communication and undermines schools' confidence in the work of the LEA.

30. The LEA has begun to distribute a regular synopsis of Education Committee decisions to schools and governors to ensure that schools and governors are provided with information about Committee decisions. This is appreciated by those concerned. The information provided to schools and governors gives a clear picture of the issues being discussed, and of the decisions arising from these discussions. The reasons for items being placed on the agenda are mostly clear, for instance where items have been brought as a response to new legislation, but the reasoning behind the decisions taken is often not transparent in the documentation.

31. In addition to this there are a number of forums which provide a point of contact between the LEA and its schools. These include meetings between senior officers and headteachers at the four-weekly meetings of the Calderdale Association of Secondary Headteachers (CASH), and termly meetings with primary headteachers. Senior officers have a termly meeting with chairs of governing bodies and there is a six-weekly forum where Members meet with a small group of chairs of governors representing primary, secondary and special schools. A new six-weekly Employees' Forum, involving the trade unions representing staff working in Community Education and teachers, meets with the employers. Headteachers and teachers are represented on the Education Committee and there are various working parties which involve teacher representation. Schools are also represented during appointment procedures for senior staff of the Education Department. The needs of individual specific schools are discussed by senior officers at primary and secondary group meetings, and at the Senior Planning Group.

32. Whilst the dissemination of information through these means has improved, the LEA has not ensured that schools understand the reasons behind many of its decisions or that, where the decisions have significant implications for schools, there is a consistent and appropriate level of consultation prior to a decision being reached. Members interviewed expressed the opinion that they should become more responsive to the needs of schools, and develop a better partnership with them. This was borne out in the interviews with headteachers and chairs of governors, who, generally, believed consultation to be poor and decision-making arbitrary. There is significant mistrust by headteachers and governors of the processes involved which the weaknesses in consultation and communication have not helped to dispel. The various forums where officers meet headteachers and governors or where Members meet chairs of governors are not regarded by headteachers and, to a lesser extent, governors, as effective. Indeed many headteachers are very sceptical about the extent to which the schools' views are taken sufficiently into account through such meetings. There is no forum where Members, officers and headteachers all meet together, and schools express frustration about the lack of proper dialogue between these partners in the education process.

**Recommendation 6. To define with greater precision the extent of the schools' entitlement to services and the means by which the use of these services is to be evaluated.**

**The schools' entitlement to services is now better defined, and some services have improved. There is, however, no consistent approach to evaluation.**

33. The Service Level Agreement Booklet published in September 1997 established for each service an entitlement for schools, and specified the overall cost of each service. In addition a number of services produced supplementary handbooks which defined the service in more detail. Schools are clear about their entitlements within service level agreements. However, there was little consultation when they were established. Recently a questionnaire has been circulated to evaluate whether the agreements have been met. As a result of schools' concerns about the allocation of support for special educational needs an Advisory Board, which includes headteachers, has been established to advise on the formula for the deployment of these services.

34. Some developments have been made by individual services to evaluate their effectiveness but nevertheless a coherent system of performance review is still under-developed. Officers indicate that up to now these developments have been carried out largely separately by individual services; hence there is some variation. All services have identified performance indicators. Some services have identified service standards which are quantifiable and measurable; others are less clear and need to be more precisely defined.

35. The LEA has devised a questionnaire to schools, asking for comments on the quality of services and their effectiveness. Some services have pre-empted this through establishing their own procedures, and making recommendations for improvement. In the case of the Education Psychology Service an evaluation has been used by the new head of service to inform the service specification. Other than this, there are no mechanisms through which consultation is carried out or service-user views can be sought.

36. Each service head has been charged with producing an annual report for the Education Department senior management team. The Action Plan indicates that services will assess whether they provide value for money. A review of the targets and timing of the Plan, presented to Committee in June 1997, indicated that a report will be presented to Performance Review Sub-Committee detailing for each service: performance indicators, schools' use of services and value for money. While it is clear that evidence will be available to allow judgements to be made on the first two issues, little attention has been given to value for money, and it is not apparent how the LEA proposes to assess it.

37. Schools believe that some services have improved, although there are disparities in the quality of individual officers. The Curriculum Support Team is well regarded, and has met the specified targets in the service level agreement. There is less satisfaction with the learning support and behaviour support services.

**Recommendation 7. To re-examine and, where necessary, re-order the way in which support is provided to schools so as to ensure co-ordinated action following OFSTED inspections and better focused support for the individual schools that need it.**

**The CST has made progress in targeting its resources on the schools with greatest needs.**

38. The action taken has been timely and in line with the proposals in the Action Plan. Three major developments have taken place in response to this recommendation. Firstly, the strengths and weaknesses of each Section 10 inspection report are summarised for the Education Management Team (EMT). Secondly, criteria and a scoring system have been established to identify primary schools with additional support needs. Thirdly, the work programmes of advisers are clearly defined, and take into account the support they are required to give to schools in special measures, those with serious weaknesses and those identified by the LEA as requiring additional support.

39. There is substantial evidence that CST is targeting effectively resources on those schools with the greatest needs. Although there is some variation, all schools requiring special measures and schools with serious weaknesses have received extensive support and resources from the LEA which in one or two schools are very considerable. In addition to these schools, the scoring system has identified 11 schools which require additional support. Curriculum advisers visit the schools identified, to explain to headteachers and chairs of governing bodies why their schools have been included. Schools are asked to devise an action plan in which they are asked to identify the support which they require to make improvements and this places responsibility securely on the school for making improvements. Senior advisers and any other officers whose sections are affected consider the support which the school requires and a programme of support is agreed with the school. This stage enables a balance to be struck between the school's needs and the level of resources available within services.

40. The CST has also been effective in regaining the confidence of secondary schools. The recently established subject adviser role is valued by the schools and is contributing to the review and improvement of standards and quality. Headteachers report a spirit of co-operation between their schools and the CST which is enabling them to make progress. Officers acknowledge that co-ordination of support from several different services still requires improvement and differences in approaches by services have not always been sufficiently overcome to enable a consistent response to schools' needs. The co-ordination of support to schools in special measures appears better.

**Recommendation 8. To examine alternative ways of providing additional primary expertise within the Curriculum Support Team, and, as soon as this proves possible, ensure that the appropriate expertise is made available.**

**The CST has been successful in providing additional primary expertise within the team, but the benefits of its work may not be sustained.**

41. Much has been achieved to develop the credibility of advisers to work in the primary phase, and the management of the service has in place processes to monitor, evaluate and improve the quality of support provided. The responses to the recommendation are appropriate. Action has met the timescale of the Action Plan.

42. Appropriate use is made of the primary and early years expertise in LEA services through the close co-operation of the CST and the Children's Services Unit (CSU) and the deployment of the special educational needs adviser. This joint working has been effective in the production of the Early Years Development Plan, the establishment of the Early Years Forum, and in the comprehensive identification of training needs. New advisers receive an induction programme which introduces them to key staff and procedures related to their role. Training is provided on specific topics, such as classroom observation, early years education and school development planning. This training is supplemented by other activities, for example shadowing colleagues and joint visiting. The curriculum advisers have detailed agendas for their visits to primary schools. Extensive briefings are provided for team members on all the items to be covered. Senior advisers monitor notes of visits, and comment on these in writing, pointing out areas of weakness, for example failure to comment on development plan priorities or to compare NC assessment results. Good use is made of the opportunities which arise for training in specific functions such as the training for moderation of KS1 assessments.

43. There are sound procedures for the identification, use and support of the primary headteachers seconded to work with schools in special measures, on governor training and headteacher appraisal. Primary headteachers have also contributed to working groups such as those on assessment and on devising a primary/secondary transition record. Reception teachers played a substantial role in developing the LEA's baseline assessment scheme and in delivering its training programme.

44. The strategies adopted to develop the skills of advisers from secondary backgrounds to work successfully in the primary phase have been effective. Evaluations show that primary headteachers have a high degree of satisfaction with their curriculum advisers; this was confirmed by interviews conducted by HMI. The management of the service has sound systems in place to judge the quality of the support given, and acts to rectify weaknesses. It is also beginning to evaluate the effects of team training, for example initial analysis of the evaluation of the quality of primary schools' development plans shows a significant improvement compared with last year.

45. There are signs that the full benefits of this thorough and intensive work will not be realised or maintained. Two advisers have recently been appointed to posts in other LEAs, and others are actively looking for other jobs. The retention of advisers is problematic because of the Council's slowness to resolve requests for regrading the posts despite the apparent anomalies in the current grading arrangements. For

instance, the four literacy consultant posts are graded at the same level as the adviser with overall responsibility for managing the literacy strategy.

**Recommendation 9. To devise with governors, heads, and parents measures designed to raise educational standards in primary and secondary schools in central Halifax so as to respond to the specific and pressing needs of these schools.**

**A great deal of activity has been undertaken but it remains unco-ordinated. Major targets in the Action Plan for the development of a school improvement project and a review of the structure of secondary school provision in Halifax have not been addressed.**

46. The LEA has planned work on eight separate strategies. Successful work has taken place on about half of these. Until the recent successful bid for an Education Action Zone no progress had been made on the most central of these; a co-ordinated school improvement project. Other initiatives include:

- a review of the structure of secondary school provision in Halifax (intended to go to Committee in December 1997, but still only partially complete);
- introduction of Integrated Learning Systems into secondary schools;
- projects in two areas funded under the Single Regeneration Budget on improving early years provision, literacy and vocational education;
- support for individual schools in raising standards in specified areas of weakness;
- access to borough-wide strategies in both information technology and management training including school self-review;
- developments in numeracy and in improving transition between primary and secondary schools which are at a very early stage.

47. This amounts to a good deal of activity, much of which is potentially valuable and appropriately deployed. There are gaps: there is no evidence of planned developments on raising the attainment of minority ethnic pupils, middle management training, mentoring or pastoral care. More importantly, support is generally uncoordinated between different services and across phases of education. Effectiveness is lost as a result.

**Recommendation 10. To devise and implement a comprehensive strategy for supporting pupils with behavioural difficulties.**

**Little progress has been made on this issue. Developments are partial, fragmented and slow.**

48. Policy is being developed in three working parties on special education needs, behaviour and disaffection which include officers, headteachers and managers of support services. Members discuss developments in the Pupil Services Working Party.

Reports to members do not display a sufficiently coherent approach. The national deadlines for the publication of a Behaviour Support Plan have been deferred until December 1998 and the LEA has allocated responsibility and devised general principles to inform the formulation of such a plan. However, in view of the circumstances which resulted in the first LEA inspection, and the target and timescale in the Action Plan, more should have been achieved.

49. The audit of schools' concerns about behaviour problems has taken place and has been analysed. It is reported that this has been used to help to identify schools which require guidance and training provided by the Behaviour Support Team. This team comprises a teacher, education welfare officer, part-time educational psychologist and five support assistants. A recent conference entitled "Excellence For All Children" included a workshop which provided schools which attended with some new approaches to the management of behaviour.

50. The access to and deployment of support from many different services remains problematic and is still of concern to some schools. Procedures for a common route of referral through a panel have been devised recently. However, this panel does not include the acting head of the Pupil Referral Unit or representatives from Learning by Achievement. Referral to Learning by Achievement continues to be conducted separately although the LEA receives information on pupils who attend. Criteria for part-time placement of groups of pupils with this project still depends on referral from the schools.

51. The LEA still lacks a continuum of provision to support pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties. Secondary schools do not feel well supported when working with pupils with behavioural difficulties. Schools with surplus places still find that they admit a disproportionate number of pupils with behavioural and social difficulties at unusual times. While the placements of pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties in the secondary phase special school have been clarified to the headteacher's satisfaction, the future of the Pupil Referral Unit remains uncertain. Leadership of the Pupil Referral Unit is still not permanent, although contracts have been extended for a further year. The proposals to open a primary unit for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties have been agreed but the location of the unit has not been finalised. The management and operation of an existing primary school unit have been improved and the work of the unit has been evaluated. While the unit has

had some success in reducing the number of pupils on the special educational needs register within the school, there is no planned dissemination of successful strategies, although it is expected that continuing review meetings will identify successful strategies that may be transferable to other schools. The Behaviour Support Team is overstretched. Pupils with severe difficulties are placed in schools out of the area.

52. There is evidence that the LEA has been more prepared to intervene when difficulties arise and has enlisted the help of the diocesan authority to mediate over the rate of exclusions from a GM school. Exclusions are still monitored by the Exclusion Sub-committee which has met about 18 times over the past year. The sub-committee has reinstated two pupils. Both pupils no longer attend school; one pupil's care placement has broken down and another pupil's exclusion was upheld on appeal. The work of this sub-committee continues to affect adversely the partnership with schools which the LEA wishes to construct. A survey has taken place which clearly shows the extent of the dissatisfaction expressed by schools and governors with the approach taken by the sub-committee. A report on this survey was presented to the Pupil Services Working Party, but advice to members on alternative ways in which they could exercise their role and maintain their interest in preventing exclusion, without causing antagonism, has not been made explicit. The profitable work which the sub-committee is able to achieve in preventing exclusion is considerably outweighed by the ill-feeling which its operation continues to create.



## APPENDIX

### SECTION 1 CONTEXT OF THE LEA - CALDERDALE

#### Characteristics of the pupil population

Indicator	Date	Source	LEA	National
1. Percentage of pupils entitled to free school meals	1997	DfEE		
i) Primary			22.1	22.8
ii) Secondary			17.4	18.2
2. Percentage of pupils living in households with parents/carers	1991	ONS Census of population		
(i) with Higher Educational qualifications			12	13.5
(ii) in Social Class 1 and 2			27.3	31.0
3. Ethnic Minorities in population aged 5-15. Percentage of ethnic group:	1991	ONS Census of population		
Asian			.3	.5
Bangladeshi			.4	.8
Black African			.1	.6
Black Caribbean			.2	1.1
Black Other			.3	.8
Chinese			.1	.4
Indian			.4	2.7
Other			.6	1.1
Pakistani			8.0	2.1
White			89.6	89.9
4. Percentage of pupils:	1997	DfEE		
(i) with a statement of SEN				
primary			1.74	1.6
secondary			2.17	3.9
(ii) attending special school				
primary			.45	1.1
secondary			1.14	1.6
5. Participation in education:				
(i) % pupils under 5 on the roll of a maintained school	1997	Audit Commission	68.7	60
(ii) % pupils aged 16 remaining in	1997	DfEE	61.8	67.4

full time education.				
----------------------	--	--	--	--

### Organisation of maintained schools in LEA area

Schools	LEA maintained	GM
Primary schools	82	8
Middle schools	-	-
Secondary schools 11-16	2	0
Secondary schools 11-18	4	9
Special schools	3	-
Pupil Referral Units	1	-

### Pupil/teacher ratio

	Year	LEA	National
Primary	1997	24.3	23.4
Secondary	1997	16.9	16.7
Special	1997	4.78	

Source: DfEE

### Class size

Rate per 1000 classes

Size of class	Year	LEA	National
31 or more KS1	1997	327.3	289.6
KS2	1997	364.0	379.0
36 or more KS1	1997	25.4	22.9
KS2	1997	15.0	35.0

### Surplus places

% surplus places	Year	LEA	National
Primary	1997	12	10
Secondary	1997	7	11

## Finance

Indicator	Source	Year	LEA	National
Funding per pupil: £ per pupil      Primary 0-4 5-6 7-10	CIPFA	1996-97	£950.5 £1289 £1192.8	£1278.8 £1180.2 £1149.4
£ per pupil      Secondary 11-13 14-15 16+	CIPFA	1996-97	£1700.5 £2074.7 £2108.8	£1567.4 £1931.4 £2440.0
Aggregated schools budget: £ per pupil      Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996-97	£1431.8 £1964.1 £10631.0	£1486.0 £2036.3 £7945.2
General schools budget: £ per pupil      Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996-97	£2095.9 £2913.7 £14125.0	£2021.8 £2694.2 £12595.0
Potential schools budget: Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996-97	£1627.7 £2284.5 £11321.4	£1664.6 £2232.6 £8819.1
Capital expenditure: £ per pupil	CIPFA	1996-97	£205.3	£128.9

## SECTION 2: THE PERFORMANCE OF MAINTAINED SCHOOLS

### PUPILS' ATTAINMENT

#### 1. Attainment at age 7 KS1 tests/tasks

	Year	% of pupils achieving Level 2 or above					
		Teacher Assessment			Tasks/tests		
		LEA	National	Difference	LEA	National	Difference
English	1996	82.8	79.3	3.5			
	1997	82.8	80.4	2.4			
English (reading)	1996	81.4	78.6	2.8	81.8	78.8	3.8
	1997	81.6	80.1	1.6	81.7	80.1	1.6
English (writing)	1996	80.7	76.6	4.00	81.7	79.7	2.0
	1997	79.8	79.5	2.5	80.4	80.4	0
Mathematics	1996	85.1	82.2	2.9	84.0	82.1	1.9
	1997	85.1	84.2	1.00	84.8	83.7	1.0
Science	1996	87.0	84.1	2.9			
	1997	86.9	85.5	1.3			

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	61.2	60.1	1.1	55.5	57.1	-1.6
	1997	62.9	63.4	0.5	60.5	63.2	-2.7
Mathematics	1996	62.9	59.9	3.0	55.9	53.9	2.0
	1997	64.3	64.1	0.2	61.9	62.0	-0.1
Science	1996	64.5	65.1	-0.7	61.1	62.0	-0.9
	1997	66.3	69.5	-3.2	64.8	68.8	-4.0

Source: DFEE

### 3. Attainment at age 14 KS3 tests/tasks

	Year	% pupils achieving Level 5 or above					
		Teacher assessment			Task/tests		
		LEA	National	Difference	LEA	National	Difference
English	1996	58.1	60.3	-2.2	53.3	56.6	-3.3
	1997	57.5	60.2	-2.6	50.7	56.6	-5.9
Mathematics	1996	57.0	60.7	-7.2	53.1	56.7	-3.7
	1997	61.9	62.8	-1.5	56.7	60.7	-4.1
Science	1996	67.3	59.7	-2.3	53.7	56.4	-2.7
	1997	60.2	62.2	-2.0	56.8	60.8	-4.0

Source: DfEE

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

Level achieved	Year	LEA percentage	National percentage	Difference percentage
1 A*-G	1995	93.2	93.5	-0.4
	1996	92.0	93.9	-1.9
	1997	90.7	94.0	-3.2
5 A*-C	1995	39.6	41.2	-1.6
	1996	39.9	42.6	-2.7
	1997	38.5	43.3	-4.8
5 A*-G	1995	83.8	87.5	-3.7
	1996	83.7	88.1	-4.4
	1997	83.5	88.5	-5.0

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 of subjects entered	Year	LEA	National	Difference
2 or more	1995	16.0	15.9	+0.1
	1996	16.7	16.8	-0.1
	1997	16.6	17.1	-0.6
Less than 2	1995	2.1	2.7	-0.6
	1996	2.1	2.7	-0.6
	1997	2.3	2.7	-0.4

Source: DfEE

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

Level achieved	Year	LEA percentage	National percentage	Difference percentage
Pass entries	1995	73.3	80.2	-6.9
Pass entries (Advanced)	1996	83.2	79.3	3.8
	1997	63.4	75.4	-12.0
Pass entries (Intermediate)	1996	72.7	69.1	3.6
	1997	63.1	68.9	-5.8

Source: DfEE

Figures show the percentage of students who were in the final year of a course leading to approved vocational qualifications who achieved them on the basis of the work done in that year.

## 7. Attendance

Percentage of pupil sessions	Year	LEA	National	Difference
Attendance in primary schools	1996	94.0	93.4	0.6
	1997	93.5	93.9	-0.4
Attendance in secondary schools	1996	90.3	90.5	-0.1
	1997	91.0	90.9	0.1

Source: DfEE