

# BRENT LEA'S POST OFSTED ACTION PLAN

## Introduction

This action plan is written in response to the Ofsted Inspection of Brent LEA, published in May 2003. It should be read in conjunction with other key plans, which are referred to throughout this document.

The report stated that, since the last inspection, Brent has made highly satisfactory progress in improving the quality of service it provides to schools and in carrying out the recommendations of the previous inspection. The LEA's performance in fulfilling its statutory duties and working to improve schools is highly satisfactory. It has improved those services that were unsatisfactory in the last inspection.

Brent LEA has particular strengths in:

- the definition of monitoring, challenge and intervention
- the identification of and intervention in underperforming schools
- financial services
- assuring the supply and quality of teachers
- the deployment of staff
- the performance management of services
- value for money of services to support school improvement
- provision for looked after children
- the quality of leadership of senior officers
- the quality of advice given to elected members
- support for raising standards in literacy
- support for raising standards in numeracy
- the provision of school places
- admissions

There are 13 recommendations for improvement. They fit very well with our own self evaluation.

What follows is an action plan for each recommendation, including:

- text from the report relevant to the particular issue
- names of the lead officer for each recommendation and key officers working for these improvement
- the outcomes we hope for by April 2004
- the names of plans where further developments in this area can be found post April 2004
- details of monitoring sources and how the progress will be evaluated
- a list of activities to be undertaken

## RECOMMENDATIONS

		PAGE
1	<b>In order to improve the strategy for special educational needs:</b> proceed with the Best Value review of special schools and other specialist provision as a matter of urgency.	4
2	<b>In order to improve the strategy for special educational needs:</b> put in place effective procedures to reduce significantly the delays caused by other agencies to the process for producing statutory statements.	7
3	<b>In order to improve the quality of behaviour support:</b> ensure that all primary schools who need it have access to behaviour support.	10
4	<b>In order to improve support for child protection:</b> ensure that all designated teachers undertake updated training.	13
5	<b>In order to improve scrutiny:</b> provide training, advice and support for Members to make the scrutiny function effective in monitoring and evaluating the work of the LEA.	15
6	<b>In order to improve the allocation of resources to priorities:</b> re-assess the adequacy of education funding, particularly that delegated to schools, in the context of the council's priority for children and young people.	18
7	<b>In order to improve the LEA's support for early years:</b> take steps to improve the coherence of planning between the LEA and the EYDCP.	22
8	<b>In order to ensure continuous improvement:</b> bring forward the planned date of the early years partnership Best Value review.	28

- 9 **In order to improve the targeting of support:**  
further differentiate the allocation of core visits by the link school improvement adviser so that successful schools do not receive more than they need. **29**
- 10 **In order to improve the effectiveness of monitoring and challenge:**  
make written records of monitoring visits more evaluative. **31**
- 11 **In order to improve the support for information and communication technology:**  
devise and implement effective systems of monitoring and evaluation in order to have accurate knowledge of schools' progress and the levels of pupils' attainment in ICT. **33**
- 12 **In order to improve the support for governors:**  
provide more guidance to governors so that they are able to play an effective part in the monitoring and evaluation of their school's performance. **35**
- 13 **In order to improve the quality of behaviour support:**  
target more effectively the support given to schools by the pre-exclusions officer to identified need. **37**

Recommendation 1	Responsibility of:
<p><b>In order to improve the strategy for special educational needs:</b></p> <p>proceed with the Best Value review of special schools and other specialist provision as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>Lead: Rik Boxer, Deputy Director</p> <p>Key Officer: Rachel Clarke, Head of SEN</p>
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>119. The LEA's performance is now satisfactory in all aspects of special educational needs. At the time of the previous inspection, the LEA's strategy for SEN was unsatisfactory. A sound policy and strategic plan for development are now in place and satisfactory progress is being made. The recommendations of the previous report have been acted upon. The LEA continues to take reasonable steps to meet its statutory obligations in respect of special educational needs but the time taken to produce statutory assessments involving advice from other agencies is unduly long. The LEA has satisfactory procedures in place for monitoring the use of funding. However, the Best Value review of special schools is yet to take place, which means the role of special schools within the strategy for special educational needs is not clear, and the value for money offered by the schools has not been examined sufficiently.</p> <p>120. The LEA now has a satisfactory policy for special educational needs and inclusive education in place. Following wide consultation, it has the support of schools, elected members and other stakeholders. The policy and associated plans are coherent with other LEA statutory and strategic plans. Operational service plans support the strategy, and the senior management team regularly reviews implementation. The special educational needs and inclusive education strategic review group, comprising representatives from primary, secondary and special schools, social services and health, meets regularly to monitor the effect of the special educational needs policy and strategy and clear progress reports are made to elected members. The "invest to save" initiative is beginning to reduce the reliance on special school places outside the borough by investing in provision inside Brent. Provision for special educational needs has been enhanced by the addition of specialist units attached to schools and effective outreach work for pupils with autism and speech and language difficulties.</p> <p>121. Some weaknesses remain in the special educational needs strategy. The authority has set a high priority on supporting children with special educational needs during their early years, but it has not made significant progress on this. Earlier intervention in mainstream schools has been supported by elected members who have agreed the allocation of increased resources for pupils with special educational needs but who do not require a statutory statement. However, the difference between the resources allocated to pupils with a statutory statement and those without, remains large. This does not encourage schools to meet the special</p>	

educational needs of pupils without a formal assessment and statement.	
122. A review of the role of special schools is planned, but they are currently unclear about their role. This reduces the potential for more effective and efficient partnership working between specialist provision and mainstream schools.	
<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>	<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Best Value Review completed</li> <li>▪ A clear action plan and timescales for the implementation of the recommendations is in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SEN and Inclusion Development Plan April 2004/05</li> <li>▪ BV Performance Plan 2003/4 and 2004/5</li> </ul>
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>	<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agendas &amp; Minutes of DMT (Departmental Management Team)</li> <li>▪ Agenda &amp; Minutes of SEN and Inclusion Strategic Review Group</li> <li>▪ Letters to Heads</li> <li>▪ Head of SEN's monitoring reports to the Deputy Director</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reports from the panel meetings</li> <li>▪ Service evaluation for the service plan – Spring annually</li> <li>▪ Overview reports in BVPP annually</li> </ul>

<b>Activities to be undertaken</b>	<b>Target Group</b>	<b>Those involved</b>	<b>Time-scale (month)</b>	<b>Resources &amp; Source</b>
Consultant employed to provide report towards BV review	Headteachers, Governors & all Stakeholders	Deputy Director and Head of SEN	April – June 2003	Within current budget arrangements (Future growth bids may be required to implement recommendations)
Meetings to be held with stakeholder groups			May and June 2003	
Preliminary reports completed.			31 June 2003	
Panel meetings provide challenge to the process			Early July 2003	
Best Value Review reported to members			Autumn cycle 2003	

## Monitoring & Evaluation Record

**May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003**

(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in May and the production of the Action Plan)

**Current Position:**

- A consultant was appointed in April to produce a report towards the Review. His work is overseen by a steering group chaired by the Deputy Director.

**October 2003, January 2004, May 2004**

**Monitoring:**

**Evaluation:**

<b>Recommendation 2</b>	<b>Responsibility of:</b>
<p><b>In order to improve the strategy for special educational needs:</b></p> <p>put in place effective procedures to reduce significantly the delays caused by other agencies to the process for producing statutory statements.</p>	<p>Lead: Rachel Clarke, Head of SEN</p> <p>Key Officer: Janet Gay, Head of Special Needs Assessment Service</p>
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>123. The LEA continues to takes adequate steps to meet its statutory obligations. There are systematic procedures in place for monitoring the statementing and annual review processes and the placement of pupils. During 2002 the rate of completion of statements within the recommended 18 weeks improved to 92 per cent, excluding those involving other agencies. In cases where medical and other advice is sought, the completion rate is low at 58 per cent, which is below that for similar authorities. Although the LEA analyses the reasons for the delays, action to remedy the situation has been insufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b></p>	<p><b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60% of all statements completed within 18 weeks (including exceptions)</li> <li>• Systems adjusted to include the sending out of early warning letters to all contributors to statutory statements</li> <li>• Monitoring information sent regularly to managers of all contributors ( including heads of Special Schools that use private therapists)</li> </ul>	<p>EAL Service Development Plan</p> <p>SENAS Operational Plan 2004-5</p> <p>SEN and Inclusion Development Plan 2004/05</p>
<p><b>Monitoring Sources</b></p>	<p><b>Evaluation mechanism</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Notes of monthly SENIE SMT meetings</li> <li>▪ Quarterly reports on performance indicators</li> <li>▪ Notes from regular meetings between Head of SEN and heads of service</li> </ul>	<p>A bi-annual report on progress will be presented to the SEN Strategic Review Group</p>

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
Letter sent to relevant managers in the Primary Care Trust explaining the context of this Ofsted recommendation.	Heads of contributing services: Children's Services, Speech and Language, Occupational Therapy, Educational Psychology, targeted Heads of Special Schools	Head of SEN and nominated SEN managers	July 2003	Within current budget arrangements
Letter sent to the Heads and Chairs of Governors of Special Schools that use private therapists explaining the context of this Ofsted recommendation.			July 2003	
Hold individual meetings with <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultant paediatrician and clinical lead on Children Services</li> <li>2. Principal Speech and Language Therapist</li> <li>3. Head of Occupational Therapy</li> <li>4. Principal Educational Psychologist</li> </ol> to go through the monitoring information, identify specific difficulties and agree actions and timelines			September – November 2003	
Hold meetings with Heads of Special Schools employing private therapists to identify timelines and actions			September – November 2003	
Set up 6 monthly meetings with those listed above to ensure regular monitoring against timelines			March – April 2004	



## Monitoring & Evaluation Record

**May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003**

(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in May and the production of the Action Plan)

**Current Position:**

- Currently, 55% of all statements are completed within 18 weeks (73% excluding statutory exceptions)

**October 2003, January 2004, May 2004**

**Monitoring:**

**Evaluation:**

<b>Recommendation 3</b>		<b>Responsibility of:</b>
<p><b>In order to improve the quality of behaviour support:</b></p> <p>ensure that all primary schools who need it have access to behaviour support.</p>	<p>Lead : Ray Carty, Head of Inclusive Education</p> <p>Key Officer: Michael Hymans, Principal Educational Psychologist</p>	
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>160. The support provided to schools for managing behaviour was not previously inspected. The LEA's support is satisfactory, although some primary schools do not have access to adequate support.</p>		
<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>	<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Audit of needs carried out within primary schools</li> <li>• Range of behaviour support interventions identified – matched to audited needs</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities of staff involved in providing behaviour support to primary schools will be clearly identified and communicated.</li> <li>• Costed growth proposals for developing a primary behaviour support service will be drawn up and submitted to members for consideration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEN and Inclusion Development Plan 2004/5</li> <li>• BV Performance Plan 2003/4 and 2004/5</li> <li>• Behaviour Support Plan</li> </ul>	
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>	<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agendas &amp; Minutes of SEN Strategic Review Group</li> <li>▪ Agenda &amp; Minutes of Annual Strategy meetings in schools</li> <li>▪ Letters to Heads regarding support services and delivery arrangements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report to Executive on review of Behaviour Support Plan</li> <li>▪ Reports to Strategic Review Group</li> <li>▪ Analysis of content of annual strategy meetings</li> <li>▪ Survey the quality and impact of support services/ teams.</li> </ul>	

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (Month)	Resources & Source
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include behaviour support on growth list for 2004/5</li> </ul>	Head teachers, Governors & all Stakeholders	SEN and Inclusion teams	July 2003	Within current budget arrangements and growth bid 2004/5 (£220,000)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carry out audit of needs in primary schools</li> </ul>			Sept - Dec 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate impact of primary behaviour projects</li> </ul>			Sept - Dec 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop agreements and service specifications for school-based support with all main service providers</li> </ul>			Jan – Feb 2004	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draw up menu of interventions available from LEA services and other services in order to meet needs and identify gaps</li> </ul>			Jan – Feb 2004	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review structure of services and management arrangements within Achievement and Inclusion to form a unified Behaviour Support Service</li> </ul>			Feb - March 2004	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit costed proposals to elected members</li> </ul>			April 2004	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publish information to schools and governors on provision available</li> </ul>			April 2004	

## Monitoring & Evaluation Record

**May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003**

(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in May and the production of the Action Plan)

### **Current Position:**

- Positive Behaviour Project, funded through Standards Fund, in place in 7 primary schools
- External consultants report towards SEN Best Value Review has been discussed with school representatives, LEA officers and other stakeholders – May 2003
- Heads of Support Services' meetings are in place – April 2003
- Lead LEA officer identified to feedback on Primary Behaviour and Attendance Pilot – June 2003
- KS3 Behaviour Consultant appointed for Sept 2003

**October 2003, January 2004, May 2004**

**Monitoring:**

**Evaluation:**

<b>Recommendation 4</b>		<b>Responsibility of:</b>
<p><b>In order to improve support for child protection:</b></p> <p>ensure that all designated teachers undertake updated training.</p>	<p>Lead: Rik Boxer, Deputy Director</p> <p>Key officer: Jonathan Braham, then Education Adviser for Child Protection (when appointed)</p>	
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>167. The LEA contributes fully to the work of the area child protection committee, and is represented on this by the relevant assistant director. A recent joint review report by the Audit Commission highlighted the work of the area child protection committee as a strength. Regular multi-agency training is provided by the committee and attendance is monitored, although the LEA does not act sufficiently vigorously to ensure that all teachers have had their training recently updated.</p>		
<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>	<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A register of named teachers is updated termly</li> <li>▪ All named teachers attend at least one training session every two years</li> <li>▪ All teachers new to the role attend training within six months of appointment</li> </ul>	<p>SEN and Inclusion Development Plan 2004/05</p>	
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>	<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data base of course and school representation</li> <li>▪ Register of course attendance</li> <li>▪ Training evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Annual report to Area Child Protection Committee training sub-group</li> <li>▪ Termly overview by education adviser for child protection</li> </ul>	

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
Appoint education adviser for child protection	Named teachers and headteachers	Deputy Director And subsequently education adviser for child protection.	September 2003	Within current budget arrangements
Update and check reliability of systems for recording school representation at training			October 2003	
Maintian a profile of school attendance at training events and check representation termly			Termly	
Contact schools where current training has lapsed			Termly	
Liaise with link advisers as necessary if there are difficulties with particular schools			Termly	
Follow up through link adviser visits as required			As necessary	

### Monitoring & Evaluation Record

<b>May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003</b>
(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in May and the production of the Action Plan)
<p><b>Current Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The post of child protection education adviser has again been advertised (May 2003) but failed to draw a suitable field. It will be re-advertised in September 2003. Until an appointment is made, the Deputy Director continues to hold overall responsibility, although a consultant is being sought to pick up the responsibility in July/September 2003 until a permanent appointment can be made.</li> <li>The training data base is maintained by the Education Welfare Service and checked for school representation.</li> </ul>
<b>October 2003, January 2004, May 2004</b>
<b>Monitoring:</b>
<b>Evaluation:</b>

<b>Recommendation 5</b>		<b>Responsibility of:</b>	
<p><b>In order to improve scrutiny:</b></p> <p>provide training, advice and support for members to make the scrutiny function effective in monitoring and evaluating the work of the LEA.</p>		<p>Lead: Michael Lyon, Lead Member for Education</p> <p>Key officer: John Christie Director of Education</p>	
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>193. The education portfolio holder works closely with the director of education and the senior management team, and respects the powers appropriately delegated to officers. Elected members receive good advice about policy options from senior officers and the portfolio holder distributes a regular briefing to her colleagues. Her hard work, commitment to education and determination to improve schools and raise standards make significant contributions to the LEA's good relationships with schools.</p> <p>194. The wider involvement of members in monitoring education policy, decision-making, and the work of the directorate is less well developed. The current scrutiny committee's role in examining cross cutting themes is very recent and political tensions remain about its remit and function. The committee has an extensive work programme but there is little evidence of it having moved beyond receiving reports to conducting rigorous and systematic examination of policy decisions. Following the publication of the Audit Commission's recent corporate assessment which judged scrutiny as weak, support from professional officers is proposed and plans are in place to review the effectiveness of the scrutiny process. In addition the director of education, with the support of the education portfolio-holder, has initiated a regular briefing session to improve the advice and information available to the opposition spokespersons for education.</p>			
<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>		<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of training opportunities on the role of scrutiny and on education have occurred, and have been well attended</li> <li>• The lifelong learning panel will have demonstrated its ability to investigate policy decisions and influence the way executive works on a number of key education issues</li> </ul>		<p>Member development programme 2004-5</p> <p>Scrutiny plans 2004-5</p>	
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>		<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agendas &amp; Minutes of Scrutiny (lifelong learning)</li> <li>▪ Agenda &amp; Minutes of CMT</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minutes of the constitutional monitoring group which will elicit a wide-ranging</li> </ul>	

	organisational view
--	---------------------

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
Scrutiny re-constituted with a lifelong learning panel	Members	Departmental Management Team	July 2003	Within current budget arrangements
Training session on the role of scrutiny open to all members (part of member development programme)			July 2003	
Presentation to members on the LEA inspection and draft action plan			July 2003	
Training session open to all members on Education (part of member development programme)			November 2003	
Departmental management team to nominate suitable issues for scrutiny to consider on a regular basis (termly)			Termly	
Lead education officer for Lifelong Learning Panel to set up an electronic liaison and planning network for key partners (Lead member for education; chair of scrutiny; Director of education; Headteacher Convenors and other key partners)			September 2003, then regular contacts	
Executive to refer significant education issues to Scrutiny on a regular basis			Executive meeting schedule	



## Monitoring & Evaluation Record

**May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003**

(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in May and the production of the Action Plan)

**Current Position:**

- A cross-party, officer-member review, reporting to full council, has determined a new structure for scrutiny in Brent. A revised constitution for the new Municipal year was adopted in May 2003. There is now a Scrutiny Committee which will meet twice a year and three Scrutiny panels which will meet quarterly: Lifelong Learning, Quality of Life, and Social Care. The Lifelong Learning panel will consider all education related issues.
- A member development officer has been appointed and is producing a comprehensive training programme
- The new lead member for Education, Arts and Libraries has been key in the development of this action plan

**October 2003, January 2004, May 2004**

**Monitoring:**

**Evaluation:**

Recommendation 6	Responsibility of:
<p><b>In order to improve the allocation of resources to priorities:</b></p> <p>re-assess the adequacy of education funding, particularly that delegated to schools, in the context of the council's priority for children and young people.</p>	<p>Lead: Michael Lyon Lead Member for Education</p> <p>Key officers: John Christie Director of Education</p> <p>Martin Stratford Assistant Director of Education</p>
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>44. The allocation of resources to priorities is unsatisfactory, although there are good aspects within the education directorate. The council has not met the DfES targets for passing on education funding to schools or its own target that primary school funding should be above the London average. Despite education being stated as a key priority for the council, the comparative financial resources made available have declined significantly since the last inspection.</p> <p>45. At the time of the previous inspection, despite the background of financial constraints, the education directorate's procedures for allocating resources to priorities were good. There were some schools with high balances and others with significant deficits, leading to a recommendation to improve the quality of support for financial management in schools. This is now satisfactory.</p> <p>46. The council's medium term financial strategy is supported by an efficient planning procedure. The corporate process for setting the council budget allows for a thorough appraisal of spending issues. The council has had to face particular spending pressures in social services and its ability to meet and finance strategic priorities is limited by its having minimal funding balances. The council's corporate strategy places the highest priority on provision and support for children and young people. However, in each of the last three years the DfES target for passing on education funding to schools has not been met. At the time of the inspection, the council had agreed, as a minimum, to pass on to education the 13.5 per cent increase in schools funding for 2003/04. A key commitment in the previous corporate strategy was that primary school funding should be above the London average. This target was achieved until 2000/01, but spending in Brent fell below by one per cent in 2001/02 and it is 6.7 per cent below in 2002/03. The overall allocation of funding has not been matched sufficiently well to the council's stated priority for education, as a result the education service, and in particular primary education, is underfunded.</p>	

<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>	<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget setting will always be preceded by detailed discussion with headteacher and governor representatives through a variety of mechanisms (eg the Schools Forum and the Funding Formula and Service Development Plan consultation process)</li> <li>• Budget setting processes will take full account of school funding in relation to national, London, and a range of neighbour comparators</li> <li>• There will be regular updates to Members on funding schools in the future</li> <li>• School funding will be recommended as an issue for the Lifelong Learning scrutiny panel to consider</li> </ul>	<p>PIR Service Plan April 2004-5 Budget setting papers 2004-5</p>
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>	<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agendas &amp; Minutes of Headteacher meetings with the Leader</li> <li>▪ Agenda &amp; Minutes of the Schools' Forum</li> <li>▪ Papers from the July and October budget making processes</li> <li>▪ Letters and associated documents from the Assistant Director, PIR to schools and governors on the budget</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EAL Service Development Plan</li> <li>▪ Report to Executive and Scrutiny</li> </ul>

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
Headteacher convenors will meet with the Leader of the Council and Deputy Leader well before the budget making process in July	Members	Departmental Management team, Headteacher convenors and other stakeholders	July 2003 and then termly	Cost of activities will be contained within existing resources. There will be growth bids for additional resources for schools in 2004/5 and future years.
The Assistant Director (Planning, Information and Resources) will provide a range of comparative data to inform the budget setting process			July 2003 and then annually	
The Lead Member for Education will ensure a careful consideration of this recommendation during the budget setting process			July 2003 through to March 2004, and then annually	
The Brent funding formula and overall school funding levels will in future be considered in detail by the School's Forum as well as through the usual consultation with Heads and Governors			Three meetings per annum	
The Lead Member, Director and Assistant Director, Planning Information and Resources will ensure that, throughout the budget process, members' attention is drawn to the impact of their decisions on schools' financial position.			Throughout the year	
They will also ensure that information about any regulatory or financial changes made by central government and the DfES, together with an assessment of their impact, are brought to Members' attention as soon as possible.			Throughout the year	

## Monitoring & Evaluation Record

**May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003**

(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in May and the production of the Action Plan)

### **Current Position:**

- The passporting of funding defines a floor of 94% for 2003/4 although this in itself will not provide a step-change in funding
- There is a commitment to meet 2003/4 targets
- The removal of the Grant Maintained protection from all schools bar one will reduce the disparity in funding between primary and secondary phases for 2003/4

**October 2003, January 2004, May 2004**

**Monitoring:**

**Evaluation:**

Recommendation 7	Responsibility of:
<p><b>In order to improve the LEA's support for early years:</b></p> <p>Take steps to improve the coherence of planning between the LEA and the EYDCP.</p>	<p>Rik Boxer Deputy Director</p> <p>Key Officer: Lesley Fox-Lee, Head of Early Years</p>
<p>200. The LEA's support for early years was not previously inspected. It is currently unsatisfactory. However, it is improving and there is the capacity to secure further improvements. The fundamental weaknesses are the lack of integrated planning to raise standards, and the legacy of under-funding of the Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership (EYDCP) by the LEA. A major strength is the quality of training available to staff in non-maintained settings.</p> <p>201. The data from Ofsted inspection of schools indicate that progress in the under fives' is insufficient and that the quality of teaching remains a significant issue. The LEA has a sound plan to raise children's attainment in the maintained sector and the EYDCP has planned clearly how it will meet national targets. However, the links between the plans are not sufficient and lack the coherence necessary to improve quality and raise standards throughout the early years. As a consequence, the assessment of children's development and learning lacks continuity.</p>	

202. Partnership working between the EYDCP and the LEA in the recent past has been a weakness. The LEA provided insufficient funding for the EYDCP to meet national targets for the provision of qualified teachers and for special educational needs co-ordinator support to non-maintained settings. However, the LEA has responded appropriately to the concerns that were raised by the EYDPC. It is now represented effectively in the partnership and is committed to making additional funding available to the EYDCP in 2003/04. In addition, the LEA has appointed an early years co-ordinator to improve the coherence and co-ordination of provision for children in the early years.

203. The EYDCP is well placed to meet all the national targets by 2004. However, providers of care and education for children in the early years in the non-maintained sector have an insufficient understanding of the EYDCP's targets and priorities. Nevertheless, the quantity of early years places available has increased and, with the exception of out of school care for children with special educational needs, the EYDCP has ensured there are sufficient places to meet demand. It is planning to provide more out-of-school places in disadvantaged areas. The partnership does much to improve the quality of the provision for which it is responsible. For example, it provides a good amount of information; it promotes relevant training, much of which is of a good quality; it supports childminding networks; and it runs a well-supported annual conference.

204. The LEA provides intensive support to ten per cent of private or voluntary nurseries and to a slightly higher proportion of primary schools catering for children in the Foundation Stage. This support includes monitoring which has identified strengths, and areas for development, and has contributed to the planning of further training. The LEA's intensive support has led to improvement, but concerns remain about the quality of some provision in the private and voluntary sector.

<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>	<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Best Value review is complete and an action plan in place</li> <li>▪ An Early Years Service is established</li> <li>▪ The Local Authority has the capacity to administer and report on its Public Service Agreement targets for Early Years</li> </ul>	SEN Service Plan April 2004 BV Performance Plan EYDCP Implementation Plan April 2004 Education Development Plan School Organisation Plan
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>	<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agendas &amp; Minutes of : Divisional Management Team, Senior Management Team, Children and Young People's Priority Action Group, Local Strategic Partnership, Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership, Children's Centres Steering group, Sure Start local programme boards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Views of Early Years providers obtained through the EYDCP annual consultation exercise and the Children's Information Service surveys</li> <li>▪ Feedback from Sure Start Unit health check visits</li> </ul>

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transfer EYDCP staff to Achievement and Inclusion division, review line management, roles, responsibilities and accountabilities (internal and external).</li> <li>▪ Arrange suitable accommodation for current staff with space for expansion to a full service.</li> </ul>	Local Authority Staff and Stakeholders	Early Years staff and other nominated Achievement and Inclusion staff  Foundation Stage teachers	September 2003	Rationalisation of current funding streams  Growth bid
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide a stimulating programme of training including training for Heads and senior managers on the Foundation Stage curriculum and its implementation in primary schools.</li> </ul>			September 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure that a temporary Early Years consultant is in post and provide targeted support to schools</li> <li>▪ Consult School Improvement Service on effective methods to monitor progress in the Foundation Stage and to evaluate the impact of support</li> </ul>			September 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recruit two additional Early Years Network Co-ordinators.</li> <li>▪ Implement system to monitor and evaluate progress in non-maintained settings.</li> <li>▪ Upgrade IT system in line with central pupil database.</li> <li>▪ Review conditions of grant for nursery education places in line with Code of Practice and add local conditions related to quality of provision.</li> </ul>			September 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recruit four members of the multi-professional SEN team to provide support and advice to the non-maintained sector</li> <li>▪ Establish working protocols between Network Co-ordinators and multi-professional team</li> </ul>			September 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Determine the focus of planning, its purpose and audience in light of new requirements.</li> <li>▪ Establish links to related plans within EAL and across directorates</li> <li>▪ Schedule planning activity to 2006 when a single EDP will be in place.</li> </ul>			October 2003	



Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review membership and functions of the EYDCP in relation to the operation of an Early Years Service, the Local Strategic Partnership and the LA corporate structure.</li> <li>▪ Review the EYDCP publicity and marketing strategy to ensure that all stakeholders have a clear understanding of its targets and priorities</li> <li>▪ Take forward recommendations from the CIS review to ensure that all stakeholders have a clear understanding of EYDCP targets and priorities</li> </ul>	Local Authority Staff and Stakeholders	Early Years staff and other nominated Achievement and Inclusion staff Foundation Stage teachers	October 2003	Rationalisation of current funding streams  Growth bid
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review Brent's Early Years publications in light of statutory assessment requirements</li> <li>▪ Consult stakeholders for their views on the types and extent of support/advice they require</li> <li>▪ Involve 'expert' teachers in reviewing, writing, leading meetings and moderation activities.</li> </ul>			October 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review models for an Early Years Service (integrated or co-ordinated)</li> <li>▪ Consult with stakeholders and make recommendations through the Best Value review</li> <li>▪ Formalise links to Lifelong Learning, Social Services Policy and Regeneration and the Primary Care Trust.</li> </ul>			November 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review financial management and procedures with regard to nursery education places, NNI capital and revenue and Children's Centres capital and revenue funding</li> <li>▪ Incorporate recommendations into Best Value review action plan</li> </ul>			November 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Complete gap analysis and recruit staff to Early Years Service, review operational progress.</li> </ul>			December 2003	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Incorporate Foundation Stage curriculum monitoring and Foundation Stage Profile data reporting into School Improvement Service link visit programme</li> </ul>			January 2004	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review operational progress</li> <li>▪ Begin implementing Best Value review action plan</li> </ul>			February 2004	

<b>Activities to be undertaken</b>	<b>Target Group</b>	<b>Those involved</b>	<b>Time-scale (month)</b>	<b>Resources &amp; Source</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recruit School Improvement Adviser with responsibility for Early Years, dependent on growth bid</li> </ul>			April 2004	

## Monitoring & Evaluation Record

**May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003**

(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in Feb and the production of the Action Plan)

### **Current Position:**

- The proposal to transfer EYDCP staff to Achievement and Inclusion has been discussed and agreed by SMT, the EYDCP staff and the EYDCP executive group.
- A comprehensive programme of Foundation Stage training for schools and non-maintained settings has been produced for distribution this term.
- Funding has been identified for approximately 55 days of consultant support for schools.
- Two additional Early Years Network Co-ordinators have been recruited to provide support for practitioners in the non-maintained sector, they will take up post in September this year.
- A system to monitor and evaluate progress in non-maintained settings was introduced in March; it is currently being used and will be evaluated in July.
- Discussions have been initiated to include early years in the upgraded central pupil database enabling the Network Co-ordinators to access a more user friendly system and to share information more widely. It has been recommended that the upgrade should take account of data currently held by the CIS
- Four members of the newly established multi-professional SEN team have been recruited. The team will form itself between June and September this year and will provide support and advice for the non-maintained sector
- The moderation of the Foundation Stage profile has been used as a trial venture in involving 'expert' teachers with a view to the dissemination of good practice, raising awareness of Early Years priorities and future capacity building.
- Preparatory work has been done in reviewing models for an integrated or co-ordinated Early Years Service in preparation for the Best Value review
- Discussions have been initiated to review financial management and procedures within Early Years
- Preparatory work has been done on a gap analysis in preparation for the Best Value review

**October 2003, January 2004, May 2004**

<b>Recommendation 8</b>		<b>Responsibility of:</b>	
<b>In order to ensure continuous improvement:</b> bring forward the planned date of the early years partnership Best Value review.		Lead: Rik Boxer Deputy Director  Key Officer: Lesley Fox-Lee, Head of Early Years	
Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)  51. The review programme for education is broadly satisfactory, although the early years partnership review, scheduled for 2004/05, comes too late in the programme, in view of the weaknesses in the work of the partnership identified by this inspection.			
<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>		<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Best Value Review completed</li> <li>▪ A clear action plan and timescales for the implementation of the recommendations is in place</li> </ul>		BV Performance Plan 2004-5	
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>		<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agendas &amp; Minutes of Divisional Management Team, Senior Management Team, Children and Young People's Priority Action Group</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report to BV steering group, Spring 2004</li> </ul>	

Current position
The Best Value review started in Spring 2003 and will report in December. Further detail is outlined in Priority 7 above.

<b>October 2003, January 2004, May 2004</b>

<b>Recommendation 9</b>		<b>Responsibility of:</b>	
<p><b>In order to improve the targeting of support:</b></p> <p>further differentiate the allocation of core visits by the link school improvement adviser so that successful schools do not receive more than they need.</p>	<p>Lead: Rik Boxer- Deputy Director</p> <p>Key Officers: Faira Ellks and Catherine Ross – Senior School Improvement Advisers</p>		
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>60. Support is now differentiated and deployed according to clear criteria, related closely to individual schools’ needs. Those in most need are supported well in both amount and quality. However, the core allocation of link school improvement adviser visits is too high for those schools whose performance gives no cause for concern. The school improvement service has reduced the annual number of such visits from six, at the time of the previous inspection, to four, and its policy is to maintain this level of provision, subject to annual review. Reasons given include: the high proportion of schools in challenging circumstances; the volatility in pupil rolls and staffing complements that many schools face; the importance of sharing good practice; and the need to strengthen relationships with schools that formerly had grant maintained status. There is merit in this case and most headteachers support the pattern of visits. Although the LEA acknowledges that successful schools are responsible for their own improvement and do not need such close attention from link advisers, sufficient progress to further differentiate the need for these core visits has not been made.</p>			
<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>		<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All schools have been consulted about pattern of link visits.</li> <li>▪ Pattern of link visits reviewed.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EDP 2</li> <li>▪ Service Development Plan</li> </ul>	
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>		<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Returns from headteachers following consultation.</li> <li>▪ Document “Support for School Improvement”.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Annual survey of schools by School Improvement Services.</li> </ul>	

<b>Activities to be undertaken</b>	<b>Target Group</b>	<b>Those involved</b>	<b>Time-scale (month)</b>	<b>Resources &amp; Source</b>
Consult with all headteachers by letter.	Headteacher	SSIA's	June 2003	Within current budget arrangement
Analyse results of consultation.			July 2003	
Review pattern of visits.			July 2003	

### Monitoring & Evaluation Record

<b>May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003</b>
(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in Feb and the production of the Action Plan)
<p><b>Current Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation letter drafted.</li> </ul>

<b>October 2003, January 2004, May 2004</b>

<b>Recommendation 10</b>	<b>Responsibility of:</b>
<p><b>In order to improve the effectiveness of monitoring and challenge:</b></p> <p>make written records of monitoring visits more evaluative.</p>	<p>Lead: Rik Boxer - Deputy Director</p> <p>Key Officers: Faira Ellks and Catherine Ross – Senior School Improvement Advisers</p>
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>63. The LEA's strategy stresses the link between monitoring, challenge and support. Monitoring and challenge are increasingly effective, particularly through the work of the link school improvement advisers and the annual review of standards in all schools. The need for the LEA to intervene in schools is reducing and the proportions of schools in special measures and with serious weaknesses have fallen significantly. Schools are given good advice about sources of support for the needs identified by monitoring and challenge. However, these are largely confined to quality-assured sources within the local area and the LEA does not undertake a wider brokering role. Following each monitoring visit, the adviser and headteacher agree a brief written record of topics discussed and actions agreed but such records lack an evaluation of strengths and weaknesses that could strengthen the LEA's knowledge and the school's development.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b></p>	<p><b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Record of monitoring visits include evaluation of school's strengths and weaknesses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EDP2</li> <li>▪ Service Development Plan</li> </ul>
<p><b>Monitoring Sources</b></p>	<p><b>Evaluation mechanism</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Records of visits.</li> <li>▪ School improvement data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Annual survey of schools by SIS.</li> <li>▪ SSAs carry out scrutiny of sample records of each SIA/advisory staff.</li> </ul>

<b>Activities to be undertaken</b>	<b>Target Group</b>	<b>Those involved</b>	<b>Time-scale (month)</b>	<b>Resources &amp; Source</b>
Revise visit form.	SIAs/Advisory Staff	SSIAs	April 2003	Within current budget arrangements
Train staff in use of revised form.			May 2003	
Ensure effective and consistent use of form by SIS.			June 2003	
Monitor implementation.			July 2003 – then termly	
Use outcomes to inform process of categorising schools.			Sept 2003 – then termly review	

### Monitoring & Evaluation Record

<b>May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003</b>
(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in Feb and the production of the Action Plan)
<p><b>Current Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visit form has been revised and staff instructed in purpose and use.</li> <li>• All SIAs/advisory staff starting to use revised form.</li> </ul>

<b>October 2003, January 2004, May 2004</b>



<b>Recommendation 11</b>		<b>Responsibility of:</b>	
<p><b>In order to improve the support for ICT:</b></p> <p>devise and implement effective systems of monitoring and evaluation in order to have accurate knowledge of schools' progress and the levels of pupils' attainment in ICT.</p>		<p>Lead: Catherine Ross and Faira Ellks – Senior School Improvement Advisers</p> <p>Key Officer: Kim Beat – School Improvement Adviser</p>	
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>60. The LEA's strategy for 2000/03 is being updated to take account of current initiatives, such as the two city learning centres. The strategy promotes the use of ICT across the curriculum and focuses on raising attainment, chiefly through New Opportunities Fund (NOF) training. However, in practice, there is insufficient emphasis on raising attainment and, other than the analysis of Section 10 inspection reports, there are no central systems to collate or analyse the standards and progress achieved by pupils. Monitoring and evaluation are under-developed.</p>			
<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>		<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Accurate information on standards and quality of teaching in ICT held on one-third of schools.</li> <li>▪ Most or all schools will set non-statutory targets for ICT for end KS2 as basis for tracking progress between KS2 and KS3.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EDP 2</li> </ul>	
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>		<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Records of ICT monitoring visits.</li> <li>▪ Record of visit forms.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adviser responsible for ICT will report on standards and teaching quality in one-third of schools to SSAs.</li> </ul>	

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
Identify one third of schools to be visited/collate information on OFSTED reports.	Primary & Secondary Schools	SSIA's ICT Team	May 2003	Within current resources to end March 2004; thereafter dependent on growth bid (£94,000 in 2004/5 and £180,00 in 2005/6)
Carry out programme of visits.			June 2003- March 2004	
Incorporate non-statutory targets for KS2 ICT into annual review of standards.	All Head-teachers		November 2003	
Provide training for school staff in KS2 and KS3 on assessment in ICT (to include cross-phase training).	School Staff KS2/KS3		Sept 2003 – March 2004	

### Monitoring & Evaluation Record

<b>May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003</b>
(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in Feb and the production of the Action Plan)
<p><b>Current Position:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary meetings held with ICT team.</li> </ul>
<b>October 2003, January 2004, May 2004</b>

<b>Recommendation 12</b>	<b>Responsibility of:</b>
<p><b>In order to improve the support for governors:</b></p> <p>provide more guidance to governors so that they are able to play an effective part in the monitoring and evaluation of their school's performance.</p>	<p>Lead: Catherine Ross and Faira Ellks – Senior School Improvement Advisers</p> <p>Key Officers: Derek Balaam Governor Support Officer and Catherine Ross, Senior School Improvement Adviser</p>
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>99. The monitoring of the effectiveness of governing bodies, a weakness at the previous inspection, is now adequate. The LEA appoints additional governors to schools that require special measures or have serious weaknesses. Governors receive information about pupils' attainment but lack sufficient guidance to enable them to monitor and evaluate effectively other aspects of the performance of their schools. However, some governing bodies are now piloting with the LEA an approach to self-evaluation that has the potential to help governors make a greater contribution to school improvement.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b></p>	<p><b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relevant governor training courses will be planned and offered as part of the LEA's governor training and development programme.</li> <li>▪ Written guidance for governing bodies will be in place.</li> <li>▪ Governors in pilot schools will have been fully involved in school self-evaluation, using Ofsted form S4</li> </ul>	<p>CASS Service Operational Plan</p>
<p><b>Monitoring Sources</b></p>	<p><b>Evaluation mechanism</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Brent Governor Training &amp; Development Programme</li> <li>▪ Brent guidance documents for governing bodies</li> <li>▪ Brent Report to Governors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GSCC</li> <li>▪ Governor training course evaluation</li> </ul>

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
Identify, create and assemble relevant guidance information.	Governors and clerks	Governor Support Officer School Improvement Advisers Governor Trainers	June 2003	Within current budget arrangements
Provide support and guidance to schools on use of Ofsted Form S4 for self-evaluation and on the involvement of governing bodies; from September 2003-			July 2003	
Devise governor training courses' content.			September 2003	
Write piece for Report to Governors			September 2003	
Offer written guidance to governors			September 2003	
Offer extra governor training courses			From January 2004	

### Monitoring & Evaluation Record

<b>May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003</b>
(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in Feb and the production of the Action Plan)
<p><b>Current Position:</b></p> <p>Discussions have been held with all schools as part of the link agenda for summer term 2003, on the use of Ofsted Form S4.</p> <p>Discussions have been held with governors about their role in school self-evaluation and extended information is being piloted in nominated schools.</p> <p>Some relevant governor training is already in place; the following courses, already available, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning For School Improvement. June 2003</li> <li>• Performance Management. Oct 2003</li> <li>• Conference workshop – Questions Governors Should Be Asking. Oct 2003</li> </ul> <p>Other recent relevant guidance includes a piece in the summer term 2003 Report to Governors "Categorisation Of Schools And Time Allocations", and a briefing at the summer term Chairs' briefing on the information provided to governing bodies on school performance.</p>
<b>October 2003, January 2004, May 2004</b>

<b>Recommendation 13</b>		<b>Responsibility of:</b>
<p><b>In order to improve the quality of behaviour support:</b></p> <p>target more effectively the support given to schools by the pre-exclusions officers to identified need.</p>	<p>Lead: Ray Carty, Head of Inclusive Education</p> <p>Key Officer: Paul Roper, Head of Pupil Referral Services</p>	
<p>Inspection Report text (with paragraph references)</p> <p>163. The LEA does not have a behaviour support team. In theory, the educational psychology service provides support to schools but, in practice, staff shortages mean there is little time available for this. The LEA has two pre and post exclusion officers, who are based in the Key Stage 3 PRU. They work closely with schools to enable pupils to be maintained in school and to re-integrate after exclusion. The number of appeals following exclusion has reduced and schools speak very highly of this service. However, the service is very stretched and is not allocated sufficiently according to the needs of schools.</p>		
<b>Outcome/Stage of Development for April 2004</b>	<b>Developments continued in the following Plans from April 2004</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A report will have been presented analysing up to date data and staff deployment</li> <li>▪ The analysis of need will result in a growth bid being considered for the next budget cycle</li> <li>▪ There will be a closer match between staff deployment and the needs of schools</li> </ul>	<p>SEN and Inclusive Education Service Plans April 2004</p>	
<b>Monitoring Sources</b>	<b>Evaluation mechanism</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agendas &amp; Minutes of SENIE SMT meetings</li> <li>▪ Agenda &amp; Minutes of DMT meetings</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluation of report by DMT</p>	

Activities to be undertaken	Target Group	Those involved	Time-scale (month)	Resources & Source
An audit of behaviour support needs in secondary schools will be undertaken	Headteachers, Governors & all Stakeholders	Deputy Director and Heads of SEN and Inclusive Education	Sept - December 2003	Within current budget arrangements and growth bid 2004/5 (£220,000)
An analysis of the current pattern of visits using data available will be undertaken, together with an analysis of the use of staff time and of the relationship between the exclusion team and PRU staff			September 2003	
An analysis of the patterns of exclusions and reasons for exclusions in out-borough schools will be undertaken, to inform the planning of exclusion officers' time			October 2003	
Regular meetings with exclusion officers in Barnet, Harrow, Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham are set up, starting with Barnet.			September 2003, and then throughout the year	
Both analyses are included in a report on the work of the Exclusions Team to be presented to SENIE SMT meeting and to DMT. A summary will be circulated to schools.			January 2004	
Consultation with schools on recommendations arising from the report on targeting of work.			January – February 2004	
The structure of services and management arrangements within Achievement and Inclusion will be reviewed, to form a unified Behaviour Support Service			February - March 2004	
Submit costed proposals to elected Members (see recommendation 3)			April 2004	
Information will be published for schools on range of provision and support available (see recommendation 3)			April 2004	

## Monitoring & Evaluation Record

**May 7<sup>th</sup> 2003**

(overview of progress made between the publication of the Inspection Report in May and the production of the Action Plan)

**Current Position:**

- Two pre-exclusion officers currently work as follows: each secondary school is visited weekly and primary schools according to need ( currently 20 'active' primary schools)

**October 2003, January 2004, May 2004**

**Monitoring:**

**Evaluation:**