

CABINET AGENDA



Monday 12th November 2007

at 9.00am

in the Red Room, Avondale Centre,
Dyke House, Hartlepool
(Raby Road entrance)

MEMBERS: CABINET:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond

Councillors Hall, Hargreaves, Hill, Jackson, Payne and Tumilty

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

To receive the Record of Decision in respect of the meeting held on 29th October 2007 (previously circulated)

4. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

No items

5. KEY DECISIONS

- 5.1 Building Schools for the Future: Proposed Brierton Community School Closure – Representations made to Published Statutory Notices – *Director of Children's Services*
- 5.2 Building Schools for the Future Stage 4 Consultation – *Director of Children's Services*

6. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

6.1 LINKs (Local Involvement Networks – *Director of Adult and Community Services*)

6.2 Scrutiny Investigation into Youth Unemployment Action Plan – *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / INFORMATION

No items

8. REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW OF SCRUTINY FORUMS

No items

9. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

EXEMPT ITEMS

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs referred to below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

10. ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

10.1 Havelock Centre, Lynn Street, Community Asset Transfer – *Director of Neighbourhood Services and Director of Adult and Community Services (Para 1)*

10.2 Hartlepool People Centre, 21 Raby Road – *Director of Neighbourhood Services (Para 3)*

10.3 Eldon Grove Sports Centre, Hartlepool – *Director of Neighbourhood Services and Director of Adult and Community Services (Para 3)*

CABINET

12 November 2007



Report of: Director of Children's Services

Subject: BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE:
PROPOSED BRIERTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL
CLOSURE – REPRESENTATIONS MADE TO
PUBLISHED STATUTORY NOTICES

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To request Cabinet to note the outcomes of the statutory notice period regarding the proposal to discontinue Brierton Community School and to determine the next stage of action.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

This report provides a summary of the representations made during the statutory notice period relating to the proposal to close Brierton School.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

Building Schools for the Future will have a significant impact on the future provision of education in Hartlepool.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Key Decision

5. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

It is recommended that members:

- note the outcomes of the statutory notice period relating to the proposed Brierton Community School closure.
- approve the closure of Brierton Community School (conditional upon agreement of Schools Adjudicator to enlargement of the other five mainstream schools)

- implement closure over two phases, beginning on 1st September 2008, with the school finally closing with effect from 31 August 2009.
- approve the subsequent transfer of the additionally resourced provision for pupils with ASD from Brierton Community School to Manor College of Technology also with effect from 31 August 2009.
- request the Schools Adjudicator to approve an in year variation to the admission numbers of the five remaining secondary schools referred to earlier in this report at section 1, paragraph 4.

Report of: Director of Children's Services

Subject: BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE:
PROPOSED BRIERTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL
CLOSURE – REPRESENTATIONS MADE TO
PUBLISHED STATUTORY NOTICES

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To request Cabinet to note the outcomes of the statutory notice period regarding the proposal to discontinue Brierton Community School and to determine the next stage of action.

2. BACKGROUND

Hartlepool Borough Council has been admitted to the BSF programme in 2007 as a Wave 5 Authority. Hartlepool has been set a timescale for its first year as a BSF authority and it is essential to adhere to this timescale in order to ensure it receives its funding allocation. Agreement on the number of schools and number of places within each school is an essential feature of the Strategy for Change, the first part of which is due for submission in December 2007.

3. THE STAGE ONE CONSULTATION PROCESS

On 25th September 2006 Cabinet authorised a first stage of consultation in preparation for Building Schools for the Future. The purposes of the consultation were to bring facts about the BSF programme and the context of Hartlepool secondary education to the attention of as many people as possible and seek views on how the Council might approach the implementation of BSF in Hartlepool. Stage One was a first formative stage of consultation; options for future organisation of secondary schools were not included at this stage.

Consultation began on 26th September 2006 and closed on 3rd November 2006. The responses indicated a range of views on how the secondary school estate might be re-configured in Hartlepool. The outcomes of Stage One, reported to Cabinet on 20th November 2006, suggested that a range of options should be presented in a second stage of consultation, before Cabinet considered approving formal proposals for change.

4. THE STAGE TWO CONSULTATION PROCESS

Following the recommendations of the BSF Project Board in December 2006, Cabinet approved a second stage of BSF consultation where a range of options were to be considered. For the 11-16 compulsory stage of education, three options were put forward:

- Option 1 – keep six secondary schools at the size they are now
- Option 2 – keep six secondary schools but make some of them smaller
- Option 3 – reduce the number of secondary schools to five by closing Brierton Community School

Consultation began on 29th January 2007 and closed on 2nd March 2007. The majority of respondents indicated support for Option 3 and Project Board recommended that Cabinet proceed on the basis of that option. On 19th March 2007, on the basis of recommendations from the BSF Project Board, Cabinet decided to formulate a proposal to discontinue Brierton Community School with effect from 31st August 2009.

5. THE STAGE THREE CONSULTATION PROCESS

Stage 3 consultation began on 4th June and concluded on 27th July. The key issues covered in Stage 3 consultation can be summarised as:

- The timing of the potential closure of Brierton School
- Transitional arrangements
- Support for pupils, families and staff associated with Brierton School
- Arrangements for pupils with ASD
- Future admission arrangements (including issues in relation to a proposed partner primary system for secondary school admissions)
- Practical issues (eg transport, school uniform)

The outcomes of Stage 3 consultation were considered by Project Board on 16th August and the Board recommended that Cabinet proceed to publish a Statutory Notice to discontinue Brierton Community School with effect from 31st August 2009, with transitional arrangements as published in the Stage 3 consultation document, subject to modifications to some primary school transfer arrangements.

6. THE STATUTORY NOTICE PERIOD

The Statutory Notice is attached as **Appendix 7**. The key issues covered in the notice are:

- Discontinuance of Brierton Community School on 31st August 2009
- Enlargement of the five remaining mainstream secondary schools
- Transfer of specialist provision for pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorders from Brierton Community School to Manor College of Technology

The Statutory Notice was posted at Brierton School, the rest of the mainstream secondary sector and local community buildings. Copies of the complete proposal were also forwarded to the governors of Brierton School, Diocesan Directors (Church of England and Hexham and Newcastle), Learning and Skills Council and the DCSF Schools Organisation Unit at Darlington.

A public notice was also published in The Hartlepool Mail. The publication date of the notice was 14 September 2007. Consultations ended on 26 October 2007.

7. RESPONSES TO THE STATUTORY NOTICE

During the six week notice period 195 responses were received.

1. Letters received that were signed by “*people who work in the community*” – 88 individual copies (**Appendix 1**)
2. Letters received that were signed by “*a parent of a child attending Brierton*” – 103 individual copies (**Appendix 2**)

In essence Letters 1 & 2 cover the same issues:

- a) timescale of closure
- b) impact of closure on pupils and staff

Respondents wished Cabinet to consider an alternative proposal whereby the current collaboration between Brierton and Dyke House schools is extended for a period of up to four years. Respondents perceived a range of benefits resulting from this alternative proposal. These benefits can be seen in the text of the letters (**Appendices 1 & 2**).

3. One letter received that was signed by a “*very concerned and anxious parent*” that makes reference to the points made in the above letters (**Appendix 3**). This response makes reference to Letters 1 & 2, and is clearly opposed to the views expressed in Letters 1 & 2 whilst making no objection to the Council’s proposals.
4. One letter received that was signed by a member of staff at Brierton who is also a parent and step parent (**Appendix 4**). The letter makes most of the points raised in Letters 1 & 2, but in addition mentions that there are a number of very vulnerable children with learning difficulties at Brierton School who will not adjust to change very easily. The respondent illustrates the personal impact of the closure proposal.
5. One letter received that was signed by a former pupil of Brierton School (1984 – 1989) (**Appendix 5**). The respondent expresses dismay that the closure is planned and queries whether the way forward would stand up to “scrutiny and judgement” given that results are improving. No alternative suggestions are provided.
6. One letter signed by parents of a current Brierton pupil (**Appendix 6**). The parents make it clear that they do not object to the closure of the school, but do wish to object to the proposed closure date as the “closure date will fall at a time when my son is due to commence the final two years of his GCSE studies. The respondent supports the alternative proposal detailed in Letters 1 & 2.

8. ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES RECEIVED

It is clear from an analysis of all 195 responses that there are two main issues that have been raised:

- whether the school should close
- the timescale of closure and associated arrangements

a) School Closure

With the exception of Letter 5 (**Appendix 5**) there are no representations that express direct opposition to the closure of Brierton School. It has been made clear during the BSF consultation process why the Council has proposed the closure of Brierton School. There are three principal reasons;

- pupil numbers are predicted to fall most at Brierton School
- Brierton School has the biggest overall problems in terms of the condition and suitability of existing buildings
- Pupil performance is not improving as rapidly at Brierton School as it is at other Hartlepool schools.

At their meeting on 29th October 2007 the Project Board unanimously agreed that their full and continuing support for the proposal to close Brierton School should be made known to Cabinet. As no new issues have been raised during consultation in relation to the closure of Brierton School, Cabinet is recommended to approve closure. The next sections consider the issues relating to the closure timescales and associated arrangements.

b) Timing of the closure

Other than the author of Letter 5, respondents focus very much on an alternative proposal that the closure period should be extended by up to four years. Respondents put forward a number of perceived benefits and these are considered in turn below:

Pupil Numbers

- *Other schools would not need to plan for an influx of pupils and larger numbers in the future*

If the period of transition leading to closure is extended by a further two years (to August 2011) there would be no need to transfer pupils from Brierton to other schools as proposed. There has, however, already been significant discussion over the potential date of closure during the Stage 2 consultations, when three possible dates were considered, August 2008, August 2009 or August 2010. The outcome of Stage Two consultation, strongly supported by all secondary headteachers and formally proposed to Cabinet by the Project Board, was that a two stage approach resulting in an August 2009 closure was the optimum timescale as it would achieve an appropriate balance between early closure and a smooth and gradual transition to new arrangements. It would also contribute to improved standards of achievement

It is important to recognise that, should this alternative proposal be adopted, a further period of consultation is likely to be required.

Building and site issues

- *No extra capital cost would be incurred in accommodating larger numbers of pupils;*
- *The site could be used in the future to house pupils from other schools while the building work under BSF proposals goes ahead on other school sites*
- *An educational establishment would remain within the Brierton community*
- *Sports specialism would be secure as would the future of the Community Sports Centre that is currently thriving*
- *A working fully operational school would not be vandalised and the community would remain a safer place*

If the period of transition leading to closure is extended by a further two years (to August 2011), in the short term there would be a reduced requirement for temporary accommodation. However, there will still be a need to provide temporary accommodation at school sites in order that the building works related to the BSF project can take place. It is possible that the Brierton school buildings could be retained to enable decanting of pupils from other schools.

If the period of transition leading to closure is extended by a further two years (to August 2011) it would be necessary to continue to maintain the current buildings with a diminishing pupil population. This continuing use of the site does add uncertainty to its future and the Council would face a time delay of up to two further years in implementing any preferred use it determines in the future, which would prolong the period of uncertainty in the local area.

If Brierton School closes, the Community Sports Centre will continue to function in its existing form as it was provided separately to the school through a major external funding initiative. Appropriate management of the Centre would be arranged. It is possible that another secondary school may wish to apply for specialist school status.

If a decision is made to close Brierton School over the proposed two year transition period, the Council will have almost two years in which to determine the best future use of the buildings and site. The Council will wish to ensure that, during this period and beyond, the site and buildings are not allowed to fall into a state of disrepair.

Staff issues

vii) All staff who work on the premises would have some degree of security or at least have more time in which to plan future career moves.

A Staffing Protocol is being developed. The prime purpose of this protocol is to support staff retention, redeployment, and recruitment. It also aims where possible to avoid redundancy. It is hoped that all partners will sign up to the Protocol and thereby ensure a smooth transition for staff whatever the transition arrangements that are implemented.

Pupil Travel

viii) Travelling distances for pupils and the associated problems would be reduced.

It is inevitable that some pupils will have further to travel to school if Brierton School closes. Every effort would be made to ensure that travel arrangements are safe and suitable and do not place unreasonable burdens on families.

Collaboration and new initiatives

ix) The building could also be used for some new initiatives or courses

x) Exciting collaborative work could be developed to raise the achievement and aspirations both of staff and pupils

xi) Increased flexibility within the two buildings would lead to ground breaking new initiatives in education

The prime purpose of BSF is to transform teaching and learning. It is expected that new initiatives, courses and a whole range of new learning experiences will be developed at all schools through significant investment in buildings and ICT provision.

9 PROJECT BOARD

At its meeting on 29 October 2007 the BSF Project Board considered the responses to the Statutory Notices for Brierton School. Members of the Board felt that there was no new information which would suggest to them that the original proposals for closure and for transitional arrangements should be amended.

The Project Board unanimously agreed that their full and continuing support for the proposals as laid out in the statutory notice without amendment should be made known to Cabinet.

10 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, having examined and considered all of the issues raised by respondents, it is not felt that the alternative proposal would provide significantly better arrangements than those contained in the Stage 3 consultation document, as modified by Cabinet. In addition, both secondary headteachers and the Project Board have indicated their full support for the proposals and therefore it is recommended that the proposals are implemented as published.

11 NEXT STEPS

Having published its statutory proposals on 14th September 2007, and having considered representations received within the consultation timescale, Cabinet is under a legal obligation to decide these proposals within two months after the end of the consultation period.

In considering its proposals in relation to the closure of Brierton Community School, Cabinet can decide to:

- a) Reject the proposals set out in the Statutory Notice
- b) Approve the proposals set out in the Statutory Notice
- c) Approve the proposals with a modification (eg closure date)

Should Cabinet wish to approve the proposal to close Brierton Community School it will be necessary to refer the proposal to enlarge the other 5 schools to the Schools Adjudicator for approval.

12 DECISIONS REQUIRED

It is recommended that members:

- note the outcomes of the statutory notice period relating to the proposed Brierton Community School closure.
- approve the closure of Brierton Community School (conditional upon agreement of Schools Adjudicator to enlargement of the other five mainstream schools)
- implement closure over two phases, beginning on 1st September 2008, with the school finally closing with effect from 31 August 2009.
- approve the subsequent transfer of the additionally resourced provision for pupils with ASD from Brierton Community School to Manor College of Technology also with effect from 31 August 2009.
- request the Schools Adjudicator to approve an in year variation to the admission numbers of the five remaining secondary schools referred to earlier in this report at section 1, paragraph 4.

The Director of Children's Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

Your ref: CL/BSF

Dear

Re. Proposals to discontinue Brierton Community School

I work in the Community and object to the proposal as a whole and specifically to the time-scale of the proposal because it is too short and will inevitably have a detrimental effect on all of the pupils and staff involved. Not only will the proposed pace of change have a detrimental effect on our pupils' academic achievements, but it will also place parents in difficult situations as well as putting all of the other secondary schools under a great deal of pressure.

I wish you to consider adopting the following proposal, which is based on making the transition of pupils and staff to other schools as smooth as possible, and which has at its core the principle that Brierton School continues to work in Federation with Dyke House over the next three years instead of only the next two.

The site itself would become Dyke House School (Brierton Site) and run as a Federation. This would continue until the new Dyke House School was constructed, so avoiding the need to move pupils to other schools.

Some of the perceived benefits of my proposal are as follows:

- other schools would not need to plan for an influx of pupils and larger numbers in the future;
- no extra capital costs would be incurred in accommodating larger numbers of pupils;
- an educational establishment would remain within the Brierton community;
- Sport Specialism would be secure as would the future of the Community Sports Centre that is currently thriving;

- travelling distances for pupils and the associated problems would be reduced;
- the building could also be used for some new initiatives or courses;
- all staff who work on the premises would have some degree of security or at least have more time in which to plan future career moves
- the site could be used in the future to house pupils from other schools while the building work under BSF proposals goes ahead on other school sites;
- a working, fully-operational school would not be vandalised and the community would remain a safer place;
- exciting collaborative work could be developed to raise the achievement and aspirations both of staff and pupils;
- increased flexibility within the two buildings would lead to ground-breaking new initiatives in education.

Fundamentally, this proposal would prevent the enormous upheaval that the proposed 'quick kill' will undoubtedly cause and allow a gradual movement away that will be beneficial to all of the pupils and staff involved. It will allow the very vulnerable Year 7 to reach the end of Key Stage 3 without upheaval and to be more easily absorbed into Dyke House at Key Stage 4; the current Year 8 to 10 pupils would continue to be educated on the Brierton site without unnecessary disruption or upheaval; the additional year would also enhance the quality of the strategic planning for the closure.

If you genuinely believe that 'every child matters' in Hartlepool, I urge you to think more carefully about the immediate future of the young people concerned and to give this proposal your very serious consideration.

Yours sincerely

15 OCT 2007

The Director of Children's Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

Dear Adrienne Simcock.

Proposal to close Brierton School August 2009

My child currently attends Brierton School and we object to the above proposal- specifically to the time-scale of the proposal because it is too short and will inevitably have a detrimental effect on my child's education

I wish you to consider adopting the following proposal, which is based on making the transition of pupils and staff to other schools as smooth as possible, and which has at its core the principle that Brierton School continues to work with Dyke House over the next three to four years instead of only the next two.

The site itself would become Dyke House School (Brierton Site) and run by Dyke House School.

This will benefit my child

- An educational establishment would remain within the Brierton community;
- Sport Specialism would be secure as would the future of the Community Sports Centre that is currently thriving;
- Travelling distances for my child would not be an issue;
- ***All staff who work on the premises would have some degree of security or at least have more time in which to plan future career moves and stop the loss of quality teaching which will only get worse over the next 12 months which will effect my child now***
- A working, fully-operational school would not be vandalised and the community we live in would remain a safer place;

- I am confident my child will receive a quality education at Brierton site with the changes my family have seen in the last six months under the leadership of the new Executive Head Teacher. This has renewed my confidence that my child will succeed at Brierton school

My child only has one opportunity to do well at school. I urge you to consider this objection with the sensible alternative proposal, which benefits all pupils in the town **but particularly my child.**

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

FAO Adrienne Simcock

Re Closure of Brierton School

I am writing regarding the latest turn of events and the attached proposition that I and every other parent of a pupil at Brierton School has received from the Brierton school staff. I do have concerns and although it may or may not seem a good idea in theory to many I wonder if it really does have the pupils best interest at heart or is it a case of some Brierton staff prolonging the inevitable and giving themselves a bit more time to find alternative jobs or maybe for some this will take them up to retirement quite nicely.

As you can see I have put comments against most of the arguments raised for allowing the pupils to finish their education at Brierton.

If what they propose happens, many parents will find themselves in a situation were they will have sons and daughters attending different senior schools. In fact this has already started to happen as many parents who have a child at Brierton have then sent their younger sibling to a different senior school in view of how Brierton was operating and the pending closure. This is a disruption in itself for many families, children leaving for school at different times, travelling to different

ends of the town, having different PD days etc.

The report they have sent seems to place great emphasis on the fact that this year the pupils managed to achieve 62% 5 GCSE grades A-C. But it doesn't mention what type of subjects this 62% covered and what did they achieve in English and Math compared to other schools and how many pupils took the exams and how many subjects did they actually take.

Other schools such as Manor and Hightonhall manage to maintain this 62% approx year after year. Just because Brierton managed it this year doesn't mean they will do it next year - in fact many of the teachers who helped the pupils achieve this have probably left or are intending to as soon as something permanent becomes available. We need to see the school maintaining this for a few years before we risk any more children's valuable GCSEs. To me this 62% has come too late and we should not leave the pupils ^{to} finish their education there on the strength of it.

The Brierton staff (whoever this is made up of) also seem to imply that these results had a lot to do with Mr Jordan taking the reins but with all due respect he did not take over until March 2007 so for all I applaud what Mr Jordan is doing now I really think that this group of pupils who

(3)

Obtained the 2007 GCSE results were the product of the firm foundation ~~of~~ that they received under Mr Weaver. Unfortunately Mr Weaver left not long after my child started their education at Brierton in year 7 and I know that my child has not had a good foundation in the last couple of years although Mr Jordan is doing a good job in trying to bring stability to the school which is going to get harder for him as more teachers jump ship.

To me transferring to another school would mean stability and a better choice of options for GCSES - pupils of Brierton are limited - will this still be the case if it is run by Dykehouse School, will they still be compelled to do GCSE sport which I think is ludicrous - this is a subject which should be down to choice but if a school is limited on subject teachers I guess they have no option. But is this fair to the pupils - every child in the town deserves the same chance and choices and therefore it makes sense to transfer the pupils out - don't keep them there and let another band of children miss out like many previous children of Brierton before them.

This latest proposal from Brierton staff will not benefit the pupils it is just prolonging the issue and the only people who may benefit will be the staff. Facts such as travelling distance is no longer relevant as this

P.T.O

(4)

year parents preferred to let their year 7 children travel further afield rather than go to Brierton. As will the future children. Brierton staff are saying don't let any more children start Brierton - so its ~~widely~~ alright for them to travel but then its abit contrary as it is saying let ~~the~~ the pupils already at Brierton stay and they won't have to travel. So its alright for some to and alright if some don't??

I really do not think increasing the year groups by approx 30 pupils over the next 2 years in the 5 remaining schools is going to be difficult. People just like to put stumbling blocks in the way. There is nothing wrong with Portacabins/Huts especially if it means more choice of options leading to a chosen career.

If this proposal happens then pupils should still be allowed to transfer to another school if they have a younger sibling already at a different senior school (year 7) or a sibling due to start one.

If parents sign this letter I think they are taking the easy option of convenience, they are not thinking what the implications in a few years time will mean such as limited GCSES.

If Dyke House is going to be responsible for all these extra children will this not have a detrimental effect on the Dyke House pupils - will they be sharing the teachers and supply teachers equally or will Brierton be

(5)
treat as second class citizens and having
mainly supply which is the normal practice.

In view of all this I am therefore
not prepared to sign in favour of it becoming
Dykehouse School Bnerton site.

I hope you take my thoughts and views
on board.

A very concerned and anxious parent.

Dear Parent / Carer of Y7, Y8, Y9 pupils

Closure of Brierton School

As you will be aware the school has had an official notice to close. Objections to the closure need to reach the Director of Children's Service, Adrienne Simcock by Friday October 26th 2007.

Early in September Paul Briggs who is the BSF Project leader came in to talk to all Brierton staff. He explained that although there had been objections to the closure no suggestions had been made as an alternative but we had a 6-week window to write and put forward an alternative. A member of staff in this meeting did indeed put forward an alternative.

In addition below is quoted from the Cabinet meeting that was held September 3rd to propose the closure;

'... Project board was of the view that although the scale of the opposition to the closure of Brierton school had increased no new arguments had been presented by those opposed to the closure of the school and the reasons why Brierton was original named as the school that might close were still relevant.'

Can we inform you that in excess of 100 letters have been sent already by members of staff, members of the governing body and other members of Brierton community.

To summarise the key points of the letter;

62%
What subjects?
How many entered
in for exams?
What was 10
for English and
Maths?

- We do not object to the closure of the school in August 2009, but wish that September 2009 that 'Brierton School' exists as a site only under the leadership of Dyke House school. I am sure you are aware that the school has been working in collaboration with Dyke house school and in that time the GCSE results moved from 31% (the lowest in the town) to 62% third highest beating St Hilds, High Tunstall and Manor school of technology.
- That we receive no new intake (the current Y6's would move to the new Secondary schools as explained in the BSF consultation) but all our current pupils would continue and complete their education at 'Brierton site'

Was this
really done
Mr Jordan
only arrived
in March!

Means
Brother
and Sister
going to
different
Senior School

Your child would benefit;

No move to a new school mid way through their Secondary education and all the negatives that would be encountered with this route

More GCSE options at
other schools - To me this
is possible

Standards would be continued and built on, under the leadership of Dyke House School (again note the turn round in results since March 07)

Teachers will continue to leave when
something permanent and long term comes up.
Teachers will continue
to leave when something
permanent and long term

In addition the £90 million would still be secured as the secondary school would officially be closed. Therefore your child and all the pupils in the town would still benefit

Great for children of the future but the present
children still deserve the best chance also !!

Attached is a copy of a letter that if you wish to support could you;

Add your address, sign the letter and post to the address on the letter to **arrive before October 26th 2007**

Alternatively you may wish to write your own personalised letter supporting this decision

Finally we appreciate you may have own reasons for not supporting the proposal and we fully respect your decision.

Thank you

Brierton staff

The Director of Children's Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

Dear A. Simcock (Director of Children's Services)

Proposal to close Brierton School

My child attends Brierton School and we object to the above proposal- specifically to the time-scale of the proposal because it is too short and will inevitably have a detrimental effect on my child's education

I wish you to consider adopting the following proposal, which is based on making the transition of pupils and staff to other schools as smooth as possible, and which has at its core the principle that Brierton School continues to work with Dyke House over the next three to four years instead of only the next two.

The site itself would become Dyke House School (Brierton Site) and run by Dyke House School.

This will benefit my child

- other schools would not need to plan for an influx of pupils and larger numbers in the future and my child be educated in schools most of which are already too full — *what is wrong with extra portacabins to accommodate the increase in pupils - It is possible and feasible*
- an educational establishment would remain within the Brierton community; *This is just clutching at straws - even if this plan goes ahead the school will eventually close in 2012 when present year 7 leave.*
- Sport Specialism would be secure as would the future of the Community Sports Centre that is currently thriving; *AS above will lease in 2012 - putting off inevitable.*
- travelling distances for my child would not be an issue; *Future children is year 6 etc who will not go to Brierton will have to do it so why not the pupils already at Brierton - is this really issue.*
- all staff who work on the premises would have some degree of security of at least have more time in which to plan future career moves and stop the loss of quality teaching which will only get worse over the next 12 months which will effect my child now - *Majority of teachers are looking for jobs now and will go as soon as something suitable becomes available. This will get worse until every child leaves.*

Putting off inevitable for 3 years

Also for many teachers it will mean others attending different senior schools

- a working, fully-operational school would not be vandalised and the community we live in would remain a safer place:

It will be working until 2009 anyway. Keeping it open for another 3 years will really stop the vandals??

- I am confident my child will receive a quality education at Brierton site with the changes my family have seen in the last six months under the leadership of the new Executive Head Teacher. This has renewed my confidence that my child will succeed if they stay at Brierton site, but their education will suffer if they have to make an unnecessary move to new school in many cases where standards are not at the level they at Brierton.

I am not confident - I think my child has a better chance of achieving 5 GCSE grade A-C including English + Maths elsewhere - This year's bit does not convince me

My child only has one opportunity to do well at school. I urge you to consider this objection with the sensible alternative proposal, which benefits all pupils in the town.

Yours sincerely



The Director of Children's Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Your ref: CL/BSF

Dear

I work in Brierton Community School as Assistant progress leader for year seven and I am also the parent and step-parent to six children who attend three secondary schools in the town, all of which will be affected by BSF in the future. I object to the proposal due to the timescale of the closure and the affect it will have on my own children and the children that I support at Brierton.

Objection regarding current year seven

Before I started my new role in September I worked from January until July as Transition Assistant working in the Primary feeder schools preparing vulnerable pupils for their transition to Brierton School. The children I worked with are the most vulnerable, children who have learning difficulties and don't cope very well with change, and children who are in care and have enough to cope with already in life by being passed from place to place they don't need this at school too. These children need structure, familiarity and people that they know and trust. They are already talking and worrying about moving again next year and being split up from their friends and shipped out to other schools in the town.

If the school remained open for another year and they remained at Brierton then these pupils would finish Key Stage 3 and move before Key Stage 4 when they are more mature and well prepared for this upheaval.

Objection regarding my own children in Brierton and St. Hilds

I have two boys in year 10 attending Brierton and a daughter in year 11 attending St. Hilds, I did in the beginning of BSF try to move them all to another school. This decision was purely based on the uncertainty of jobs guaranteed for Teachers; I worried that staff would have to look for jobs and there would be only supply teachers left to teach them.

I was more than happy for the children to stay at Brierton with the Teaching staff that are there, and my boys want to stay at Brierton as long as they have the Teachers that they have now, the BSF proposal and uncertainty of future jobs for staff means that Teachers are leaving.

This is stressful for me and my sons who are in their most vital years of school life, they have been back at school three weeks and I have heard of 3 members of staff leaving in the near future and again I am worrying about who will teach them and if they will suffer in their academic achievements.

After all who wants a job without security in a school that is closing?

My daughter managed to get a place at St.Hilds and is settled there and BSF won't affect her as she will have left school by then.

If the school remained open for longer and the Staff were given some degree of security pupils will have the staff they know and trust. This will also enable the staff more time to plan future career moves.

Objection regarding three step-children in Dyke House.

I have three step-children attending Dyke House School, one in year nine and two in year seven, my objections to the BSF proposal in this instance is due to larger numbers of pupils attending from next year when Brierton's current year seven and nine are split up and divided across the other secondary schools. This will affect the two younger children as the schools will be under more pressure to cope with larger year groups and classes.

Again I think if Brierton was to remain open and keep our current year seven until the end of Key Stage three then the children will have chosen their optional subjects and will be all going down different paths, this I believe would be a better time to move and integrate them.

Overall it is my opinion that if Brierton stayed open for at least another year it would be beneficial to both pupils and staff at Brierton. Vulnerable year seven pupils would have time to prepare themselves for the future change and the rest of the pupils would benefit from knowing that staff would be around for longer. It would also relieve the pressure of increasing pupil numbers and the cost to accommodate pupils in the other schools.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
24th September 2007

Director of Children's Services
Adrienne Simcock
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road TS24 8AY

For the Personal attention of Ms Simcock

Brierton Community School – Ref CL/BSF

I write with regard to the above and to express my dismay at the short sighted and dreadful decision to close this great school. The wonderful education that I received at Brierton Comprehensive, between 1984 and 1989 was delivered by first rate teachers in a quality environment. Having left the town in 2002 for pastures new in Cumbria, I noticed via the Hartlepool Mail that the intention was to close the school and I was deeply saddened at this news.

It appears that the prospect of significant government monies is the catalyst for change, closure and pain and anxiety for staff, governors and pupils. Having worked in Local Government for 18 years (6 at HBC), I can well appreciate the appeal of extra funding for local authorities but the proposed way forward has to be questioned – does it stand up to scrutiny and judgement? I am familiar with the process and consultation that has been undertaken but feel the decision taken is unwise and certainly unjustified. Government monies may well fund new buildings but this will not necessarily create a 'school' and the learning, caring environment that is required.

I note with interest that Brierton is a specialist sports college and results have improved greatly in the last two years. Whilst numbers on roll may have dropped in recent times, there is no evidence to suggest that this trend will continue. I recently made contact with the school and received a reply from the Deputy Head-Teacher inviting me to visit the school and meet teachers who were still investing their time and efforts in educating the children of Hartlepool. I was also shown around by the Head Boy and Girl. I came away from the school feeling grateful for the visit though an overwhelming sense of sadness. In a world obsessed with tick boxes, performance indicators and money, I had hoped that the Members of Hartlepool Borough Council would have voted against the recommendation to close the school. Yet again however elected Members have voted for the option which contradicts public opinion and dooms this great educational establishment to the history books.

I hope at least that the teachers are rewarded for their long and faithful service and that the children's needs are met though in the meantime, please accept this letter as an objection to the proposal, which is sheer lunacy.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Cc Mayor S Drummond
CEO Paul Walker
Portfolio Holder for Children's Services – Cath Hill
Brierton Community School

17 OCT 2007

[REDACTED]

The Director of Children's Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

**For the direct attention of Mr A Simcock
Director of Children's Services**

Dear A Simcock (Director of Children's Services)

PROPOSAL TO CLOSE BRIETRON SCHOOL

My child, [REDACTED], attends Brierton School. As you will appreciate, I strongly object to the proposal advanced by the Council to close Brierton School, particularly as the suggested date of closure will come at a critical time in my son's studies.

Whilst I do not object directly to the closure of Brierton School, I do object to the proposed closure date, and to the proposal that my child be required to attend a school that is some 1.87 miles from my property! The present closure date will fall at a time when my son is due to commence the final two years of his GCSE studies. In today's employment market, where so much emphasis is placed upon what qualifications a potential applicant has, it is vitally important that **all** children have the opportunity to receive the best education possible, so that they can in turn achieve the best GCSE grades possible. Just taking a brief cursory look at your own employment opportunities at the time of writing this letter, you yourself insist on a pre-requisite number and level of GCSE results. If my son's GCSE results were below your requisite level, would you allow him the benefit of the doubt and employ him because your plans interrupted his studies and affected the grades he received. I highly doubt you would!

I fail to see how you have considered the needs of Brierton's pupils. You must appreciate that not all children take well to change. Some children take considerable time to adjust to different surroundings/teaching methods, and at Year 10, time to adjust is not available! Coupled with this is the fact that problems such as bullying occur most often to new students, which again can be highly disruptive.

I wish you to consider adopting the following proposal, which is based on making the transition of pupils to other schools as *smooth* as possible, and which has, at its core,

the principles that Brierton School continues to work with Dyke House over the next three to four years instead of only the next two.

In exchange for Brierton School entering a "shutdown period," over the next four years (i.e. until current Year 7 students have completed their GCSE studies), Brierton School will, for all intents and purposes close as of September 2009, and will become a campus of Dyke House School. The school site will be led, and directed, by Dyke House School, but all pupils and teaching staff will remain at Brierton School. In this way, although you will not have access to the site immediately, you will none the less secure whatever aims you have in mind for the site, all-be-it in four years rather than two.

The price of not holding good GCSE results is higher now than ever before. I am confident that my child will receive a quality education at Brierton, and this confidence has been renewed by the changes I have witnessed over the last six months under the leadership of the new Executive Head Teacher. Uprooting my child, in my opinion, can only have a detrimental effect.

I urge you to consider my objection, and look forward to receiving a prompt reply to my letter.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature area]



PUBLIC NOTICE

PROPOSALS TO DISCONTINUE BRIERTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL AND MAKE ALTERATIONS TO THE FIVE REMAINING SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN HARTLEPOOL

Part 1:

Notice is given in accordance with section 15(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 that Hartlepool Borough Council, Civic Centre, Victoria Road, Hartlepool TS24 8AY intends to discontinue Brierton Community School (A Specialist Sports College), Catcote Road, Hartlepool TS25 4BY on 31 August 2009.

The proposed closure will be phased, beginning from 01 September 2008. If this proposal is approved, there will be no Year 7 pupils admitted to Brierton Community School in September 2008. Pupils due to begin Year 8 and Year 10 in September 2008 will be required to transfer to another secondary school in Hartlepool. Pupils due to transfer from Year 9 to Year 10 in September 2009 will be required to transfer to another secondary school in Hartlepool.

The Council has met its statutory requirement to consult in relation to this proposal to close Brierton Community School. This has principally been managed through the completion of an intensive three stage consultation process carried out with all relevant interested parties during the course of the 2006/07 academic year.

It is proposed that pupils attending Brierton Community School will be offered places in the remaining five secondary schools in accordance with the Local Authority's community schools admissions policy, or in the case of a Voluntary Aided or Foundation school, the Governing Body's admissions policy. If this proposal is approved, the admission process for all pupils who will need to transfer from Brierton Community School to other Hartlepool secondary schools in either September 2008 or 2009 will begin in November 2007.

Arrangements will be made to increase the admission number and enlarge the capacity at each of the remaining five schools in order to admit existing Brierton pupils. In the main, this will be managed by providing good quality temporary accommodation units, pending the major capital investment planned through the Building Schools for the Future programme. Please see Parts 2 and 3 of this notice for further information.

The Council also proposes to transfer the additionally resourced provision at Brierton Community School which provides for children who have an Autistic Spectrum Disorder, to Manor College of Technology.

Transport issues arising from the closure of Brierton Community School will be dealt with in line with the Local Authority's Local Transport Plan which has at its core the continuing development of high frequency bus services together with the objective to increase the network of cycling and walking routes.

Copies of the complete proposals, including all Building Schools for the Future consultation documentation and those required in another language or format, can be obtained by contacting Christine Lawson on (01429) 523754 or by writing to the address below. Information relating to these proposals can also be found on the Council's website at: www.hartlepool.gov.uk/schoolscapital/bsf

Within **SIX WEEKS** from the date of publication of these proposals, any person may make objections to or make comments on the proposals by sending them to The Director of Children's Services (**ref CL/BSF**), Hartlepool Borough Council, Civic Centre, Victoria Road, Hartlepool, TS24 8AY.

Signed : Adrienne Simcock, Director of Children's Services, Hartlepool Borough Council

Dated : 14 September 2007

Explanatory Notes

1. With effect from September 2009, the Authority is moving from a system of geographical admission zones for secondary schools to a system based on partner primaries. This new system will create a closer relationship between a secondary school and a defined group of primary schools and will improve progression between primary and secondary phases of education. It is expected that overall this will lead to better outcomes for pupils. From September 2009, parents who would have applied for entry to Brierton Community School will now make their application based on this new arrangement and which will be clearly set out in the Parents' Information booklet for that year. Parents will still be able to express a preference for any secondary school in Hartlepool.
2. Hartlepool Council will continue to offer school places to children that are within a reasonable distance of their place of residence. Where this is not practical the Authority will aim to try to ensure that journey times to and from school for pupils are reasonable, and it will work with providers to consider possible revisions to transport routes where necessary. In addition, it will encourage walking to and from school in order to reduce the number of car journeys as part of the Council's commitment to protecting the environment.

Part 2:

Notice is given in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 that Hartlepool Council intends to make prescribed alterations to the following schools from 01 September 2008:

- High Tunstall College of Science, Elwick Road, Hartlepool TS26 0LQ
- Dyke House School, Mapleton Road, Hartlepool TS24 8NQ
- St Hild's Church of England (Aided) School, King Oswy Drive, West View, Hartlepool TS24 9PB
- English Martyrs' Roman Catholic Voluntary Aided Comprehensive School, Catcote Road, Hartlepool TS25 4HA
- Manor College of Technology, Owton Manor Lane, Hartlepool TS25 3PS

It is proposed to increase the admission number of these schools in order for each school to accommodate a proportion of pupils transferring from Brierton Community School, which is proposed to close on 31 August 2009. Please see Part 1 of this notice for further information.

The current capacity of High Tunstall College of Science is 1205 and the proposed capacity will be 1325. The current number of pupils registered at the school is 1187. The proposed admission number for the school will be 260.

5.1 Appendix 7

The current capacity of Dyke House School is 1050 and the proposed capacity will be 1140. The current number of pupils registered at the school is 1026. The proposed admission number for the school will be 230.

The current capacity of St Hild's Church of England (Aided) School is 900 and the proposed capacity will be 1020. The current number of pupils registered at the school is 874. The proposed admission number for the school will be 200.

The current capacity of English Martyrs' Roman Catholic Voluntary Aided Comprehensive School is 1637 and the proposed capacity will be 1667. The current number of pupils registered at the school is 1590. The proposed admission number for the school will be 260.

The current capacity of Manor College of Technology is 1125 and the proposed capacity will be 1185. The current number of pupils registered at the school is 1059. The proposed admission number for the school will be 230.

Hartlepool Council will implement these proposals and in the case of Manor College of Technology (Foundation School), St Hild's Church of England (Aided) and English Martyrs' Roman Catholic Voluntary Aided Comprehensive Schools, will work in close partnership with the respective Governing Body.

Copies of the complete proposals, including all Building Schools for the Future consultation documentation and those required in another language or format, can be obtained by contacting Christine Lowson on (01429) 523754 or by writing to the address below. Information relating to these proposals can also be found on the Council's website at: www.hartlepool.gov.uk/schoolscapital/bsf

Within **FOUR WEEKS** from the date of publication of these proposals, any person may make objections to or make comments on the proposals by sending them to The Director of Children's Services (**ref CL / BSF**), Hartlepool Borough Council, Civic Centre, Victoria Road, Hartlepool, TS24 8AY.

Signed : Adrienne Simcock, Director of Children's Services, Hartlepool Borough Council

Dated : 14 September 2007

Explanatory Notes

The number of pupils to be admitted to the following year groups at High Tunstall College of Science from 01 September 2008 are proposed to be: Year 7 – 260 pupils, Year 8 – 260 pupils and Year 10 – 275 pupils. Year 8 and Year 10 numbers include children transferring from earlier age groups.

The number of pupils to be admitted to the following year groups at Dyke House School from 01 September 2008 are proposed to be: Year 7 – 230 pupils, Year 8 – 230 pupils and Year 10 – 235 pupils. Year 8 and Year 10 numbers include children transferring from earlier age groups.

The number of pupils to be admitted to the following year groups at St Hild's Church of England (Aided) School from 01 September 2008 are proposed to be: Year 7 – 200 pupils, Year 8 – 200 pupils and Year 10 – 209 pupils. Year 8 and Year 10 numbers include children transferring from earlier age groups.

The number of pupils to be admitted to the following year groups at English Martyrs' Roman Catholic Voluntary Aided Comprehensive School from 01 September 2008 are proposed to be: Year 7 – 260 pupils, Year 8 – 260 pupils and Year 10 – 275 pupils. Year 8 and Year 10 numbers include children transferring from earlier age groups.

The number of pupils to be admitted to the following year groups at Manor College of Technology from 01 September 2008 are proposed to be: Year 7 – 230 pupils, Year 8 – 230 pupils and Year 10 – 244 pupils. Year 8 and Year 10 numbers include children transferring from earlier age groups.

Part 3:

Notice is given in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 that Hartlepool Council intends to make a prescribed alteration to Manor College of Technology, Owton Manor Lane, Hartlepool TS25 3PS from 01 September 2009.

The proposal is to establish a new specialist provision for up to 20 pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorder. Provision is currently made for such pupils at Brierton Community School, which is proposed to close on 31 August 2009. Please see Part 1 of this notice for further information.

The Council will implement this proposal together with any transitional arrangements needed, in close partnership with the school's Governing Body.

Copies of the complete proposals, including all Building Schools for the Future consultation documentation and those required in another language or format, can be obtained by contacting Christine Lowson on (01429) 523754 or by writing to the address below. Information relating to these proposals can also be found on the Council's website at: www.hartlepool.gov.uk/schoolscapital/bsf

Within **SIX WEEKS** from the date of publication of this proposal, any person may make objections to or make comments on the proposal by sending them to The Director of Children's Services (**ref CL / BSF**), Hartlepool Borough Council, Civic Centre, Victoria Road, Hartlepool, TS24 8AY.

Signed : Adrienne Simcock, Director of Children's Services, Hartlepool Borough Council

Dated : 14 September 2007

Explanatory notes

1. In addition to the Council's consultations on the proposal to close Brierton Community School, it has been seeking views on its partner primary plans. It is intended to make Manor College of Technology the partner secondary school to Kingsley Primary School which already has established an additionally resourced provision for primary children with Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD). As all the children with ASD at Brierton need to be given the chance to continue to be taught with their peers, any transfer arrangements will need to mirror the mainstream arrangements. Outreach will be provided to all schools from a specialist teacher. This provision for children with ASD forms part of Hartlepool's Inclusion Policy. Children with ASD will continue to be educated in mainstream schools with specialist support and special schools, as

5.1 Appendix 7

appropriate. In Hartlepool, the Council believes that all children should have an equal opportunity to be included in a mainstream school, and should have access to the support they need.

CABINET REPORT

12th November 2007



Report of: Director of Children's Services

Subject: BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE
STAGE 4 CONSULTATION

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform members of the outcomes of the fourth stage of consultation in preparation for the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme and to determine the next actions to be taken.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

This report provides a summary of the outcomes of the fourth stage consultation process in preparation for Building Schools for the Future. It makes recommendations about the next issues which need to be addressed and the processes to be followed.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

Building Schools for the Future (BSF) will have a significant impact on the future provision of education in Hartlepool.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Key decision.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet, 12th November 2007.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

It is recommended that Members:

- Note the outcomes of the fourth stage of consultation in preparation for Building Schools for the Future and Special Educational Needs.
- Approve in principle the development of a proposal to co-locate Catcote and Springwell schools and to identify a range of options as to how this might be achieved.
- Authorise the publication of a formal statutory notice to re-designate Catcote School to admit up to 30 pupils with statements of special educational needs for behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD) within the age range 10 years – 17 years.
- Authorise further consultation with members of the Secondary Behaviour and Attendance Partnership and other stakeholders of possible options for making provision for pupils who have been permanently excluded from school.
- Recommend that the Schools Forum consider the allocation of funding to support specialist teacher outreach from Catcote and Springwell Special Schools and High Tunstall College of Science.
- Authorise the publication of a formal statutory notice to discontinue the additionally resourced provision for children with learning difficulties at Key Stage 1 pupils at Jesmond Road Primary School.

Report of: Director of Children's Services

Subject: BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE
STAGE 4 CONSULTATION

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform members of the outcomes of the fourth stage of consultation in preparation for the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Programme and to determine the next actions to be taken.

2. BACKGROUND

Hartlepool Borough Council has been admitted to the BSF programme as a wave 5 authority. The funding available to Hartlepool secondary schools is likely to be between £80-90 million of which approximately £9 million will be earmarked for spending on information and communications technology (ICT) equipment and infrastructure.

Both Catcote School and the Pupil Referral Unit (currently based at Access to Learning – A2L) are eligible for BSF funding and must be included in the authority's Strategy for Change. The Strategy for Change also requires the local authority to demonstrate how its plans will improve provision for pupils with special educational needs (SEN).

Catcote School is a special school for pupils in the age range 11 to 19. It currently has 78 pupils on roll. In addition it is making provision under a service level agreement with the local authority for up to 30 secondary aged pupils with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD). These pupils have statements of special educational needs as they have long term learning needs associated with their emotional and social vulnerabilities. The school supports provision for a significant number of other students through outreach support by teaching assistants and by access for Key Stage 4 pupils from mainstream secondary schools across the town to its vocational courses. Catcote also makes provision for young people over 19 years of age under a franchise agreement with Hartlepool College of Further Education.

The Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) makes provision for young people of secondary school age who have been permanently excluded from school. On very rare occasions provision has to be made for primary aged pupils but this requires an individual package of provision. No primary aged pupils were excluded from Hartlepool schools during the 2006/07 school year. There are currently 8 pupils receiving tuition at A2L at the Brierton Lane site.

In addition to Catcote Special School, the local authority has a primary special school, Springwell, which is not eligible for BSF funding. Springwell currently has 46 pupils on roll. It supports pupils in mainstream schools by outreach and the provision of short term 'guest' pupil provision.

Springwell works closely with the local authority, alongside Catcote and mainstream schools (both with and without additional resourced facilities for various types of special educational needs) to ensure that there is a range of specialist provision across the town. This continuum aims to be as inclusive as possible, meeting the individual needs of children and young people and providing parents with options to choose between mainstream and special school provision for their children. This continuum of provision also reduces the need for young people from Hartlepool to have to go outside the town in order to have their needs met.

Any proposals affecting one aspect of SEN provision in the town are likely to have an impact at some level on other SEN provision within Hartlepool. For this reason, this report also makes reference to SEN provision at High Tunstall College of Science and Brierton Community School and at Jesmond Road Primary School.

3. STAGE 1 CONSULTATION PROCESS

Stage 1 was the first, formative stage of consultation which brought facts about the BSF programme and the context of Hartlepool secondary education to the attention of as many people as possible. Issues relating to special educational needs were included from the very beginning in BSF consultation. Stage 1 noted the Council's vision and aim for inclusive education and Hartlepool's special schools' role within this. Plans for mainstream schools must set out how they will increase access for disabled pupils and those with special educational needs and Stage 1 consultation emphasised the continuing importance of inclusion as a key element of BSF planning.

4. STAGE 2 CONSULTATION PROCESS

The Stage 2 consultation process included a range of options for 11-16 mainstream schools in Hartlepool. Stage 2 also put forward 2 options for special educational needs. These were:

- Option 1 – Catcote Secondary Special School and Springwell Special Primary School to remain on their present separate sites.
- Option 2 – Catcote School and Springwell School to come together on a single site, with shared facilities designed to meet the needs for a wide range of special needs.

A report on the Stage 2 consultation was presented to members on 19th March 2007. This made specific recommendations in relation to Brierton School which were taken forward in Stage 3 of the BSF consultation process. Members also authorised further exploration of the possible co-location of Catcote and Springwell schools on a single site with shared facilities, during the period of preparation of the BSF Strategy for Change. This was taken forward as Stage 4 consultation.

5. STAGE 3 CONSULTATION PROCESS

Stage 3 consultation was focused on a proposal to close Brierton Community School. This included one specific issue in relation to special educational needs as Brierton Community School has additionally resourced facilities for pupils with autistic spectrum disorders (ASD). The consultation document indicated that the BSF Project Board's preferred option was that if Brierton School closed, this additionally resourced provision should move from Brierton Community School to Manor College of Technology and that outreach support would be provided to all schools from a specialist teacher. The outcome of Stage 3 consultation forms the content of a separate report which will be presented to members.

6. STAGE 4 CONSULTATION PROCESS

The Stage 4 consultation process was focused on meeting the needs of children and young people who have a range of special educational and additional needs. It looked specifically at the possible co-location of Catcote and Springwell schools, as authorised by Cabinet on 19th March 2007. In view of the inter-related nature of other issues concerning special educational needs, the opportunity was taken to consult on a number of these other SEN issues.

The consultation document sought views on the following key issues:

1. Special Schools – the possible co-location of Catcote and Springwell schools.
2. Provision for behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD) at Catcote School.
3. Provision for excluded pupils.
4. Support in mainstream schools
 - 4.1 outreach support
 - 4.2 provision for pupils with physical and/or medical difficulties
 - 4.3 special support at Key Stage 1

The BSF and SEN Stage 4 consultation period began on 24th September 2007 and ran until 26th October 2007. Twenty four consultation meetings/briefings took place during this period:

- Three meetings at each of the schools specifically named in the consultation document – Catcote, Springwell, High Tunstall and Jesmond Road.
 - All teaching and support staff
 - Governors
 - Parents and the public
 (Staff, parents and the management committee for the Pupil Referral Unit were specifically invited to the Catcote meeting)
- A meeting for all headteachers and chairs of Hartlepool schools
- A briefing for elected members
- Three Neighbourhood Forum meetings
- Briefing for the Diocesan representatives
- Briefing for Health and Care Strategy Group
- Briefing for the HVDA Forum
- Briefing for the Special Educational Needs and Disability teams within HBC Children's Services
- A public meeting at Owton Manor Community Centre
- A meeting of the BSF Stakeholder Board
- A report for information to the Hartlepool Partnership

Over 300 people attended the meetings described above.

Families of school age children received copies of a summary leaflet which gave information about the public meetings and where to get further information. Over 10,600 copies of the summary were distributed.

The full consultation document was targeted specifically at staff, governors and parents of pupils at schools named within the consultation, with appropriate covering letters. It went to headteachers, staff, governors and parents of all pupils at Catcote, Springwell and Jesmond Road. All other headteachers and chairs of governors also received copies of the consultation document. The full consultation document was not sent to all parents at High Tunstall but went to parents and carers of children within the support base. The full document went to A2L staff and management committee and parents and carers of children under five who were known to the care co-ordination system and the Hartlepool Network for Disabled Children.

Members of the SEN and Disability teams in Children's Services and family resource workers received the full consultation document, as did college principals, health therapy services, neighbouring authorities and the Project and Stakeholder Board members, 24 other strategic partners, including key partners from the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership, and the unions.

Health visitors were sent copies of the full documentation and in addition, the full document was provided to day nurseries, doctors' and dentists' surgeries, housing offices and libraries.

Details of the responses to the Stage 4 consultation have been placed on the Council's website www.hartlepool.gov.uk/schoolscapital/bsf. Some responses

received were collective responses and in addition a number of individual responses were received. Not all responses commented on all aspects of the consultation. The responses are summarised in **Appendix 1** and are analysed in the next few sections of this report.

7. STAGE 4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES: CO-LOCATION OF CATCOTE AND SPRINGWELL SCHOOLS

Collective responses were received from:

- Hartlepool secondary headteachers
- English Martyrs School and Sixth Form College
- Parents attending drop-in/ focus group at Catcote
- Springwell senior management team
- Hartlepool Special Needs Support Group
- Hartlepool Educational Psychology team
- Hartlepool PCT
- High Tunstall College of Science
- Secondary Behaviour and Attendance Partnership

All these responses supported co-location although the response from High Tunstall College of Science raised concerns that the primary reason for looking at co-location was cost efficiency and the needs of children must be put first. The response from the parent drop-in indicated some parental concerns that if resources were shared this might lead to reduced access for Catcote pupils. Parents were also concerned about the name of a co-located provision, and suggested the word 'Campus' might be appropriate.

There were 14 individual responses, the majority of which were in favour of co-location but there were a number of differing views about the site. These ranged from an exhortation to 'think big' to more cautious responses suggesting it would be prudent to develop further the good work already going on at Catcote in improving the site there.

Overall, within the responses, seven indicated Brierton as the preferred site. Two responses specifically disagreed with co-location and two recorded concerns that it would cause too much change.

Comments included in both the collective and individual responses are summarised in detail in **Appendix 1**.

8. STAGE 4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES: PROVISION FOR PUPILS WITH BEHAVIOURAL, EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL DIFFICULTIES AT CATCOTE SCHOOL

Collective responses were received from:

- Hartlepool secondary headteachers
- English Martyrs School and Sixth Form College
- Parents attending drop-in/focus group at Catcote
- Springwell senior management team
- Hartlepool Special Needs Support Group
- Hartlepool Educational Psychology team
- Secondary Behaviour and Attendance Partnership
- High Tunstall College of Science

Six of the responses supported Catcote School making provision for pupils with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties. The responses from the two groups involving parents did not directly oppose the suggestion but expressed concerns about how the needs of this group of young people could be met alongside the complex needs of young people with profound and multiple learning difficulties.

Eleven individual responses were received. There was positive agreement about Catcote making provision for pupils with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties from six respondents. Four raised issues about needing to ensure that the needs of different groups were properly protected and one reply was opposed to the suggestion.

Comments included in the collective and individual responses are summarised in detail in **Appendix 1**.

9. STAGE 4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES: PROVISION FOR EXCLUDED PUPILS

Collective responses were received from:

- Hartlepool secondary headteachers
- English Martyrs School and Sixth Form College
- Springwell senior management team
- Hartlepool Educational Psychology team
- Secondary Behaviour and Attendance Partnership
- High Tunstall College of Science

Four of these responses supported broadly the idea of a 12 place pupil referral unit (PRU) and some had additional comments about an outreach service to complement this. Two responses questioned whether a PRU was needed and suggested other solutions could be considered. A number of responses raised issues about the location and the cost effectiveness of building a new PRU.

Seven individual responses were received. Five of these supported the notion of a separate pupil referral unit. One respondent raised the need to look for best practice nationally before making a decision about location and set up. One respondent felt that it was a matter for school leadership teams to decide.

Comments included in collective and individual responses summarised in detail in **Appendix 1**.

10. STAGE 4 CONSULTATION RESPONSES: SUPPORT IN MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS

Collective responses were received from:

- Hartlepool secondary headteachers
- English Martyrs School and Sixth Form College
- Springwell senior management team
- Hartlepool Educational Psychology team
- Hartlepool PCT
- High Tunstall College of Science

All six of these responses supported the extension of outreach by specialist teachers from specially resourced facilities/schools. Four of the responses specifically endorsed the proposal to close the Key Stage 1 support base at Jesmond Road School.

Ten individual responses were received which supported outreach, although respondents raised issues indicating that this should only progress as long as resources are available. Some parents commented that support in mainstream school does not suit every child. Two individual responses specifically endorsed the proposal to close the Key Stage 1 base at Jesmond Road.

There were no objections in either the collective or individual responses to the proposal for the formal closure of the support base at Jesmond Road School.

Comments included in the collective and individual responses are summarised in detail in **Appendix 1**.

11. OVERVIEW OF RESPONSES AND POSSIBLE OPTIONS

The volume of responses to the Stage 4 Consultation has been small in comparison to those received in relation to earlier stages of the consultation. This reflects the fact that there was a smaller target group, focusing on individuals with direct links to Catcote and Springwell special schools, Access to Learning, High Tunstall College of Science and Jesmond Road Primary School. Parents of children with special educational needs in other schools were, however, given the summary leaflet to ensure that they could access the information if they wished.

Co-Location of Catcote and Springwell Schools

The majority of formal responses received, both collective and individual, are supportive in principle of the co-location of Catcote and Springwell schools, but a small number disagreed and some raised concerns about the implications of co-location.

Within the responses and the comments generated in the various stakeholder and public meetings, a wide range of issues have been raised. One significant issue is the consideration of whether co-location should be based on enhancing existing provision at the Catcote site or whether there should be a vision for a wider scheme on a new site, with efforts made to draw in additional funding from other sources and to create a facility that, whilst it would have the two co-located schools at the heart, would encompass much wider facilities both for those with additional needs and for the wider community. A number of respondents indicated that the Brierton site, should the decision be made to close Brierton School, would provide a possible location for such an enhanced facility.

A number of other issues were raised, some of which reflected anxieties about how to ensure that the needs of very vulnerable pupils could be met within a larger specialist facility.

Co-location raises a number of areas of risk. Funding is only guaranteed through the Building Schools for the Future programme for Catcote School; Springwell School is not entitled to BSF funding although it could potentially access funding from the Primary Capital Programme depending on Hartlepool's future Primary Strategy. Funding from other sources will need to be obtained if co-location is to be moved forward. There are a number of options which can be explored in relation to this and officers are actively in discussion with representatives of the DCSF and Partnerships for Schools (PfS), highlighting the project as something innovative and worthy of special consideration. These funding issues raise the associated risk that the expectations of stakeholders and the public will be raised and that ultimately the funding resources will not be available to meet these expectations.

In relation to the issues raised about how the needs of very different groups of pupils could be met on a co-located site, it was particularly heartening that at the consultation meetings with school staff, the staff were formulating solutions, eg "if co-location was to happen, break times would be the main problem, but this could be overcome by introducing different start and end times for breaks." "It is all down to practicalities and management as older children gain a lot from younger children and vice versa."

At this stage it is clear that there is support for the principle of co-location, but there are a number of significant issues which need to be resolved. It is therefore recommended that Cabinet approve in principle the development of a proposal to co-locate Catcote and Springwell schools and identify a range of options as to how this might be achieved. This proposal should be completed

by submission of the Outline Business Case for BSF which must be submitted by October 2008. This would need to explore some of the financial issues which would need to be resolved as well as looking in more detail as to how some of the practical issues could be addressed to ensure that co-location appropriately meets the needs of the different groups of pupils who would be on site.

Provision for Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties at Catcote School

The proposal to designate Catcote School as a school catering for pupils with statements of special educational need for behavioural, emotional and social difficulties was widely endorsed by professional groups. There were some understandable concerns from parents about the implications for other pupils and how this could be managed. Catcote School has been meeting the needs of pupils with statements for behavioural, emotional and social difficulties since April 2007. This has been done under a service level agreement with the local authority. This is proving to be a successful initiative and significant progress and benefit is seen already for the pupils in this group whose needs were not previously fully met as part of Access to Learning. Whilst the pupils are on a separate site, at Brierton Lane, individual pupils have, as part of their curriculum package, accessed activities on the main Catcote site. The success of this initiative demonstrates that with proper management, different groups of pupils can be managed under Catcote's leadership. The risks of proceeding with the formal designation of Catcote School to meet the needs of pupils with BESD appear, therefore, to be small. A far greater risk is associated with continuing to make ad hoc arrangements for this group of pupils and failing to meet their long term special educational needs. There are no significant funding issues for the Council in this option as these pupils are already funded within the overall schools budget.

The provision at Catcote is designed for secondary aged pupils. However, it is suggested that the formal designation should encompass the age range 10 years to 17 years. This has been done to provide a safety net for particularly vulnerable pupils. In some cases it is during the final year of primary school that mainstream schooling with support finally becomes untenable for pupils with this type of need. It is not in a pupil's best interests to have to change schools in Year 6 for a period of a few months before transferring to their longer term secondary age provision. Designating Catcote as being able to take pupils with this type of need from the age of 10 years upwards would ensure that no individual children were affected in this way. Similarly, it is expected that students with BESD would be ready to move on to college and other post-16 options at the end of Year 11. However, it is recognised that there may be some particularly immature or vulnerable individuals for whom an extra year in schooling would be advantageous.

It is therefore recommended that Cabinet authorises the proposal of formal public notices to designate Catcote School as a school catering for pupils with BESD in the age range 10 years to 17 years, in addition to its current school population.

Provision for Excluded Pupils

Provision for excluded pupils is an issue which has already been addressed in some detail by Hartlepool's Secondary Behaviour and Attendance Partnership, which is a close collaboration between schools and the local authority. Ultimately the local authority has the legal responsibility for pupils who are permanently excluded from school. Secondary schools and the local authority have worked very successfully together to reduce the number of permanently excluded pupils who require this form of alternative provision. However, for that small number of pupils who do require provision at a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) it is imperative that adequate provision is made. Exactly how this could be done in a manner that is proportionate in relation to the funding available requires further consideration. It is therefore proposed that Cabinet should refer the matter of provision for excluded pupils back to the Behaviour and Attendance Partnership for further consideration in consultation with other stakeholders to prepare a report for Project Board about the scope and location of facilities for pupils who are excluded from schools and a complementary outreach service.

Support in Mainstream Schools

There was universal support in the responses received for enhancing outreach support both from Catcote and Springwell Special Schools and also from the additional resourced facilities at High Tunstall School. Support for outreach from Manor College for pupils with autistic spectrum disorders was also noted in some responses, although it was not specifically part of this consultation as it was included in Stage 3 BSF consultation. There are no financial implications for the Council in supporting such a scheme. The funding for enhanced outreach support will come from within the overall schools budget and is a revenue, not a capital cost. It is a matter for decision by the Schools Forum. It is therefore recommended that Cabinet authorises a report to be presented to the Schools Forum who have the responsibility for decision making in relation to the Dedicated School Grant, from which the funding would need to be top-sliced.

No objections were received during the consultation to the proposals to close the additionally resourced facility at Jesmond Road School. All the responses that were received supported the proposal. There have been no pupils using the additionally resourced base for a period of over a year and there have been no pupils brought to the attention of the Special Educational Needs team who might have benefited from such a resource had it been operational during the past year. It is recommended that Cabinet authorises the publication of a formal public notice to discontinue the additionally resourced facility.

12. NEXT STEPS IN THE PROCESS

If Cabinet authorises further exploration of options for co-location of Catcote and Springwell schools no legal processes would need to be pursued at this

stage. Ultimately transfer orders would be necessary to transfer each school to a new site if this is what is determined.

If Cabinet authorises the formal re-designation of Catcote School to include provision for pupils with BESD a formal statutory proposal will need to be published. It is likely that a statutory notice could be published before the end of 2007 with a report back to Cabinet in the new year.

If Cabinet authorises the preparation of a report to go to the Schools Forum to support the funding of outreach by specialist teachers no legal processes are needed. The allocation of funding will be a matter for the Schools Forum to determine.

If Cabinet authorises the formal closure of the additionally resourced facility at Jesmond Road Primary School a formal statutory proposal will need to be made to discontinue the resource. It is likely that a statutory notice could be published before the end of 2007 with a report back to Cabinet in the new year.

13. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Cabinet authorise the BSF Project Board to work with officers and other stakeholders to formulate a proposal to co-locate Catcote and Springwell Schools which identifies a range of options, identifying the risks and financial implications associated with each.

It is recommended that Cabinet authorise the publication of the formal statutory notice to designate Catcote School to admit up to 30 pupils with statements of special educational needs for behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD) within the age range 10 years to 17 years. There are no specific financial implications associated with this recommendation.

It is recommended that there is further exploration with members of the Secondary Behaviour and Attendance Partnership and other stakeholders of possible options for making provision for pupils who have been permanently excluded from school for consideration by the Project Board. The local authority has a statutory obligation to meet the needs of these pupils, but there are significant financial implications particularly in relation to proportionality as part of the overall funding available for Building Schools for the Future.

It is recommended that a report is presented at the Schools Forum to request their consideration of the allocation of funding to support specialist teacher outreach from Catcote and Springwell Special Schools and High Tunstall College of Science. This has no additional cost implications for the Council as the money is contained within the Dedicated School Grant.

It is recommended to move to the publication of a formal statutory notice to discontinue the additionally resourced provision for children with learning difficulties at Key Stage 1 at Jesmond Road Primary School. There were no objections to this proposal raised during consultation and the financial

resources have already, by negotiation, been removed from the school budget and used to support pupils with special educational needs within their own mainstream schools.

14. DECISIONS REQUIRED

It is recommended that Members:

- Note the outcomes of the fourth stage of consultation in preparation for Building Schools for the Future and Special Educational Needs.
- Approve in principle the development of a proposal to co-locate Catcote and Springwell schools and to identify a range of options as to how this might be achieved.
- Authorise the publication of a formal statutory notice to re-designate Catcote School to admit up to 30 pupils with statements of special educational needs for behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD) within the age range 10 years – 17 years.
- Authorise further consultation with members of the Secondary Behaviour and Attendance Partnership and other stakeholders of possible options for making provision for pupils who have been permanently excluded from school.
- Recommend that the Schools Forum consider the allocation of funding to support specialist teacher outreach from Catcote and Springwell Special Schools and High Tunstall College of Science.
- Authorise the publication of a formal statutory notice to discontinue the additionally resourced provision for children with learning difficulties at Key Stage 1 pupils at Jesmond Road Primary School.

5.2 Appendix 1

Collation of Responses – Stage 4 Consultation (SEN)

Co-location

• In favour of co-location	19
• Co-location will make transition easier	8
• Must make sure it is for community use and not just for special needs to prevent prejudice	7
• Preferred site would be Brierton	7
• Access to facilities and professionals would improve with co-location	5
• Funding for other services must be looked at carefully as extended services is a necessity	5
• Must not lose the work already done need to enhance current provision. Accessibility needs to be from a curricular point not just architectural	5
• Need to make sure there is more provision for post 19	5
• Concern about mixing age groups so there must be two individual schools even if co-located	4
• Marketing of co-location will be all important to avoid community misconceptions	4
• Pools (hydrotherapy, swimming) could be built linked to current sports centre therefore utilising current facilities	4
• Traffic congestion and transport must be taken into account when planning the site	4
• Current Catcote site well located and has recent investment might be prudent to channel further investment into current site	3
• More specialised staff would be required to enable more inclusion and more funding should be allocated	3
• The name given to co-location is very important to avoid misconceptions - campus	3
• Would allow for many more extended services	3
• Brierton playing fields need to be protected and could be incorporated into a new co-location site with added outdoor facilities	2
• Co-location could be linked to sponsorship	2
• Co-location will cause too much change and upset	2
• Concern over where co-location will be built	2
• Concern that children will be 'singled out' and not included if co-location goes ahead	2
• Concerns that the intimacy may be lost with co-location	2
• Disagree with co-location	2
• Excellent design of building is required	2
• People of the town couldn't request something to be included in co-location if they don't know it exists in the first place	2
• Possibility of only having one governing body	2
• Respite/holiday care could be incorporated	2
• Time management of shared facilities needs to be looked at carefully	2
• What will happen to both sites if co-location is somewhere else?	2
• Shared use of facilities could reduce service to children	1
• As BSF is secondary Springwell must not be allowed to become the poor relation in co-location	1
• Catcote site maybe too small to allow for future development	1
• Clear linking co-location to all Hartlepool schools will be required	1
• Co-location will cause segregation of pupils with disabilities	1
• Locate SEN and Disabilities Team on site	1
• Benefits in staff from all agencies providing services to young people with additional needs being located together	1

5.2 Appendix 1

- Sponsorship could help 'Business & Enterprise' status but opposed to academy 1
- Important to take into account differing needs of different ages 1
- Must be a central site 1
- Needs a neutral name – not using 'inclusion' 1
- In the interests of efficiency support co-location 1
- Reasons for co-location are not enough and are based on cost 1
- Co-location would enhance the work Catcote and Springwell already do together 1
- Co-location would lead to social development and interaction 1
- Combined site would stretch resources too far 1
- Concern that co-location would work against inclusion (children like new build better) 1
- Concern that support will continue during co-location 1
- Concerns that in such a large facilities the individual needs of pupils may be missed or overlooked 1
- Extended Services (out of school hours) would not benefit SEN pupils 1
- If all extended services are placed on co-location site some people may be put off using them due to the connection with school 1
- Mainstream secondaries should offer vocational courses rather than pupils having to go to Catcote 1
- Need to look at different start and finish times and break times 1
- Preferred site would be Catcote 1
- Specialist teams not wanting to be permanently based on co-location - wish to appear neutral 1
- Upgrade Catcote – co-location can come at a later date 1
- Are there any plans for the St Hild's site 1
- If co-location goes ahead primary schools should be paired with primary schools rather than secondary schools 1
- The hydrotherapy pool should be retained 1

5.2 Appendix 1

BESD Provision

- Support BESD pupils being provided for at Catcote better to be going to school than a unit 8
- Opposed to BESD pupils on Catcote site 4
- BESD pupils should be on/in mainstream sites/schools 3
- SEN children too vulnerable to be mixed with BESD 3
- Appropriately trained staff are needed 1
- BESD pupils with SEN pupils a step backwards 1
- Concerns Catcote could become 'a last resort' for these pupils 1
- If co-location goes ahead provision for both secondary and primary BESD is needed 1
- Need to keep pupils in Hartlepool 1
- Not all children with emotional difficulties are disruptive or have learning difficulties 1
- Possible good idea as long as Catcote good work is not compromised 1
- Safety issues with putting these pupils in with vulnerable SEN pupils 1
- Set up a small separate site for BESD pupils 1
- Attention needs to be given to disparate needs of different groups 1
- 30 extra pupils is too many 1
- BESD pupils should be on a separate site but under Catcote umbrella 1

Pupil Referral Unit

- PRU should be on its own site and a provision unit in its own right 6
- Excluded pupils should be provided for on their mainstream site in a special area with adequately trained staff 3
- PRU should not be on the co-location site 2
- PRU should be for about 12-16 secondary age pupils 1
- All decisions should be left up to the leadership team 1
- Crisis support needs greater co-ordination from all appropriate services 1
- If a new PRU is built pupils may prefer it there and not want to go back to their mainstream school 1
- More preventative work from specialist outreach support is required 1
- Separate PRU not needed mainstream and special schools have sufficient strategies to cope along with inreach and outreach 1
- Support town wide PRU location needs further discussion 1
- To build a completely new PRU would not be very cost effective 1

5.2 Appendix 1

Support in Mainstream Schools

- Support the closing of the Key Stage 1 Base at Jesmond Road 6
- Support High Tunstall should be given more resources 5
- Springwell and Catcote staff could provide more specialist out reach support but resources must be in place to cover their absence 4
- More outreach/inreach support is a very good idea 4
- Support the transfer of ASD unit to Manor (if Brierton closes) 3
- High Tunstall may have facilities but not adequate expertise 2
- Support for Catcote and Springwell to be additionally resourced 1
- Decision to close Key Stage 1 base is fine as long as resources are in place for Springwell staff to help as and when needed. 1
- Needs to be a complete change of attitude from mainstream schools and their Headteachers 1
- Outreach support needs to be very carefully managed as there are many strands 1
- Outreach support will be very expensive 1
- Specialised teachers as well as support workers are needed 1
- Specialist staff from mainstream schools could provide support for inclusions at other schools 1
- Support could be hampered due to costs and locations available 1
- Support funding of a specialist teacher in ASD for outreach support 1

CABINET REPORT
12th November 2007



Report of: Director of Adult and Community Services

Subject: LINKs (Local Involvement Networks)

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update Cabinet on the preparation for the introduction of a LINK within Hartlepool and to seek endorsement of the procurement process and a planned consultation event.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report outlines the progress since the last report to Cabinet in relation to procurement and consultation.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

Project has a town wide impact.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non Key

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet 12th November 2007

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Cabinet are requested to:

- i) Note the progress made to date.
- ii) Endorse the procurement process contained in the report.
- iii) Endorse the proposed consultation event.
- iv) Support the formation of a Steering Group.

Report of: Director of Adult and Community Services

Subject: LINKs (Local Involvement Networks)

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To update Cabinet on the preparation for the introduction of a LINK within Hartlepool and to seek endorsement of the procurement process, a planned consultation event and the proposed Steering Group.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Department of Health have agreed to the Development of Local Involvement Networks (LINKs) to improve Service User and Public Engagement in Health and Social Care.
- 2.2 The aim of the LINKs Network is to create a system where more people are empowered to be active partners in the Health and Social Care system rather than passive recipients of care.
- 2.3 At the Cabinet meeting of 1st October 2007 Members considered:
- The role of LINKs
 - The role of Host organisation
 - The procurement process
 - The role of expert advisory team
- 2.4 Cabinet agreed to:-
- The LINKs grant being ring-fenced to the procurement and provision of a LINKs service.
 - Collaborative contract commissioning arrangements being pursued.
 - The procurement process being delegated to the Director of Adult and Community Services.
- 2.5 A report has also been presented to the Scrutiny Forum on 23rd October 2007 for their information and comments.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 The Local Government Public Involvement in Health Bill has now passed through the Commons and preparation for the Hartlepool LINK needs to be progressed.

- 3.2 The Government has allocated £10,000 for the development, preparations and procurement stages. A further allocation to implement and deliver the LINKs is awaited.
- 3.3 The procurement process has now been developed on a Tees Valley basis with an overall common tender approach with local accountability and management of the contract. This ensures that the contract is procured in the most efficient way but with the benefits of strong local control.
- 3.4 Middlesbrough Council have offered to take the lead in the process with the costs shared between each of the Councils. Hartlepool's share of the costs is £2500 to be funded from the £10,000 allocation.

The procurement process includes:-

- Preparing tender documents including liaising with early adopters and researching other relevant information for inclusion.
- Issuing the advert
- Administering the tender process
- Dealing with enquiries
- Setting up tender evaluation panel
- Circulating all relevant information
- Awarding the Tender
- Awarding the Tender award and subsequent enquiries and debriefings
- Arranging / hosting / interviews / presentations

- 3.5 The timetable for the process can be summarised as follows:

- Advertisement for Tender - 12th November 2007
- Award Tender - February 2008
- Start of Contract - April 2008

- 3.6 It is important that the local community and key stakeholders are fully involved in the development of the LINK. An event is being arranged on the 16th November that will cover:

- the background to LINKs,
- who should be involved in the LINK network
- what the host organisation will need to do to establish a LINK in Hartlepool, and
- what a successful LINK in Hartlepool will look like.

- 3.7 Funding for the event will come from the £10,000 allocation.

3.8 It is proposed that a steering group should be established after the consultation event to manage the process. It is suggested that the composition of the Group should be:

- Portfolio Holder for Adults and Public Health - Councillor Gerard Hall
- Portfolio Holder for Children's Services – Councillor Cath Hill
- Chair of Adults and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum – Councillor Jonathan Brash
- PCT Representative
- Director of Adult and Community Services
- Director of Children Services
- Voluntary Sector Representative

3.9 There will be an officer working group to support this process and to engage further with stakeholders.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Cabinet are requested to:

- i) Note the progress made to date.
- ii) Endorse the procurement process contained in the report.
- iii) Endorse the proposed consultation event.
- iv) Support the formation of a Steering Group.

CABINET REPORT

12 November 2007



Report of: The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT
- ACTION PLAN

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To agree an Action Plan in response to the findings of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum investigation into Youth Unemployment.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

2.1 The report provides brief background information on the Youth Unemployment Scrutiny Investigation and provides an Action Plan (**Appendix A**) in response to the Forum's recommendations.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

3.1 At its meeting of 11 June 2007 Cabinet agreed the Scrutiny Forum's recommendations and requested that an Action Plan for the implementation of these recommendations be prepared and reported back to Cabinet.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

4.1 Non-Key.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

5.1 The Action Plan and the progress of its implementation will be reported to Regeneration & Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 6th December 2007.

6. DECISION REQUIRED

- 6.1 That Members of the Cabinet approve the Action Plan (**Appendix A**) in response to the recommendations of the Regeneration & Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's Youth Unemployment Investigation.

Report of: The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT
- ACTION PLAN

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To agree an Action Plan in response to the findings of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum investigation into Youth Unemployment

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 11 June 2007, Cabinet considered the Final Report of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum into Youth Unemployment. The report was well received, and all of the Scrutiny Forum recommendations were approved, with a request that an action plan for the implementation of these recommendations be prepared and reported back to Cabinet.
- 2.2 The overall aim of the investigation was to identify key issues that impacted on youth unemployment in Hartlepool and to develop suggestions for improvement. Over the course of the investigation Members employed a variety of methods, which included evidence gleaned from:-
- Hartlepool Borough Council Officers
 - The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing
 - Representatives from Jobcentre Plus
 - Research commissioned on behalf of Economic Development 'Youth Unemployment in Hartlepool: Developing an evidence base report.
 - Written submission on behalf of The Connexions Services Locality Manager and The Learning & Skills Council (LSC)

3. ACTION PLAN

- 3.1 As a result of the Youth Unemployment scrutiny investigation the Forum made the following recommendations:-
- a) That the Authority is commended for taking on an active role in relation to Youth Unemployment and that the value of this work is supported and that, wherever possible, it should be supported further.
 - b) That the data issues and potential project areas identified in the *Youth Unemployment in Hartlepool: Developing an evidence base report*, which has been attached at Appendix A (of the Final Report), are

supported as a means to maintain the momentum generated for this issue through the introduction of the LAA.

- c) That, given that Connexions is being brought under the remit of the Local Authority, the Authority (and Economic Development and Children's Services, in particular) seek to work closely with Connexions to support young people to achieve economic well-being.
 - d) That further research should be conducted into the impact of the provision of key stakeholders on careers guidance and training for under 16's and that these services should be fully integrated within schools.
 - e) That the Authority should lobby for increased flexibility of the New Deal programme so that young people are able to access training programmes through this programme even if they have been unemployed for less than six months.
 - f) That the Community and Voluntary Sector's role should be maximised, wherever possible, in providing services for tackling youth unemployment.
- 3.2 An Action-Plan in response to these recommendations has now been produced and is attached at (**Appendix A**) which is to be submitted to the Regeneration and Planning Services Forum on 6 December 2007.

4. CURRENT POSITION

- 4.1 Following the recommendations given by Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum members it was acknowledged that a partnership approach was required to tackle youth unemployment within Hartlepool. Therefore, in the first instance an initial meeting between representatives of Economic Development and Children's Services (including officers from The Connexions Service) was arranged so that the issues relating to youth unemployment could be raised and actions taken. Within the meeting it was agreed that Officers would meet on a quarterly meeting with membership being extended to The Learning & Skills Council (LSC) and Jobcentre Plus as both agencies were identified as being key stakeholders.
- 4.2 These meetings have identified that through collaborative working there is a far greater opportunity for the cross cutting targets relating to youth unemployment and to reduce the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) can be achieved.
- 4.3 Economic Development has commissioned a consultant to undertake a number of tasks including;

- Engaging with Jobcentre Plus to identify whether there can be early interventions for those young people aged 18 plus who have registered with Jobcentre Plus on Job Seekers Allowance (Currently there is a six month wait for young people to enter onto the New Deal 18 to 24 years programme unless day one eligibility is given by a New Deal Adviser).
 - Identifying where there are future opportunities for the number of Modern Apprenticeships to be increased within the public, private and voluntary sector (with a specific review of Hartlepool Borough Council and the Primary Care Trust).
- 4.4 Following the Scrutiny Review meeting's the Economic Development Department have re-visited all of the organisations who have been allocated Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) Jobs & the Economy Themed funding to ensure that where appropriate their projects positively engage and target young people who are NEET or unemployed.
- 4.5 Bi-monthly meetings with Hartlepool Working Solution's (HWS) (A subsidiary of Economic Development) Officers who manage NRF Jobs & The Economy Themed funded projects has been introduced so that they are regularly updated on the number of young people who are unemployed so that a proportion of the project's activity can be aligned to this key group. Within these meetings other agencies are invited to attend including the Youth Offending Service and the Leaving Care Service so that officers can highlight current projects and where possible formulate a plan of action to engage with young people from these departments.
- 4.6 In terms of the NRF funding, Hartlepool Economic Forum is the Jobs & the Economy thematic partnership and is responsible for the commissioning of £2.2 million of NRF projects between 2006 to 2008. This funding has been used to lever in a further £1 million of European Funding to assist in the delivery of the Economic Forum's key objectives (including reducing youth unemployment).
- 4.7 A number of these NRF funded projects have provided significant support to young people including HWS Workroute's Intermediate Labour Market (ILM) programme which provides a fixed term contract with the Local Authority (minimum 26 weeks) offering the opportunity for an individual to work towards career aspirations; gain training while earning a realistic wage and help to overcome barriers to employment. There are specific projects managed by HWS including Women's Opportunities and Jobsbuild with the latter providing job creation and apprenticeship subsidies, back to work grants and a Bursary Scheme (A one-off payment of a maximum of £500 for those with a guaranteed job offer who require, for example, tools, licences or uniforms).
- 4.8 Through this funding stream, the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) continue to successfully deliver a number of training programmes which

target specific groups such as young people who are unemployed, NEETs, Carers, people with drug and alcohol misuse issues, young people who are homeless or are at risk of becoming homeless. It is worth noting that two specific projects, 'Carers into Training and Employment' which is delivered by Hartlepool Carers and The Homelessness (STEP) project delivered by DISC have LPSA funding and are featured as outcomes within the Local Area Agreement (LAA) Jobs and the Economy Theme. The programmes provided through the NRF have given young people mentoring support, access to flexible accredited training, voluntary opportunities within a working environment and progression routes into further training or employment. A recent evaluation of the NRF funded projects managed by Economic Development Officers highlighted high satisfaction rates across all programmes.

- 4.9 Representatives from Economic Development have attended initial meetings with the new Children's Services Integrated Service Managers (ISMs) to review how employment and training provision can be effectively promoted within the five ISM locality areas (As shown in the table below). Economic Development will also contribute towards each operational business plan (with a clear indication of how it will assist in working towards economic well-being for all). Economic Development will also link in with the newly appointed Parenting Practitioners (who are a single referral point for families) to ensure that they are fully briefed on current programmes such as Connect2Work but more importantly ensure that individuals can be referred to qualified Information, Advice and Guidance Officers on request.

Localities	Wards
NORTH 1	St Hilda
	Brus
	Hart
NORTH 2	Dyke House
	Throston
CENTRAL 1	Grange
	Park
	Elwick
	Stranton
CENTRAL 2	Foggy Furze
	Rift House
SOUTH 1	Rossmere
	Seaton
	Owton
	Fens
	Greatham

- 4.10 A representative from Economic Development will become a member of the Hartlepool Intervention Partnership (HIP) multi-agency meetings to ensure that there is an employment and training theme considered when producing

action plans for young people and their families. It is anticipated that this representation will give clear direction to the HIP Strategic Officers on what employment and training provision is currently available within Hartlepool and how young people and their families can access this.

- 4.11 A longer term strategy will be for Economic Development Department to further develop and lead on the JobsMart consortia. JobsMart is Hartlepool's Employment and Skills Consortia with a current membership of over 40 employment and training providers from the public, private and voluntary sector who have access to mainstream and area based funding which will provide a broad range of provision to customers and beneficiaries. Jobs Mart has been established in order to provide a more cohesive and integrated approach to employment and training provision in the town, which will be used to better target residents in the NRF wards, raise employment rates in these areas and reduce benefit dependency. The consortia approach is one that Central Government are supporting to capacity build and develop communities to deliver services at a local level and address local (neighbourhood) need.
- 4.12 JobsMart will operate a first point of contact employment shop from premises in Park Road and will be managed by Hartlepool HWS and staffed by members of the Jobs Mart Consortia. The consortia development is built on the existing Outreach Networks and will formalise partnerships and join together in a coordinated approach the range of existing services and organisations in Hartlepool that exist to support workless residents into employment, education or training, or to develop social/life skills (with young people benefiting from the service).
- 4.13 HWS have developed a JobsMart Steering Group with representatives from New Deal for Communities, Economic Development, Jobcentre Plus, the VCS and the private sector to provide a strategic approach to the consortia. Partnership agreements have been drafted which will bring agencies closer together so that organisations can develop new initiatives and identify where there are gaps in provision.
- 4.14 Where gaps in provision are identified, Economic Development will utilise this joint working to bid for funding opportunities through the European Social Fund (ESF) Co-Financing Objective 3. It is estimated that over £155 million of ESF funding will be available within the North East with one of the key priorities being to reduce the number of young people who are NEET in the region.
- 4.15 Economic Development have continued to develop innovative projects which will target young people who are NEET and since April 2007 have led on a very successful programme titled Connect2Work which provides Family Caseload support. This project provides pre-employability programmes for young people who are NEET and will offer 30 Intermediate Labour Market (ILM) placements with The Connexions Service and The Leaving Care

Service guaranteed ten places each. To date there have been nearly 140 young people referred to the programme.

- 4.16 Economic Development have also been working closely with Jobcentre Plus who have Deprived Area Funding (DAF) of approximately £400,000 for 2007/08. This funding is a refocused, area based approach that encourages key stakeholders who support customers in recognised ward areas of social and economic disadvantage to further develop partnership working and create flexible provision.
- 4.17 Presently, a number of the DAF projects are predominantly working with young people who are NEET. Through these projects, there will be enhanced opportunities for residents to access support and mentoring (including 1-1 support) so that they can gain the confidence and motivation in which to work towards a qualification (including skills for life courses), enter into voluntary work and progress into their chosen employment or training path. Projects will provide regular information, advice and guidance to individuals so that they are constantly kept up to date on labour market opportunities.
- 4.18 There are also specific projects which provide mentoring and counselling to young people to sustain them in employment or training. This approach is quite unique and compliments the Regional Employability Framework (REF) which highlights the need for aftercare to ensure that support services continue after an individual enters into employment or training. Currently, service provision tends to cease when an individual enters into employment but this initial stage is often when continual support is most needed. Therefore, these projects are a vital service which is necessary to sustain an individual in employment or training.
- 4.19 Through the DAF fund, a Neighbourhood Employment Awareness Programme (NEAP) survey was undertaken. The NEAP survey was a questionnaire which was designed to help local residents identify their training and employment needs and to advise on what current opportunities were available to individuals in Hartlepool. The survey was carried out by teams of IAG workers undertaking a door-to-door knocking exercise across the stated wards with 4,420 residents being engaged with.
- 4.20 There was a total of seven community organisations involved with the delivery of the IAG interviews and NEAP survey. The tables below show the providers involved in completing the survey and a breakdown of how many surveys were completed in each geographical area.

Name of Providers
Owton Fens Community Association (OFCA)
Belle Vue (BV)
Manor Residents (MR)
Owton Manor West (OMW)

Wharton Trust (WT)
West View Employment Action Centre (WVEAC)
Headland Development Trust (HDT)

Geographical Area Surveyed	No. of Surveys completed
Rossmere/Seaton Grange	642
New Deal	394
Owton Manor	895
Rift House	529
Dyke House	503
West View	967
Headland	490
Total	4,420

- 4.21 Following on from this survey, Economic Development have met with a number of the above agencies to ensure that they re-engage with these residents. Within a meeting with the Wharton Trust, it has been agreed that a pilot project will be developed that will target specific streets in the Dyke House ward. Economic Development will provide support to The Wharton Trust who will lead on the co-ordination of all activity. A number of agencies such as The Connexions Service and Jobcentre Plus will provide Advisers who will form part of a team that will be developed which will engage with workless households. Volunteers will be involved in this engagement and up to ten jobless residents will be funded to complete an NVQ Level 2 in Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG). A working group has now been established to implement this project with representatives from a raft of agencies including the Wharton Trust, Economic Development Department, the Family Intervention Partnership Team, Connexions, Jobcentre Plus and Neighbourhood Services.
- 4.22 Economic Development continues to lead on a number of projects such as Tees Valley Works and Building Futures which are partnerships between the five local authorities. These partnerships have provided opportunities to deliver community based programmes aimed at engaging with the hardest to reach client groups and have been very successful in developing innovative projects that meet the needs of individuals from specific target audiences. For example, funding from Tees Valley Works and Aim Higher was used so that West View could deliver a pre-employability training programme for care leavers and looked after children. This programme provided participants with a guaranteed interview for an ILM place and the retention and achievement rate amongst the group was above 90%. Building Futures continues to offer training and employment opportunities within the construction sector and continues to develop partnerships with key agencies and employers to ensure that young people can continue on programmes such as Modern Apprenticeships in areas such as bricklaying, joinery and plumbing.

- 4.23 Economic Development commissioned a consultant to identify if there are future opportunities to increase the number of Modern Apprenticeships within the public, private and voluntary sector. A proposed action currently being assessed is the development of a blueprint for HBC to facilitate another organisation to take on the role of a Group Training Association (GTA).

A GTA is highlighted within the Modern Apprenticeships – Apprenticeship Task Force report as *“bringing together employers in a locality to share the costs and administrative burden of running an apprenticeship programme which has encouraged many smaller companies to take on apprenticeships”* pg21, (July 2005). A Modern Apprenticeship Taskforce was set up in February 2003 with the twin objectives of increasing the number and range of employers offering apprenticeships and ensuring that these apprenticeships reflect the changing needs of employers and young people. This Taskforce is made up of private, public sector representatives and agencies involved in the delivery of the apprenticeships programme. Promotion of GTAs is a recommendation in the Apprenticeships Task Force Report (2005) and this report recommends that the LSC should make initial funding available for their set up.

Interest and support has been expressed from partners (including HBC and the Primary Care Trust) for an intermediary body to support both the employer and the young person. Discussions are currently ongoing with the LSC in relation to funding the start up for a GTA. A host organisation is still to be identified who could become a GTA ‘Ambassador’ but it is proposed that if start up funding is secured then it should be utilised to employ an Intermediary worker. This individual would be employed by the host organisation who would liaise with a number of employers within a specific geographical area or across a number of sectors.

In Australia, similar schemes such as Group Training Companies are running successfully. The proposed GTA would provide a similar scheme to the Australian model which provides core services to the employer including:

- Arranging and monitoring apprenticeships training
- Arranging job rotation
- Mentoring (for apprentice and employer)

For sustainability of the GTA, the consultant is also evaluating the feasibility of charging employers a small cost recovery charge for providing this service.

An Employer event in February 2008 is being arranged through Worksmart to promote the benefits of the introduction of a GTA including support to employers from Small to Medium Sized (SMEs) companies to offer apprenticeships and mentoring and support (for the apprentice and employer).

5. RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 Cabinet is requested to approve the Action Plan attached at (**Appendix A**) in response to the recommendations of the Regeneration & Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's Youth Unemployment Investigation.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	
(1)	That the Authority is commended for taking on an active role in relation to Youth Unemployment and that the value of this work is supported and that, wherever possible, it should be supported further.	Economic Development acknowledges the support of the Regeneration and Planning Services Members.	Antony Steinberg	Completed
(2)	That the data issues and potential project areas identified in the <i>Youth Unemployment in Hartlepool: Developing an evidence base report</i> , which has been attached at Appendix A, are supported as a means to maintain the momentum generated for this issue through the introduction of the LAA target.	Hartlepool Economic Development will continue to develop partnerships so that they can maximise funding opportunities and progress project areas as identified within the stated report. Economic Development continue to lead on a number of very successful sub-regional employment and training projects (which are in partnership with the five local authorities within the Tees Valley) and this proven track record will be advantageous in bidding for other funding opportunities through Jobcentre	Antony Steinberg	July 2007

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
----------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------

		Plus and The Learning & Skills Council's ESF Objective 3 Co-financing round.		
(3)	That, given that Connexions is being brought under the remit of the Local Authority, the Authority (and Economic Development and Children's Services, in particular) seek to work closely with Connexions to support young people to achieve economic well-being.	Hartlepool Economic Development Department and Children's Services have formally agreed to meet on a quarterly basis as part of a working group to identify key actions that can be introduced to increase the number of young people to achieve economic well-being. The membership of this working group has further been widened and representatives from Children's Services (including the Assistant Director, Connexions Interim Locality Manager, 14-19 Co-ordinator, Economic Development Manager with Jobcentre Plus and the Learning & Skills Council) also being in attendance at future meetings.	Antony Steinberg	November 2007

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	
(4)	That further research should be conducted into the impact of the provision of key stakeholders on careers guidance and training for under 16's and that these services should be fully integrated within schools.	A Curriculum Development Officer has now been appointed by the Children's Services Department whose remit is to develop and improve Careers Educational Guidance (CEG) within schools. Connexions have jointly commissioned a consultant to complete an audit review of current Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) across Hartlepool. With the roll-out of national IAG standards due in April 2008 an improvement action plan will be introduced as providers will need to measure against these new IAG standards.	Mark Smith and Tom Argument	April 2008
(5)	That the Authority should lobby for increased flexibility of the New Deal programme so that young people are able to access training programmes through this programme even if they have been unemployed for less than	There has been meeting's with Jobcentre Plus which has highlighted that day one eligibility for young people who have literacy and numeracy problems, are ex-offenders or where English is not their first language	Antony Steinberg	November 2007

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
	<p>sixmonths.</p> <p>continues. Jobcentre Plus acknowledge that waiting six months before accessing the New Deal programme is not always beneficial but there was concerns that the mandatory nature of New Deal may mean that young people who access the service too early – and cannot sustain the programme – are at serious risk of potential benefit sanctions. Therefore, Economic Development Department are exploring the potential to introduce a pre-New Deal project to work with young people unemployed less than 6 months to provide intensive support which will be used as a vehicle to assist individuals to identify suitable progression routes.</p> <p>This issue will be further reviewed within the quarterly youth unemployment working group as outlined in Ref. 3.</p>		

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	
(6)	That the CVS's role should be maximised, wherever possible, in providing services for tackling youth unemployment.	Hartlepool Economic Development Department will continue to identify and raise awareness of funding opportunities through the commissioning and procurement process for the CVS. Currently over 40% of NRF and Jobs & the Economy Themed funding for 2007/08 has been allocated to the CVS and will be given to maximise funding opportunities through Jobcentre Plus and The Learning & Skills Council's ESF Objective 3 Co-financing round and JCP Deprived Area Fund. Where appropriate, partnership proposals will be submitted to utilise the specialist services available through the CVS which will compliment an holistic approach to overcoming the complex issues of eradicating youth unemployment.	Antony Steinberg	December 2007

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	
(7)	Identifying where there are future opportunities for the number of Modern Apprenticeships to be increased within the public, private and voluntary sector (with a specific review of Hartlepool Borough Council and the PrimaryCare Trust).	<p>Economic Development commissioned a consultant to identify if there are future opportunities to increase the number of Modern Apprenticeships within the public, private and voluntary sector. A proposed action currently being assessed is the development of a blueprint for HBC to facilitate another organisation to take on the role of a Group Training Association (GTA).</p> <p>A GTA is highlighted within the Modern pprenticeships – Apprenticeship Task Force report as <i>“bringing together employers in a locality to share the costs and administrative burden of running an apprenticeship programme which has encouraged many smaller companies to take on apprenticeships”</i> pg21, (July 2005).</p>	Patrick Wilson	April 2008

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
		<p>Interest and support has been expressed from partners (including HBC and the Primary Care Trust) for an intermediary body to support both the employer and the young person. Discussions are currently ongoing with the LSC in relation to funding the start up for a GTA. A host organisation is still to be identified who could become a GTA 'Ambassador' but it is proposed that if start up funding is secured then it should be utilised to employ an Intermediary worker. This individual would be employed by the host organisation who would liaise with a number of employers within a specific geographical area or across a number of sectors.</p> <p>In Australia, similar schemes such as Group Training Companies are running</p>	

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
	<p>successfully. The proposed GTA would provide a similar scheme to the Australian model which provides core services to the employer including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arranging and monitoring apprenticeships training • Arranging job rotation • Mentoring (for apprentice and employer) <p>For sustainability of the GTA, the consultant is also evaluating the feasibility of charging employers a small cost recovery charge for providing this service.</p> <p>An Employer event in February 2008 is being arranged through Worksmart to promote the benefits of the introduction</p>		

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Youth Unemployment

DECISIONMAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 11 June 2007

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
	of a GTA including support to employers from Small to Medium Sized (SMEs) companies to offer apprenticeships and mentoring and support (for the apprentice and employer).		