

Cottam, Julie

From: Robinson, Susan
Sent: 25 June 2010 09:00
To: Cottam, Julie
Subject: RE: EHE audit review
Attachments: Draft Children Missing Education Guidelines and Practice - july.doc

The pupil audit is half-termly and is for secondary schools only, although the secondary PRUs' do send data as well.

Attempts to identify pupils who have never engaged by raising awareness with other agencies so that they contact us should they come across such a person.

I have attached the draft guidelines, there will be changes and I have started to look at them again – the July relates to July 2009.

I have now met with Mike Snelson and agreed that a termly report regarding CME will be sent to SMT and I will provide an overview report in September. This will also be sent to Safeguarding and relevant strategic managers.

Let me know if you need to discuss anything else.

Susan

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 25 June 2010 08:44
To: Robinson, Susan
Subject: EHE audit review

Hi Susan

You may remember that I came to see you a few weeks ago to discuss the arrangements within the CME team and the links the team has with the EHE team. I'm pulling my file together and I have a couple of further queries.

You mentioned during our meeting that your service undertakes half yearly audits of the pupils on roll at schools. Can you clarify – does this include PRU's, LEMS, CAMHS etc?

How does your service attempt to identify children missing education who may never have been registered with a formal education provider?

Is it possible for you to send me a sample of the data that the audit process provides you with?

You mentioned that you have draft procedural guidance documentation for CME but that it has not yet been approved. Would I be able to see a copy of the draft version?

Thanks for your assistance.

Regards

Julie Cottam

25/06/2010

Senior Audit Assistant
Lancashire Audit Service
Extension 36043

Cottam, Julie

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 25 June 2010 08:36
To: Jerstice, Angela
Subject: EHE audit review

Tracking: **Recipient** **Delivery**
Jerstice, Angela Delivered: 25/06/2010 08:36

Hi Angela

I've got a couple more queries for you.

In our earlier correspondence you mentioned a Record of Visit form which is used by the EHE support officers to claim hours worked. Are there any other monitoring records kept? Are hours controlled in total – eg are there any spreadsheets to monitor overall hours.

I can see how significantly the number of cases has increased over the years. Would you know whether the contracts for the EHE support officers have increased accordingly over the same period to enable them to manage the number of cases?

Does the EHE service have a formal complaints procedures? Is it documented and if so can I have a copy please?

Thanks for your help.

Regards
Julie

Cottam, Julie

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 25 June 2010 08:44
To: Robinson, Susan
Subject: EHE audit review

Hi Susan

You may remember that I came to see you a few weeks ago to discuss the arrangements within the CME team and the links the team has with the EHE team. I'm pulling my file together and I have a couple of further queries.

You mentioned during our meeting that your service undertakes half yearly audits of the pupils on roll at schools. Can you clarify – does this include PRU's, LEMS, CAMHS etc?

How does your service attempt to identify children missing education who may never have been registered with a formal education provider?

Is it possible for you to send me a sample of the data that the audit process provides you with?

You mentioned that you have draft procedural guidance documentation for CME but that it has not yet been approved. Would I be able to see a copy of the draft version?

Thanks for your assistance.

Regards

Julie Cottam
Senior Audit Assistant
Lancashire Audit Service
Extension 36043

25/06/2010

Cottam, Julie

From: Jerstice, Angela
Sent: 25 June 2010 09:30
To: Cottam, Julie
Subject: RE: EHE audit review
Attachments: Teacher Caseload Hours correct at 08.06.10.xls

Hi Julie

Please see my answers below.

Many thanks, Angie

Angela Jerstice
Clerical Officer
Elective Home Education (EHE)
01772 532289

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 25 June 2010 08:36
To: Jerstice, Angela
Subject: EHE audit review

Hi Angela

I've got a couple more queries for you.

In our earlier correspondence you mentioned a Record of Visit form which is used by the EHE support officers to claim hours worked. Are there any other monitoring records kept? Are hours controlled in total – eg are there any spreadsheets to monitor overall hours. The ROV form has to be signed by one of the LEIS Senior Managers, who should be aware of the EHE Support Officer hours so they can loosely monitor. A Support Officer can only exceed their allotted hours (i.e. if they have to make an extra visit due to concerns) if they first get permission from a Senior LEIS Manager, or usually, Angela Robinson (who does put in unofficial management time for EHE, as does Maureen). All hours claimed are then inputted on the MIS system, which is accessible to the Support Officer, LEIS Managers, Angela Robinson, Maureen etc – so anyone checking the hours can see what hours have been claimed, what hours are outstanding and how many hours the Officer has exceeded their caseload by, if applicable.

If there are any discrepancies or concerns over the teacher hours, I would flag this up immediately with either Maureen or Angela. I also send them a spreadsheet (attached), which shows at a glance, how many hours capacity they have on their caseload, how many of these hours have been filled with allocated children and how many new children they could potentially take on. I actually discussed our current spreadsheet concerns with Angela Robinson yesterday and we are awaiting an influx of ROV's from staff, which should bring their outstanding hours down to a more representative figure.

I can see how significantly the number of cases has increased over the years. Would you know whether the contracts for the EHE support officers have increased accordingly over the same period to enable them to manage the number of cases? No, the EHE budget has remained the same, so we are still only contracted for 3 full-time Support Officers (made up from 9 part-time LEIS teachers). We still don't have an official manager, again due to

budget constraints.

Does the EHE service have a formal complaints procedures? Is it documented and if so can I have a copy please?

It states on the back page of our information pack that EHE is part of the LEIS Service and is therefore subject to all the policies of the Service, including complaints procedures. NB: EHE is supposed to be moving over to Bob Stott's Team from LEIS, although this hasn't happened yet, so all our procedures could change!

As I am the frontline for all EHE enquiries, any complaints will come through to me in the first instance and then I will pass these on to either Maureen or Angela. The main complaint is usually about the lack of government funding for EHE from parents and can be very abusive sometimes. I will usually email Maureen/Angela with as much detail as I can, and if the child is on our database, I will also add a note under their record. All complaints are dealt with on an individual basis as quickly as possible.

Thanks for your help.

Regards
Julie

Cottam, Julie

From: Jerstice, Angela
Sent: 02 June 2010 09:03
To: Cottam, Julie
Subject: RE: EHE audit review

Hi Julie

Please see below my responses to your queries. Hope these are ok – let me know if you need any further information.

Many thanks, Angie

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 01 June 2010 10:51
To: Jerstice, Angela
Subject: RE: EHE audit review

Hi Angela

I can come across on Thursday morning if that's OK with you.

I am interested in the following information:

- The guidance notes and flow charts that have been compiled explain the processes that should be followed. Ho have these been supplied to? Maureen Davenport (Head of LEIS) and Angela Robinson (Senior Manager LEIS) who both provide management time for EHE; myself; the EHE Support Officers; CME; Overview and Scrutiny. LS1 ✓
- I need some further clarification about the training provided to the EHE support officers. Are records held to support training provided. Are there any recruitment records held for the EHE support officers to show that appropriate recruitment and vetting checks have been carried out or are these held centrally. Do the officers have to be CRB cleared and if so do they have to be checked every 3 years? All of our Support Officers are fully-qualified teachers employed by LEIS. All have been CRB checked as a condition of employment and these checks are updated every 3 years. All the Officers are given necessary training as part of their employment with LEIS. I do not hold these records myself as they are held centrally by LEIS. LS2 ✓
- I would like to know whether there are any records to manage the EHE hours worked against individual cases (what monitoring is undertaken based upon the hours allocated). Yes, the hours worked against individual cases are claimed by the Support Officers on a Record of Visit form which is then checked and signed off by a Senior Manager and recorded by me on the MIS. The Senior Managers and Support officers have full access to this information so they can check what their outstanding/completed hours are whenever they need to. LS3
- Each Support Officer works to a certain percentage of a FTE (full time equivalent) and this equates to a total number of hours. This total is the amount of support time that each Officer can spend on their EHE caseload. For each academic year, all new cases are awarded 8 hours (for two visits plus time for travel, report writing, attending meetings/reviews etc). All older cases are either awarded 4 hours (for an annual visit) LS3

or 6 hours if stated (for annual visit plus Statement review). However, this is only a guide – some cases may use more/less hours, therefore the total number of hours for that child may be adjusted accordingly. The Support Officer must obtain permission from a Senior Manager if they want to claim extra hours for a case.

- I'd be interested to know how case numbers have increased over say the last 3 years (if you have any data that would be useful) and whether there has been any increase in staff resources over the same period. Yes, we've found a steady increase in numbers over the last 3 years (please see attached for data). This year, the figures did dip slightly but we believe this is as a result of the delay in secondary school placement notifications. Also, as a result of improved multi-agency working and communications with schools. Currently the figure is rising swiftly as we are getting an influx of new EHE cases on a daily basis. LS3

- Also what contingency arrangements are available to the service – as you mentioned one EHE support officer is long term sick – is there any facility to appoint temporary staff or agency staff and what approval arrangements are required. Fortunately the Support Officer who was on long term sick leave has now returned so she is now arranging and making visits as normal. If she would have continued to be off sick for an extended period of time, then Maureen would have discussed and requested additional support time via employing another LEIS teacher with her Managers. LS3

- Can you tell me whether your service uses IMPULSE or ISSIS and if you do what you use the systems for.
I don't use ISSIS but I do use Impulse on an occasional basis to check a child's details. Luckily, the MIS is already linked to Impulse, so if the child is listed on Impulse, most of the information I need to register that child on the MIS will be added electronically if I do a search by name. However, this only relates to children who have previously attended schools in Lancashire and it also relies on our information being recorded in exactly the same way as on Impulse so the system can find an exact match. If the system does not recognise the child as being on Impulse then that is when they will appear on the MIS as a (temp pupil) – which you previously enquired about.

- I have become aware that the CME team also have their own database (and that other services which link to EHE may also have their own databases) – is there any reconciliation of data against other key databases to ensure that the data is correct and that no cases are missed. The CME Team is the main agency who will work with us in this way – they will usually email or phone me with a list of names they want to check are on EHE. Using the MIS I am able to notify them straight away if the child is registered or not. We have also had similar queries from the Traveller Service, Pupil Access and less frequently, the Young People's Service and possibly Health Workers. However as part of our responsibility to ensure child safeguarding, we would not share any information unless that agency is known to us and the querent is able to prove their identity to us (for example, we have asked staff from the Immunisation Team to come to the office and meet with Maureen so she can check this). O

- Can you tell me what governance arrangements are in place for the service. I am aware that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertook a review and that reports have been provided to them – does the service continue to report to this committee? Does the service report to any other Committees? Are reports provided to senior managers within CYP? Yes, Maureen has been reporting back to the Overview and Scrutiny Team over the past year; however now that the Badman Report has fallen through and we have had a change of Government, we don't yet know what the implications for EHE will be or whether O&S will have any further input. The Badman Report was a major factor in the O&S report. We are continuing to request clearer legal LS4

guidelines for us to follow with EHE but as EHE is due to move to another Team (Bob Stott), we don't know at this stage in what direction they will want to move the Service forward. We have not reported to any other Committee as far as I am aware, although for as long as EHE remains under LEIS, Maureen will keep the Directorate managers informed of progress etc. The O&S reports have been discussed at EHE meetings and made available (via O&S website) to the EHE Support Officers and any attendees at the meetings i.e. CME.

- Are there any terms of reference for the service team meetings? Sorry, I am not sure what you mean exactly with this one? LS4
- Can you clarify what a CME 2 form is please or do I need to check with Susan Robinson? Yes, a CME 2 is basically just a notification or 'receipt' that we get back from the CME Team when we've sent them a referral for a child not engaging with EHE (CME 1). The CME 2 lets us know that the CME Team have received our form i.e. that it has not gone astray and that they will now follow their usual procedures. LS5
- What action is taken where there are suggestions that schools have pressured parents to opt for EHE in order to improve attendance figures/ exam results etc or where parents are at risk of being taken to court due to non attendance at school. This is something we would flag up with the CME Team as soon as we found out – usually though this is at the initial visit stage which can be a number of weeks following de-registration. CME are currently gathering a body of evidence together to raise the matter at a higher level and to try and prevent this sort of thing from happening in the future. I think they have been working jointly with Frances Molloy's Team on this (Attendance). Maureen will also contacted schools directly and query anything that may hint at co-ercion such as mass-referrals to EHE from a single school i.e. 4 or 5 referrals which are all Year 11's. Sometimes if the child has only just come off or is due to come off roll we can get the school to keep the child and look at more suitable alternatives but 99.9% of the time, sadly, once a parent writes to the school asking for them to be removed, there is little we, or the school can do as there are no legal measures to block a parent's decision. The only exception is where the child has a Statement or attends a Special School – in this case the child cannot be removed until SEN have reviewed the Statement and agreed that EHE would be suitable for the child's needs. Other exceptions may be where there is a safeguarding/child protection issue – the school may call a TAC meeting first to discuss suitability of EHE. This doesn't necessarily prevent EHE – again if the parent is determined to home educate we have very little legal ground on which to challenge them. We are currently looking at solutions to this with CME and Attendance, such as encouraging schools to hold a multi-agency meeting prior to any child coming off roll for EHE, where we could check the parent is fully aware of what EHE entails and any concerns can be raised and dealt with there. Alternatively there could be a 'cooling off' period where the parent can trial EHE and if it is unsuitable they can go straight back on roll. However, EHE is due to move to another Team in a few months time (Bob Stott) and we don't know as yet how they will want to move EHE forward. LS5

Thanks for all your help with this audit.

Regards
Julie

From: Jerstice, Angela
Sent: 01 June 2010 09:40
To: Cottam, Julie
Subject: RE: EHE audit review

Hi Julie

Yes that should be fine – can do Wednesday or Thursday at any time that is convenient. Is there any info I can get ready for you in advance?

Many thanks, Angie

Angela Jerstice
Clerical Officer
Elective Home Education (EHE)
01772 532289

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 28 May 2010 11:20
To: Jerstice, Angela
Subject: EHE audit review

Hi Angela

I hope you have had a good break from work.

03/06/2010

I've been pulling my notes together from our last meeting and I've identified some further areas where I would like to get some additional information or some clarification. Would it be possible for us to get together w/c 1 June. I go on leave from Friday 4 June for 2 weeks.

Regards
Julie

Cottam, Julie

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 01 June 2010 10:51
To: Jerstice, Angela
Subject: RE: EHE audit review

Hi Angela

I can come across on Thursday morning if that's OK with you.

I am interested in the following information:

- The guidance notes and flow charts that have been compiled explain the processes that should be followed. How have these been supplied to?
- I need some further clarification about the training provided to the EHE support officers. Are records held to support training provided. Are there any recruitment records held for the EHE support officers to show that appropriate recruitment and vetting checks have been carried out or are these held centrally. Do the officers have to be CRB cleared and if so do they have to be checked every 3 years?
- I would like to know whether there are any records to manage the EHE hours worked against individual cases (what monitoring is undertaken based upon the hours allocated).
- I'd be interested to know how case numbers have increased over say the last 3 years (if you have any data that would be useful) and whether there has been any increase in staff resources over the same period.
- Also what contingency arrangements are available to the service – as you mentioned one EHE support officer is long term sick – is there any facility to appoint temporary staff or agency staff and what approval arrangements are required.
- Can you tell me whether your service uses IMPULSE or ISSIS and if you do what you use the systems for.
- I have become aware that the CME team also have their own database (and that other services which link to EHE may also have their own databases) – is there any reconciliation of data against other key databases to ensure that the data is correct and that no cases are missed.
- Can you tell me what governance arrangements are in place for the service. I am aware that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertook a review and that reports have been provided to them – does the service continue to report to this committee? Does the service report to any other Committees? Are reports provided to senior managers within CYP?
- Are there any terms of reference for the service team meetings?
- Can you clarify what a CME 2 form is please or do I need to check with Susan Robinson?

Sorry it's such a big list – I'm sure you'll be able to answer some straight out. If there is anything that you can e-mail me in advance please do so if you get chance.

Thanks for all your help with this audit.

Regards
Julie

From: Jerstice, Angela
Sent: 01 June 2010 09:40
To: Cottam, Julie
Subject: RE: EHE audit review

Hi Julie

Yes that should be fine – can do Wednesday or Thursday at any time that is convenient. Is there any info I can get ready for you in advance?

Many thanks, Angie

Angela Jerstice
Clerical Officer
Elective Home Education (EHE)
01772 532289

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 28 May 2010 11:20
To: Jerstice, Angela
Subject: EHE audit review

Hi Angela

I hope you have had a good break from work.

I've been pulling my notes together from our last meeting and I've identified some further areas where I would like to get some additional information or some clarification. Would it be possible for us to get together w/c 1 June. I go on leave from Friday 4 June for 2 weeks.

Regards
Julie

Cottam, Julie

From: Jerstice, Angela
Sent: 01 June 2010 09:22
To: Cottam, Julie
Subject: RE: EHE audit

Hi Julie

~~We would send our current information pack to other organisations or direct them to our website~~ or if another organisation has a specific query about our Service, they might speak to Maureen directly etc.

~~There are no links with LEMS or CAMHS as such~~ we may record on the visit reports or database that these agencies have had some past involvement when the child was still in school but because the child has to be on roll to receive this support, any involvement with these agencies that the child has ceases when EHE is opted for. The only way LEMS/CAMHS might have future involvement would be if it is decided at a TAC meeting or by the parent etc that it would be in the best interests of that child to be placed back in school and thus access these services again. However in these cases, we would refer to CME who would then notify us when the child was successfully back on roll.

Hope this is OK!

Many thanks, Angie

Angela Jerstice
Clerical Officer
Elective Home Education (EHE)
01772 532289

From: Cottam, Julie
Sent: 25 May 2010 09:28
To: Jerstice, Angela
Subject: EHE audit

Hi Angela

I'm not sure if I have asked you already but has the EHE service produced any publicity materials for use with other organisations and if so what is available and where has it been shared. I know that you have got information for parents on the intranet and that you provide documentation to families that you are aware of.

Also where there are children on the database for medical reasons are there any links with LEMS or CAMHS?

Regards
Julie

01/06/2010

Lancashire County Council	Lancashire Audit Service Terms of Reference	A1
---------------------------------	--	----

Children & Young People Directorate

Children Educated Otherwise than at School

2009-10

Project Sponsor	Bob Stott – director for universal and prevention services
------------------------	--

	Maureen Davenport – Lancashire Education Inclusion Service – head of service
--	--

Key Contact(s):	Angela Jerstice – Lancashire Education Inclusion Service – elective home education clerical officer
------------------------	---

	Susan Robinson – children/ young people missing from education county co-ordinator
--	--

Audit team:	Audit relationship manager	Ian Rushworth – principal auditor
--------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

	Audit assignment manager	Ruth Fairbrother – senior auditor
--	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------

	Audit team leader	Julie Cottam – senior audit assistant
--	--------------------------	---------------------------------------

Agreed Start Date	26 April 2010 13 May 2010	Planned Days	15 days
--------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------	---------

Expected Completion Date	21 May 2010
---------------------------------	-------------

*This is our estimated target date for the issue of the draft report. We will endeavour to meet this date but it may be subject to change due to circumstances beyond our control. We will ensure that the project sponsor and key contacts are informed of any significant delays in meeting this target.

Report Distribution

Draft	Maureen Davenport – Lancashire Education Inclusion Service – head of service
--------------	--

Final	Maureen Davenport – Lancashire Education Inclusion Service – head of service
--------------	--

	Bob Stott – director for universal and prevention services
--	--

Date Terms of Reference agreed	
---------------------------------------	--

RF
21/7/10

Lancashire County Council	Lancashire Audit Service Terms of Reference	A2
---------------------------------	--	----

Children & Young People Directorate

Children Educated Otherwise than at School

2009-10

OBJECTIVE

To review the adequacy and effectiveness of the arrangements in place to record and monitor children missing in education or educated otherwise than at school, to ensure a child's welfare is not at risk.

BACKGROUND

Since the county council's Elective Home Education (EHE) team was established in 2001, the number of children being home educated has increased significantly to nearly 500 pupils. The Lancashire Education Inclusion Service (LEIS) needs to establish why the parents have chosen to be responsible for educating their child, and how they intend to deliver the child's education. There are a number of reasons why a parent chooses to home educate their child including medical, bullying, religious, exclusion, reactive/ proactive and travellers.

In addition to potential concerns regarding the child's education, the EHE team also need to ensure that all 'parents of every child of compulsory school age shall cause him to receive efficient full-time education' (in accordance with *Section 7 of the Education Act 1996*). When a child is removed from school to be home educated, the LEIS teachers from the EHE team are responsible for identifying those children and consulting with the Children Missing Education (CME) team.

In accordance with the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) local authority guidelines, the responsibility for a child's education rests with their parents. These guidelines are intended for use in relation to elective home education only and to support local authorities in carrying out their statutory responsibilities, and to encourage good practice by clearly setting out the legislative position.

Following concerns raised in July 2008 by members of the CYP Overview and Scrutiny Committee, a review was conducted by the established task group who in turn reported back on suggested recommendations they wished to raise. A number of documents including statutory obligations were considered a part of the review including the Every Child Matters Framework, revised statutory guidance for local authorities in England to identify children not receiving a suitable education and internal guidelines.

A review was also conducted by Internal Audit as part of the 2008/2009 audit plan into traveller education. Although not specific to this aspect of the service, we will follow up all recommendations made in that report to ensure they have been adequately implemented.

Lancashire County Council	Lancashire Audit Service Terms of Reference	A3
--	--	-----------

Children & Young People Directorate

Children Educated Otherwise than at School

2009-10

RISKS

There is a risk to the council that if statutory guidelines in relation to EHE are not implemented effectively, children are at risk at not receiving the appropriate level of education.

The following key risks which have been identified in respect of this review:

- The council do not identify those children not registered at mainstream schools (or other education providers);
- Council guidelines do not consider continuously changing statutory obligations;
- Inappropriate assessments do not adequately evaluate the family situation, and the child does not receive the appropriate level of education;
- There is no strategic lead for the service to ensure appropriate ownership; and
- The EHE does not comprehensively assess all those children missing from education.

SCOPE

The work on this area will be carried out during a visit to LEIS to ensure that the procedures are adhered to.

The audit work will be undertaken will:

- Discuss the arrangements in place within LEIS (EHE);
- Identify the systems controls and procedures in place to recognise those children not in education and how they are assessed; and
- Test these controls to determine their effectiveness.

At the end of our audit review we will provide a detailed report of our findings, and recommendations as appropriate.

The findings from the review will be discussed and agreed with the key contacts on conclusion of the visit.

The draft report will be shared with senior management within the service to ensure its factual accuracy to enable us jointly to consider appropriate recommendations and management responses.

Prepared by	Ruth Fairbrother	Authorised by	Ian Rushworth
Date	6 April 2010	Date	12 April 2010

Fairbrother, Ruth

From: Stott, Bob
Sent: 12 April 2010 10:20
To: Mann, Faith; Fairbrother, Ruth
Subject: RE: Internal Audit review - children educated otherwise than at school

Ruth sorry for not replying earlier. I am just back off leave. I would agree that this should be me.

Regards

Bob

Bob Stott
 Director of Universal and Prevention Services
 Lancashire County Council
 Tel: 01772 531652
 Mobile: 07833 095076

From: Mann, Faith
Sent: 06 April 2010 10:30
To: Fairbrother, Ruth
Cc: Stott, Bob
Subject: RE: Internal Audit review - children educated otherwise than at school

Hi Ruth,

EHE is just about to move from my area to Bob Stott's so I think that it would be better for him to be the directorate sponsor for this piece of audit work.

Is that OK Bob?

Faith

Faith Mann
 Director of Targeted and Early Intervention Services
 Children and Young People's Directorate
 County Hall
 Preston

Tel: 01772 534237
 E-mail: faith.mann@lancashire.gov.uk

From: Fairbrother, Ruth
Sent: 06 April 2010 10:18
To: Mann, Faith
Subject: Internal Audit review - children educated otherwise than at school

Good Morning Faith,

Hope you are well.

On the 25 March, I managed to scope one of the final 2009/2010 Internal Audit reviews as part of the CYP directorate audit plan. The audit is to focus on the internal control environment within the Elective Home Education (EHE) service.

As part of the audit process, we identify a project sponsor for the review (usually at director level) to ensure ownership for the audit. Am I right in thinking that the service lies within your portfolio? I have already scoped the review with Maureen Davenport, and hope to get the terms of reference issued by the end of this week/ early next week.

Thank you for your help with this matter, and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards,

Ruth Fairbrother
Senior Auditor

Lancashire Audit Service
Resources Directorate
Lancashire County Council
County Hall

Tel: 01772 5-34932

Email: ruth.fairbrother@lancashire.gov.uk

**Meeting with Angela Jerstice – Admin officer EHE
13 May 2009**

The EHE service does not have a designated manager specifically for the service. The Head of LEIS currently has responsibility but it is likely that the service will move to Universal and Prevention Services under Bob Stott but it is not known when.

Notifications of families who are undertaking elective home education is received from a number of sources:

- parents
- carers
- schools
- health workers
- CME team
- Pupil access team
- SEN team
- Traveller Service.

Once a notification is received, a form is completed for each child which is used to identify background information for inclusion on the EHE Management Information System database. An information pack is sent to the family to assist and advise them of the implications of deciding to home educate.

The main issue with identifying children who are EHE are where the child has never been registered in a mainstream school as there is no way to identify the child without external notification. Where a child has been previously registered at a mainstream school and leaves, the CME team periodically review this information and identify children taken off roll.

Following registration with the EHE team, an initial visit is undertaken as soon as possible. The EHE team has 9 support officers who were previously LEIS teachers and therefore have teaching knowledge to enable them to support the families.

Each support officer has a caseload which is allocated based on a geographic area (north, east, south). These support officers are the main contacts for the families and act in an advisory capacity in addition to monitoring the effectiveness of the education that is being provided to the child.

During the initial visit to the family, the support officer completes a parent agreement form which sets out the plan of learning of the child and identifies information in accordance with the ECM protocol. The parent is required to sign the contract. The LCC solicitors have had input into the contract. The paperwork is reviewed annually and the parental contract has been in use for approximately 12 months.

Parents are also requested to provide a signature for inclusion in the NHS immunisation programme and to receive support from the LYPS (where the child is between 13 and 19 years of age).

EF
21/2/10

A registration card is completed for each child and is given to the child in order that it can be produced on request should the child be stopped by a truancy officer.

The parents receive a copy of the parent agreement and completed report following the visit.

A follow up review is undertaken after approximately 6 months. A letter is sent to the family advising of the date of the visit. As an alternative to a visit, parents may choose to submit evidence of the education provided, rather than participating in follow up visits.

The LEIS support officers still complete a report based upon the evidence received. If concerns are identified the support officer may request more evidence or may make a referral to the CME team.

In addition, there is an automatic referral to the CME team if there are 2 successive visits planned without successful contact being made.

The CME team will make referrals to other service teams e.g children's social care for safeguarding issues, pupil access team etc. when necessary.

The EHE and CME teams work closely and meet regularly to discuss specific cases.

A CME referral form is completed by the support officer and passed to Angela Jerstice who keeps a copy and passes to the CME team. A spreadsheet is maintained to record CME referrals. The cases remain referred on the database until the EHE team is advised otherwise. At present there are 19 children referred on the database.

Those children that remain on roll the EHE database receive an annual visit from a support officer. Where the child has an SEN statement, the support officer attends the annual review and undertakes a meeting as close to the statement meeting as possible.

At present there are 444 children registered on the EHE database of which 425 are active.

Traveller service:

- Provides support to the traveller community with regard to cultural issues as well as educational advice. Also provide some teaching support e.g worksheets etc via learning centres based on the Gypsy Roma Traveller sites.
- EHE support officers also visit sites to liaise with parents and children and work closely with traveller education service.

The EHE database is updated by the admin officer. Since November 2009, the team have operated a paperless system. The first signed report is

retained on file manually but all other documentation is retained electronically within the database. The MIS system is a comprehensive store of information which is password protected and can be accessed by the EHE team and the support officers.

The information is also retained on the service's network drive R which is also password protected.

Various reports can be extracted from the database. The Head of LEIS requests data periodically to analyse patterns e.g trends. Reports are extracted for the CME team. Case loads are extracted for support officers periodically. Information is also provided to LYPS and the NHS immunisation team.

The EHE hold termly multi service meetings which are formally minuted. These are used to discuss service developments, best practice etc.

Internal audit working paper
Audit Review: EHE

Rf
21/7/10

Meeting with Susan Robinson (Head of CME)
21. May 201

With effect from April 2010, the CME team sits within the Pupil Access team of the CYP directorate. This section is within the Universal and Prevention Services Section under Bob Stott. Prior to April, the CME team sat within the Safeguarding Section.

Due to the fact that there has been no certainty over where this service would sit within the directorate, documented policies and procedures are not in place. A draft procedures document has been compiled but has not yet been finalised or approved. There are meetings planned to discuss and finalise the guidance document.

The service has close links with other key partners from the public, private and voluntary sector for the purpose of sharing information, particularly with regard to the identification of children who are missing education. Multi agency awareness sessions have been undertaken which has included posting information on the internet and the intranet, sending information to voluntary agency's and contacting key people from the health service and the library service. Details of the key contacts have been provided but there has been no formal publicity material produced.

Formal documentation which should be completed to notify CME of relevant families is available on the portal and on the internet. Referrals are received from a number of sources, including health, YOT, LYPS, Pupil Access, EHE, library service etc. The CME team also undertake a half yearly audit of all pupils in attendance at school to identify pupils who have be taken off roll. These pupils are tracked to ensure that they are all continuing to receive a suitable education.

The CME team use an access database to record and monitor details of children and families who are referred to them and with whom they are working. The team can also access the ISSIS and IMPULSE systems to check pupil details against them.

The database used by CME is not the same database that is used by the EHE team. When the CME refer a pupil to EHE, the case is closed on the CME database. Formal documentation is completed to support the referral to EHE and an acknowledgement t e-mail is received to verify that the pupil has been added to the EHE database.

There are regular meetings between the CME manager and the EHE administrative officer to discuss case referrals and ensure that children are adequately tracked and cases are followed up where necessary.

CME officers also attend the termly EHE meetings to ensure that policy and procedural arrangements are discussed and agreed.

Where necessary, the CME officers, EHE support officers and GMT staff undertake joint home visits to families.

Internal audit working paper
Audit Review: EHE

Meeting with Susan Robinson (Head of CME)
21. May 201

RF
21/7/10

IMPLUSE/ EDIMIS extracted from Intranet....

What is EDIMIS?

The Directorate for Children and Young people owns and operates an Oracle based database system that is designed and packaged by Arete Software Ltd. The Arete Software Ltd product name for the database is 'IMPULSE'. Lancashire County Council refers to the database as EDIMIS – Education Integrated Management Information System. EDIMIS has a central core of data on pupils, establishments, assessment results and contextual data. Around the core are a number of modules for provision of operational systems like SEN, Admission, Welfare Benefits and so on

The EDIMIS database stores pupil information supplied by schools (650 schools – approximately 240,000 pupil records) and pupil information provided by service teams within the Children's Services Authority. The current modules of EDIMIS include:

- **Core Information** – pupil details, addresses, persons, establishments. Holds the central ('core') information in the Impulse system.
- **Special Educational Needs** - Records all details of the SEN Statementing process for children, holding information on the referral, assessment, provisions and reviews.
- **Admissions** - enables users to select all children taking part in the current year's admissions round. There is also an Online Admissions system which enables parents to apply for school places for their children online.
- **Appeals** - Records details of children whose guardians are appealing for a school place for their children, holds details of the arrangements for the appeal hearing and any outcomes.
- **Results** - Holds Key Stage 1-3 results going back to 2002 and Key Stage 4 for 2004.
- **Welfare Benefits** - Enables users to maintain a list of those households whose children are entitled to receive free school meals or clothing grants and send lists to the appropriate schools.
- **Exclusions** - Records a Child's exclusions, whether lunchtime, fixed period or permanent, as well as tracks any referrals that are made from the exclusion teams to other teams or agencies.
- **Education Psychology** - Enables planning and reporting of EPs visits (and any resulting actions) as well as holding information on requests for EPs consultations from schools.
- **Social Inclusion** - One of the latest Modules in Impulse which includes Referrals, Attendance, Children Entertainment & Chaperones, Children in Employment, and Courts.
- **Transport** - Enable the users to calculate which children are entitled to free transport passes and to pass this information to the Environment Transport team which allocates the children to bus routes and issues passes.

RF
21/7/10.

Vulnerable children

The tragic death of seven-year-old Khyra Ishaq who starved to death in Birmingham has placed Birmingham Children's Services and home education under the spotlight. Special Children reports

The trial of Angela Gordon and Junaid Abuhamza for the murder of seven-year-old Khyra Ishaq ended in February with pleas of manslaughter being accepted by the court. Angela Gordon was diagnosed as suffering from severe depression at the time of Khyra's death and Junaid Abuhamza of being schizophrenic. Both received lengthy prison sentences. The circumstances of Khyra's tragic death are now known. One of six children living with her mother Angela Gordon and her step father Junaid Abuhamza in Leyton Road, Handsworth, Birmingham, she was withdrawn from school to be home educated in December 2007. She died five months later in May 2008. Her death was the result of 'an overwhelming infection brought on by severe malnutrition'. Khyra was the victim of an extreme disciplinary regime in which she was denied food, beaten with a cane and doused in cold water. At the time of her death she weighed just 2st 9lbs. She had in effect been starved to death.

Failure of social services?

The focus of the questions being asked of Birmingham Children's Services is whether or not they did all in their power to protect her, especially after she was withdrawn from school. Birmingham Safeguarding Children Board (BSCB) will conclude a serious case review into Khyra's death but it is clear from statements issued by key figures in the local authority and the independent chair of the BSCB that they believe the main blame lies elsewhere.

Tony Howell, strategic director children young people and families, said: 'A particular concern that has come out of this case for us all is that our powers in relation to elective home education are inadequate. We continue to lobby for legislation that will strengthen our ability to monitor and support children who are being educated at home and we welcome the changes related to that in the Children, Schools and Families Bill currently

working its way through Parliament.

'Another major concern that has come out of the trial is that many people in the local community were aware, or had suspicions, that all was not right in the home where Khyra died, yet no one felt able to alert any of the authorities. We are currently addressing how through closer relationships with communities, we can get a clear and strong message about how those communities and public agencies can work better together on this important issue.'

Cllr Les Lawrence, cabinet member for children young people and families said: 'Khyra's case clearly demonstrates an essential need for local authorities to be given greater powers to support children whose parents or guardians elect to teach them at home. We recognise that the vast majority of families who opt to educate their children at home do an excellent job and welcome the support from the council as and when needed. But we need the necessary power to step in where home education is not working. The Badman Inquiry, which we contributed to, made specific recommendations, some of which are in current legislation going through the House of Commons and which we support.'

Hilary Thompson, the BSCB Chair, expressed similar views.

Cause to suspect harm

Critics, however, believe the response of the local authority is an attempt to shift blame from itself. While many accept the need for greater community vigilance in the case of vulnerable children, they point out that teachers at Khyra Ishaq's school had contacted Birmingham Children's Services within days of her being withdrawn from school.

Between January and February 2008 no fewer than five BCS staff visited Khyra's home. In February two even managed to see Khyra and some of her siblings on the doorstep and concluded there was no cause for concern. But Liz Davies, senior lecturer in social work at

London Metropolitan University, believes this pattern of denying access to Khyra should have been enough to trigger child protection protocols. In an article for Channel 4 News she says: 'The social worker should have conducted a child protection investigation as the case had certainly reached the legal threshold of a reasonable cause to suspect actual or likely significant harm.'

'This would have included police and social workers making initial checks and deciding if immediate protective action was needed.'

'There should have been a multi-agency strategy meeting to examine evidence from all agencies and plan an investigation. This would include collating known history, interviewing children on their own, medical examinations and interviews of the parents/carers and other witnesses.'

Birmingham Children's Services also had a duty to ensure that Khyra was receiving efficient full-time education suitable to her age, ability and aptitude, and that any special educational needs she had were being met (Section 7 of the Education Act 1996).

Although no section of the national media has mentioned it, Khyra Ishaq had a statement of special educational needs. While this doesn't preclude home education, section 8:95 of the Code of Practice states that in such cases: 'it remains the LEA's duty to ensure that the child's needs are met. The statement must remain in force and the LEA must ensure that parents can make suitable provision, including provision for the child's special educational needs.'

A High Court judgement pertaining to the care order for Khyra Ishaq's siblings confirms that Khyra was statemented. Made in March 2009 it has only just become public. In it the presiding judge, Mrs Justice King DBE, notes that one of Khyra Ishaq's siblings, M, is autistic, has very significant special needs and attends a special school, while another of Khyra's siblings, L, attended the same primary as



Khyra and was also statemented. L was withdrawn from school in December 2007 along with Khyra.

Concern from school

The judgement charts the physical decline of the children as Angela Gordon and Junaid Abuhamza's disciplinary regime took hold. Staff at the special and mainstream schools were the first to notice the children's loss of weight and obsession with food. At the special school teacher, Q, 'did everything he could to protect M, even to manipulating school meals so that he could have more food...'. In relation to the mainstream primary school Mrs Justice King wrote: 'As with Mr Q I have nothing but admiration for all that the staff at that school did to try to protect the children in their care. The school went the extra mile to try to ensure the children were safe. The fact that they, in their opinion, "failed" is not their fault and they should not under any circumstances reproach themselves or feel in any way responsible for what happened to K.'

The 43-page judgement also details the attempts by staff from the primary school to engage social services in Khyra Ishaq's case. These started as early as 19 December 2007, when the deputy headteacher of the school made a written

referral to social services but social services declined to become involved. On 21 December 2007, Angela Gordon notified the Special Educational Needs Assessment Services (SENAS) of her intention to withdraw the children from school. On 10 January 2008 SENAS wrote to the Education Otherwise adviser H informing him of the mother's decision. As the judgement notes: 'Mr H was reminded that Z and L had statements of educational needs and therefore it was the duty of the authority to ensure their particular special needs were being met and that the provision was suitable. To that end Mr H was asked to respond to SENAS within four weeks.'

Following a meeting at the primary school on 28 January 2008 at which school staff expressed the view that the children were 'at risk', a social worker attempted to visit the house in Leyton Road but got no response. On 8 February 2008, H visited the house with a senior social worker to assess whether the children were receiving a suitable full-time education. They stayed for an hour but never saw the children. Angela Gordon was left with an Education Otherwise advisory report and asked to submit teaching plans by the end of February. These were not forthcoming but it wasn't until 7 April that H

contacted the family again informing them of a further visit on 16 April. H and the senior social worker attended the property on 16 April but there was no reply. He did not follow up this abortive visit prior to Khyra Ishaq's death a month later. Despite this, the evidence available suggests that H 'did in fact give approval indicating that he was satisfied with the proposed educational provision despite the fact that mother had failed to provide any educational plan. The names of the children were accordingly removed from the school roll.'

Parallel attempts by a social worker and educational social worker to see the children as part of an initial assessment also failed. The only exception was a fleeting glance of them on the doorstep of their home in late February. Delays, confusion and poor communication between services led to the initial assessment being abandoned when it became clear Education Otherwise was involved with the case.

While accepting that Khyra Ishaq's death was the responsibility of Angela Gordon and Junaid Abuhamza, the judgement concludes: 'that in all probability had there been an adequate initial assessment and proper adherence by the educational welfare services to its guidance, K would not have died.'

The LEA should consider these points very carefully in cases where they are not the admissions authority for the school in question: that is, another authority maintains it or it is a voluntary aided or a foundation school.

- 8:86** Admissions over the number fixed for admissions in special schools may be more complex because the admissions number is expressed as a global total rather than per class or year group. In such cases, the LEA should consider the number in the class to which the child would be admitted rather than the total for the whole school.

Transport costs for children with statements

- 8:87** The parents' preferred school might be further away from the child's home than another school that can meet the child's special educational needs. In such a case, it might be open to the LEA to name the nearer school if that would be compatible with the efficient use of the LEA's resources. It would also be open to the LEA to name the school preferred by the child's parents on condition that the parents agreed to meet all or part of the transport costs.
- 8:88** The school named in a child's statement must be capable of meeting the child's special educational needs. LEAs should not, therefore, promulgate general transport policies that seek to limit the schools for which parents of children with statements may express a preference if free transport is to be provided.
- 8:89** Transport should only be recorded in the statement in Part 6 in exceptional cases where the child has particular transport needs. In most cases LEAs will have clear general policies relating to transport for children with special educational needs that should be made available to parents.⁶² Such policies would need to set out those transport arrangements which are over and above those required by section 509 of the Education Act 1996.
- 8:90** Where the LEA names a residential provision at some distance from the parents' home and the local authority, the LEA should provide transport or travel assistance; the latter might be reimbursement of public transport costs, petrol costs or provision of a travel pass.

Education otherwise than at school

- 8:91** Children with statements may be educated otherwise than at school because:
- (a) the LEA has made other arrangements
 - or
 - (b) parents have made suitable arrangements of their own.
- 8:92** Section 319 of the Education Act 1996 empowers the LEA to arrange for some or all of a child's special educational provision to be made otherwise than at school. Such arrangements would include education in a pupil referral unit, home tuition or education that reflected key stage 4 flexibilities.

⁶² DfEE 'Home to School Transport for Children with Special Educational Needs: Good Practice Guidance'. March 2001.

- 8:93** Section 320 enables the LEA to make arrangements for a child with a statement to attend an institution outside England and Wales: where they do so, the LEA may contribute to or pay the fees of the institution and the travelling and other expenses of the child and any person, including a parent, who might accompany the child.
- 8:94** The LEA should consider carefully any representations made by parents in favour of their child attending an establishment outside England and Wales. If the LEA consider that some or all of a child's special educational provision should be made otherwise than at school, including attending an institution outside England and Wales, they may specify those arrangements in Part 4 of the statement.
- 8:95** Section 7 of the Education Act 1996 recognises parents' right to choose to educate their child at home. Such arrangements are described as 'education otherwise than at school'. In such cases, if the child has a statement of special educational needs, it remains the LEA's duty to ensure that the child's needs are met. The statement must remain in force and the LEA must ensure that parents can make suitable provision, including provision for the child's special educational needs. If the parent's arrangements are suitable the LEA are relieved of their duty to arrange the provision specified in the statement. If, however, the parents' attempt to educate the child at home results in provision which falls short of meeting the child's needs, then the parents are not making 'suitable arrangements' and the LEA could not conclude that they were absolved of their responsibility to arrange the provision in the statement. Even if the LEA is satisfied, the LEA remains under a duty to maintain the child's statement and to review it annually, following the procedures set out in Chapter Nine.
- 8:96** In such situations section 324 (4A) of the Education Act 1996 does not require the name of a school to be specified in part 4 of the statement. Part 4 should state the type of school the LEA consider appropriate but go on to say that: "*parents have made their own arrangements under section 7 of the Education Act 1996.*" The statement can also specify any provision that the LEA have agreed to make under section 319 to help parents provide suitable education for their child at home.

Children educated at parents' expense

- 8:97** Parents may choose to place a child with a statement in an independent school (whether or not approved under section 347) or a non-maintained special school at their own expense. If parents choose to make such provision for their child, the LEA must be satisfied that the school is able to make special educational provision for the child that meets their special educational needs before they are relieved of their duty to arrange provision in an appropriate school. The LEA is not required to specify the name of a school in part 4 of the child's statement where they are satisfied that the child's parents have made suitable arrangements but they **must**, in those circumstances, state the type of provision. Parents should not be treated as having made suitable arrangements if the arrangements do not include a realistic possibility of funding those arrangements for a reasonable period of time. The LEA are, whether or not a school is named in the statement, still under a duty to maintain the child's statement and to review it annually, following the procedures set out in Chapter Nine.