Staffordshire County Council

Working Group
of the
Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee

Children Missing out on Education (CMOOE)

Final Report

Staffordshire County Council

Contents

	Page Number
Chairman's Foreword / Summary	1
Conclusions and Recommendations	2
Setting the Scene	4
Scope of the Work / Terms of Reference	5
Membership	6
Methods of Investigation	6
Findings	7
Community Impact	13
Acknowledgements	14
List of Appendices / Background Papers	15
Glossary	17

Chairman's Foreword / Summary

Children in Staffordshire are at potential risk because of the lack of agreed processes for sharing information between government departments. While the systems which trace Children Missing out on Education (CMOOE) inside Staffordshire County Council are robust and working well some of the vital partnership relationships are missing which limits our effectiveness in resolving the problem.

There are two probable outcomes for children who remain CMOOE, firstly they may become education underachievers more likely to become NEET (Not in Employment, Education or Training). The second outcome is that these children become more vulnerable and more easily the target for abuse, as evidenced in the recent Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) reviews in both Rotherham and Stoke on Trent.

While the number of children missing out on education in Staffordshire is small we have a duty to ensure that all children are safe. I remain concerned that we "don't know what we don't know", meaning that there may be a child in Staffordshire at risk, of whom we have no knowledge. Failing one child because we are unaware of their whereabouts is one too many. The responsibility to ensure that all Staffordshire school aged children are receiving a satisfactory education lies with the County Council, made explicit in the Education and Inspection Act 2006. We must therefore continue to strive to solve these issues, particularly in light of the responses we received from some agencies, some of which in my mind were staggeringly weak in their lack of commitment to solving this matter urgently. We will need to lobby hard to highlight the system deficiencies and gain the changes necessary to overcome the problem.

Mr Martyn Tittley,
Working Group
Chairman

1. Conclusions and Recommendations

This review was undertaken following the concerns raised by Ofsted on children missing out on education across the country. During our investigation we have been encouraged by the infrastructure in place to address this issue in Staffordshire, both in terms of the partnership working with Local Support Teams and District Inclusion Partnerships, the work of the Virtual Headteacher and the Virtual School, and in particular the work of the Children Missing Education Officer (CMEO) and his team.

We note the work the CMEO has undertaken to foster effective partnership working and good communications with other local authorities as well as through regional CME networks and his efforts to create effective information sharing protocols with those agencies who hold information that may help identify children not in education and "unknown" within the County, specifically the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC). We feel strongly that effective partnership working and good communications are key in enabling the work of the CMEO to be effective and productive. In an attempt to move this issue forward we met with and spoke to representatives from the DWP. Staffordshire has recently developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the DWP to help address issues of Post 16 young people becoming NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training). We hoped to create a similar MoU to help identify children missing education, however on further investigation it became apparent that the information needed, ie that which links the child to the parent, is held by HMRC. A draft MoU was drawn up by the CMEO and discussed with representatives of HMRC. Unfortunately our understanding is that the HMRC data guardian has blocked this MoU from being signed, and therefore regrettably has prevented this information sharing.

Alongside this we have concerns about the number of children who may be resident in Staffordshire but of whom the Council is unaware. There is no requirement on a parent to register their child with the local authority. Should parents elect to educate their child at home, or indeed to educate them through the private school system, the local authority could easily be unaware of that child's existence within the County, yet they are still legally responsible for ensuring **all** children resident within their borders are receiving a satisfactory education. They also have a duty to identify children not receiving an appropriate education and to address this. This presents a dichotomy for the local authority, on the one hand they respect the right of parents to choose how their child is educated whilst on the other they need to ensure all children are safe and receiving appropriate education provision and be able to evidence this.

The Graham Badman report on elective home education in England recommended the establishment of a compulsory national registration scheme, administered locally, for all children of statutory school age who are, or become, electively home educated. We have sympathy with this

recommendation and feel that there are potential safeguarding issues for **any** unregistered child within a county, not just those who are home educated.

We wrote to the Children's Commissioner, HMRC Child Benefits Office, and the Secretary of State for Education raising our concerns over non registered pupils and seeking support for the proposed information sharing with HMRC. The Children's Commissioner's response acknowledged that our letter raised important issues, shared our concerns, recommended that all children were made aware of their right to protection under Article 34 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and wished us well with our review. She indicated that teachers were very well placed to identify the signs of sexual abuse and exploitation and that schools therefore gave an extra layer of protection.

HMRC's response indicated that they were considering how best to work with local authorities on this issue and referenced their recent information sharing pilot with Sheffield, Haringey, Greenwich and Sunderland. However they went on to say that they were not clear what legal basis existed for information sharing with local authorities but were actively looking at how they could provide disclosure whilst remaining compliant with The Commissioners for Revenue and Customs Act (CRCA) 2005.

We also received a reply from a representative of the Independent Education and Boarding Team of the Department for Education indicating there were no plans to revive the registration scheme proposal and explaining that the government believed the current arrangements struck the correct balance between the rights of parents and the role of local authorities. However we remain concerned that having no requirement for registering your child with the local authority effectively creates a barrier to the authority's ability to fulfill its statutory responsibilities. There are also potential safeguarding issues to the local authority being unaware of children resident in its county. The recent reports on Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) from both Rotherham and Stoke-on-Trent clearly show the link between CSE and children missing education. In Rotherham CMOOE were recorded in 63% of cases of those children who were sexually exploited. In Stoke-on-Trent, of the sexually exploited children who were interviewed during the review, 65% were not attending school.

We therefore **Recommend** that:

1. the Working Group Chairman, on behalf of the Select Committee, persist in making representations to HMRC over our continued concerns around information sharing protocols and how to overcome these barriers, inviting their representatives to meet us to identify ways forward;
2. the Working Group Chairman, on behalf of the Select Committee, write again to the Department for Education asking them to reconsider making it a requirement for parents/carers to register their school aged child with the local authority in which they live. The current statutory responsibility for local authorities to ensure all children resident within their borders are receiving a satisfactory education is made more

difficult where there is no such requirement, and raises concerns over potential safeguarding issues for vulnerable children;

3. a copy of this report be forwarded to the Children's Commissioner asking her to act to reduce the safeguarding risks to children not in education by championing the requirement for parents/carers of school aged children to register their child with the local authority in which they live. Such a register does not preclude educational choice but enables the local authority to discharge its responsibilities in identifying CME and targeting its resources more effectively;
4. a copy of this report be forwarded to the Chair of the local Safeguarding Board to highlight our concerns.

The role of the Virtual School is key in supporting looked after children's education and preventing them becoming CMOOE. We had some concerns early on in our investigations that the list of individual school designated teachers for looked after children was out of date. However work is ongoing to address this and we have been pleased to note a number of developments around the governance of the Virtual School, including linking their governance arrangements with the Corporate Parenting Panel. Further developments included the launch of a Pupil Premium Plus Policy which asks schools to give termly account of how the funding is used, to confirm the name of their designated teacher, identify any dual registered pupils showing their hourly education provision and setting up robust tracking systems to support this. The introduction of the Looked After Quality Mark for Staffordshire schools is also a positive, and whilst we understand that it is not possible to insist schools follow these guidelines, it is anticipated that Ofsted will expect to see clear evidence of good practice in this area.

We therefore **Recommend** that:

5. after a twelve month period the Virtual Headteacher give an account to the Select Committee of how effective the mechanisms have been in operating the Pupil Premium Plus Policy.

2. Setting the Scene

At its meeting on 24 January 2014 the Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee received the final report of the Working Group on the Ofsted Inspection of Local Authority (LA) School Improvement Arrangements. A recommendation of that review was for further investigation into the issue of pupils missing out on education following a recent Ofsted report.

The Ofsted report had looked at children missing **out on** education, therefore broadening the issue to include all those not receiving a full education time table.

The Ofsted report examined the experiences of children and young people who were not in full-time education at school. Inspectors visited 15 local authorities and 37 schools and services, undertook 97 case studies of children

and young people, and interviewed leaders in a further 41 secondary schools. Inspectors found poor quality and insufficient provision for many of these young people as well as incomplete information at a local level.

Under Section 436A of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 a local authority must make arrangements to enable them to establish (so far as they are able to do so) the identities of children in their area who are of compulsory school age but: a) are not registered pupils at a school, and b) are not receiving suitable education otherwise than at a school. In Staffordshire the Ofsted Inspection Programme Board had identified that a co-ordinated database should be created that would allow the Council to address, track and monitor such pupils.

Mindful of the educational and safeguarding implications of children missing out on education, the Select Committee agreed the recommendation that a further piece of work be undertaken to consider children missing out on education in Staffordshire. It was proposed and agreed that a Member of the Safe and Strong Select Committee be asked to join the Working Group.

3. Scope of the Work / Terms of Reference

The Working Group sought to identify the systems and practices in place to make sure that the Council fulfils its statutory duty to ensure that all children and young people of school age are accessing full-time education, and what systems and practices are in place to ensure that the LA has information about children and young people not accessing education and that safeguards are in place. The main groups of children and young people are as follows:

- permanently excluded;
- have particular social and behavioural difficulties and have personalised learning plans;
- have mental health needs and access child and adolescent mental health services;
- have medical needs other mental health needs;
- rarely attend school and have personalised learning plans as part of attempts to integrate them into full-time education;
- are pregnant or are young mothers of compulsory school age;
- have complex needs and no suitable school place is available.

In addition, there may be small numbers of children who are returning from custody and a school place has not been found for them; are new to the country and are awaiting a school place; are from Gypsy, Roma or Traveller background and alternative provision has been made and/or have moved from another area and a school place has not been secured (this may include looked after children).

The Working Group sought to:

- establish the size and scope of this issue in Staffordshire

- find out what arrangements are in place to educate children and young people who fall into these categories
- find out what systems and practices we have in place in Staffordshire at school and local authority level to monitor pupils missing from education.
- understand who is accountable for monitoring and reviewing pupils missing from education in Staffordshire
- identify what impact pupils missing from education has on educational attainment.
- find out what safeguards are in place to monitor pupils missing from education.

4. Membership

The following Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee members participated in this Working Group:

Mr Martyn Tittley (Working Group Chairman)
Mrs Maureen Compton
Mr Mark Deaville **
Rev Preb Michael Metcalf
Mr Stephen Sweeney

Mr Stephen Sweeney represented the Safe and Strong Communities Select Committee on the Working Group.

[** Following the 15 May 2014 Annual Council meeting Mr Mark Deaville became a Cabinet Support Member and therefore took no further part in this review.]

5. Methods of Investigation

We met six times between March and November 2014 to consider the issue of children missing out on education in Staffordshire, produce our report and agree our recommendations.

During our investigation we met with the following officers:

Lynda Mitchell	Deputy Commissioner for Education
Steve Hewitt	Children Missing Education (CME) Officer
Sue Coleman	Interim Strategic Lead – Targeted Services
Paul Wilkie	Education Coordinator, Looked After Children
Sarah Rivers	District Lead, Targeted Services and appointed as the new Virtual Headteacher from June 2014
Andrew Marsden	County Commissioner for Access for Learning
Tina Evans	Partnership Officer, Midlands Shires District, Department for Work and Pensions

6. Findings

Size and scope of the issue in Staffordshire

During the twelve months between 8 August 2013 to 7 August 2014, 1313 children had been, or were in the process of being investigated by the Children Missing Education (CME) team. Children are investigated where they have ceased to attend their school or education provider and their location is unknown. Of these 1313 children only three of the total completed investigations were termed "untraceable". This term refers to where all reasonable lines of enquiry have been exhausted and the child's whereabouts remain unknown.

Of a Staffordshire school population of 117,575 pupils the number of CME is small. On 25 June 2014 there were 197 CME cases, 0.17% of the school aged population. On 17 September 2014 there were 102 CME, 0.09% of the school aged population. 1192 investigations were completed between 8 August 2013 and 7 August 2014, with 1189 children located and a successful outcome established, giving a 99.75% success rate.

It is difficult to compare the number of CME with statistical neighbouring authorities as each authority classifies its CME slightly differently. In Staffordshire the definition of "Known" refers to where the authority knows a child is resident in Staffordshire but they do not have a school place whereas an "Unknown" is where a child's whereabouts is unknown and therefore so is their educational provision. The table below gives figures shared at a termly Midlands CME Regional Meeting, with Stoke-on-Trent City Council's figures included for the same period.

LA	Total no. of pupils not on a school roll & whose whereabouts are…						Date 25.6.14
	Known			Unknown			
Birmingham	41			261			
Derbyshire*	19			57			
Dudley	78			89			
Gloucestershire	3			0			
Herefordshire	5			2			
Leicestershire*	11			76			
Northamptonshire*	11			178			
Sandwell	104 (64 > 21 days)			4			
Solihull	12			4			
Staffordshire	**7**			**190**			
Stoke-on-Trent	42			90			
Telford & Wrekin	18			5			
Walsall	79			27			
Worcestershire*	47			26			

*refers to Staffordshire's local authority statistical neighbours

The Staffordshire CME Team is proactive in seeking to identify those children who are not receiving education and whose whereabouts is categorised as “known” or “unknown”. The 197 Staffordshire children shown above are actively investigated until their whereabouts have been established and/or if they remain resident in Staffordshire, an appropriate education provision is in place. It is a surprise to us to see that some authorities have such low recorded numbers of CME, however this is likely to be due to recording processes rather than because there are fewer CME.

When we started our investigations in March 2014 there were 274 pupils off roll in Staffordshire. Of those, 97 were considered a priority due to vulnerability factors. No child is taken off the CME list until there is confirmation that they are receiving education, either attending an out of County placement, alternative educational provision or is known to and being worked with by education professionals in another LA.

Those vulnerable of missing education in Staffordshire include:

a) Unaccompanied asylum seekers: these children can be difficult to place in education as schools are reluctant to take them when they have little or no English and are unlikely to be in a position to take any examinations. Work with short stay schools is undertaken to help support English tuition and help in accessing examinations where possible. There are usually up to 20 unaccompanied asylum seekers in Staffordshire at any one time, supported through the Entrust Ethnic Minority Achievement Service.

b) Gypsy/Roma/Traveller (GRT) children generally have good school attendance to the end of KS2 but this drops off significantly. GRT families tend to be wary of the mixed sexes in secondary schools which they feel allows the opportunity for “lax morals”. Significant work is being done to address these concerns, for example with initiatives such as the Kushti club and alternative vocational educational provision.

c) Electively Home Educated (EHE) pupils: Whilst the LA has a statutory duty to ensure every child receives a satisfactory education there is no such requirement on parents, the responsibility remains with the LA. There is no agreed definition of “satisfactory” in this context and therefore it is difficult to challenge educational provision given to EHE children. There is also no requirement for parents to co-operate with the LA or to register their child as being home educated. Where a child has been registered as being home educated the LA makes efforts to engage with parents and children, sending a welcome pack of useful educational resource information, informing them of the EHE resource website and seeking to visit the child to build a relationship with those involved and to assess the education provided. Annual visits are then made to those children where the LA has no concerns, with more frequent visits where concerns exist. However there is a very active

national home educating lobby that can discourage co-operative working with LAs and this presents a challenge. In cases where provision is either not in place or is deemed to be unsatisfactory a School Attendance Order can be made by the LA requiring a parent to register their child in school.

d) Teenage pregnancy: Staffordshire is above the national average for its number of teenage pregnancies. Where possible pregnant teenagers are now supported to stay in mainstream education rather than an automatic referral to short stay provision.

e) Other causes for CMOOE can be through poor attendance, exclusion, behaviour, mental health or medical needs. Pupils are regularly tracked by the CME Officer, with checks made every six weeks to identify pupils who drop off school rolls. 100% of permanently excluded pupils received education provision from the 6th day of their exclusion, normally through Pupil Referral Unit (PRU). Other reasons for pupil non-attendance can be that the child is school phobic, a school refuser, or that they have complex medical needs. Where children are missing education through poor attendance, schools and Families First Local Support Teams (LSTs) work in partnership to address this, including intervention where a pupil's attendance falls below 85%.

f) Excluded pupils: there are six Short Stay Schools in Staffordshire (also known as PRUs) who take excluded pupils, or those at risk of exclusion. These schools offer small teaching groups, often with more vocational learning and with a focus on standards of behaviour. At March 2014 there were 55 pupils in Staffordshire short stay schools on part-time timetables. Ideally pupils return to mainstream schooling after a short stay. If this is not possible it is likely that the pupil will be referred to Loxley Hall, the County's secondary school for children with emotional, behavioural or social difficulties (EBSD). Primary provision for EBSD pupils is through Cicely Haughton and Chasetown primary schools with Cicely Haughton and Loxley Hall being run as a federation

g) The Youth Offending Service has education workers within their service to work in re-engagement with education for those young people leaving custody. This progress is tracked through the District Inclusion Partnership for the young person's home area. Numbers of young people leaving custody and CMOOE are small, with one young person out of 15 leaving custody not being in education as at March 2014.

h) Looked After Children remain in their original school where ever possible. The Virtual School has responsibility for overseeing the educational provision for all looked after children. It focuses on improving attainment and achievement of these children, as well as improving attendance and reducing exclusions. The Virtual School tracks and monitors individual outcomes and targets and can provide

staff support and training, particularly around Personal Education Plans (PEPs).

i) The unknown unknowns: we are concerned that children may be resident in Staffordshire that the LA have no knowledge of because they have never been registered at a school, either because they attend a private school, are unregistered EHE or move into the County without registering with the LA. Whilst this is likely to be a small number of children there remains the potential for significant safeguarding issues and a need to be able to identify this group and ensure they are safe and receiving a satisfactory education.

Who is accountable for monitoring and reviewing CME and the systems and practices at school and local authority level

Local authorities have a duty to identify children not receiving a suitable education, as set out in the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and the 2009 Revised Statutory Guidance. The duty of local authorities to monitor and track CME is set out in the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) guidance Working Together to Safeguard Children (March 2010) which states that:

"There is a Children Missing Education (CME) named point of contact in every Local Authority. Every practitioner working with a child has a responsibility to inform their CME contact if they know or suspect that a child is not receiving education."

The DfE defines CME as:

"All children of compulsory age who are not on a school roll, nor being educated otherwise (eg privately or in an alternative provision) and who have been out of any education provision for a substantial period of time (usually four week or more)."

In 2010 the role of Children Missing Education Officer (CMEO) was created within Staffordshire County Council as the "named point of contact".

An independent review of Staffordshire's CME was undertaken in 2012 by Anne Hayward Consortium. The Review found that the CMEO, working with partners, had made significant progress and put in place more effective mechanisms and partnerships to support the identification of CME and facilitate their return to education. The Review found that the service presented an improving picture and gave recommendations that should serve as "signposts" to areas for further development. In particular it suggested fostering greater integration with the Local Support Teams (LSTs) to facilitate a more effective strategic and collaborative approach to supporting CME.

We looked in detail at the role of the Families First Local Support Teams and at the work of Staffordshire's Virtual School for Looked After Children. Following the Ofsted inspection in January 2014 and the new policy for

Children Missing Out On Education (CMOOE) (to include CME, children in public care, excluded pupils and children with attendance issues) work was undertaken to ensure that Staffordshire had the correct processes in place to address this broader definition. An action plan has been produced to support this process, identifying responsible officers for specific activity, progression and development, and having the agreement of all partners involved in CMOOE.

What arrangements are in place for those vulnerable to being CME
In Staffordshire the CME Officer investigates the whereabouts of children who may be missing from education. The Officer works with schools to ensure children return to education as soon as possible, working with early help and specialist safeguarding providers where there are concerns for children's vulnerability.

In Staffordshire reports on those children who have been removed from school rolls, and where no new school appears to be identified, are produced half-termly (i.e. six times per year), with the CME Officer investigating and establishing their current educational provision. There is a duty on Local Authorities under the Education Act 1996 (Section 434A) to ensure integration of arrangements for joint working and information sharing with other local authorities and relevant partner agencies that come into contact with children and families and Staffordshire has a number of information sharing agreements with local authorities. CME officer involvement ceases once an unregistered pupil has been identified as being on the roll of a school or in other appropriate education provision.

The authority regularly encourages schools to provide immediate and detailed notification when children are de-registered (and no later than within 10 days) to ensure that their whereabouts are not simply recorded as "unknown" or that, where this is the case, an early request can be made to Families First LSTs to visit the home. The priority for an LST visit is to ensure that the child is safe and well, and that the family have the information and support needed to get their child into full-time education at the earliest opportunity.

Schools, Entrust and Families First meet on a regular basis in District Inclusion Partnerships (DIPs) which cover the eight districts in Staffordshire. The Partnerships discuss each young person missing out on full-time education either for reasons of exclusion or through being placed on modified timetables, and agree a plan to ensure that they are returned to full-time education as soon as possible. In the majority of cases, children are already known and are receiving specialist or targeted services, with those services discussed in terms of facilitating the child's return to full-time education at the earliest opportunity.

The additional early help interventions delivered by LSTs through their work with maintained schools are also available for academy schools to purchase. The LSTs deliver interventions that include: identifying actions to combat issues; assess and act on the child's unmet needs; deliver interventions and

consultation; case work; preparation work for Court (where necessary); group and family based work; and whole school intervention. The LST will also assist the school to work closely with universal and specialist services to provide a continuum, avoid duplication and multiple assessments and enhance communication to ensure a child's needs are met. Should academy schools choose not to purchase this offer from the LST there would still, on occasion, be circumstances where the LST may provide specific "early help" support for those individual children as part of their agreed plan initiated and led by the schools' own pastoral team.

Short Stay Schools (Pupil Referral Units)
Young people in receipt of part time education at a Short Stay School are the responsibility of the local authority as single registered students on roll at the Short Stay School. These young people are managed carefully, each with an individual plan with an offer of a full-timetable being the objective. Part time timetables are acceptable when engagement with education is an issue and there is evidence that this is a useful strategy to re-engage students with poor attendance. All Short Stay Schools carefully monitor attendance and are held to account for it in the same way as a mainstream school.

There are some students who are dual registered on the roll at both their mainstream school and the Short Stay School. In these instances the mainstream school retains the responsibility for the pupil's education when not on the Short Stay site. This has the potential to be difficult to monitor and requires both schools to communicate effectively about students, with timetables adjusted when appropriate. DIPs also contribute to this process and provision is reviewed at termly meetings.

There is a central roll that contains names of pupils for whom the Short Stay School is not a suitable placement and who are not on a school roll. The numbers vary but rarely reach double figures. Of the current cohort, all were known, with provision being sought either through SEN assessment or via tuition as an interim whilst a school place is being agreed.

Children Looked After in residential homes have access to education immediately via the Short Stay Schools, should this be necessary.

Pupil Premium
The pupil premium is additional funding given to publicly funded schools in England to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils and help to close the gap between them and their peers. In the financial year 2014-15 schools will receive £1,300 for primary and £935 for secondary aged pupils registered as eligible for free school meals at any point in the last six years. Evidence of how the pupil premium has been successful will need to be shown and will be a consideration in any Ofsted inspection.

For looked after children an allocation of £1900 per pupil will be made by the DfE. This is more than double the amount received in 2013-14. The cohort of looked after children who attract the pupil premium is bigger and includes

children looked after from their first day of care rather than, as previously, only those who had been looked after for six months or more. The grant allocation must now be managed by the Virtual School Headteacher in the authority that looks after them. There is now no requirement for an authority to pass the funding onto the school where the child is on roll, although the presumption is that it will be used to help support meeting the needs identified in the child's PEP. In Staffordshire £500 per looked after pupil will go directly to schools to help with school planning. The remainder will be held centrally and used for additional support to help address the needs of the child as set out in their Personal Education Plan (PEP).

Data Sharing
Staffordshire has information-sharing protocols with 6 neighbouring authorities which facilitates tracking outside of the county but within the West Midlands' area, and work is underway to establish 7 further such agreements with other nearby authorities. The CME Officer uses the national network to pursue enquiries where intelligence suggests that a family may have left the region.

Staffordshire has good data sharing with health colleagues and has good mechanisms in place for solving problems on an individual basis for those with complex needs, involving parents and carers.

There remains an issue around the identification of children resident in Staffordshire whom the LA is unaware of, ie those who have never registered at a maintained school or who have moved into the County without informing the LA. Data sharing with the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) would help the identification of such children, specifically through child benefit claimants. Efforts are being made to engage HMRC in the replication of a protocol they have agreed with authorities in the North West which facilitates the sharing of information about benefit claims. This would further improve capacity to locate those children and families whose whereabouts are no longer known.

The impact of CMOOE on attainment and achievement
There is a clear link between poor attendance at school and lower academic achievement. Of pupils who miss more than 50 per cent of school only 3% manage to achieve five or more GCSEs at grades A* to C including Maths and English. 73% of pupils who have over 95 per cent attendance achieve five or more GCSEs at grades A* to C. The evidence also shows that children with poor attendance are more likely to be NEET when they leave school.

Community Impact

Resources and Value for Money
Whilst there would be an administrative cost to the registration of children living within the County, this would be balanced by the gain from being able to target the CMEO's time more effectively. The numbers of children not applying for a school place with the local authority is small, and therefore most school aged children would already be registered.

Equalities and Legal
Under Section 436A of the Education and Inspection Act 2006 a local authority must make arrangements to enable them to establish (so far as it is possible to do so) the identities of children in their area who are of compulsory school age but – a) are not registered pupils at a school, and b) are not receiving suitable education otherwise than at a school.

Risk
There is a risk to the Authority that they will be unable to meet their statutory obligations in ensuring that each child resident in the county receives a suitable education, if they are not able to identify all children living within their borders. There are risks for those children who miss out on education, being less likely to achieve five or more GCSEs and more likely to become NEET. There are also potential safeguarding risks for children not in education.

Climate Change
There are no climate change implications.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following officers who supported the Working Group:

Lynda Mitchell	Deputy Commissioner for Education
Steve Hewitt	Children Missing Education Officer
Sue Coleman	Interim Strategic Lead – Targeted Services
Paul Wilkie	Education Coordinator, Looked After Children
Sarah Rivers	District Lead, Targeted Services and appointed as the new Virtual Headteacher from June 2014
Andrew Marsden	County Commissioner for Access for Learning
Tina Randall	Scrutiny and Support Manager
Helen Phillips	Scrutiny and Support Officer

County Councillor Martyn Tittley
Working Group Chairman
November 2014

Contact Officer/s

Tina Randall, Scrutiny and Support Manager
Staffordshire County Council
Telephone: 01785 276148
E-mail: tina.randall@staffordshire.gov.uk

Helen Phillips, Scrutiny and Support Officer
Staffordshire County Council
Telephone: 01785 276143
E-mail: helen.phillips@staffordshire.gov.uk

List of Appendices/Background Papers

Appendices

- Organogram showing those involved in Staffordshire CMOOE

Background papers

- Final Report of the Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee on the Ofsted Inspection of School Improvement Arrangements http://moderngov.staffordshire.gov.uk/documents/s45813/Scrutiny%20Review%20Final%20Report%20-24%20January%202014.pdf
- Minutes of the 24 January 2014 Prosperous Staffordshire Select Committee http://moderngov.staffordshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=868&MId=4458&Ver=4
- Alternative provision (100233) Ofsted 2011 www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/100233 http://moderngov.staffordshire.gov.uk/documents/s45593/WG%20Covering%20report.pdf
- Pupils missing out on education – low aspirations, little access, limited achievement – Ofsted November 2013 http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/pupils-missing-out-education
- School attendance – Departmental advice for maintained schools, academies, independent schools and local authorities –Department of Education November 2014 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-attendance
- Improving attendance at school – Charlie Taylor, Government's expert adviser on behaviour 2012 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/180772/DFE-00036-2012_improving_attendance_at_school.pdf
- Report to the Secretary of State on the Review of Elective Home Education in England, Graham Badman, June 2009 https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/downloadableDocs/PDF%20FINAL%20HOME%20ED.pdf
- Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham 1997-2913 Alexis Jay OBE

http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/1407/independent_inquiry_cse_in_rotherham

- The Child Sexual Exploitation Service and Missing Children Service for young people in Stoke-on-Trent: A Review July 2014, Christine Christie http://www.moderngov.stoke.gov.uk/mgconvert2pdf.aspx?id=67986
- Letter dated 11 August 2014 to Mr Tittley from S Bishop, Independent Education and Boarding Team
- Letter dated 12 August 2014 sent by email to Mr Brian Edwards from the Children's Commissioner
- Letter dated 19 August 2014 to Mr Tittley from Tim Cox, Complaints Investigator, HMRC

Glossary	
CME	Children Missing Education
CMEO	Children Missing Education Officer
CMOOE	Children Missing Out on Education
DfE	Department for Education (previously DCSF/DES/DfES)
DIPs	District Inclusion Partnership
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
EBSD	Emotional, Behavioural or Social Difficulties
EHE	Elective Home Education
GRT	Gypsy, Roma, Traveller
HMRC	Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs
LA	Local Authority
LST	Local Support Team
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NEET	Not in Education, Employment or Training
PEP	Personal Education Plan
PRU	Pupil Referral Unit
SEN	Special Educational Needs
YOS	Youth Offending Service