

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

13th January 2015

PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE BY TUDOR GRANGE ACADEMY SHORT, SHARP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE GROUP’S RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Relevant Portfolio Holder | Councillor Phil Mould, Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Tourism. |
| Portfolio Holder Consulted | No, though he did participate in the Executive Committee’s decision about the group’s first recommendation. |
| Relevant Director | Kevin Dicks, Chief Executive. |
| Ward(s) Affected | No specific ward relevance. |
| Non-Key Decision | |

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

This report provides an update on the decisions that have been taken on the recommendations that were made by the Proposals for Change by Tudor Grange Academy Short, Sharp Review.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that
the report be noted.**

3. KEY ISSUES

Background

- 3.1 The Proposals for Change by Tudor Grange Academy Short Sharp Review was launched in August 2014. The review was undertaken at the agreement of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in order to address concerns raised by local residents in email correspondence regarding changes that Tudor Grange Academy Redditch proposed to make to the school’s admissions process.
- 3.2 Five Members were appointed to the review; Councillors P Witherspoon (Chair), C Gandy, P Hill, D Thain and N Wood-Ford. The review was completed in November 2014.
- 3.3 At the end of the review Members proposed three recommendations. The first of these recommendations requested that the Chief Executive of Redditch Borough Council write to the Secretary of State for Education and the Minister of State for Schools to request that specific guidance be provided to schools regarding changes to the age range of pupils when operating in a three tier education system. This recommendation was approved by the Council’s Executive Committee on 16th December 2014.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

13th January 2015

- 3.4 Updates on the progress that is made in implementing this recommendation and any responses received will be provided in the Overview and Scrutiny Quarterly Recommendation Tracker report.
- 3.5 The other two recommendations proposed by the group required action by Worcestershire County Council. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorsed both of these recommendations in November 2014 and a copy of the report was subsequently sent to relevant Officers at Worcestershire County Council.
- 3.6 The relevant lead County Council Officer, under delegated powers, has considered the group's proposals and the Officer's decision on the two recommendations is detailed in Appendix 1 to this report.

Financial Implications

- 3.7 There are no direct financial implications relating to this report.

Legal Implications

- 3.8 There are no legal implications directly relating to this report.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.9 There are no direct service or operational implications that have been identified for this report.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.10 No direct customer or equality and diversity implications have been identified for this report.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

No risks have been identified.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Response from Worcestershire County Council.

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Jess Bayley, Democratic Services Officer
Email: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel.: (01527) 64252 Ext: 3268