

From: @eastriding.gov.uk [mailto:@eastriding.gov.uk]
Sent: 09 May 2005 17:40
To:
Subject: EHE draft guidelines

Dear,

I am not sure why the draft guidelines were not circulated more widely to LEAs. I obtained a copy via a most circuitous route.

However, I wanted to congratulate you on a job well done. Most of what you have described in the guidelines matches very closely with what we do already in this authority. I am pleased that you have strengthened the guidance with respect to Child Protection and a better right of access to see the child where there are real concerns about a child's welfare. In fact, this is one area that we think could be strengthened even further. We have had instances where we have not known if a child was dead or alive because of parental refusal to allow access over a considerable period of time. The one area where I think your guidelines are inaccurate are in the section on flexi-schooling. We promote flexi-schooling because we see it as a win-win situation for the child and the school. You say, however, that flexi-schooling is by agreement with the school - which is correct. But you also imply that it is also by agreement with the LEA - which, so far as we understand it, is not in the statute. In my experience with several LEAs, there are some where there has been considerable antagonism to elective home education and they have sought to prevent it by a 'big stick' approach. I understand that not giving permission for flexi-schooling has been one of the strategies adopted. The view of this LEA is that flexi-education is a good thing and that it begins to pave the road to the future of education for all children - the road to fully personalised and individualised learning. We would therefore wish to promote it but would not wish to have the statute changed to give the LEA any right of veto.

Senior Adviser (Education) - with responsibility for the quality assurance of elective home education assessments in the East Riding of Yorkshire School Improvement Service