

Lancashire County Council

Education Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 5th February, 2020 at 10.30 am in Committee Room 'C' - The Duke of Lancaster Room, County Hall, Preston

Agenda

Part I (Open to Press and Public)

No. Item

1. Apologies

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

Members are asked to consider any Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests they may have to disclose to the meeting in relation to matters under consideration on the Agenda.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 29 October 2019 (Pages 1 - 6)

4. Lancashire Schools Attainment (Pages 7 - 30)

5. Education Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20 (Pages 31 - 38)

6. Urgent Business

An item of urgent business may only be considered under this heading where, by reason of special circumstances to be recorded in the Minutes, the Chair of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency. Wherever possible, the Chief Executive should be given advance warning of any Member's intention to raise a matter under this heading.

7. Date of the Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Committee is due to be held at 10.30am on the 3 March 2020 in Cabinet Room 'C' at County Hall, Preston.

L Sales
Director of Corporate Services

County Hall
Preston

Lancashire County Council

Education Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, 29th October, 2019 at 10.30 am in Committee Room 'C' - The Duke of Lancaster Room, County Hall, Preston

Present:

County Councillor Munsif Dad BEM (Chair)

County Councillors

A Cheetham	D T Smith
S Clarke	D Stansfield
B Dawson	P Steen
A Kay	M Salter
J Mein	J Purcell
J Molineux	B Yates
E Nash	

Co-opted members

Mrs Janet Hamid, Representing Parent Governors
(Secondary)
Simon Smith, Representing RC Schools
Dr Sam Johnson, Representing CE Schools
Mr John Withington, Representing Parent Governors
(Primary)

County Councillors Yates and Purcell replaced County Councillors Wakeford and Gardiner respectively.

County Councillor Munsif Dad, the Deputy Chair of the committee, chaired this meeting.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from County Councillor Jimmy Eaton, and Kenvyn Wales.

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

None were disclosed.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2019

Resolved: The minutes from the meeting held on 22 July 2019 be confirmed and as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

4. Lancashire Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Partnership - Ofsted Revisit Preparation

The Chair welcomed Sarah Callaghan, Director of Education and Skills and Dr Sally Richardson, Head of Inclusion to the meeting.

The report sets out the preparation for the forthcoming Ofsted and Care Quality Commission (CQC) re-visit due to take place by the end of October 2019, including the production of a self-assessment. In presenting the report, the committee noted that out of the twelve areas of concerns identified during the Ofsted inspection in November 2017, the following five areas of concern still required improvement:

1. The transitioning from primary school to secondary school;
2. The quality of the Education Health and Care Plan's (EHCP);
3. The needs of the offer to local areas;
4. The neurodevelopment pathways; and
5. The educational outcomes for children with Special Educational Needs (SEN).

To improve these areas, members were informed that a task group had been formed to help scrutinise these areas and to make improvements.

Responding to the report, the following key issues were raised by the committee:

Members raised concerns about the Education Health Care (EHC) plans. Among the concerns raised were;

- The EHC plans not following a child during the transition period between primary and secondary school;
- The lack of EHC plans in place for a child during nursery and before the child enters mainstream school;
- The shortage of Education Psychologists; and
- The results of the EHC plan quality audit outlined in the report.

Responding to these concerns, members' were informed that this was an improving picture and changes had already been made to address these concerns. These included implementing a new Electronic Information System to record all the information coming into the local authority on a child to ensure it is all recorded centrally, engaging more with early years to ensure additional assessments are being carried out on a child at nursery level and the training of additional Educational Psychologists.

Addressing the concerns of the results of the auditing of the EHC plans, the committee were informed that the quality of the EHC plans had already substantially improved.

Additional concerns were raised by the committee on the access to CAMHS in Lancashire. In response, members' were informed that additional investment had been made to address this and the number of mental health workers available had been increased.

Recognising that the level of exclusions in Lancashire were too high, members' were informed that work was continuing to reduce the number, such as carrying out additional work to identify a child's individual needs an early stage to ensure a plan is in place to address those needs before an exclusion is warranted.

Resolved: That;

- i. The information presented on the preparation for the forthcoming re-visit by Ofsted and the CQC be considered; and
- ii. The feedback on the self-assessment attached at Appendix 'B' of the report be discussed and agreed.

5. Supporting Pupils at Special School with Medical Conditions: Task Group Update

The Chair welcomed Dave Carr, Head of Service Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well), Ellen Smith, Policy, Information and Commissioning Manager, Lesley Tiffen, Senior Commissioning Manager at the Fylde Coast Clinical Commissioning Group and Sarah Darbyshire from West Lancashire Clinical Commissioning Group to the meeting.

The report provided an update on the progress made by the multi-agency Special Schools Nursing Task and Finish Group against the recommendations made by the Children Services Scrutiny Committee in respect of special school nursing provision in Lancashire. In presenting the report, the committee noted that a joint action plan had been developed for the Special Schools Nursing Task and Finish Group which detailed the progress made on each of the recommendations and the next steps.

Responding to the report, the following key issues were raised by the committee:

Members' expressed concerns on the training being provided to health and education staff, specifically around the funding for the training and where parents or carers could go for advice or to raise their concerns about the training being provided. Responding to these concerns, members' were informed that the funding for the training was still under discussion and that a Designated Clinical Officer (DCO) had been appointed to each of Lancashire's district as a point of contact for parents or carers. It would be the DCO's responsibility to capture any of the concerns a parent or carer and to feed it back into the appropriate Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

In terms of the level of support that has been identified in producing the policy, members' were informed that that the policy had been developed by taking into account the best practices from other areas.

Regarding the views on the policy by headteachers, members' were informed that there were three headteachers who were members' of the Special Schools Nursing Task and Finish Group and who have actively engaged with other headteachers, including circulating the draft policy to obtain their views through the Lancashire Special School Head Teacher Association (LASSHTA).

In response to a query on the timescales for the finalising of the policy, members were informed that although there were no current timescales on when the final version of the policy would be signed off, the task group was anticipating that the draft policy would be finalised early in 2020.

Members' raised concerns regarding the six schools who had failed to respond to the data gathering exercise conducted by the task and finish group. In response, members were informed that the three headteachers who are on the task and finish group had tried a number of times to obtain a response from these schools which included raising it at various groups, emailing them and personally contacting them but the schools had so far failed to respond. Responding to this, members' requested that the committee be provided with details of those schools to support the service in obtaining responses.

Resolved: That;

- i. The progress made to date against the recommendations and the proposed ongoing activity against the project plan be noted; and
- ii. The feedback on the draft policy be discussed and agreed.
- iii. The committee be provided with the names of the schools in the Lancashire area to encourage responses to the data gathering exercise questionnaire.

6. Education Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20

The Chair presented to the committee the work programme for the 2019/20 municipal year.

The work plan for the Education Scrutiny Committee for the 2019/20 municipal year was presented to the Committee. The topics included were identified at the work planning workshop held on 22 July 2019.

Resolved: That;

- i. The report and work plan presented be noted.
- ii. An additional meeting of the committee be held in February 2020 to discuss the attainment data for Lancashire's schools; and
- iii. The following additional topics be included on the work plan ;
 - a. Child Poverty – impact of pupil premium on attainment and impact of mentors funding for armed forces families;
 - b. Physical Education;
 - c. Maintained Nurseries (update following Cabinet report in December 2019);

d. Parking outside schools; and

7. Urgent Business

There were no items of Urgent Business.

8. Date of the Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Education Scrutiny Committee is due to be held on 3 March 2020 at 10.30am in Cabinet Room C at County Hall, Preston.

L Sales
Director of Corporate Services

County Hall
Preston

Report to the Education Scrutiny Committee

Meeting to be held on Wednesday, 5 February 2020

Part I

Electoral Divisions affected:
All Divisions

Lancashire Schools Attainment

(Appendix 'A' refers)

Contact for further information:

Sarah Callaghan, Director of Education and Skills

Sarah.Callaghan@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

The report provides detail of standards in Lancashire schools, together with a summary of judgements by Ofsted.

Recommendation

The Education Scrutiny Committee is asked to:

- i. Note the standards of achievement by Lancashire children
- ii. Review and comment on the work undertaken to address any issues and sustain improvement.

Background and Advice

Lancashire is a diverse county and this is reflected in the differential in outcomes for children and young people living in less affluent areas and also for particular groups of children who are more vulnerable. Background information has been provided through a published annual report from 2018 (titled 'Key drivers of the disadvantage gap') which summarises the key drivers of the disadvantage gap in attainment among pupils in England (excerpt of this report attached at Appendix 'A').

This report summarises the educational attainment and progress for children and young people across the age phases from reception to post 16. The data within it will drive the priorities for the service to address some of the areas where performance is less positive and supports the developing new system led model for school improvement.

The new delivery model will harness the expertise within schools to drive and sustain improvement. It is recognised that facilitating swift and easy access to a range of support services from early help, inclusion and health is key to addressing the issues

that impact on performance set out within this report. Access to key services is a feature of the proposed new approach and this will help to ensure that children and young people in more challenging circumstances are not prohibited from reaching their full potential.

Outcomes for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), for Disadvantaged pupils, Children Looked After (CLA) and Children in Need (CIN), and for White British Boys, are not currently good enough and are key priorities for the service moving forward.

The proportion of pupils reaching age related expectations in Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS), Key Stage 1 (KS1) and Key Stage 2 (KS2) is below the national average and (except at KS2) has been persistently below for the last 4 years. Headline progress measures show that Writing outcomes are stronger, progress in Maths is in line with national and progress in Reading is low. The combined Reading, Writing and Maths measure at the end of KS2 this year is below national. Pupils with SEND and CLA perform well below the average for all pupils, and gaps are generally larger than national.

KS4 attainment is in line with national data. Attainment is above national at standard and higher grades in English and for Maths; below for English Baccalaureate (EBac) measures (gap closing over time, including provisional 2019 data). Pupils with SEND and CLA achieve well below the averages for all pupils and gaps are expected to remain generally larger than national.

There are wide variations in outcomes by local district (Burnley, Pendle, Hyndburn lowest) – Burnley improved faster than any other in 2019. Whilst the rate of improvement is positive to see, the differential of experience across the County where results are less positive for our most vulnerable groups of children and young people is a concern and so is identified as a key priority for the service over the next 12 months.

KS4 Progress 8 is below average over time. A key priority for the service moving forward is to address the inequities of experience for some of our most vulnerable children so that background does not become a determinant of poor outcomes.

At KS5, attainment in academic subjects is above average over time, currently below average in the new Technical Awards. Outcomes for disadvantaged young people and those with SEND are well below other pupils, and whilst improving, the proportion of school leavers moving into education, employment and training is below the national average.

Our key priorities remain to:

- Improve reading and vocabulary across all KS and especially early language development in the Early Years;
- Address the inequity of outcomes for vulnerable groups evidenced in educational outcomes for children and young people, including for pupils with SEND, Children Looked After and Children in Need, and for White British Boys across all Key Stages;

- Increase the percentage of good or outstanding schools, especially secondary by increasing the quality of leadership and provision by challenging and supporting targeted outcomes.

Primary Schools

The proportion of pupils reaching age related expectations in Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS), Key Stage 1 (KS1) and Key Stage 2 (KS2) is below the national average.

Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) – All pupils

EYFS Results	Lancashire (%)		England (%)	
	GLD	Ave FSP	GLD	Ave FSP
2018/19	69.2	34.1	71.8	34.6
2017/18	69.7	34.3	71.5	34.6
2016/17	69.4	34.6	70.7	34.5
2015/16	69.3	34.9	69.3	34.5

GLD = good level of development, the expected standard at the end of Reception.

- The proportion of children making a Good Level of Development (GLD) is below the 2019 National Average and below the 2018 Lancashire figure.
- The 2019 Lancashire Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (FSP) is below the Lancashire 2018 average with an average point score of 34.1 against 34.6 at national. This represents a 4 year falling trend.

Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) – Disadvantaged Pupils (FSM)

EYFS (FSM)	Lancashire		England	
	% GLD	Ave FSP	% GLD	Ave FSP
2018/19	52.0	30.5	56.3	31.4
2017/18	54.1	30.9	57.0	31.5
2016/17	53.1	31.2	56.0	31.5
2015/16	52.2	31.2	54.0	31.5

- The proportion of FSM (free school meal) children making a Good Level of Development (GLD) is below the 2019 National Average and below the 2018 Lancashire figure.
- The 2019 Lancashire Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (FSP) is below the Lancashire 2018 average with an average point score of 30.5 against 31.4 at national. This represents a 3 year falling trend.

A decline in attainment is evident in Good Level of Development (GLD), Communication Language and Literacy (CLL) and Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFSP) average points scores for all pupils and the disadvantaged cohort (FSM), with both below their National Average respective figures.

Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) – Children Looked After (CLA) and Children in Need (CIN)

		CLA		CIN	
		No	% GLD	No	% GLD
2018/19	England	1090	48		
2017/18	England	950	46		
2018/19	Lancashire	51	39.2	28	42.9
2017/18	Lancashire	52	50	22	31.8

- The proportion of CLA achieving a Good Level of Development declined below national in 2018/19.
- The proportion of CIN achieving a Good Level of Development increased in 2018/19 (there are no comparative national figures for CIN).
- The proportions of both groups of pupils achieving a Good Level of Development are well below the average for all pupils.

Key Stage 1 (KS1) – All pupils

KS1 Results	Lancashire (%)				England (%)			
Year	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+
2018/19	74.0	68.0	74.0	63.3	75.0	69.0	76.0	64.9
2017/18	74.6	69.3	75.1	64.2	75.0	70.0	76.0	65.3
2016/17	75.0	68.0	75.1	63.4	75.5	68.2	75.1	63.7
2015/16	73.5	66.5	72.3	60.9	74.0	65.5	72.6	60.3

- The proportion of KS1 pupils attaining the individual expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics are all below the 2019 National Average. Reading, Writing and Maths 2019 outcomes are also all below the Lancashire 2018 figures.
- The proportion of KS1 pupils attaining the combined expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics are below both the 2019 National Average and Lancashire 2018 attainment figure.

Key Stage 1 (KS1) – Disadvantaged Pupils (FSM)

KS1 (FSM)	Lancashire (%)				England (%)			
Year	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+
2018/19	58.3	51.9	57.5	45.3	60.0	53.0	61.0	48.5
2017/18	57.3	50.1	57.7	44.9	60.0	53.0	61.0	0.0
2016/17	58.1	49.1	58.8	43.9	61.0	52.0	61.0	0.0
2015/16	58.0	48.5	56.3	42.8	60.0	50.0	58.0	0.0

- % of KS1 FSM pupils attaining the individual expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics are all below the 2019 National Averages. Reading and Writing continue a 4 year improvement trend.
- % of KS1 FSM pupils attaining the combined expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics are below the 2019 National Average but continue a Lancashire 4 year improving trend.

- Results for FSM pupils at KS1 are well below those for all pupils; whilst this is also the case nationally, the Lancashire gaps are slightly larger.

Key Stage 1 (KS1) – Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

KS1 (SEND)	Lancashire (%)				England (%)			
Year	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+
2018/19	23.5	16.6	26.8	14.2	29.6	21.6	32.6	18.6
2017/18	23.5	15.7	25.3	12.9	30.0	22.0	33.0	0.0
2016/17	25.3	16.6	27.8	14.3	31.0	21.0	32.0	0.0
2015/16	22.9	14.4	24.4	11.1	30.0	20.0	30.0	0.0

- % of KS1 SEND pupils attaining the individual expected standard in Reading, Writing, Writing and Mathematics, and the combined measure, are all well below the 2019 National Averages and do not show any clear trend over time, although there is some improvement on 2017/18.
- Results for SEND pupils at KS1 are well below those for all pupils; whilst this is also the case nationally, the Lancashire gaps are larger.

Key Stage 1 (KS1) – Children Looked After (CLA) and Children in Need (CIN)

		CLA		CIN	
		No	% RWM	No	% RWM
2018/19	England	1570	37		
2017/18	England	1690	37		
2018/19	Lancashire	48	39.6	102	28.4
2017/18	Lancashire	77	36.4	94	41.5

- The proportion of CLA attaining the combined expected standard improved above national in 2018/19.
- The proportion of CIN attaining the combined expected standard fell sharply in 2018/19 (there are no comparative national figures for CIN).
- The proportions of both groups of pupils attaining the combined expected standard are well below the average for all pupils.

Key Stage 2 (KS2) – All pupils

Headline progress measures show that Writing outcomes are strong, progress in Maths is in line with national and progress in Reading is low.

KS2 Results	Lancashire				England			
Year	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+
2018/19	72.3	78.1	78.4	64.0	73.0	78.0	79.0	65.0
2017/18	75.9	78.2	76.2	64.8	75.0	78.0	76.0	64.0
2016/17	71.2	77.4	75.5	61.0	71.0	76.0	75.0	61.0
2015/16	65.4	77.5	70.0	54.3	66.0	74.0	70.0	54.0

- The proportion of KS2 pupils attaining the expected standard in Writing is above the 2019 National Average. In both Reading and Mathematics this % is below

the 2019 National Average. Reading and Writing 2019 outcomes are below Lancashire 2018 figures with Maths above. 4 year upward trend in maths, but national improvement is 0.6% higher.

- The proportion of KS2 pupils attaining the combined expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics is below both the 2019 National Average and Lancashire 2018 outcomes.

Key Stage 2 (KS2) – Disadvantaged (FSM)

KS2 (FSM)	Lancashire (%)				England (%)			
Year	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+
2018/19	56.9	60.9	62.0	45.4	58.0	64.0	63.0	47.5
2017/18	58.3	59.1	58.4	42.7	60.1	62.6	59.4	46.1
2016/17	52.3	58.8	56.9	39.4	55.0	61.0	59.0	43.0
2015/16	45.3	58.6	48.6	31.8	49.0	60.0	54.0	36.0

- % of KS2 FSM pupils attaining the individual expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics are all below the 2019 National Average. Reading is below Lancashire 2018 figures with Writing and Maths above.
- % of FSM pupils attaining the combined expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics is below the 2019 National Average. 4 year upward trend in Lancashire which is 2.1% higher than the national % improvement over the same period.
- Results for FSM pupils at KS2 are well below those for all pupils; Lancashire gaps are generally similar to those nationally.

Key Stage 2 (KS2) – Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

KS2 (SEND)	Lancashire (%)				England (%)			
Year	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+	Reading+	Writing+	Maths+	RWM+
2018/19	31.1	29.4	36.7	17.8	35.9	33.8	40.4	22.0
2017/18	36.2	28.8	34.5	18.6	38.4	33.3	37.2	21.3
2016/17	31.4	25.2	32.5	15.7	34.0	30.0	36.0	18.0
2015/16	24.3	25.3	28.2	11.4	29.0	29.0	32.0	14.0

- % of KS2 SEND pupils attaining the individual expected standard in Reading, Writing and Mathematics, and the combined measure, are all below the 2019 National Average.
- Whilst all measures for SEND are above figures in 2015/16, Reading results showed a dip last year, Writing and Mathematics showing an improving 4-year trend.
- Results for SEND pupils at KS2 are well below those for all pupils; Lancashire gaps are slightly larger than those nationally.

Key Stage 2 (KS2) – Children Looked After (CLA) and Children in Need (CIN)

		CLA		CIN	
		No	% RWM	No	% RWM
2018/19	England	2960	37		
2017/18	England	2770	35		
2018/19	Lancashire	90	31.1	147	34.7
2017/18	Lancashire	92	40.2	135	26.7

- The proportion of CLA attaining the combined expected standard at KS2 declined below national in 2018/19.
- The proportion of CIN attaining the combined expected standard at KS2 improved in 2018/19 (there are no comparative national figures for CIN).
- The proportions of both groups of pupils attaining the combined expected standard are well below the average for all pupils.

Primary School District Profiles

Key Stage 1 (KS1)

KS1 Results	2019				2018				2019 v 2018
KPI	Reading +	Writing +	Maths +	RWM +	Reading +	Writing +	Maths +	RWM +	RWM+ +/-
England	75.0	69.0	76.0	64.9	75.0	70.0	76.0	65.3	-0.4
Lancs	74.0	68.0	74.0	63.3	74.6	69.3	75.1	64.2	-0.9
Burnley	66.0	60.2	66.9	56.9	68.8	63.2	69.2	57.2	-0.3
Chorley	76.4	69.8	75.6	64.5	76.5	70.4	77.2	65.8	-1.3
Fylde	76.2	71.6	76.9	67.9	81.1	75.8	80.0	71.1	-3.2
Hyndburn	69.7	64.2	69.0	59.3	72.7	67.8	72.5	61.7	-2.4
Lancaster	73.2	67.1	75.0	62.3	72.1	67.7	73.3	62.1	0.2
Pendle	66.1	61.2	68.5	56.6	71.6	64.1	72.2	60.3	-3.7
Preston	74.9	71.3	76.6	66.3	75.1	69.9	75.8	64.9	1.4
R Valley	81.6	75.1	79.2	70.6	81.2	76.1	81.3	71.0	-0.4
Ross'dale	74.2	69.3	74.6	65.1	72.8	68.7	73.9	62.9	2.2
S Ribble	75.6	69.9	74.6	64.1	75.9	70.1	75.5	64.6	-0.5
W Lancs	76.4	69.2	77.6	64.8	77.0	72.6	78.7	67.4	-2.6
Wyre	75.3	68.8	77.6	65.6	77.1	72.5	77.5	67.9	-2.3

- Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle are below both 2019 national and 2019 Lancashire average outcomes across all Key Performance Indicators. They are also all lower than 2018 Lancashire figures.
- In 2019, only three districts (Lancaster, Preston and Ribble Valley) of twelve have improved the % of children reaching the combined expected standard in Reading, Writing and Maths when compared against Lancashire 2018 outcomes.

Key Stage 2 (KS2) – District Profile

KS2 Results	2019				2018				2019 v 2018
KPI	Reading +	Writing +	Maths +	RWM +	Reading +	Writing +	Maths +	RWM +	RWM+ +/-
England	73.0	78.0	79.0	65.0	75.0	78.0	76.0	64.0	1.0
Lancs	72.3	78.1	78.4	64.0	75.9	78.2	76.2	64.8	-0.8
Burnley	64.2	71.8	70.1	54.7	68.9	74.3	68.4	55.8	-1.2
Chorley	76.5	80.0	82.3	67.7	80.0	81.0	78.6	69.4	-1.7
Fylde	79.4	84.0	84.5	72.4	81.0	81.9	80.1	70.8	1.6
Hyndburn	68.6	74.9	75.9	59.9	73.7	76.8	74.4	61.5	-1.7
Lancaster	71.9	76.4	79.5	63.8	74.0	76.6	73.6	62.8	1.0
Pendle	65.2	73.1	72.5	56.2	67.4	73.7	73.0	57.6	-1.5
Preston	70.8	76.7	78.6	63.4	76.0	77.3	77.4	65.3	-1.9
R Valley	77.8	82.6	82.8	69.1	81.3	81.7	79.7	67.3	1.8
Ross'dale	73.0	79.6	78.6	64.7	79.3	79.7	78.5	68.2	-3.5
S Ribble	72.6	78.8	78.9	65.1	78.3	77.7	77.2	66.3	-1.2
W Lancs	73.8	81.1	77.8	65.5	78.1	81.3	78.7	68.7	-3.1
Wyre	73.3	77.5	80.7	65.3	77.9	80.1	78.0	67.5	-2.2

- Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle are below both 2019 National and 2019 Lancashire average outcomes across all Key Performance Indicators. They are also all lower than their 2018 Lancashire figures.
- In 2019, only 3 districts (Fylde, Lancaster and Ribble Valley) of 12 have improved the % of children reaching the combined expected standard in Reading, Writing and Maths when compared against Lancashire 2018 outcomes.

Secondary Schools

Key Stage 4

Year	Region	P8	P8 (Disadvantaged)	Attainment 8	% Maths G9-4	% English G9-4	% Maths & English G9-4	% Ma & En G9-4 (Disadvantaged)	% Ma & En G9-4 (SEND)	% Ma & En G9-4 (CLA)
2018/19	England	-0.030	NYA	46.7	70.1	75.9	64.6	NYA	NYA	NYA
2017/18	England	-0.020	-0.440	46.5	69.5	75.4	64.2	44.5	25.9	17.5
2016/17	England	-0.030	-0.400	46.3	69.2	75.5	63.9	44.5	25.1	17.4
2015/16	England	-0.030	-0.380	50.1	68.8	75.1	63.3	43.2	24.2	17.4
2018/19	Lancashire	-0.11	NYA	46.6	70.7	76.5	65.5	42.6	27.3	25.3
2017/18	Lancashire	-0.085	-0.619	46.7	70.9	76.7	66.1	43.1	26.5	21.9
2016/17	Lancashire	-0.136	-0.597	45.7	70.0	76.0	64.8	42.1	22.8	18.2
2015/16	Lancashire	-0.106	-0.580	49.7	69.9	74.5	63.6	38.8	22.7	15.1

NYA – Not Yet Available G9-4 = a "standard pass", equivalent to A*C in legacy GCSE exams

- Attainment 8 (A8) is just below the 2019 National Average figure.
- The proportion of KS4 pupils attaining a standard pass in English, a standard pass in Maths and the combined English & Mathematics measure are above 2019 National Average figures.
- All four KPIs are below 2018 figures.
- The proportion achieving a standard pass for the combined English & Mathematics measure is lower than 2018 for Disadvantaged pupils (dip not quite as great as for all pupils), higher than 2018 for pupils with SEND and CLA (no national comparative data at this stage).

Year	Region	% Maths G9-5	% English G9-5	% Maths & English G9-5	% English Baccalaureate 9-4	% English Baccalaureate 9-5	English Baccalaureate APS
2018/19	England	49.0	60.6	43.2	24.9	17.1	4.08
2017/18	England	49.5	60.6	43.5	24.2	16.8	4.05
2018/19	Lancashire	49.5	61.6	43.9	21.2	14.8	4.01
2017/18	Lancashire	50.3	61.5	44.2	19.8	13.9	3.99

G9-5 = a "higher pass", the new expected national standard at the end of secondary school

- The proportion gaining a higher pass in English is above national and just above 2018.
- The proportion attaining higher passes in Maths is just above the 2019 National Average, but below 2018; as a result, the proportion attaining a higher pass in both English and Maths is just above national but just below 2018.
- For the English Baccalaureate measures, the proportions attaining a standard pass and the proportion gaining a higher pass and the average point score have all improved, but all remain below National Averages.

Further analysis from 2019 Statistical First Release and Fischer Family Trust data suggests:

- English Baccalaureate scores are limited by entry patterns in Humanities and, particularly, in Languages.
- Overall English performance is lowered by English *Literature*, but improving over time (partly arising from a move away from Year 10 early entry). Progress in Maths is lower than in English.

District Profile – Key Stage 4

- There are wide variations in Attainment 8 outcomes by local district with Burnley, Pendle and Hyndburn lowest. Burnley demonstrated the largest improvement when compared against 2018 outcomes.
- Four districts improved on their Attainment 8 outcomes (Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Rossendale) with the remaining nine showing a decline on 2018 figures.

- Only Burnley and Rossendale showed an improvement across all 3 KPIs (A8, G4+EM, G5+EM) when compared against 2018 outcomes.
- Five districts showed a decrease in outcomes across all 3 KPIs (A8, G4+EM, G5+EM) when compared against 2018 outcomes (Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston, West Lancashire and Wyre).

District	2017/18			2018/19			Difference 2019 v 2018		
	%G4+ EM	%G5+ EM	Attainment 8	%G4+ EM	%G5+ EM	Attainment 8	%G4+ EM	%G5+ EM	Attainment 8
England	64.2	43.3	46.5	64.6	43.2	46.7	+0.4	-0.1	+0.2
Lancashire	66.1	44.2	46.7	65.5	43.9	46.6	-0.6	-0.3	-0.1
Burnley	51.4	30.1	38.3	57.3	37.2	41.2	5.8	7.1	2.9
Chorley	76.1	56.3	50.6	75.7	56.3	51.1	-0.4	-0.1	0.5
Fylde	64.7	42.5	45.5	66.8	40.6	47.1	2.1	-1.9	1.5
Hyndburn	58.0	33.9	42.8	53.3	33.0	42.2	-4.7	-0.9	-0.7
Lancaster	69.3	50.0	50.0	67.0	50.2	45.9	-2.3	0.2	-4.1
Pendle	57.9	32.4	42.1	54.6	28.6	40.6	-3.3	-3.8	-1.5
Preston	70.6	49.5	49.5	62.4	43.1	46.7	-8.2	-6.5	-2.8
Ribble Valley	73.3	51.3	52.2	74.4	55.3	51.8	1.1	3.9	-0.4
Rossendale	68.2	46.5	47.4	72.2	53.0	49.7	3.9	6.5	2.2
South Ribble	70.0	47.2	48.3	70.4	47.2	43.8	0.4	0.0	-4.5
West Lancashire	62.7	41.7	45.4	61.0	38.2	42.6	-1.6	-3.5	-2.7
Wyre	66.7	43.9	46.0	64.8	41.9	40.1	-1.9	-2.0	-6.0

Post-16

Key Stage 5: Average Points per Entry

Year	Region	All Level 3	A Level/	Academic	Technical Level	Applied General
2018/19	England	32.23	32.89	33.02	28.64	28.89
2017/18	England	31.84	32.12	32.29	28.11	28.43
2016/17	England	32.33	31.13	31.32	32.25	35.69
2018/19	Lancashire	34.43	34.65	35.22	27.63	28.98
2017/18	Lancashire	34.62	35.02	35.16	25.96	26.50
2016/17	Lancashire	34.89	33.65	33.76	35.70	38.10

- Attainment overall at Level 3 has remained above national over time.
- Attainment in A level and Academic courses has remained above national over time.
- Attainment in Technical Level subjects has been below national for the last two years; in Applied General subjects, attainment improved in 2018/19 to be just above national.

Key Stage 5: Disadvantaged (FSM) – no data yet available for 2018/19

Young people achieving level 3 by the age of 19, by FSM eligibility						
	All		Eligible for FSM		Not Eligible for FSM	
	2016/17	2017/18	2016/17	2017/18	2016/17	2017/18
England	57.6%	57.2%	36.0%	35.0%	61.2%	60.7%
Lancashire	60.8%	59.5%	31.6%	32.2%	64.9%	63.4%

- Whilst the proportion of all students achieving Level 3 qualifications in Lancashire has remained above national over time, this is not the case for FSM students.
- As is the case nationally, the proportion of FSM students achieving Level 3 qualifications is well below the proportion of pupils overall.

Key Stage 5: Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) – no data yet available for 2018/19

Young people achieving level 3 by the age of 19, by SEND status in Year 11						
	All		All SEND Pupils		No Identified SEND	
	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018
England	57.6%	57.2%	28.2%	26.6%	64.8%	63.1%
Lancashire	60.8%	59.5%	27.4%	26.5%	66.5%	63.9%

- The proportion of SEND students achieving Level 3 qualifications in Lancashire improved in 2017/18, remaining just below the national figure.
- As is the case nationally, the proportion of SEND students achieving Level 3 qualifications is well below the proportion of pupils overall.

Key Stage 5: Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)

December 2018 to February 2019 3 month average

	Lancashire	National
NEET	2.1% (519 young people)	2.6% (29,570)
Not Known	8.0% (2,017)	2.9% (32,163)
Combined NEET and Not Known	10.0% (2,536)	5.5% (61,733)

Latest figures compared to same point last year

	NEET	Not Known	Combined
December 2019	2.5% (639 young people)	5.6% (1,434)	8.1% (2,073)
December 2018	1.9% (468 young people)	11.6% (2,903)	13.5% (3,371)

Proportion of Students staying in education or employment for at least two terms after 16 to 18 study (for students studying Level 3 qualifications)

	2016/17	2017/18
Lancashire	90%	89%
National	89%	88%

- At the latest official reporting period, the proportion of students in Lancashire who were NEET was well above the national figure, largely as a result of school-leaver destinations not being known.
- The latest figures suggest a notable improvement, whilst remaining higher than the national figure from the previous year.
- Once students gain a place in education, employment or training, more of them tend to stay on than do so nationally.

Ofsted judgements

Overall the quality of education has continued to be a strong picture in terms of Ofsted judgement outcomes.

Strongest areas continue to be in nursery (where PVI sector shows a clear rising trend over time in outstanding judgments), primary and special education with strong outcomes when compared with national averages with weaker outcomes being seen in secondary and Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) settings.

The number of schools retaining their outstanding status has declined in 2019 and this is a reflection in the change of criteria the judgement of outstanding, also seen nationally. There is also a decline in the proportion of schools judged to be good or outstanding.

Early indications from initial inspections under the 2019 Education Inspection Framework suggest that inspection outcomes are expected to sustain and improve further, as a result of an extended period of support to school leaders and governors to strengthen their key focus on the curriculum.

- The percentage of maintained nursery schools attaining a good or better judgement is 96% (nationally this is 94%).
- The percentage of primary schools attaining a good or better judgement is 92.9% well above the national average of 86.5%.
- The percentage of secondary schools attaining a good or better judgement is 75.0% which is in line with the national average of 75.1%.
- The percentage of special school settings attaining a good or better judgement is 96.7 % which is above the national average of 92%.
- The percentage of PRU settings attaining a good or better judgement is 80% which is below the national average of 83%.
- 75% (six) of the colleges in Lancashire are rated as Good or Outstanding by Ofsted and 25% (two) of the colleges in Lancashire are rated as Requires Improvement by Ofsted.

Ofsted Inspections – Primary School 3 Year Trend (2017 – 2019)

Judgement	2017		2018		2019		3 Year Trend %
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Outstanding	99	20.54	100	20.75	91	18.88	-1.66
Good	353	73.24	344	71.37	357	74.07	+0.83
Requires Improvement	26	5.39	34	7.05	29	6.02	+0.63
Inadequate	4	0.83	4	0.83	5	1.04	+0.21
Total	482	100	482	100	482	100	
Good +	452	93.8	444	92.1	448	92.95	-0.13

Ofsted Inspections – Secondary School 3 Year Trend (2017 – 2019)

Judgement	2017		2018		2019		3 Year Trend %
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Outstanding	17	20.48	18	21.43	19	22.62	+2.14
Good	48	57.83	43	51.19	44	52.38	-5.45
Requires Improvement	14	16.87	16	19.05	14	16.67	-0.20
Inadequate	4	4.82	7	8.33	7	8.33	+3.51
Total	83	100.0	84	100.0	84	100.0	
Good +	65	78.3	61	72.6	63	75.0	-3.3

Consultations

N/A

Implications:

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

Risk management

There are no significant risk implications.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

List of Background Papers

N/A

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A

Key drivers of the disadvantage gap

Literature Review

Education in England: Annual Report 2018

Whitney Crenna-Jennings

July 2018

EDUCATION
POLICY
INSTITUTE

Research Area:
Vulnerable Learners
and Social Mobility



Part 2. Breaking down the gap: what does it represent?

Taken at face value, school attainment signifies academic ability. Yet, given that the ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ skills necessary to succeed at school are primarily a result of parental cultivation and investment from birth onward, facilitated by the resources to which families have access, assessment scores in large part reflect family socio-economic position. We break down the family-level factors that play a role in the attainment gap below.

Inequalities in child development

From conception onwards, factors related to disadvantage act and interact to influence development, health and well-being. Rapid brain development occurs in the first three years of life; poverty has been shown to affect the architecture of the developing brain, with the largest differences in brain structure detected in the poorest children.^{3,4} Mechanisms through which disadvantage influences early life development are reviewed here.

Perinatal factors

Epidemiological studies show that exposure to risk factors before birth can have a lifelong impact; the health of mothers before and during pregnancy is therefore highly important. While it is difficult to isolate causal effects of exposures during pregnancy given the mostly observational evidence base, there are several factors focused on in the literature:

- There is evidence that **stress** in pregnancy is linked to poorer foetal and cognitive development.^{5,6} Living in challenging social and economic conditions breeds chronic stress; analysis of UK-wide GP records found that the odds of deprived mothers aged 35 to 45 years experiencing antenatal depression or anxiety were more than two and a half times greater compared to non-deprived mothers, with a significant, but weaker, relationship in younger mothers.⁷
- The evidence is conclusive that **smoking** in pregnancy increases the risk of preterm birth and **low birth weight**.⁸ Low birth weight infants are at increased risk of negative long-term cognitive outcomes, including behavioural problems.⁹⁻¹¹ Expectant mothers living in deprived areas in the UK are substantially more likely to smoke; this has been attributed to higher levels of stress associated with hardship and a lack of access to support and resources to assist them in quitting when they become pregnant.¹²⁻¹⁴
- **Breastfeeding** has been strongly linked to better cognitive development and a range of health benefits throughout childhood and later life.¹⁵ The UK has one of the lowest global prevalence rates of breastfeeding, and the latest data shows a stark socio-economic gap in prevalence: 90 per cent of mothers in managerial and professional occupations self-reported breastfeeding compared to 74 per cent of mothers in routine and manual occupations in the latest national data (2010).¹⁶ Experts emphasise that a mother’s ability to breastfeed is shaped by the environment in which she lives and support she is able to access.¹⁷ More recent studies have focused on the **role of confounders** in the apparent relationship between breastfeeding and cognitive outcomes: an evaluation of international evidence suggests that the effect is mainly accounted for by maternal socio-economic and cognitive factors.¹⁸

The physical and social home environment

The environment into which disadvantaged children are born tends to be less conducive to healthy family functioning and child development, and school readiness and performance; these pathways are explored below.

The impact of material deprivation

Lacking sufficient money has a direct impact on the resources families can access to support child development and learning. These include **basic items** like nutritious food – critical for healthy brain development - and toys and books that promote cognitive stimulation.¹⁹ Disadvantaged families are also more likely to live in poor quality or overcrowded **housing** that can negatively affect child mental and physical health.²⁰ Additionally the gap in access to **computers and internet** at home between the poorest and richest households may hamper young people's ability to complete schoolwork and maintain peer relationships; home internet access has been linked to a 10-point increase in GCSE attainment in LSYPE participants.²¹

Family stress and functioning

Child development is relational; it is a product of interactions between child and caregiver. The literature focuses on several interlinked pathways through which disadvantage leads to family stress, disrupts relationships and can result in worse outcomes for children:

- **Attachment security** refers to the positive expectations infants develop about themselves and others; it stems from positive and predictable interactions with the caregiver on a regular basis during the first year of life.²² In families with complex needs, up to two thirds of children may be insecurely attached; poor attachment is strongly associated with worse resilience, socio-emotional and behavioural problems, and early school leaving.^{23,24} Some evidence suggests that insecure types of attachment are just as harmful to children as maltreatment.²⁵
- The impact of toxic stress resulting from **adverse childhood experiences (ACEs)**ⁱⁱⁱ on children's brains is highly significant – and has been shown to have a lifelong effect.^{26,27} **Almost half of participants in a 2014 nationally representative English survey report experiencing at least one ACE.**²⁸ While no single factor causes carers to maltreat children, challenging social and economic environments are more frequently associated with early life neglect and certain types of abuse.²⁹ Parental support and involvement have been shown to partially buffer the impact of ACEs on outcomes, yet disadvantage also tends to disrupt healthy family interactions.³⁰ In a school context, ACEs can act as a barrier to concentration and learning, causing children to withdraw from or become aggressive in the classroom.³¹ Children in contact with social services, especially those deemed to be at risk of significant harm, are at high risk of poor attainment at every assessment stage.³²
- There is particularly strong evidence supporting a causal link between socio-economic position, **maternal psychological health** and poor child outcomes.^{33,34} Among MCS families, moving into income poverty over time was found to increase the odds of maternal mental ill

ⁱⁱⁱ ACEs include: physical, sexual or emotional abuse, physical or emotional neglect, domestic violence, household substance abuse, household mental illness, parental separation or divorce, or an incarcerated household member.

health by 50 per cent even after employment status was taken into account.³⁵ Children of depressed mothers have been found to experience poorer parenting and attachment security, delayed development, as well as behaviour problems, worse performance, smaller achievement gains and more absences in primary school.³⁶⁻³⁸ Regarding the impact of other chronic parental illness, findings are less clear cut: disadvantaged parents are more likely to have poorer health given the social gradient in health, yet the impact on children is likely mediated by the extent to which family functioning is disrupted.³⁹

- **Inter-parental conflict (IPC)** is increasingly recognised as an important determinant of child outcomes. The ‘family stress model’ illustrates the pathway linking disadvantage to IPC: economic hardship causes emotional distress in parents, which disrupts the inter-parental relationship and leads to a worse parent-child relationship, in the form of negative parenting (harsh, uninvolved or inconsistent) resulting in worse outcomes for children.⁴⁰ Evidence suggests IPC is predictive of mental health problems in children, as well as poor academic performance.⁴¹

The home learning environment (HLE)

The evidence is conclusive that the HLE, including the extent to which children read with their parents, learn the alphabet and numbers, sing songs, play games and go on educational visits, is crucial for the **development of skills** that determine school attainment. These include reading, verbal and spelling abilities, and positive behaviour, well-being and enjoyment of school; children who experience a strong HLE also have a lower likelihood of being identified with SEND.⁴²⁻⁴⁴

In MCS families, poorer children were significantly less likely to experience a rich home learning environment, while findings from the EPPSE suggest that HLE quality is only moderately associated with parental education or occupation.^{45,46} In addition to the negative impact of deprivation on the physical home environment and quality of caregiver-child interactions, US and UK studies show that low-income parents are much more likely to **underestimate the impact they have on their child’s cognitive development and learning** – and therefore may be less likely to engage in the practices listed above.^{47,48} There is evidence that other characteristics may play a role in this relationship; most notably, girls have been found to experience a higher quality HLE than boys.^{45,49,50}

Child-rearing strategies

Qualitative and quantitative evidence from the US and UK suggest socio-economic differences in parenting approaches privilege more affluent children in education.

In their landmark ethnographic study of American families, Lareau and colleagues identified a strategy of ‘**concerted cultivation**’ among the middle-class families they followed: parents tended to encourage their children to interact with institutions and communicate with authority figures, and enrol them in enrichment activities from a young age.⁵¹ The researchers concluded that these strategies gave middle-class children an advantage in school settings. Among the disadvantaged families they studied, the researchers identified a strategy of ‘**natural growth**,’ in which parents were less invasive and did not structure their children’s daily activities.

While subsequent studies have highlighted internal class diversity in parenting practices, overall US and UK evidence supports the findings of the original study.⁵²⁻⁵⁴ In MCS children, stark social differences were found in participation in **enrichment activities**: double the proportion of

advantaged seven-year-olds participated in sports and other clubs compared with their disadvantaged peers, and 26 per cent of advantaged 11-year-olds took music lessons compared to 6 per cent of disadvantaged children.⁵⁵ The same study found an independent positive effect of sport and other organised activities on attainment at age 11.

More affluent parents are also able to buy additional academic support for their children: 11 to 16-year-old pupils from richer families are twice as likely to have ever received **private tuition** (30 per cent v 15 per cent), and between a third and a half of families who do not purchase private tuition for their children cite affordability as the reason.⁵⁶ Private tuition is becoming more common in England; 26 per cent of children have had a private tutor at some point – and 40 per cent in London – up from 18 per cent a decade ago. Of these children, close to two fifths were tutored specifically in preparation for a GCSE exam, and approximately a fifth for their grammar school entrance test.

The role of community disadvantage

For a more complete understanding of education outcomes, it is necessary to consider the broader context in which children grow up. However, few existing studies adequately account for the complex interplay between individual and place. There is some international evidence linking **neighbourhood poverty** to poorer child development, including worse cognitive skills and school readiness, after accounting for family socio-economic factors.⁵⁷ In the UK, area deprivation has been found to be independently associated with emotional and behavioural problems in young children; it is less clear if there is an independent impact on school attainment specifically, or whether the relationship is accounted for by family-level socio-economic factors.^{58,59} Pathways identified in the literature include **community social capital**, or the networks, norms and institutions that shape social interaction in a community, and **resources**, including access to green space and after school programmes or other activities that promote healthy child development, as well as **school quality** in school-aged children.^{57,60}

The most compelling evidence for the effect of place on child development and life chances comes from the US. Under the 1990s Moving to Opportunities experiment, 4,600 randomly selected families were given housing vouchers to move from high-poverty housing estates to lower-poverty neighbourhoods. Reviewing the impact almost two decades later, and controlling for a range of factors, researchers found that children who moved before adolescence were **more likely to attend post-secondary education** and went on to **earn 30 per cent more** than those that were not selected.⁶¹ They noted that as outcomes were only observed for children aged four or older, it is possible that the effect would be even stronger for younger children who move given the strong and lasting impact of early life adversity. A subsequent analysis tracking over seven million families and their moves over time found that outcomes improved the longer a child spent growing up in a better neighbourhood.⁶² Conversely the impact on older children was found to be negative – moves were posited to be more disruptive for older children with established relationships in their communities.

Other longitudinal studies from the US, using advanced modelling methods, find a strong neighbourhood effect on school performance indicators. Accounting for the impact of family socio-economic position throughout childhood as well as duration of exposure to area poverty, young people growing up in disadvantaged neighbourhoods were **significantly less likely to graduate**: among non-black children, growing up in the most deprived neighbourhoods was associated with a graduation prevalence of 87 per cent, v 95 per cent among those in the least disadvantaged areas;

among black children the proportions were 76 and 96 per cent respectively.⁶³ Research also suggests an intergenerational impact of community deprivation on **cognitive ability**: a family's exposure to neighbourhood poverty across two consecutive generations was found to reduce a child's cognitive ability by more than half a standard deviation.⁶⁴ Given this, the impact of community poverty, as well as other area-level factors, on school performance in English pupils warrants further investigation.

Inequalities in school preparedness

The factors reviewed above mean that disadvantaged pupils and their more privileged counterparts do not enter school on the same footing. Our analysis shows that children eligible for the Pupil Premium start school at a level of development 4.3 months behind their more advantaged peers; MCS five-year-olds in the lowest income tertile were found to be 2.9 points higher on a measure of behaviour problems and lagged **13.5 months** behind their high-income peers in vocabulary scores.⁶⁵ The gap in school readiness has an impact on the duration of pupils' academic careers and subsequent opportunities. Given that language is the foundation of learning and social interactions, the stark disparity in language development is especially significant.

Additionally, throughout their school years, disadvantaged children and young people are disproportionately more likely to **lack the necessary precursors** – a good level of health and well-being, a nutritious diet, a supportive and stimulating home environment – to learn and perform in school. Across practically every health outcome, disadvantaged children are worse off; notably, MCS children from low-income families are **four times as likely to have mental health difficulties**, and evidence suggests that social inequalities in behavioural and socio-emotional difficulties have gotten worse in the UK over time.^{60,66-68} There is a strong link between poverty and special educational needs or disabilities; **over a quarter of pupils eligible for FSM are also identified with SEND**.⁶⁹

Access to high quality early years education

High quality preschool has a positive impact on all round child development, attainment and adult earnings, with disadvantaged children benefiting in particular who experience a more deprived home learning environment.⁷⁰⁻⁷² A high quality early years environment means a skilled and experienced staff, who engage in warm and responsive interactions with children, a low child-to-staff ratio, a language rich environment, age appropriate curricula and materials in a safe physical setting.^{73,74}

However recent EPI research has identified concerning trends in the sector, including an increasing **reliance on unpaid staff** and a **decline in levels of qualifications**.⁷⁵ Our research has also found that the introduction of the 30-hour childcare entitlement, Tax-Free Childcare, and Universal Credit may **worsen the socio-economic gap in access**: a two-parent family on the national living wage and earning £19,000 per year is likely to receive 20 per cent less childcare subsidy for a child aged three or four than a two-parent family with annual earnings of £100,000, meaning that those on higher incomes will likely be the main beneficiaries of these policies.

Stressors experienced by disadvantaged children in school

Once in school, disadvantaged pupils tend to have a **different experience** compared to their more affluent peers: it is more likely to be characterised by instability, lower quality teaching and curricula, and psychosocial stressors arising from the disconnect between the school and home environments. We draw out these aspects in more detail below.

Mobility

Non-compulsory moves, at times other than the transition from primary to secondary, are strongly linked to social disadvantage, and especially affect certain low-attaining groups, notably Roma, Gypsy or Traveller children.^{76,77} An analysis of school census data from 2003 found that 30 per cent of movers were eligible for FSM compared to 17 per cent of stayers.⁷⁶

The research suggests that non-compulsory moves are detrimental for attainment. A meta-analysis of the impact of school mobility on reading and maths achievement in primary school found a three to four-month lag effect, while UK evidence suggests that it is the socio-demographic factors driving school moves that lead to reduced attainment in the primary phase.^{78,79} In secondary school, the independent impact of mobility on attainment is more clear-cut: at Key Stage 4, after accounting for individual characteristics, pupils who were mobile in Years 7 to 9 were found to experience a depressed average point score of over 20 points, while pupils mobile in Year 10 saw an average score 70 points lower than their non-mobile peers.⁸⁰ In addition, the transition from primary to secondary has been shown to be particularly difficult to navigate for disadvantaged pupils.⁸¹

Social psychological factors

It is well established that so-called ‘non-cognitive’ factors influence how a child performs in school. The **sense of alienation** felt by disadvantaged children and young people in education has been documented since the 1960s.⁸² Interview data from the last 20 years suggests that many continue to experience ‘education as failure.’² Despite increased access to higher education, 22 per cent of the most deprived state school pupils drop out of university within two years, compared to 7 per cent of the least deprived;⁸³ young people from disadvantaged backgrounds report feeling a sense of isolation – from both the middle-class university environment as well as from their own community.⁸⁴ A body of social psychological research supports this relationship:

- From a young age, pupils are **aware of social differences** and of how they may be perceived differently because of them.^{85,86} A host of experimental studies since the 1990s, mostly from the US, have shown that individuals who are part of negatively stereotyped groups are more likely to perform poorly in a context where the stereotype is invoked – a process known as **stereotype threat**.^{87,88} Two meta-analyses show that test scores systematically underestimate the academic ability of negatively stereotyped students.⁸⁹ This chimes with qualitative findings from the UK: drawing on interviews with young people across the socio-economic spectrum, Reay and colleagues concluded that ‘the shame and humiliation of being thought of as stupid [was] ever present’ for the disadvantaged children interviewed.²
- Findings from experimental studies suggest that a **sense of belonging** is one of the most important determinants of whether an individual decides to enter, continue or abandon a pursuit.⁹⁰ Belonging is associated with positive attitudes towards school, which are in turn positively predictive of attainment.^{91,92} In a 2018 study, Easterbrook and colleagues found

that, after accounting for attainment, lacking a sense of belonging and feeling that people from similar backgrounds did not usually do well in school significantly predicted lower GCSE grades, application to lower-ranked universities, worry about academic work and self-reported stress among pupils eligible for FSM.⁹³ The relationship was found to operate through **role model visibility**: individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds and communities may be less aware of people with similar backgrounds who have progressed successfully through education.

- **Attitudes and aspirations** are widely viewed as important drivers of the gap.⁹⁴ However, we should be wary of a simplistic interpretation of the evidence; it is necessary to consider the distinct impact of specific beliefs.⁹⁵ Much of the evidence suggests that most pupils and families have high educational and career ambitions.^{48,96-98} The evidence on the link between attainment and both aspirations and **attitudes towards education** is inconclusive, with a recent study of PISA data finding both an association between attitudes and achievement, and significantly more positive attitudes among first- and second-generation immigrant pupils than native children.^{98,99} The literature generally supports the notion that **beliefs about their own abilities** play a role in the lower attainment of disadvantaged pupils; these are likely partially a reflection of prior attainment, and also likely related to their experiences of education.¹⁰⁰⁻¹⁰² Qualitative evidence highlights the intergenerational nature of these beliefs.²
- Deprived children are less likely to feel a sense of control over their ability to affect outcomes at school – known as a lower **locus of control**.¹⁰¹ Studies show that this is a result of being under pressure to perform tasks in which they may lack confidence.¹⁰³ Evidence from the 1970 British Birth Cohort Study found locus of control at age 10 predicted educational achievement, while high-achieving disadvantaged children in the EPPSE had a stronger sense of agency than their low-achieving counterparts, however there is generally a shortage of evidence in this area.^{95,104,105}

Thus far, there is limited evidence to support the targeting of aspirations and attitudes to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils. There is some evidence that participation in programmes such as mentoring, service learning, outdoor adventure and social and emotional learning have been shown to have an impact on self-beliefs and other ‘non-cognitive’ skills that are important for school performance.¹⁰²

Differential school practices

Schools serving disadvantaged areas have more **complex needs** than those in more affluent areas. Funding premiums do not fully account for this complexity, including problems with teacher retention, low parental participation and a high prevalence of school absences that require investment in the home-school relationship. Moreover, as **volunteers and funds raised by schools themselves** become increasingly central to school activities, schools in more affluent areas stand to gain an additional advantage over those in more deprived parts of the country.¹⁰⁶

School-level factors are particularly important for the attainment of underprivileged and initially low-attaining children.^{107,108} Yet pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds are less likely to attend

good schools than their more advantaged peers.¹⁰⁹ Below we explore differences in school practices that may work to exacerbate the attainment gap.

Teaching

The most important school-level factor for pupil attainment is teacher effectiveness: evidence shows that the difference between being taught by a good versus bad teacher is equivalent to a whole year of learning for disadvantaged pupils.¹¹⁰ However, disadvantaged pupils are more likely to experience **lower quality teaching**. In schools serving disadvantaged communities, teachers, on average, are less likely to have a formal teaching qualification, have less experience, and are more likely to lack a degree in the relevant subject; these schools are also more likely to see a higher teacher turnover rate.¹¹¹ Within schools, pupils in lower sets and streams, who are disproportionately FSM-eligible, are more likely to be taught by less experienced teachers.¹¹² The **extra work** for teachers in schools with a higher intake of disadvantaged pupils, including providing emotional support, more one-on-one time with pupils with barriers to learning, and having to adapt to changing circumstances that come with high levels of mobility, may be more difficult for those with less experience.¹¹³

Additionally, schools with a higher intake of disadvantaged pupils have been shown to employ worse **classroom practices**. A study of 125 year 5 classes in the EPPSE found that schools with a higher intake of disadvantaged pupils offered fewer opportunities for pupils to practice maths problem solving and demonstrate subject knowledge in the classroom, less social support for learning eg taking every pupil's contribution seriously and using pupil error as a learning opportunity, and poorer organisation of work and classes.¹¹⁴

Unconscious bias

Furthermore, some evidence suggests disadvantaged and other minority pupil groups experience unconscious bias in the classroom. A study of teacher assessments of MCS primary school pupils' reading and maths attainment found that these varied according to family income, ethnicity, special educational needs status, spoken language and gender.¹¹⁵ An analysis of school census data found that black and poor white British pupils were **marked down in teacher assessment** relative to their Key Stage results, while Indian and Chinese pupils were marked up, after controlling for individual characteristics and school effects; discriminatory marking was found to be more pronounced in areas with fewer black or poor children, and teacher assessments were found to be partially informed by the past year's performance of members of the pupil's group.¹¹⁶ Other studies show that the allocation of pupils to 'ability' groups is often done on an inconsistent and subjective basis: disadvantaged pupils are more likely to be allocated to lower attainment groups, after controlling for prior attainment.¹¹⁷⁻¹¹⁹

The evidence is clear that there are **systemic inequities** according to socio-economic position, ethnicity and gender in how schools discipline children.¹²⁰⁻¹²² Notably, even when a comprehensive set of factors including attainment and SEND are accounted for, black Caribbean pupils are still more likely to be excluded, indicating systemic bias in how exclusions are administered.¹²³ School exclusion is one of the most important risk factors for poor attainment and later life outcomes.

Attainment grouping

Across the English education system, grouping pupils according to attainment, whether into streams, sets or within classes, is the norm. Despite this, research from the last 30 years show that these practices have a negligible impact on pupil achievement, with the Education Endowment Fund's review indicating a negative impact on the attainment of pupils in lower attainment groups – who are disproportionately disadvantaged – and a positive effect on pupils in higher attainment groups.¹²⁴⁻¹²⁶

There are several explanations for this. Aside from the evidence showing unconscious bias in how pupils are allocated into groups, placement into lower streams or sets can be **stigmatising**, and can **undermine confidence**, discourage learners' beliefs that they can affect outcomes through effort, and negatively affect attitudes and engagement in the long term.^{2,100} Moreover, pupils in low-attaining groups have been shown to be more likely to experience worse quality teaching and fewer educational opportunities.¹²⁷

Curriculum

Disadvantaged pupils tend to have less access to a **broad curriculum** compared to their advantaged peers. In Years 5 and 6, the amount of time spent teaching languages was found to be negatively related to the proportion of FSM pupils: 13 per cent of high FSM schools teach languages for less than 30 minutes per week compared to 7 per cent of low FSM schools.¹²⁸ There is also evidence that pupils in high-deprivation schools have fewer opportunities for **out-of-classroom education**.¹²⁹ A range of studies show that educational experiences outside of the classroom benefit attainment, and skills crucial to school performance, including motivation, behaviour and self-esteem – factors that have been linked to the gap.¹⁰⁴ Schools that require parental contributions to fund these experiences restrict access to children from low-income families.

Furthermore, over the last two decades, **careers advice** and **work experience** have been significantly reduced in schools, and disadvantaged pupils are currently less likely than their better-off peers to receive careers guidance.^{68,130} This may be particularly detrimental, as disadvantaged young people may lack social networks with the knowledge and contacts to replace guidance offered in school.

Education Scrutiny Committee

Meeting to be held on Wednesday, 5 February 2020

Electoral Division affected: (All Divisions);
--

Education Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20

(Appendix 'A' refers)

Contact for further information:

Craig Alker, Tel: 01772 537997, Business Support Officer,
craig.alker@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

The work programme for the Education Scrutiny Committee is attached at Appendix 'A'.

The topics included were identified at the work planning workshop held on 22 July 2019.

Recommendation

The Education Scrutiny Committee is asked to:

- i. Note and comment on the report and work programme;
- ii. Discuss and confirm the topics scheduled for the next meeting and reasons for scrutiny.

Background and Advice

A statement of the work to be undertaken and considered by the Education Scrutiny Committee for the 2019/20 municipal year is set out at Appendix 'A'. The work programme will be presented to each meeting for consideration.

Members are requested to note and comment on the report and to discuss and confirm the topics scheduled for the next meeting and reasons for scrutiny.

Consultations

N/A

Implications:

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

Risk management

This report has no significant risk implications.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 List of Background Papers

Paper	Date	Contact/Tel
-------	------	-------------

None		
------	--	--

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A

Education Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20

The Education Scrutiny Committee Work Programme details the planned activity to be undertaken over the forthcoming municipal year through scheduled Committee meetings, task group, events and through use of the 'rapporteur' model.

The items on the work programme are determined by the Committee following the work programming session at the start of the municipal year in line with the Overview and Scrutiny Committees terms of reference detailed in the County Councils Constitution. This includes provision for the rights of County Councillors to ask for any matter to be considered by the Committee or to call-in decisions.

Coordination of the work programme activity is undertaken by the Chair and Deputy Chair of all of the Scrutiny Committees to avoid potential duplication.

In addition to the terms of reference outlined in the [Constitution](#) (Part 2 Article 5) for all Overview and Scrutiny Committees, the Education Scrutiny Committee will:

- Scrutinise matters relating to education delivered by the authority and other relevant partners
- Fulfil all the statutory functions of an Overview and Scrutiny Committee as they relate to education functions of a Children's Services Authority

The Work Programme will be submitted to and agreed by the Scrutiny Committees at each meeting and will be published with each agenda.

The dates are indicative of when the Education Scrutiny Committee will review the item, however they may need to be rescheduled and new items added as required.

Topic	Scrutiny Purpose	Lead Officers/ Organisation	Proposed Date(s)	Recommendations	Progress
Schools Finance	To receive an update on the schools financial position	Andrew Good	22 July 2019	Noted	NA
Early Education	Overview of service provision and current challenges	Paul Duckworth Mel Foster Kate Dewhurst	22 July 2019	All county councillors be provided with details on the local offer of early year's places for all districts including service planning areas to support the service and parents in the consideration of early year's providers where there is capacity.	
Maintained Nurseries	Update on financial position and the working group	Andrew Good Paul Foster Mel Foster Kate Dewhurst	22 July 2019	Noted	NA
Task group update	Progress on recommendations from Pupils at Special School with Medical Conditions task group	Head of Policy, Information and Commissioning	29 October 2019	The committee be provided with the names of the schools in the Lancashire area to encourage responses to the data gathering exercise questionnaire	Received – only 2 SEMH schools in Lancs where SS nursing services is not provided, therefore response not required.
SEND	Self-assessment ahead of SEND inspection. Focus on inspection preparation	Head of Inclusion	29 October 2019	Noted	

Lancashire Schools - attainment data	Attainment outcomes report	Director of Education and Skills Head of Education, Quality and Performance	5 February 2020		
Schools Causing Concern task group	Final draft report	Chair of task group	3 March 2020		
SEND Provision Development	Progress update on the implementation of principles following August Cabinet report	Head of Inclusion	3 March 2020		
Early Years Strategy	Update on strategy progress with health	Head of Education, Quality and Performance Health representative – TBC	3 March 2020		
SEND Inspection	Outcome of local area inspection	Head of Inclusion Director of Education and Skills	TBC		

NEET (not in education, employment or training)	Update on progress to reduce numbers of NEET in Lancashire. To include how child poverty impacts on numbers of NEET and how this is addressed	Director of Education and Skills 16-19 Skills Lead	TBC		
Lancashire Breaktime	Proposal for future delivery following review agreed at August Cabinet	Head of Inclusion	TBC		
Outdoor Education Provision	Physical education in schools – grant funding to support PE and sport activities – outcomes and impact	TBC	TBC		
Briefing Notes					
Transitions	Have we got it right? – Work undertaken by steering group? Include children's to adults services and special schools to further education	Transitions steering group - TBC			
Exclusions	Progress on the strategies to support reduction	Head of Education, Quality and Performance			
Elective Home Education guidance	Policy updates following release of EHE guidance in April 2019. To include: Data on numbers children withdrawn from school	Head of Education, Quality and Performance			

	How does neglect strategy feed into EHE service provision				
Schools causing concern	Annual update	Head of Financial Management (Development and Schools)			
Information Sessions (BSBs)					
School admissions	Locality information sessions on school admissions, place planning process, support and standards	TBC	TBC		

Other potential topics:

Schools transport – SEND transport policy, SEND transport arrangements, PRU consultation outcome

SEN equipment in schools – review of 'fit for purpose' equipment in schools

*Exclusions

Child poverty - effects on education and how pupil premium is making a difference. To include armed forces families mentor funding

Parking at schools

Maintained nurseries (following Cabinet report in January)

Early Help inspection outcome