

## Lancashire County Council

### Education Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 15 July, 2014 at 10.00 am in Cabinet Room 'C' - County Hall, Preston

#### Agenda

##### Part 1 (Open to Press and Public)

No.	Item
-----	------

1.	<b>Apologies</b>
----	------------------

2.	<b>Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests</b>
----	--

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.	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2014</b>	(Pages 1 - 8)
----	--	---------------

4.	<b>Lancashire Learning Excellence</b>	(Pages 9 - 20)
----	---------------------------------------	----------------

5.	<b>Lancashire Youth Council Consultation Report</b>	(Pages 21 - 30)
----	---	-----------------

6.	<b>Report of the Pupil Premium and Attainment Task Group</b>	(Pages 31 - 54)
----	--	-----------------

7.	<b>Work Plan and Task Group Update</b>	(Pages 55 - 60)
----	--	-----------------

8.	<b>Urgent Business</b>
----	------------------------

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.

**9. Date of the Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the Committee is due to be held at 10.00am on the 21 October 2014 in Cabinet Room 'C' – The Duke of Lancaster Room, County Hall, Preston.

I M Fisher  
County Secretary and Solicitor

County Hall  
Preston

# Agenda Item 3

## Lancashire County Council

### Education Scrutiny Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday, 17 June, 2014 at 2.00 pm in Cabinet Room 'C' - The Duke of Lancaster Room, County Hall, Preston**

#### **Present:**

County Councillor Cynthia Dereli (Chair)

#### **County Councillors**

T Aldridge	C Henig
P Buckley	S Holgate
Mrs S Charles	D Lord
A Cheetham	S Perkins
C Crompton	M Perks
B Dawson	C Wakeford

#### **Co-opted members**

Mr Kenvyn Wales, Representing Free Church Schools  
Mr John Withington, Representing Parent Governors  
(Primary)

#### **1. Apologies**

County Councillors Steven Holgate and Terry Aldridge replaced County Councillors Bev Murray and Misfar Hassan respectively, for this meeting.

Apologies for absence were presented on behalf of co-opted members Janet Hamid, Teresa Jones and Fred Kershaw

#### **2. Appointment of Chair and Deputy Chair**

It was reported that Full Council, at its meeting on 15 May 2014, had approved the appointment of County Councillor Cynthia Dereli as Chair of the Committee and County Councillor Susie Charles as Deputy Chair for 2014/15.

**Resolved:** That the appointment of County Councillor Cynthia Dereli as Chair of the Committee and County Councillor Susie Charles as Deputy Chair for 2014/15 be noted.

### **3. Membership, Terms of Reference and Programme of Meetings.**

A report was presented on the Membership and Terms of Reference of the Committee.

**Resolved:** That the Membership and Terms of Reference of the Committee, as now reported, be noted.

### **4. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

None disclosed

### **5. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2014**

The Minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee meeting held on the 11 March 2014 were presented and agreed, subject to the inclusion of apologies from Mr K Wales.

**Resolved:** That the Minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee held on the 11 March 2014, as now amended, be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

### **6. Transport Policy for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities**

The Chair welcomed County Councillor Matthew Tomlinson, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Schools who was attending the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 23.6(4) in order to respond to questions and comments.

She also welcomed and introduced the following officers from the Directorate for Children and Young People.

- Louise Taylor – Interim Executive Director for Children and Young People
- Sally Riley - Head of Inclusion and Disability Support Scheme.

The Chair then introduced County Councillors Michael Green and Graham Gooch who had been invited to attend the meeting in order to present the case in support of the call-in.

### **Purpose of the Meeting**

Wendy Broadley explained that following the request from five county councillors, as set out in the report, this special meeting of the Committee had been called in order to discuss whether the Committee wished to formally "call in" the decision by the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Schools to introduce a

parental contribution for discretionary post-16 transport support for young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).

It was explained that the Committee would initially hear presentations from County Councillors Green and Gooch, followed by the cabinet member. Members of the Committee would then have an opportunity to ask questions or clarify any issues before making a decision in relation to the formal 'call in'.

The Committee was reminded that the purpose of the meeting was not to consider the cabinet member's actual decision but to determine if and on what grounds the cabinet member could be asked to reconsider it.

At the Chair's invitation, County Councillor Green presented reasons for the call in request. He contended that the cabinet member had failed to take proper account of the 630 responses to the consultation, 80% of which had been opposed to the changes being considered and that insufficient account had been taken of the needs of young people with SEND. He referred to what he described as a frank and thorough discussion at the Executive Scrutiny Committee following which that Committee had resolved to suggest amendments to the proposals. These included a recommendation that the annual increase to the parental contribution be based on the Retail Price Index only and that the proposed additional 5% annual increase be dropped. He expressed the view that the policy would have the greatest impact on vulnerable members of society, and also that the changes would have a significant impact on the educational achievements of young people with SEND, restricting their choice of school/college, and perhaps whether to attend at all.

County Councillor Gooch expressed significant concerns with the consultation, in particular that insufficient efforts had been made to secure a wide range of responses, and also that, in his view, that it had been a cosmetic exercise with positions already established before the responses came in. He referred to relevant legislation including that which placed an obligation on local authorities to ensure those with a disability can access education. He said that disabled young people were already over-represented in the NEET (not in education, employment or training) group; this proposal would make matters worse by "pricing out learners" and would also impact on those hoping to attend university by preventing them from obtaining the necessary qualifications. He felt that the decision taken discriminated against disadvantaged young people.

Sally Riley provided some context and background to the current position relating to discretionary transport for young people with SEND, much of which was also set out in the report which had been provided in the agenda papers.

She summarised the financial implications of discretionary transport for the county council and also for service users and explained that the cabinet member's decision aligned the transport policy for young people with SEND with the mainstream transport policy.

She explained that every effort had been made to conduct a comprehensive consultation - 2,500 direct letters had been sent to service users, proposals had

been available on-line, and the consultation had been conducted in the same way as the consultation for mainstream transport provision. Every response had been read.

It was explained that this county council's approach to transport support was comparable with that of other local authorities, most of which were consulting on discretionary charges and the cabinet member's decision was in line with what was happening nationally.

Much work was ongoing to actively reduce the overall spend on transport provision, for example the 'one school, one operator' approach currently being trialled at three special schools.

Sally Riley emphasised that nothing was being done that would limit opportunities for this group of young people and the county council was doing its best to provide as many opportunities as possible to allow young people to develop.

County Councillor Tomlinson added that his decision had been taken in the context of significant financial pressure on the county council. He emphasised that this type of transport provision was discretionary and that the parental contribution had been set at a level that fell in the middle of the range set by other authorities nationally. The 5% annual increase had been set to allow service users to plan with some certainty for future years' increases. Also, he believed that setting the level of increase now would reduce the possibility of a decision to apply a larger increase in the future. He refuted suggestions that the consultation had been inadequate and said that the vast majority of service users would be unaffected by his decision. He was confident that his decision had been fair, transparent and sustainable.

The Chair then invited comments and questions from the Committee; the main points are summarised below:

- It was suggested that £475 per annum was a large sum of money to request from families in the first year of charging and that increases equivalent to the RPI plus 5% would be much higher than families would receive in their salaries. It would be more difficult for families with more than one child and it was families and carers just above the free school meals threshold who would be most affected; a smaller increase would be preferred.
- In response to a question how many young people would be affected by this decision, it was anticipated that 235 would be affected in year 1; 219 in year 2; and 217 in year 3. 90% of young people would be in receipt of free transport; 10% were affected. It would be the same figure whether or not the young person was in the mainstream category or the SEND category.
- It was pointed out that the outcomes of the consultation had been prepared by the Corporate Intelligence Unit – completely separate from the Children and Young People Directorate.
- Members acknowledged that there were a number of checks and balances within the decision, including a review of the arrangements within 12 months. It was important, however, to ensure that families did not experience hardship

and reassurance was sought that means testing would be robust. In response, it was explained that the same approach that applies throughout the council would be taken, with the possibility of expanding the criteria to achieve a more explicit understanding of whether or not the family was eligible for the charge.

- Sally Riley said that some families have access to a mobility vehicle, which could be used to transport the young person to school, with the ability to make a claim for mileage if appropriate.
- It was suggested that the cabinet member's decision be delayed until the implications of the new SEN Code of Practice had been fully considered.
- The cabinet member again explained that he had decided to apply a 5% increase to provide some future certainty to those affected by the charges.
- The Committee was reassured that robust systems were in place to support families with children with SEND. The point was made that young people with SEND do not themselves wish to be treated differently from others, however, if a family's financial circumstances changed help would be available; there was an ongoing commitment that all young people would have the opportunity to attend further education.
- In response to a direct question to CC Green asking what he felt should have been done differently in the consultation process, CC Green said he was concerned that the consultation had allowed for only one reply per household. Sally Riley reminded the Committee that anyone could respond on-line including others in the household.
- The Chair reminded the Committee that means testing was not 'fool proof' and that there was an appeals process available for families who were judged as ineligible for free transport.
- It was recognised that it was important for all young people, including those who might have a range of difficulties in differing degrees, to feel part of their peer group. The Committee was assured that the policy covered all needs and the level of support was adjusted, as appropriate, to enable the young person to get to school or college. There was a range of skilled support staff, including SEN assessment staff and social workers, working alongside each other and educational services to provide a holistic approach.
- Regarding the conduct of the consultation, a question was asked whether there was any information to suggest that the consultation had been conducted differently from any other, or whether there was evidence that the cabinet member had not been dutiful in taking account of the responses. The cabinet member again confirmed that the consultation had been sent directly to every parent/guardian of children and young people in receipt of SEN school or college transport and that each response had been looked at. The views of the Executive Scrutiny Committee had been considered and one of its recommendations accepted. He asserted that his actions had "not been perverse or unusual".
- Sally Riley confirmed that the methodology had been exactly the same as that relating to mainstream transport. The letter referred to above had been an exceptional step. Additionally, the consultation had been available to all on the 'Have Your Say' website. The Lancashire Parent Carer Forum had also received the consultation (all consultees were listed in the report). It was

understandable that mixed views had been received – some in favour and some against.

- CC Gooch reiterated his point that the responses from families affected would have been predictable. He said that disability discrimination legislation allowed for positive discrimination and that the transport policy for young people with SEND should not be aligned to the mainstream policy; this group deserved more support.
- The cabinet member's assertion that applying a 5% annual increase allowed service users to plan was challenged as invalid and not legitimate, and it was suggested that it was this element of his decision that should be reconsidered.
- The Consultation document referred to concerns raised by Cardinal Newman College that a number of pupils would have to change colleges mid-way through their course. Sally Riley reported that she had re-iterated to the MP and also the college that the proposed approach was about finding the most appropriate course for the young person and, if that was delivered at a college further away than their nearest college, transport would be provided; there would be no disadvantage in that respect.

Following the discussion, the Chair invited County Councillors Green and Gooch to make closing comments.

County Councillor Green pointed out that the recommendations of the Executive Scrutiny Committee had had cross party support. He felt that a parental contribution of £475 from the outset of charging was excessive, as was an increase equivalent to the RPI plus 5%. He recognised the financial pressures on the authority, but felt that this proposal would impact on the most vulnerable people in Lancashire, and he was asking the cabinet member to look again at the impact of his decision on the vulnerable and take proper account of the recommendations of the Executive Scrutiny Committee; his decision appeared to have been taken quickly and without proper account of the views of that Committee.

County Councillor Gooch also asserted that families would be unable to afford the additional annual 5% increase.

County Councillor Tomlinson replied that he had taken a difficult decision, but in doing so had built in checks and balances. He was confident that the consultation methodology had been fair and transparent and had gone beyond what would normally be expected. He had met with Cabinet colleagues, including the Leader, following the meeting of Executive Scrutiny Committee to discuss the recommendations made by that Committee and had accepted one of four proposed changes. He assured this Committee that he had had due regard to the views of Executive Scrutiny.

Following the debate, it was moved and seconded that the Cabinet Member should not be asked to reconsider his decision made on 5 June 2014 in relation to the introduction of a parental contribution for home to school/college transport for young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).



On being put to the vote the motion carried and it was:

**Resolved:** that the Cabinet Member should not be asked to reconsider his decision made on the 5 June 2014 in relation to the introduction of a parental contribution for home to school/college transport for young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).

**7. Urgent Business**

No urgent business was reported.

**8. Date of the Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday 15 July 2014 at 10.00am at County Hall, Preston.

I M Fisher  
County Secretary and Solicitor

County Hall  
Preston



**Education Scrutiny Committee**  
Meeting to be held on 15 July 2014

Electoral Division affected: None
--------------------------------------

## **Lancashire Learning Excellence**

Contact for further information:  
Bob Stott, 01772 531652, Children and Young People,  
[Bob.stott@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:Bob.stott@lancashire.gov.uk)

### **Executive Summary**

The purpose of this report is to provide Education Scrutiny with an update around the "school facing" traded services which are delivered by the County Council to education providers within Lancashire and beyond the County. Lancashire has a long history of delivering high quality services to support schools and other educational providers in delivering to children and young people.

The 2011 Education White Paper "The importance of teaching" stressed that Local Authorities should develop a new relationship with their schools around delivering services. Lancashire undertook a major review with all school partners across the Autumn of 2011 and Spring 2012 focussing of the types of traded services which were valued and which schools wanted the County Council to deliver. That consultation led to a refinement in the services that we offer through Lancashire Learning Excellence and the way in which services are presented through the schools portal.

This report will focus on traded services delivered under the Lancashire learning Excellence "umbrella" as well as those delivered by the Schools Human Resources Service. Traded services are a key aspect of the support given to schools within the county to improve outcomes for children and young people.

### **Recommendation**

Education Scrutiny is asked to consider and comment on this report and to receive further updates as appropriate.

## **Background and Advice**

### **Lancashire Learning Excellence**

Lancashire Learning Excellence (LLE) is the name given to a family of services from within CYP Directorate that trade with schools and other education providers. The overriding principle is that the development of Lancashire Learning Excellence

should, even from the early stages, be focused on reducing bureaucracy, increasing efficiency and finding savings, which will benefit schools in Lancashire.

A report commissioned by Lancashire County Council and undertaken by Graham Talbot of Graham Talbot Associates Ltd, an independent consultancy set the context for the development of Lancashire Learning Excellence. The report lists various options for Lancashire County Council to configure its school improvement services through a traded arrangement with schools and other settings.

A presentation to headteachers at the Executive Director's Conference in January 2013 raised important questions both from the headteachers and from staff. The feedback from this conference and other conversations with schools resulted in a decision to make any change to the current traded arrangements only after further consultation.

A 'slow burn' introduction was agreed to ensure that schools and other potential customers were not alarmed or concerned by what might appear to be a major change, particularly as their only experience of change akin to this has not been a wholly positive one. Since 2013 schools have received updates on LLE development through officers attending Lancashire Association of Secondary School Headteachers and Primary Headteachers in Lancashire. County Union Secretaries have also been updated on progress.

### **Governance Arrangements**

Lancashire Learning Excellence is managed through a management board supported by a Partnership Board capable of reflecting the views of Lancashire schools as core users of the service.

Lancashire Learning Excellence Board

Chair Mike Hart (*Director CYP*)

Bob Stott (*Director CYP*)

Andrew Good (*Head of Finance (CYP)*)

Jonathan Hewitt (*Head of Quality and Continuous Improvement*)

Stan Johnson (*Head of Development and Innovation*)

Sally Riley (*Head of Inclusion and Disability Services*)

Lancashire Learning Excellence Partnership Board

Alison Callon (*Clitheroe Pendle Primary School*);

Sue Conron (*Duke Street Nursery School, Chorley*)

Suzanne Fish (*Lytham St Annes Mayfield Primary School*);

Ann Gray (*Bishop Martin Church of England Primary School, Skelmersdale*)

Sue Kitto (*Holly Grove School, Burnley*);

Christopher Riding (*All Hallows Catholic High School, Penwortham, Preston*);

Ruth Ross (*St Mary's Catholic Primary School, Cloughton-on-Brock*);

LA Officers: Mike Hart (Chair); Jonathan Hewitt; Stan Johnson; Bob Stott  
Services within the Lancashire Learning excellence Family:

The services currently operating within the group are:

- Quality and Continuous Improvement (QCI), School Improvement
- Governor Services
- Lancashire Professional Development Service (Learning Excellence)
- Lancashire Music Service
- Inclusion and Disability Support Services (DSS) Traded Service
- Graduate Teacher Programme (School Salaried Direct)
- Lancashire Outdoor Education Service
- Lancashire Teaching Agency (Supply Agency)

Services being included in the Lancashire Learning Excellence family must meet stringent tests on their ability to achieve full cost recovery. Where the whole team is effectively 'traded' this is a relatively simple application of unit cost analysis (including all on costs) and effective pricing of services. Where services are 'part traded' this is a more complex and the teams joining LLE with a variety of income streams may require additional support to establish the relationships between activity and funding streams. Although the commercial performance against key performance indicators for each service will be undertaken by the central team through their monitoring and evaluation role the responsibility for performance and for meeting financial targets will remain with the service manager.

It is a key principle that the services should meet an agreed set of quality standards. These standards are (draft).

- All goods and services are quality assured to meet the individual school's changing needs and the standards of the relevant regulatory/ governing bodies
- All services are delivered by teams who are competent, fully trained and have the required current qualifications, knowledge and experience linked to their area of work.
- Schools will be offered flexibility and choice to provide the right level of service at the right time.
- Services will listen to schools and respond quickly and effectively to feedback
- There will be consultation on service development and improvement ensuring that Lancashire LE continues to develop and provide services and products that meet the needs and expectations of schools
- All data and information collected will be managed in accordance to Data Protection and Information Security Legislation:

Work has also been undertaken to establish the rights of the user in terms of customer expectation and quality assurance. The following is a 'working draft ':

*Services within Lancashire Learning Excellence have agreed to endeavour to meet the highest service standards. If a service fails to meet these standards then individual schools can raise the issue with any visiting LCC officer, or by email\* or phone.\* The Business support unit of Lancashire Learning Excellence will pass on any complaints to the service provider with the expectation that the service concerned will contact the school and resolve the issue within a period of 10 working days. Should the issue remain unresolved then the Lancashire Learning Excellence Board will have the authority to reimburse the school an agreed portion of any fees*

*paid or service level agreement contract costs commensurate with the level of failure of service should the complaint be upheld.*

### **Delivery of traded services outside Lancashire**

Changes in government's attitude to the role of Local Authorities in school improvement set the scene for the trading of services both within and outside the local authority footprint. Lancashire Professional Development Service (LPDS) has established trading in cities such as Leeds, Liverpool, London, Manchester and Birmingham. The demand for advisory services and governors' support services beyond the Lancashire borders remains untested, although some provision has been provided by direct request. There are plans to expand into these markets in order to complement the current portfolio of 'externally' traded services and to supplement income from Lancashire schools where capacity exists and where the needs of Lancashire schools are not compromised. Traded services delivered outside Lancashire are charged at a higher level than those to county schools.

Successful arrangements has been sustained with Wigan schools (The Forward Together Alliance) and Salford Local Authority for the provision of professional development courses and consultancy. In other local authorities such as Sefton, Bolton and Knowsley, groups of schools have commissioned curriculum based consultancy or training courses.

External programmes of course delivery and consultancy continue in London, Liverpool, Leeds and Manchester although this is not part of any arrangement with the local authority. In addition exploratory programmes have been undertaken in Nottingham and Durham. These have not been established as future centres and a limited range of provision has been offered.

Services such as LPDS have secured national and regional contracts to provide curriculum support to schools (eg The Literacy team were DfE recognised providers of phonics training and LPDS are preferred providers for some school clusters and academy chains). Such contracts enhance the reputation of the service and place it in the national context. This might be of significant importance if the DfE choose to regulate or license school improvement providers. It is therefore important that Lancashire Learning Excellence seeks such contracts particularly when Lancashire schools can be the beneficiaries (eg Phonics training).

A recent visit by the DfE to review the quality of support provided for schools in preparation for the new National Curriculum described Lancashire's provision to be "... *at the forefront of curriculum implementation*" and "*The materials/resources and events that your department have developed/organised/co-ordinated are of the best I have seen.*". The officer concluded "*The schools in Lancashire should be very proud and lucky to have such a strong support network in your staff, I can confirm that other if not most LA's do not compare.*"

## Centralised business and administrative support

The provision of business support and the administration of training and consultancy for the Lancashire Learning Excellence family are, for the most part, undertaken by the team within LPDS. This has been expanded to develop additional capacity and to provide service expertise with the addition of two posts (3 staff) from Inclusion and Disability Support Service (Traded) business support officers. It is intended that service knowledge and expertise is protected and grown within this team to ensure that the customer experience is positive and relationships with schools are enhanced. As a measure of the business support team's efficiency drive it has reduced the total number within the team to 11 from over 30 posts in the original set up of the business support for each of the individual services.

The Centre for Learning Excellence (Woodlands) accommodates the central support teams. The current layout provides office accommodation and small ICT training suites. The co-location of those business support officers who support traded activity continues to generate efficiency across the team whilst retaining specialist support to schools seeking help on course and consultancy commissioning.

The aim is that this team becomes 'self-sufficient' covering its costs from income generated through charging services for support.

## Development and Innovation

Traded Activity 2013/14

### **Lancashire Professional Development Service**

Total Course Bookings	25111
Total Course Attendance (All groups)	22700
Total Course LPDS	11039
Total Events Planned (All Groups)	1357
Number of Events Planned LPDS only	820

### **LPDS Consultancies 2013/2014**

Consultancy bookings (All Groups)	1755
Consultancy bookings (LPDS)	1233

### **Inclusion & Disability Support Service (Traded)**

<b>IDSS Academic Year 2013/2014</b>	
Specialist Teaching	375 schools
Counselling Service	35 Schools
Educational Psychology	105 Schools

### **Lancashire Music Service**

Number of Specialist teachers	140+
Pupils taught per week (Approx)	16,000
Pupils attending Music Centres (12 centres)	900 per week
Access to live music performance in school	20,000 pupils
<b>Individual Pupil Achievement</b>	
Arts Award	300 pupils

Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music - Music Medals	600 pupils
Graded Certificate Practical Examination	79 pupils
<b>On line study</b>	
Number of active licensed schools	416 schools
Individual teacher accounts within those schools	910 teachers
Teachers' usage	284,578 page views
Teacher' time on line	94,560 minutes
Pupils' usage	344,375 page views
Pupils' time on line	556,080 minutes
Average time on line per pupil	35 minutes
Schools with pupils signed up for <i>Music World</i> Program	369 schools
Pupils completing <i>Music World</i> Program	5750 pupils
<b>Advanced Performance</b>	
Students auditioned and accessing County Bands or Orchestras.	270 pupils
County Ensembles	2 Orchestras 2 Concert Bands 1 Brass Bands 2 Jazz Orchestras
Instruments on loan to schools	20,000

### **Lancashire Outdoor Education Service**

	BH	TW	HL	WH	TOTAL
Schools Booking Residential Stays	64	77	84	83	308
Residential Guests	1905	2054	2799	2000	8758
Number of Day Visits	59	60	70	113	302
Day -Visit Pupils	2525	1109	2171	2700	8505
Total Schools	115	96	154	196	561
Total Pupils	4430	3163	4970	4700	17263
Inset Days	196				196
Conference Days	117	1	18		136
Conference/ inset Guests	2546	112	256		2914
Lancashire Break Time Visits					46
Lancashire Break Time Guests					486

### **Lancashire Governor Services**

Number of Governors in Lancashire	9000+
% of LCC Maintained Schools using Clerking/Governing Body Adviser Services	84%
% of LCC Maintained Schools Governor Services to support their own clerk/GB Adviser	11%
% of LCC Maintained schools buying Governor Services	95%
% of Academies using Clerking/Governing Body Adviser Services	58%



% of Academies using Governor Services to support own clerk/GB Adviser	8%
% of Academies buying Governor Services	66%
Number of meetings facilitated across all schools	3350

### **Initial Teacher Training (Schools Direct salaried)**

Trainees	Current	12/13
Primary	26	22
Secondary	27	51

### **NQT Steering Group**

<b>Schools buying LCC as the Appropriate Body</b>	
LCC Schools	
Academies	14
Independent Schools	9
FE Colleges	2
<b>NQTs</b>	
Total NQTs Registered	498
NQTs Requiring Additional Support	59
NQTs supported by LPDS	16
NQT supported within own school provision	22
NQTs now passed having had support	6
NQTs resigned or ending short-term contracts	15

### **Woodlands Conferencing**

Woodlands footfall 2013/14 was **68,900**.

<b>Footfall 12/13</b>			
Total Footfall	60,626	Total Bookings	2720
External	4,355		174
Edge Hill University	5,141		277
LCC Conferences	18,384		357
Schools (CPD)	10,934		473
LCC Meetings	21,812		1439

### **Quality and Continuous Improvement (QCI)**

<b>Schools that purchase the School Service Guarantee</b>	
<b>Primary</b>	
	482
LCC (maintained)	472
Academies (in Lancashire)	7
External	3
<b>Secondary</b>	
	67
LCC (maintained)	61
Academies (in Lancashire)	6
<b>Special schools</b>	
LCC (maintained)	26

## LTA

2013/14 Schools Using LTA	
Primary	205
Secondary	26
Special	16
TOTAL	247

Number of Teacher Days	22,215
Support Staff Days	16,618

## Outcomes

The information set out below shows that key outcomes in Lancashire schools are better than the national average in most areas and compare well with similar local authorities. The quality of provision in schools across Lancashire is also improving well and is better than that found nationally and amongst most statistical neighbours. Clearly, this success is due to the hard work undertaken by governors, head teachers and their teaching staff in classrooms all over the County. Nevertheless feedback from schools and Ofsted reports indicate that the support given to schools by LA traded services is highly valued and helps contribute to these outcomes.

### Key messages

- There is an improving trend in achievement in Lancashire with better than average attainment at all Key Stages except Key Stage 1
- There is an improving trend in achievement in the achievement of FSM pupils but KS4 performance remains below average for this group of pupils
- The proportion of good or better schools is above average with a better rate of improvement in Lancashire than that found nationally
- Support for schools is based on a traded model of school improvement where around 99% of primary schools and over 80% of Secondary schools buy in
- There is very strong school to school support across Lancashire with around 24 National Leaders in Education (NLE), over 40 Local Leaders in Education (LLE) and 9 Teaching School Alliances
- There is a strong track record of school improvement for schools requiring special support through support, challenge and intervention

## Outcomes

### Early Years Foundation Stage: Good performance

#### Overall

- 59% reached a good level of development
- 7% above national average
- Top quartile statistical neighbours

#### FSM

- 40% reached a good level of development
- 4% above national average

### **Key Stage 1: Key area for improvement**

#### Overall

- Improving performance in Reading Writing and Maths but remained just below national average for all pupils
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Quartile of statistical neighbours

#### FSM

- Improving performance in Reading Writing and Maths but remained below national average for FSM pupils

### **Key Stage 2: Good performance**

#### Overall

- Improving performance with 77% reaching level 4+ in reading, writing and maths combined
- 1% above national average
- Consistently above national average in recent years
- 2<sup>nd</sup> quartile statistical neighbours

#### FSM

- Improving performance with 60% reaching L4+ in reading, writing and maths combined
- In line with national average
- Consistently in line with national average in recent years

### **Key Stage 4: Good performance overall but FSM is key area for improvement**

#### Overall

- Improving performance with 60% gaining 5+ A\*-C GCSEs including English and maths
- Slightly above national average (0.4%)
- Consistently above national average in recent years
- 2<sup>nd</sup> quartile statistical neighbours

#### FSM

- Improving performance with 36% gaining 5+ A\*-C GCSEs including English and maths
- Below national average (0.4%)
- Consistently below national average in recent years

### **School performance**

#### **Nursery schools**

- All nursery schools in Lancashire are good or better
- This is above the national average

### **Primary schools**

- 86% of primary schools are good or better rising from 69% in 2012
- This is above the national average of 80%
- Lancashire is in the top quartile compared with statistical neighbours
- There is a strong track record of improvement over the past 2 years (Lancs +17% good; Eng +11% good)
- Under 1% of schools are in an OfSTED category of concern
- The proportion of schools below the Floor Standard has reduced and is currently below average
- 72% of primary schools judged grade 3 in 2012 are now good or better (105 schools)

### **Special Schools**

- 93% of special schools are good or better rising from 83% in 2012
- This is above the national average of 87%
- Lancashire is in the second quartile compared with statistical neighbours
- There is a strong track record of improvement over the past 2 years (Lancs +10% good; Eng +6% good)

### **Secondary schools**

- 73% of secondary schools are good or better rising from 61% in 2012
- This is above the national average of 71%
- Lancashire is in the 2nd quartile compared with statistical neighbours
- There is a strong track record of improvement over the past 2 years (Lancs +12% good; Eng +6% good)
- Just over 9% of schools is in a category of concern including 2 academies in Special Measures
- The proportion of schools below the Floor Standard has reduced but is currently above average.

Nearly 40% of secondary schools judged grade 3 in 2012 are now good or better (12 schools)

### **Schools HR Team**

The Schools' HR Team is currently a centrally-funded Service, delivered free to maintained schools. The Service is currently available to academies, and to schools outside the LCC boundary on a traded basis.

The Team work in partnership with Schools and Centrally Managed Services to provide a HR consultancy service to assist headteachers, other School Leaders and Governing Bodies in meeting their legal obligations, to support them in managing HR issues in an effective and professional manner, and to enable the Local Authority's responsibilities as an Employer to be met.

This is achieved through the following activities:-

- The provision of model policies, procedures and guidance covering a wide range of HR/employee relations matters, available on the Schools Portal;
- The provision of advice relating to the application and interpretation of employment law, in a manner which safeguards the interests and equality of opportunity of all stakeholders;
- The facilitation of harmonious and productive relationships with the trade unions;
- Prompt intervention in conjunction with colleagues from the Quality & Continuous Improvement team in situations where Schools and Services are in or at risk of entering an Ofsted category;
- Evaluation of the impact of Government and Local Authority policy changes upon Schools and Services, and the provision of support in bringing about change;
- The provision of expert advice and assistance on individual complex casework matters involving the following:
  - Discipline and dismissal
  - Competence and capability
  - Grievance/Bullying and Harassment
  - Sickness Absence Management
  - Pay and Performance Management
  - Pensions
  - Safeguarding/Child Protection
  - Redundancy, management of staffing, re-organisations (including closure/ Academy conversion), workforce planning
  - Trade union relations and dispute
  - Recruitment and selection

Whilst the core service is not currently a traded service, certain aspects of the Team's work is delivered on a costed basis, including:

- The provision of a suite of training courses for School leaders, covering a range of HR issues
- Mediation service, to resolve conflict and disputes
- Undertaking investigations on behalf of the Headteacher/Governing Body, where required, when the involvement of the Headteacher/Governing Body could be seen as biased/tainted

### **Performance data – casework**

The Team record casework once there is a need for more than basic intervention and the case becomes a more significant piece of work. The average number of live cases open at any one time is approximately 220.

The number of cases opened during the Financial Year 2013-14 is as follows:

Type of case	Number
Disciplinary	152
Absence	233
Grievance	71
Restructure	86
B&H	9
Capability	58
ET claims	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>619</b>

The number of schools involved in these cases was 312. This does not take account of schools that contact the Schools HR Team regularly for general advice about a casework matter. Nor does it take account of cases that were opened prior to this financial year, but required continued intervention during the financial year. Whilst there are schools that never make contact with the Schools HR Team, this number is in the minority.

### **Performance data – training**

Over the academic year 2013-14, 753 delegates attended a training course delivered by the Team. This figure excludes any briefings that the Team deliver that do not result in income, including the Chairs of Governors annual conference, Governor training and induction briefings for new Headteachers.

### **Future delivery of Schools HR Team Service**

With effect from 1 April 2015, it is proposed that the Schools HR Team will be delivered on a traded basis, whereby schools will have to purchase a Service Level Agreement in order to receive the Service. Schools have not yet been consulted on this proposal. The consultation process is expected to take place during the Autumn term, during which time the service offer will be finalised, together with a costed model.

**Consultations:** N/A

**Implications:**

**Risk management**

This report is for information and there are no risk management implications.

### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

#### **List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
N/A		
Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate		
N/A		

**Education Scrutiny Committee**  
Meeting to be held on 15 July 2014

Electoral Division affected: All
-------------------------------------

**"We all need a little help at times" Lancashire Youth Council Consultation report.**

Contact for further information:  
Kirsty Houghton, 01772 532014, Children and Young People's Directorate,  
[Kirsty.houghton@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:Kirsty.houghton@lancashire.gov.uk)

**Executive Summary**

In September 2013 the Chair of the Lancashire County Council Education Scrutiny Committee asked members of Lancashire Youth Council to carry out a consultation that would enable them to identify any barriers to education that young people encountered.

From the ensuing research and consultation process the Youth Council identified a number of points:

- 69 of the 80 young people responding to the survey said they had faced difficulties which impacted on their learning.
- The main issues quoted as affecting young people during their learning were: bullying, mental and emotional health issues and family and friends issues such as bereavement and financial difficulties.
- 43 respondents quoted a variety of channels from which they had received support, ranging from friends, family, school, college, external agencies and specialists.
- 21 young people suggested that what would help would be a better understanding of emotional health and well-being and personal support, with someone to talk to.
- The Youth Council have found through this consultation that the majority of young people who identified that they have barriers to learning tended to be aged 15+

From these points it has been identified that young people are facing a number of issues that are construed by them as barriers to learning, many of which are being addressed both within the education establishment and by external partners and organisations.

**Recommendation**

Education Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and comment on the findings of the Youth Council's consultation with young people on 'barriers to educational learning' and in particular on the three recommendations identified by the Youth Council and as set out in this report.

## Background and Advice

In September 2013 Lancashire Youth Council were asked to develop and deliver a consultation that would identify the barriers to learning that young people face in Lancashire. Members of Lancashire Youth Council worked to devise a questionnaire in partnership with the Head of Young People's Service and the Chair of the Education Scrutiny Committee (See Appendix A).

The questionnaire was then distributed to the District Youth Councils, Children in Care Council, Young Carers Forum and SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) Youth Forum and received eighty responses from across eight of the Lancashire districts. The age range of the respondents varied from aged eleven to nineteen with forty seven being age sixteen and below.

Members of Lancashire Youth Council helped distribute the questionnaire and encouraged young people to complete it and worked to ensure that a diverse range of young people were consulted with. The results should be considered as a small scale survey and the Youth Council felt that if they were to do this piece of work again they would recommend distributing the questionnaire to a wider group of young people including schools, youth work provisions and voluntary youth organisations. The details of the results and feedback from young respondents to the questionnaire are documented in Appendix B.

Key findings in addition to those presented above:

- The majority of young people responding did reference an issue they had faced which they felt impacted upon their learning. The issues they raised broadly fell into three categories: bullying, mental health and family/friends issues. Some young people reference issues with access and travel, disability and school/college courses. (see Appendix B for the full list of issues raised)
- 11 young people out of the 80 respondents stated that they hadn't had anything negative impacting on their learning.
- 6 of the young people consulted felt that there was very little, and in some cases no support offered to them in order to continue with their learning development.
- 22 respondents said the support they got was helpful, whereas 8 felt it wasn't.
- Young people quoted a variety of support channels that they had used which could be shared with schools/colleges to ensure that others are made aware of these support channels (See Appendix B, responses to Question 2). There is a whole range of agencies who can and do work in partnership with schools to offer wrap around support for young people. The responses also heavily referenced the valued support of parents and other trusted adults in support young people with difficult issues.
- 8 districts are represented, with South Ribble having the most respondents with 23 and West Lancashire receiving the lowest with 2 responses. Districts with no responses were Hyndburn, Ribble Valley, Rossendale and Wyre



## **Existing Campaigns and Initiatives**

It would be useful for the Education Scrutiny Committee to be aware that the Youth Council takes an active interest in this area of work and two of their chosen campaign areas are Emotional Health and Well-being and Sex and Relationships Education (SRE).

The Emotional Health and Wellbeing group specifically want to raise awareness of the issues affecting young people and try to remove the stigma around mental health. They have made a display which is being taken to different locations around the county, starting with Morcambe library in July 2014.

Currently the SRE group are working with UCLAN on a European research project on teenage relationships 'Stir it up' (safeguarding teenage intimate relationships) which seeks to raise awareness of 'healthy' relationships and where to go for support if this develops into a controlling or 'unhealthy' relationship. The youth council is utilising social media to promote this through the use of cartoons.

The Children and Young People's Health and Wellbeing Board (PULSE) have initiated a support project called 'Life's Up's and Downs' which offers practical tips and advice for combating emotional health and well-being issues.

The Youth Council were also involved in developing the Lancashire Anti-Bullying Charter which all schools have been asked to sign up to. This sets out the rights and responsibilities of young people and asks schools to develop an action plan for ensuring young people are aware of their responsibilities and that their rights are upheld.

The SRE group also developed the SRE Charter for all secondary schools in Lancashire which asks schools to commit to recognising that Sex and Relationships Education is important to young people and how they will ensure young people are informed and educated in this area.

The Youth Council have also recently helped re-design the marketing materials for the Young People's Service telephone, text and web talk service which is available 365 days per year for young people to use. They wanted to highlight the issues that young people may be facing so that young people would understand more clearly what the service could potentially help them with. They came up with a list of key issues which they feel young people face and these have been incorporated into the posters promoting the service.

## **Youth Council Recommendations following the initial consultation exercise**

Lancashire Youth Council recommends that further work is done to identify specific needs that young people may require help with to overcome barriers to learning:

- 1) Further awareness raising should be undertaken to ensure that young people, schools and colleges are familiar with the work of the Youth Council campaign on Emotional Health and Well-being and the work of Pulse (Children and Young People's Health and Wellbeing Board) on 'Life's up's and Downs'. These campaigns and initiatives are working to raise awareness of the issues affecting young people, offer support and advice and remove the stigma surrounding mental health issues.
- 2) Further consultation should be undertaken with a larger sample group, perhaps focusing on specific groups of young people such as particular age groups/gender groups. Additionally further work could be done with the groups of young people who were already consulted with to look at what may already be available or could be provided to support these young people and their education establishments in overcoming the barriers they face.
- 3) Lancashire Youth Council felt that it may also be beneficial to share the consultation findings with LASSH (Lancashire Association of Secondary School Heads) and the Lancashire College Principal's groups so that they can be made aware of the issues and help that young people felt they needed throughout their education. They could also be reminded about initiatives such as the Bullying and SRE Charter and be encouraged to promote services which young people can access for support.

## **Consultations**

Lancashire Youth Council gave out 110 questionnaires and received 80 responses from young people aged between 12 and 19 years old from a variety of youth forums, including targeted groups. For detailed results from the consultation please see appendix B.

## **Implications:**

### **Risk management**

There are no risk management implications arising from this report.

## **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

### **List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
N/A		

**Lancashire Youth Council Research Questionnaire**

**We all need a bit of help at times**

Lancashire youth council have been asked by the Lancashire County Council Education scrutiny panel to consult with young people across Lancashire on the barriers to learning that they face or have faced.

Please could you take a moment to fill in this questionnaire and return it to the address at the bottom?

- 1) **Have you had to deal with or are you dealing with anything that has negatively impacted on your learning in and out of school?  
(Please give a few details of what this was)**
  
- 2) **What support have/did you get to help you overcome any barriers to your learning and who was it from?**
  
- 3) **Has it helped/is it helping? Please give a few details of how it is helping/has helped...**
  
- 4) **Could anything help/have helped make your learning experience better?  
If so what?  
(For example someone to talk to, support with costs of meals, counselling services)**
  
- 5) **If you answered yes to question 4 why would this have helped/ help?**

The below details are to help us identify specific information for example gender, age and area in which young people live and will not be shared with any other organisations.

District \_\_\_\_\_

Age \_\_\_\_\_

If you would like us to stay in touch please fill in the below details, we will not share this with any other organisation.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail address \_\_\_\_\_

Please return this questionnaire to Kirsty Houghton either by e-mail [Kirsty.houghton@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:Kirsty.houghton@lancashire.gov.uk) or by post Room 203, JDO Building, East Cliff, Preston, PR1 3JT by 10th<sup>th</sup> February.

**Lancashire Youth Council Research Questionnaire Results**  
**"We all need a little help at times"**

**1) Have you had to deal with or are you dealing with anything that has negatively impacted on your learning in and out of school?**

**(Please give a few details of what this was)**

- Falling out with friends
- Death of a parent x 2
- Family issues x 3
- Yes I am dealing with a family issue
- Medical conditions not fully supported for 3 of 5 years at high school. Lack of support and understanding, same again in college being told that medical reasons aren't good enough excuse for missing lessons.
- Emotional and physical bullying x 4
- Mental health issues x 3
- Bullying by other pupils in school x 7
- Financial problems
- Nothing x 11
- Didn't go to primary school
- Behaviour issues
- Learning difficulties
- Anger issues
- The college I wanted to go to was not accessible because of my disability
- College work because I was unsure of what to do
- Too big classes
- I was given the incorrect level exam paper
- Friends with mental health issues
- Travelling to school – the time it takes to get from Preston to Lancaster and back and the cost is too much
- Personal issues affecting exams
- Sexually assaulted which left me emotionally broken and affected my school work
- Loss of hearing in both ears
- Bullying that went on for 3 years and was really poorly dealt with at school and then college

**2) What support have/did you get to help you overcome any barriers to your learning and who was it from?**

- Guidance from parent/tutor
- Counselling x 6
- Support from the police
- Started receiving better support from the high school nurse who understood the condition and followed care plan.
- Two teachers from high school offered extra support and help with lessons even though they didn't teach me.
- My teacher helped me x 12
- None x 3
- Pastoral support
- Support worker through Lancashire Mind
- Support from college including financial bursary
- Very little support x 3
- Moved to a special school
- Lancashire County Council
- Family x 4
- Carers
- Friend's x 4

- Spoke to my head of year who helped me to sort things out and catch up on work I missed
- School helped but nothing externally
- YPS
- CAMHS
- Health professional
- Referral to ELCAS
- Support from learning mentor

**3) Has it helped/is it helping? Please give a few details of how it is helping/has helped...**

- Yes it gives you guidance and support on how to deal with the situation  
It is helping me better emotionally
- Yes I am starting to cope better
- The support from teachers helped a lot, helping me to catch up on work I had missed
- The school nurse asked if I wanted counselling two years ago when I refused I had no support from then on.
- Yes x 4
- Not really x 4
- Yes until I left school
- Enabled me to feel capable enough to complete my studies
- Gave me advice
- More time for me to deal with a variety of situations
- Smaller class size helped
- School and its resources
- Releases some anger
- The bullying has stopped
- A little bit but not so much
- Helped me to complete future work
- It helped but I struggled to confide in them to start off with as it wasn't easy to discuss
- Lancashire College helped me to do my level 2 maths
- Less pressure, reassurance and building confidence
- Encouraged me to think and be more positive
- It helped me to work through the issue
- Confidence building
- Negative experience of counselling as they discussed the problem with my teachers

**4) Could anything help/have helped make your learning experience better? If so what?**

**(For example someone to talk to, support with costs of meals, counselling services)**

- No x 5
- Knowing that there is someone to talk to about the issues
- Support from family
- Teachers offering more support x 2
- Counselling
- Extra time in exams
- Support to do my homework in school
- Support from staff and exam boards
- College communicating with my support team
- Help with costs at high school x 2
- More emotional support
- Understanding of mental illness
- More support
- One to one support x 5
- Someone to talk to x 4

- There is a Christian youth worker at our school but teachers need to be more aware of how to talk to and handle young people's needs
- Giving ASD young people the chance at college and the right style of education
- Teachers need to have more training on how to deal with young people affected by mental health issues and those who are supporting them, phoning parents and sign posting to gp is not enough.
- Schools need to inform young people in year 11 about university so that they have a little longer to prepare
- More bullying focused counselling
- More interactive and field based learning
- Better pastoral care at school needed x 2
- Counsellors and staff being more sensitive with confidential information especially when it isn't a safeguarding issue

**5) If you answered yes to question 4 why would this have helped/ help?**

- Make me feel better in myself and I wouldn't think about the problem as much during exams and work at college.
- It would have given me more time to sort out everything in my head x 2
- Give me support to complete tasks
- I would've been able to stay in education
- No
- Would make it easier to stay in school
- General issues x 2
- Teachers know how to deal with the situation
- It will help ASD children and young people have the chance to education like everyone else
- Feeling more comfortable talking about personal issues x 2
- To make school a more enjoyable place
- Makes learning more enjoyable and enables an efficient learning environment for young people
- Teachers need more training around how to deal effectively with bullied young people x 2
- Young people would know they have someone they can talk to

District	Age
Lancaster	11 13 17 18
Chorley	12 x 2 13 14 16 x 3 17 x 2 18 19 x 4
Fylde	14 x 2 16
South Ribble	10 15 16 x 10 17 18 x 2
West Lancs	16 18

<b>Preston</b>	11 13 15 x 2 16 17 x 3 18 19
<b>Pendle</b>	13 x 3 14 16 17 x 3 19
<b>Burnley</b>	13 14 x 3 15 x 2 16 18
<b>Unknown</b>	X 4



# Agenda Item 6

**Education Scrutiny Committee**  
Meeting to be held on 15 July 2014

Electoral Divisions affected: All
--------------------------------------

## **Report of the Pupil Premium and Attainment Task Group** (Appendix A refers)

Contact for further information:  
Josh Mynott, (01772) 534580, Office of the Chief Executive,  
[josh.mynott@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:josh.mynott@lancashire.gov.uk)

### **Executive Summary**

Attached at Appendix A is the report of the Pupil Premium and Attainment Task Group.

### **Recommendation**

The Committee is asked to:

- i. Support the recommendations of the Task Group, as set out in the report at Appendix A;
- ii. Consider the appropriate mechanism for reviewing the responses to the Task Group's recommendations.

### **Background and Advice**

At its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> July, the Education Scrutiny Committee considered a report on the Educational Attainment of Pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM).

The Committee resolved to establish a task group to explore these issues and begin to identify possible actions. The work of the task group would begin as soon as the statistical data for 2013 became available.

### **Membership of the task group**

County Councillor Cynthia Dereli (Chair)  
County Councillor Susie Charles  
County Councillor Anne Cheetham  
County Councillor Chris Henig  
County Councillor Bernard Dawson  
Mrs Janet Hamid  
Mr Ken Wales

## Scope of the Scrutiny exercise

To review the effectiveness of the Pupil Premium scheme, with a focus on the groups where statistics indicate more work is needed in raising standards, in particular FSM children at Key stages 3-4

- interrogate the data available in relation to FSM children
- drill down into the detail of the data, subdividing it into more discrete sub-sets, such as by: gender: geographical location; schools; community/ethnic settings; pupil/population density (rural/urban); FSM density
- select and investigate further particular data sub-sets to illuminate reasons why the performance of those FSM children remains below the Lancashire and national average
- explore with practitioners what they see as the specific barriers around learning and achieving amongst those FSM they are working with
- appraise the role and performance of the County Council's Quality and Continuous Improvement Team in supporting Lancashire's head teachers and school governing bodies to deploy their Pupil Premium resources to best effect.
- identify local examples of good practice in use of the Pupil Premium
- make recommendations for improvements.

## 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/Directorate/Tel
-------	------	-------------------------

N/A.

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A.

**June 2014**



# **Pupil Premium and Attainment Overview & Scrutiny Review**

**For further information about this report please contact**

**Josh Mynott**

**Committee Support Team Leader**

**01772 534580**

[josh.mynott@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:josh.mynott@lancashire.gov.uk)

# Contents

	Page
Background to the review	3
Membership of the task group	3
Scope of the scrutiny exercise	3
Methodology	3
Witnesses	4
Introduction	5
Findings	6
Primary Schools	7
Secondary Schools	9
Good Practice Examples	12
Ethos and Culture	13
Effective Use of Pupil Premium Money	14
Issues and Challenges	16
Conclusions	17
Recommendations	20
Acknowledgements	21

## Background to the review

At its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> July, the Education Scrutiny Committee considered a report on the Educational Attainment of Pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM).

The Committee learned that nationally as well as in Lancashire the educational attainment of FSM children is consistently well below their peers. In 2011, the Government's Pupil Premium Scheme was introduced, whereby budget allocations for individual schools from the Department for Education were boosted according to the numbers of FSM children on the school roll. Authority was delegated to head teachers and school governing bodies to choose how best to make use of this Pupil Premium in raising the learning and attainment levels of FSM children in their care.

The Committee resolved to establish a task group to explore these issues and begin to identify possible actions. The work of the task group would begin as soon as the statistical data for 2013 became available.

### Membership of the task group

- County Councillor Cynthia Dereli (Chair)
- County Councillor Susie Charles
- County Councillor Anne Cheetham
- County Councillor Chris Henig
- County Councillor Bernard Dawson
- Mrs Janet Hamid
- Mr Ken Wales

### Scope of the Scrutiny exercise

To review the effectiveness of the Pupil Premium scheme, with a focus on the

groups where statistics indicate more work is needed in raising standards, in particular FSM children at Key stages 3-4

- interrogate the data available in relation to FSM children
- drill down into the detail of the data, subdividing it into more discrete sub-sets, such as by: gender; geographical location; schools; community/ethnic settings; pupil/population density (rural/urban); FSM density
- select and investigate further particular data sub-sets to illuminate reasons why the performance of those FSM children remains below the Lancashire and national average
- explore with practitioners what they see as the specific barriers around learning and achieving amongst those FSM they are working with
- appraise the role and performance of the County Council's Quality and Continuous Improvement Team in supporting Lancashire's head teachers and school governing bodies to deploy their Pupil Premium resources to best effect.
- identify local examples of good practice in use of the Pupil Premium
- make recommendations for improvements.

### Methodology

The Task Group examined statistical data on attainment, considered reports from Ofsted and the Sutton Trust, conducted a series of one to one discussions with Primary School headteachers, held meetings with Secondary School Heads, and conducted a number of visits to Secondary schools.

## **Witnesses**

### **Lancashire County Council**

- Jonathan Hewitt, Head of Quality and Continuous Improvement, Lancashire County Council
- Paul Dyson-Knight, Senior Adviser & Team Leader, Secondary Team, Quality and Continuous Improvement

### **Headteachers from Primary and Secondary Schools in Lancashire**

- Richard Varey, Headteacher, Blessed Trinity RC College, Burnley
- David Burton, Headteacher, Sir John Thursby Community College, Burnley
- Sally Cryer, Headteacher, Unity College, Burnley
- Bob Wakefield, Headteacher, Shuttleworth College, Burnley
- Damien Callagher, Headteacher, Christ the King Catholic Maths and Computing College, Preston
- Siobhan Collingwood, Headteacher, Morecambe Bay Primary School, Morecambe
- Gillian Thomas, Headteacher, Thurnham Glasson CE Primary School
- Jo Williams, Headteacher, Wilson's Endowed CE School, Over Kellet
- Stephanie Reeves, Headteacher, Garstang Community Primary School, Garstang
- Cathryn Wilkinson, Headteacher, SS Mary and Michael Catholic Primary School, Garstang
- Jo Longworth, Headteacher, Bowerham Community Primary School, Lancaster
- Gill Jackson, Headteacher, Archbishop Temple School, Preston

- Jonathan Smart Our Lady Queen of Peace Catholic Engineering College Skelmersdale
- Caroline Sephton, Assistant Headteacher, St Michaels CE High School, Chorley
- Sean Bullen from Millfield Science and Performing Arts College.

Headteachers also introduced us to other staff and pupils during site visits

## Introduction

Whilst the efforts of secondary schools in particular have yet to show through consistently in improved levels of achievement for Free School Meals pupils, schools in Lancashire are doing excellent, innovative and effective things with Pupil Premium funding. That much is clear and needs expressing from the start. The Task Group was deeply impressed by the commitment, enthusiasm, hard work and ability being brought to the task of using this funding to help children and young people by schools and teachers, supported by the County Council.

The schools spoken to by the Task Group were reflective of all schools in Lancashire, Primary and Secondary, big and small, from all parts of the county and at different stages of the work towards high attainment for all Lancashire children. Whilst the detail of what was being done differed, the commitment to excellence was shared.

This report, as a reflection of what the task group saw and heard, is a reflection of good practice, an attempt to show to a wider audience what is being done. The report also sets out the challenges faced, the difficulties experienced. Finally, the report sets out the characteristics of the good practice the Task Group has seen, with a view to supporting the development of a checklist that can be used by school leadership teams and governors to assess their own use of Pupil Premium funding.

It is essential that attainment levels for this group of children and young people improve. It is hoped that the findings of the Task Group will be used to support schools in delivering this aim.

## Findings

Lancashire County Council, working alongside the schools in Lancashire, aims to ensure that all children in the county get the best possible education, and reach the levels of attainment they are capable of. It is the case in Lancashire, as in the rest of the country, that children who are in receipt of free school meals have lower attainment levels than those children who are not. The reasons for this are many and complex. Clearly it is the case that children's entitlement to Free School Meals indicates that they are likely to be economically disadvantaged, and this will often go hand in hand with social deprivation, worklessness in the family and a range of other challenges. However, whilst there may be a range of reasons which make it harder for some of these pupils to achieve, it is by no means an automatic excuse for those children or their schools for them not reaching the levels of attainment they are capable of. Partly to address this very issue, the government introduced the Pupil Premium in 2011. The Pupil Premium (PP) is a sum of money paid to schools for each pupil who is entitled to Free School Meals. For 2014/15, the amounts will be £1,300 for primary-aged pupils and £935 for secondary-aged pupils

The use of this money is monitored by Ofsted, and schools are required to account for their spending of PP to demonstrate it is being spent on those pupils for whom it is intended.

It was not, therefore, the intention of the task group to duplicate the work of Ofsted. Instead, the Task Group's aim was to establish the things that worked in the use of PP for FSM pupils and the challenges that schools face in this area, to produce a form of checklist of things to consider for schools, the county council and other interested bodies when considering how to support

FSM pupils to achieve, attain and aspire.

In examining the data, the position in Lancashire is fairly clear in that attainment levels for FSM pupils are far lower than those for non-FSM. This is not unique to Lancashire, nor is it unique that the most significant areas of under performance are amongst boys at KS4, and particularly in English. What is true is that Lancashire's results for FSM pupils at Primary level are in line with or better than the National average, but below the average at KS4 and that there has been little improvement in attainment at KS4 over the past few years despite a clear focus on this issue. Rather than look at that issue in isolation, however, the Task Group spoke to both primary schools (where differences in attainment are less pronounced) and secondary schools to see what the different approaches were and what interventions, actions and support activities had been demonstrated to work. It should be stressed that PP has, in some sense, not been in place for long enough to be able to assess the long term impact. However, it is equally clear that schools have seized the opportunities to act quickly and decisively, as well as innovatively to address the problem and start showing positive results.



## PRIMARY SCHOOLS

### Experience of Primary Schools: introduction

Primary Schools generally recognised the advantages they gained from being smaller than secondary schools in terms of being able to engage with their families. The simple fact that parents were usually present to drop off and collect children from school, giving the school the opportunity to engage face to face with parents, was mentioned. With lower numbers of staff, and staff who will work full time with the same group of pupils, issues could be identified early, and information could be exchanged between staff members with relative ease.

### What Primary Schools do with Pupil Premium funding

The Task Group saw many projects, programmes and support activities undertaken by Primary Schools using Pupil Premium funding. The Task group broke down the types of support into four broad categories, although it is clear that there is significant overlap between them. The categories were:

- Personal: direct support for a child's individual needs to facilitate good attendance and achievement
- Social and Emotional: support with a child's broader wellbeing
- Teaching: academic and specific educational support
- Working with families: Support aimed at the child's wider environment, helping families to become resilient and able to support their own children.

Examples include:

#### Personal

- Help with the cost of essentials

from uniforms to food and equipment

- Help with the cost of school trips and out-of-school clubs
- Contributing to cost of home to school transport
- Funding for breakfast clubs

#### Social and emotional: Building confidence:

Schools identified types of social and emotional need to be targeted that included lack of 'boundaries' at home, language deprivation, poor routines and impoverishment of opportunities. Examples vary from specific cases to whole school policies.

- Running summer schools for pre-reception children to prepare them for the school experience
- Employing one-to-one Teaching Assistant (TA) support or mentoring
- Employing home school liaison workers
- Running Counselling Services
- Providing staff to take a pupil to a hearing test when the parent was unable to do so

#### Teaching Support

Pupil Premium funding was often used to pay for extra teachers or TAs. The importance of high quality teaching was emphasised repeatedly. There were many innovative ways of utilising this to meet the needs of the pupils.

- Running after school clubs, including homework clubs, but also clubs for creative and sporting activities
- Providing extra/specialist teaching support for individuals or groups.
- Adapting the spread of mixed age classes to meet the needs of pupils

- Creating smaller classes allowing the curriculum to be tailored to individual learning needs
- Adding value through extra teacher training
- Employing a specialist teacher for literacy
- Paying for an apprentice to do individual education plans for children

attainment. Many Secondary Schools run their own tests rather than rely on data from Primary Schools. While this is clearly not universally true, it may be an area which would benefit from more discussion and collaboration between primary and secondary schools.

### **Working with families**

There were many very specific examples of how schools have used extra resources to step in when families are under stress to enable the child's schooling to continue.

- Employing TAs specifically to mentor parents
- Employing a Mentor/ Parent Support officer to support FSM families
- Providing specific targeted support for families through extra welfare support at lunch times and a homework club
- Paying for home/school liaison workers and social workers
- Money spent on attendance issues
- Sessions for parents sign-posting support available
- Liaison work with the local Children's Centre

### **Transition**

Several primaries expressed concern about transition arrangements to Secondary Schools. There was a view that the Secondary sector does not always take enough notice of the information about the support a child has received and may need, and about their family circumstances, sometimes apparently preferring to almost start from scratch. The same criticism was also made in relation to academic

## SECONDARY SCHOOLS

### What the secondary schools told us

All schools recognised that, in comparison with the Primary sector, being larger schools made it harder to know families in the same way. However, the larger size of secondary schools meant that they could achieve "economies of scale" – they had enough funding to purchase expertise in a wider range of areas.

There was also a general consensus that there were pupils in need of support who did not fit into the FSM category. Schools vary in their expression of their ethos, but all agree they want the best for students, and we found that, to this end, innovation was widespread.

### What Secondary Schools do with Pupil Premium funding

#### Personal

As with Primary Schools, there are a whole range of different items of 'behind the scenes' spending to support the individual pupil and help to bridge the gap.

- Support with uniform costs
- Support for costs of school trips
- Breakfast clubs – a safe space in the early morning
- Purchasing books
- Specialist support staff, including in one school music classes
- Help with travel costs

#### Social and emotional:

Schools were emphasising a range of issues that interrelate to raise the confidence and hence achievement of FSM pupils:

- Giving high priority to pastoral issues, including significant

- investment in staff working in purely a pastoral capacity
- Creating a House system, with this vertical structure providing a 'family' with same tutor relations through their school career, and "vertical" tutor groups, including pupils from years 7-11
- Addressing emotional intelligence, including running special classes for children experiencing difficulties in this area
- Directly employing a social worker (as part of a Lancashire-wide pilot scheme)
- Supporting disciplinary structures, for example through the use of internal exclusion and one-to-one work
- Paying for school trips – as a reward for good behaviour, attendance etc
- Employing dedicated staff to work on attendance
- Bringing in careers advice early - rolling out a programme of careers advice from year 7, and using Facebook to interest pupils in careers advice
- Offering support for pupils throughout the day eg providing a special activities room for lunch time break and offering personal contact through the ex-service personnel mentoring scheme – and cutting lunch time to keep the focus on education.
- Providing extended work experience to support well-being of pupils not engaged.

#### Teaching

In addressing the gap for FSM pupils' attainment, teaching of course is central. So is having a school ethos and pastoral structure linked to attainment, with a vision for both strong discipline and positive learning going hand-in-hand. Schools agreed that getting quality

teachers was paramount, adding in many cases that support for the staff who will deliver the improvements was also important to them. A significant amount of Pupil Premium funding goes on staffing, recruiting and retaining the best teachers and making the best use of TAs.

Varieties of initiatives on these themes included:

- Providing targets for each child in every subject
- Having a schools tracking system on which FSM pupils are highlighted for all staff to see with staff able to share concerns quickly via the internal school system
- Promoting literacy across the curriculum,
- Where literacy is a problem, especially with boys, ensuring that all staff see literacy as their issue
- Making use of student literacy leaders
- Providing a Reading Club
- Having a Catch-up programme on literacy with year 7
- Running a repeat Year 6 for low achieving pupils
- Use of TAs to work intensively with a child, with a view to enabling the child to function independently
- Providing additional lessons at weekends and in holidays, using both teachers and TAs
- A school which only shuts at Christmas – with staff paid to teach in all other holidays to provide continuity of learning experience as well as of discipline
- Providing a specialist language support worker for newly arrived families
- Employing speakers of foreign languages where a high

proportion of pupils speak that language at home

- Where there is large population of pupils for English is an additional language (EAL) employing a ‘floating’ English teacher to lead on English across the curriculum

## **Working With Families**

Schools recognise that social deprivation has many factors and as a result were providing many different measures from employing a school counsellor or attendance officer to investing in developing relations with families through a wide variety of measures:

- Employing attendance officers who work out in the community
- Staff being present at the front of the building to welcome children and parents from 8.0am
- Sending letters home to encourage engagement of parents
- Recognising the importance of having engagement of parents, having staff contact parents on day of parents evening with a reminder
- Tracking information about parental attendance at meetings

Schools also commented that the support they had had from other agencies in tackling these issues, is now diminishing because of budget cuts.

## **Transition and structural issues**

As with primary schools, several secondary schools expressed dissatisfaction with some aspects of transition from Year 6 to 7. It was noted that transition is hard for many students, and relative roles of primary and secondary schools were questioned.

There was criticism of SATS data as not being objective, a feeling that some primary schools were pushing pupils through SATS, with the result that secondary schools distrusted data provided by primary schools. There was also a feeling that the time gap from finishing SATS to secondary school entry may be part of the problem and schools were taking action to address this. Finally it was noted that sometimes parents can exacerbate problems, finding it hard to adjust, for instance, if they no longer have one person to contact.

Schools were taking action to address transition issues by:

- Having several staff dedicated to dealing with this
- Having staff going into primary schools to work with pupils identifying social/emotional needs and allocating pupils to houses in advance
- Holding summer schools for FSM pupils prior to year 7 entry and even for year 5 pupils; or yr 6 pupils in school for 2 days a week for half a term in June/July to begin their Y7 studies
- Employing primary specialists to support pupils in year 7, in some cases effectively running a repeat year 6 for those pupils

For the future, there was a view that a move to progression rather than attainment measures would be better, but some concerns about how this would work in practice.

## Good practice examples

One school was faced with a situation where a parent's mental health issues were causing the child to miss school. A successful deal was made with the parent that the school would pay for a taxi in the morning if the parent would pick up the child from school in the afternoon.

A secondary school has used PP money to put £1 a day on the electronic lunch card of every child entitled to FSM. The £1 is automatically removed if it's not spent before 8.45, meaning that it has to be used for breakfast at school (also encouraging improved punctuality).

One school explained how fortunate they had been to be part of a pilot scheme for schools to directly employ a social worker, reporting to the Headteacher. The school felt that this meant they were so much more responsive, faster to deal with issues and also better able to coordinate a child's education and wellbeing needs. The Headteacher suggested that the scheme should be rolled out to all schools.

For smaller schools, and therefore especially primary schools, there simply is not that much PP funding available. Some of the initiatives run by larger schools and schools with larger numbers of FSM pupils are simply beyond the reach of some, and this is a major frustration. A child who the school feel would benefit from specialist help may not be able to get it because it is simply not financially viable. The Task Group heard some schools starting to talk about sharing resources and working in co-operation with others to identify if there were ways in which these specialist services could be accessed in that way.

A child's academic attainment cannot be separated from their home and social surroundings. A chaotic home life will cause problems for punctuality, attendance, homework and engagement. A primary school used PP money to employ a cleaner to help a family who were struggling. The cleaner didn't just clean the home – they showed the parents how to maintain a clean home. Other schools have offered support with cooking, and nutrition.

A number of different approaches to developing literacy across the curriculum have been tried. One school runs a "theme of the week" running across all subjects. Examples might include "to-too-two" or "Capital Letters", which will be referred to and addressed in all lessons. Other schools have employed floating English teachers, who both work with small groups of students and lead on literacy projects across the curriculum.

Many schools use PP funding to provide equipment and uniform for pupils. One school explained that their policy in this area was to always provide a child with the equipment they needed. Items supplied would be new and good quality, not just drawn from the schools stock of older or used items. However, this would be done once and once only, and the child and family would be given the clear message that they were expected to look after and respect the equipment. The school felt that this policy was working for them, as an expression of the wider culture of the school.

Establishing a "safe" place for children – somewhere they could go outside of lesson times – can be a crucial element in the pastoral care a school can offer. One secondary school has invested extensively in a room, open to all children, where they can go, be around familiar faces, seek help and advice, or just play computer or board games. This safe room has also become a conduit for wider activities, for example, the children who regularly use it have undertaken visits to offer help themselves to other members of the community, such as older people. The room functions both as a place where children who may otherwise be struggling with some social activities can feel they belong, whilst also providing a place where the school can reach those children, understanding and offering the support mechanisms the child needs back in the "real world" of the school and academic achievement.

Although transition was picked up as an issue by both secondary and primary schools, again there are pockets of good practice. One school used the post-exam space in the summer timetable to bring in year 6 pupils, not just for a day or two, but for two days a week for the last weeks of term. As well as helping the children adapt to their new surroundings, this also tackled the issue identified by some secondary schools, who felt that Year 6 children often failed to continue progress post SATS, and indeed even went backwards over the long gap between the SATS, over the summer holidays and into September.

doing this, they emphasised strongly that the key to raising attainment for one group was inextricably tied up with the overall ethos of the school. Schools emphasised that they were working to create an ethos or culture running which permeates the whole school and which is understood by students, teachers, families and the community. One repeated theme that came from schools is the desire to not allow a child's personal circumstances to affect their potential to attain. Some described this as enabling a child to "leave their baggage at the door" of the classroom. Others said that the aim was "to understand but not to excuse" poor behaviour. Either way, the meaning was clear – that the school would do all it could to provide the maximum support to remove any possible barrier to effective and successful learning.

## **Ethos and culture**

All the schools the Task Group spoke to stressed that tackling the issue of attainment of pupils entitled to FSM required support tailored for that group, whether in individual help for a single student facing particular issues, or more general help for the cohort. However, in

## **Effective use of PP money**

There is no one size fits all when it comes to the use of PP money. As many schools, both primary and secondary, said – many of the things they do with PP money they would be doing in any case. Many noted that PP was not additional money, and that reductions in funding elsewhere cancelled out the money from PP. Many others made it clear that they did not treat FSM pupils as a distinct group, even though performance reporting did. Schools preferred to stress the needs of all pupils and sought to address them in any circumstances.

However, it is clear that the schools spoken to as part of the review have approached the issue in a number of ways, but where there has been success, this is often in line with a number of clear principles evident in the following features.

### **Governance and Strategic Leadership**

- The school has a clearly expressed ethos, and demonstrates this to others. It is well understood by teachers, non-teaching staff, students, families and the wider community
- Steps have been taken to identify students entitled to free schools meals and to encourage take up
- The specific issues and conditions that apply to the needs of students, school and community as they relate to the pupil premium are well understood
- There is a fully developed long term strategy to identify whatever issues are faced by the individual school and by those pupils in receipt of the Pupil Premium

- The Management Team play a full and active role in ensuring the high attainment of pupils on FSM
- The Governing body is actively engaged in challenging and supporting the school in how Pupil Premium funding is used
- There is a clear understanding of what success will look like
- Pupil Premium funding is clearly targeted at those pupils for whom it is designed
- There is a clear structured plan behind the activities, projects and processes put in place to achieve the objectives behind the provision of Pupil premium funding
- The outcomes of activities paid for by Pupil Premium funding are monitored and measured
- Each individual piece of work or initiative is assessed for its impact on attainment
- Schools are open to opportunities for co-operation and collaboration with other schools.

### **Working With Students, Families and Communities**

- There is good engagement, knowledge and understanding of not just the child, but their family and community.
- There is a communications strategy in place to talk to students, families and the community about attainment, support for pupils, and the pupil premium
- Information and understanding is shared between different members of staff involved in a child's support



- The role of classroom teachers and support staff in the pastoral support for students is clearly defined and appropriate for the school.
  - Engagement with other child and family support services not provided by the schools (for example, social care professionals) is strong
  - Internal mechanisms exist for classroom teachers to engage with and refer to specialist support services
  - Support for any given individual pupil is tailored to their specific needs
- Year 6 pupils will be moving on to, in order to ensure a smooth transition
- Information passed on to secondary schools is accurate and useful
  - There is an ongoing relationship with primary schools to ensure best understanding of their former pupils is carried forward as they move into year 7
  - Pupils are prepared for secondary schools post SATs

### **Transition**

Secondary schools:

- Strong and positive relationships exist with feeder primary schools
- Feedback on pupil attainment and progress to Primary schools at Yr 7, 8 and beyond is given
- There is confidence that information provided by feeder primary schools can be trusted and used to assist the new intake (including 'softer' information about pastoral support needs alongside achievement data)
- Alternative forms of teaching provision to Year 7 students have been considered and, where appropriate, implemented
- Extra support is in place at year 7 to help students having difficulties with transition, and those students needing that extra support are identified early

Primary schools:

- Strong and positive relationships exist with secondary schools that

## Issues and Challenges

The use of PP money is not a straightforward area. Whilst it is a requirement that the spend is reported to Ofsted, it is clear that there is no such thing as a typical FSM pupil, nor that all FSM pupils share any particular characteristic, other than the obvious one that they are entitled to free school meals. The issues are numerous: Many pupils fall just above the threshold. Many may be entitled to FSM, but don't claim it for a range of reasons (pride, lack of awareness or understanding). Some pupils not in any way entitled to FSM will have the same complex needs or poor attainment that are being tackled by the use of FSM money. Schools are spending money appropriately, but there are grey areas.

Another significant grey area is in the simple question of how much schools can really be responsible for. Many schools, when asked what the greatest challenge to the attainment of FSM pupils was, said it was nothing to do with their schooling or education, but to do with their family and social background. Children coming to school with poor nutrition, parents uninterested in education and unsupportive of schools, lack of aspiration in the family or community, not speaking English as a first language, and a whole range of social and physical problems all posed challenges. Schools recognised that many other service providers and support mechanisms are being lost in the difficult public sector spending climate, be that social care from the County Council or benefits from central government, and it's clear that many of the things schools are spending PP money on are in areas that are not what would usually be understood as educational matters. Clearly, helping a family get organised, helping them learn to cook cheap healthy meals – all these things will help a child at school. But the extent to which they are a school's

problem and to which schools should pay for them is a major issue.

One issue which was highlighted to the Task Group was how statistics don't always tell the full story. Whilst there are exceptions, it is more likely that those pupils who effectively don't attain at all on the published data are FSM pupils. One school highlighted that, amongst any group of pupils, it is more likely that the "non-achievers" will be found within that group entitled to FSM. Even a small handful of pupils who effectively contribute very little to the formal attainment measures can skew averages downwards, even if schools work hard to find alternative provision or help for those pupils, who may be non-attenders, facing serious family issues, be experiencing serious health problems and so on.

The final point to note is on the role of the County Council. The Council provides a great deal of support to schools, support that is valued by the schools, as demonstrated by the fact that large numbers of schools continue to subscribe to what are often paid-for services. School advisors, for example, obviously have a key role. The County Council can take into account, when making its difficult budget decisions, the impact these will have on schools and on FSM pupils and their families. And the County Council can play a key role in co-ordinating activities with schools and other partners to deliver whole family solutions, perhaps especially so now that the Council has direct responsibility for public health matters.

## Conclusions

The strengths and numerous examples of good practice highlighted in this report should be recognised and acknowledged. However, the reasons why the Task Group originally chose to undertake this work have not gone away. In choosing to focus on examples of good practice, the Task group are under no illusions that to date there remains a gap between the achievement of those in receipt of the Pupil Premium and their peers, particular at the end of KS4. The task group calls on all schools and the County Council to maintain the focus in this area and maximise efforts to address this attainment gap. The task group therefore recommend that:

**The gap between the achievement of those in receipt of the Pupil Premium and their peers, particular at the end of KS4 must continue to be a key focus for schools, and that the County Council must retain a close overview of the performance of this group, including regular reporting to Councillors.**

Lancashire schools are working intelligently, creatively and effectively in their use of PP funding to drive attainment amongst those pupils entitled to Free School Meals. Schools are clearly working hard to create an ethos which is both nurturing and yet attainment focussed, and it is clear that the support offered by Lancashire County Council is also geared to that same goal of providing the best quality education for all children and young people in Lancashire. We therefore recommend that:

**The work being undertaken by Schools, with support from the County Council, to create an ethos of inclusivity, caring and community-focus that in many schools is helping to bridge the gap for FSM pupils is recognised and applauded.**

Whilst there are many areas of very good practice, as highlighted in this report, it is the case that a number of schools, both at Primary and Secondary level, are concerned about transition. This is a difficult time for pupils, and can be especially difficult for those who are experiencing other difficulties. It is essential that schools from the two sectors are encouraged to work with each other in an open and honest atmosphere, to identify cooperative ways of working to benefit the children. We therefore recommend that

**The issues that can arise in the transition from primary school to secondary school are recognised by all concerned, especially for vulnerable pupils, and that the County Council considers what they can do to support good practice in this area.**

Whilst PP funding has been welcomed, schools make clear that the funding is not an additional sum that makes anything possible. Many schools said simply that they would be doing the things they are doing with PP money anyway, and that PP money is simply the name given to a slice of the funding they receive, not an extra amount. For many schools, particularly smaller schools (and therefore especially Primary schools), there is an issue of scale. For example, they are keen to tap

into specialist support, but have neither the money nor the need to pay for the extra member of staff this might entail. One possible option is for schools to investigate working in co-operation with other schools, and possibly even pooling resources to allow them access to these more expensive specialist services. The Task Group believe that the county Council has a role to support and facilitate this kind of work with schools. It is therefore recommended that:

**The County Council considers how best to facilitate partnerships between schools where there are aspirations in relation to the use of Pupil Premium money which are limited by financial constraints**

Of concern to the Task group was the need to ensure that schools get the money they need. That means making sure that pupils are registered as being entitled to FSM. The government's programme to offer free school meals to all KS1 Pupils is very welcome; however, there is a major concern (identified in the pilot areas for universal infant FSM) that this policy will remove the incentive for many parents to register their entitlement, and thus reduce the amount of money coming into schools. The Task Group is aware of some excellent partnership work undertaken by the County Council and the District Councils on data matching to identify families who would be entitled to FSM. It is felt that it is essential that this work is continued to make sure schools in Lancashire don't lose out. It is recommended that:

**The benefits flowing from the Pupil Premium budgets are recognised, and that therefore the County Council continues, in partnership with the District Councils in Lancashire to address the issue of take up of benefits, and that these efforts, particularly in the context of forthcoming changes to Free School Meals for all Key Stage 1 children, are sustained**

This Task group work has naturally focussed on schools. What schools have said, and what is demonstrated by many of the activities they undertake with PP money, is that this is not simply a school issue. Attainment and aspiration is affected by all sorts of outside factors – family, community, expectations, health, economic prosperity. Schools alone can't tackle these issues. The difficult financial situation faced by the wider public sector is recognised, and it is acknowledged that some services which supported the same ambitions as schools are no longer available in the same form as in previous years. However, there is still much that can be done, and where these issues cover whole communities and neighbourhoods, the County council is in a position to help, perhaps especially since the responsibility for Public Health – a massive factor in and reflection of a child's chances in life – now lies with the council. It is recommended that:

**The County Council considers how it can work in partnership with schools where there are particular community or locality barriers to achievement.**

Finally, whilst there is so much that is good happening in Lancashire, there is no room for complacency, and there are always ways in which schools can improve. The Task group identified in this report the characteristics of schools that make excellent use of PP funding. It is felt that using this information to produce a toolkit for school leaders and governors to carry out a form of self-assessment to challenge their performance would be extremely useful. Whilst the Task group have laid these out as a set of statements, it is felt that schools may benefit more if these principles were set out as questions for schools to answer. Such an assessment would undoubtedly help schools improve and evidence their improvement to Ofsted. It is therefore recommended that:

**The County Council develops a check list or guidance for schools' leadership and governors to use as a tool for assessing their use of Pupil Premium, based on the good practice identified and set out in this report**

## Summary of Recommendations

The Task Group recommend that:

1. The gap between the achievement of those in receipt of the Pupil Premium and their peers, particular at the end of KS4 must continue to be a key focus for schools, and that the County Council must retain a close overview of the performance of this group, including regular reporting to Councillors.
2. The work being undertaken by Schools, with support from the County Council, to create an ethos of inclusivity, caring and community-focus that in many schools is helping to bridge the gap for FSM pupils is recognised and applauded.
3. The issues that can arise in the transition from primary school to secondary school are recognised by all concerned, especially for vulnerable pupils, and that the County Council considers what they can do to support good practice in this area.
4. The County Council considers how best to facilitate partnerships between schools where there are aspirations in relation to the use of Pupil Premium money which are limited by financial constraints
5. The benefits flowing from the Pupil Premium budgets are recognised, and that therefore the County Council continues, in partnership with the District Councils in Lancashire to address the issue of take up of benefits, particularly in the context of forthcoming changes to Free School Meals for all Key Stage 1 children
6. The County Council considers how it can work in partnership with schools where there are particular community or locality barriers to achievement.
7. The County Council develops a check list or guidance for schools' leadership and governors to use as a tool for assessing their use of Pupil Premium, based on the good practice identified and set out in this report

## **Acknowledgements**

The Task Group would like to express their sincere thanks to all those who supported the work of the Task Group. Special thanks go to those Headteachers who kindly opened up their schools to the Task Group for visits, and to those teachers and pupils who allowed the Task Group to interrupt their day and took time to deal with their questions.





# Agenda Item 7

**Education Scrutiny Committee**  
Meeting to be held on 15 July 2014

Electoral Division affected: None
--------------------------------------

## **Work Plan and Task Group Update** (Appendix A refers)

Contact for further information:  
Wendy Broadley 07825 584684, Office of the Chief Executive,  
Wendy.broadley@lancashire.gov.uk

### **Executive Summary**

The plan at Appendix A summarises the work to be undertaken by the Committee in the coming months, including an update of task group work. The statement will be updated and presented to each meeting of the Committee for information.

### **Recommendation**

The Committee is asked to note the report.

### **Background and Advice**

A statement of the current status of work being undertaken by the Committee is presented to each meeting for information.

**Consultations** - N/A

### **Implications:**

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

### **Risk management**

There are no significant risk management implications.

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

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
N/A	N/A	N/A

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate - N/A



Education Scrutiny Committee – Workplan 2014/15

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Agenda Setting Meeting</b>	<b>Chair's Briefing Session</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Purpose/Key issues</b>
15 July	9 June – 10.30am	9 July – 2.00pm	Youth Council	Kirsty Houghton	What barriers do young people face when accessing, or whilst in education
			Traded Services	Bob Stott	Update in light of new arrangements post OCL, in particular the new arrangements relating to HR services
			Attainment of Pupils in receipt of FSM task group report	Josh Mynott	Final report of the task group for approval
21 October	15 September – 10.30am	15 October – 2.00pm	School term dates	tbc	Report on the outcome of a county wide consultation of schools to gauge opinion on school term and holiday dates
			Fire prevention/sprinklers task group report	Wendy Broadley	
			Provisional GCSE results		
			Collaboration arrangements between schools		

Date of Meeting	Agenda Setting Meeting	Chair's Briefing Session	Topic	Author	Purpose/Key issues
24 March	16 February – 10.30am	18 March – 2.00pm	School Attendance Service	tbc	Looking at the exclusions process and the involvement of PRUs

### Task Group Summary

Name of Task Group	Completion Date and/or Committee Date
Attainment of Children Eligible for Free School Meals	July
Fire Prevention/School sprinkler systems	October

### **Briefing Notes Summary –**

(to obtain outline information for consideration for inclusion within the workplan OR to provide members with updated information following a Committee meeting)

Name of Briefing Note	Date Due

### **Potential Future Topics – (yet to be agreed)**

- 14-19 Education
- Children in Care , educational (and personal) attainment – regular report
- Mentoring

- Improving educational attainment of youth offenders
- Govt requirements for additional services: impact on schools' capacity to deliver without impacting on academic teaching and learning standards
- Alternative and Complementary Education and Residential Services (ACERS)
- Student Support
- Pupil Attendance

