
Meeting: Schools Forum

Date: 26 November 2012

Subject: Support for Vulnerable Pupils at Key Stage 2

Report of: Deputy Chief Executive, and Director of Children's Services

Summary: This report summarises the impact of the KS2 targeted funding in 2011/2012 and sets out how it is being used in 2012/2013. The overall aim is to embed good practice and facilitate school to school support which can be utilised beyond the term of this project.

Contact Officer: Helen Redding, Head of Learning and School Support

Public/Exempt: Public

Wards Affected: All

Function of: Council

RECOMMENDATION:

The Forum is asked to note the report on the use and impact of the funding in 2011/12 and 12/13

Reason for Recommendation: Report requested at Schools Forum meeting of 5 March 2012

Background

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | On 5 March 2012, the Schools Forum received and considered a report which sought an extension of funding previously agreed to support maintained middle and primary schools raise attainment at Key Stage 2. |
| 2. | The Forum noted the previous years Key Stage 2 results as being low (66% of pupils achieving level 4 or above compared to 74% nationally and 76% for statistical neighbours. |
| 3. | The Forum resolved that £90,000 be allocated to maintained middle schools and primary schools with year 5 pupils identified as not making sufficient progress towards their Key Stage 2 targets be approved. |

Rationale 2011/12

- | | |
|----|---|
| 4. | Funding was approved to support 19 maintained middle and primary schools to raise standards in KS2 given the results in 2011. If schools became Academies during this period, the schools would not receive the second payment. This was only the case in one school. |
|----|---|

5.	Year 5 data and the targets for SATs were analysed to focus the additional funding to support pupils who were at risk of not achieving challenging targets at the end of Year 6 in reading, writing or maths and / or two levels progress from the end of KS1.
6.	703 pupils were identified in this target group across the Local Authority (LA). The cost of this initiative was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £105,450 for schools based upon £150 per targeted pupil • £19,000 for schools based upon £1,000 to support administrative costs • £1,800 additional consultancy costs Total: £ 126,500
Process	
7.	In September 2011, each school reviewed Year 5 end of year data and identified Year 6 pupils at risk of not achieving targets and / or two levels progress.
8.	Data was provided to the Council acting as the LA on current levels of achievement from the end of Year 5 / start of Year 6, and targets for the end of the year. There were 703 identified pupils across 18 middle schools and primary schools with Year 6 pupils. All identified schools chose to engage with this process.
9.	Funding could be used at the school's discretion, for 1-1 support, small group work etc. It also funded additional teaching support. School Improvement Advisers (SIAs) evaluated the impact of this support and also shared some of the good practice from other schools.
10.	Schools were encouraged to work with other local schools to maximise the funding available.
11.	School Improvement Advisers (SIAs) met with Headteachers and senior curriculum managers at the start of each half term to explore the impact of the funding and review overall data for Years 5 and 6. There was also time to review next steps. Progress data was submitted half termly.
12.	In November 2012, there was a workshop for all middle schools and primary schools in CBC with contributions from colleagues in other areas to highlight effective practice. Eighty colleagues attended.
13.	Two workshops were held in February 2012, planned by the Middle Schools Heads Association to prepare for the build up to SATs attended by 80+ colleagues. Children's services officers attended and contributed presentations.
Impact	
14.	<p>Of the original 703 targeted pupils 66% made two levels progress from the end of KS1 to the end of KS2 in Maths</p> <p>Of the original 703 targeted pupils 72% made two levels progress from the end of KS1 to the end of KS2 in English.</p>

15.	These are positive outcomes given that these pupils were at high risk of not making the expected rate of progress. These figures also include some pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN).
16.	There was a significant development in terms of schools sharing good practice whilst exemplifying school to school support. This included Academy and Non-Academy schools and some Bedford Borough Schools. An example of this is the KS2 workshops facilitated by the Middle Schools Heads association in February 2012.
17.	An audit of good practice was completed by SIAs and key factors that supported success were identified.
18.	There was a significant development in terms of schools sharing good practice whilst and delivering this through school to school support. This included Academy and Non-Academy schools and some Bedford Borough Schools. An example of this work can be seen in the KS2 workshops facilitated by the Middle Schools Heads association in February 2012.
19.	Robust assessment and target setting had a significant impact on pupils' rates of progress especially where this included sharing with pupils their criteria for success so they were very clear about their next steps in their learning. Provision of resources where thirds of level progress steps were in a form accessible to pupils and parents aided this further.
20.	The four visits by School Improvement Advisors to each school each half term ensured that schools were given appropriate levels of challenge and support. All schools welcomed this provision as part of the drive to raise standards along with the information they provided about different strategies which were seen to be effective in other schools.
21.	There was a value in subject teachers being held to account for their pupils' achievements by subject /senior leaders. This was best achieved through rigorous Pupil Progress meetings each half term. In such cases links were identified with objectives in the staff performance management process and suggestions were made for how pupils who were going off track could overcome the barriers and catch back up.
22.	Item level analysis of questions in the 2011 KS2 test papers helped to inform teachers' of the gaps in attainment which identified possible misconceptions. This aided planning to address such misconceptions occurring with the new Y6 cohort.
23.	Ensuring rigorous tracking of pupil progress helped to inform teachers' planning.
24.	Peer mentoring where pupils in Year 8 supported pupils in Year 6 resolve learning based problems based upon their experience and school to school support put the onus back on schools having responsibility for improving outcomes. Many schools also commented that peer mentoring improved pupil behaviour across the school because of pastoral links across year groups.

25.	Engagement of parents in supporting the drive to raise standards through parent friendly workshops etc. For example, several schools highlighted for parents the ways in which they could support their children and booklets were prepared to underpin this process for reference purposes.
26.	Schools moved from operating booster groups after school to focused, targeted support in lesson time. There was agreement that twilight "Booster" groups were not effective when pupils were tired and less responsive to support.
27.	Drawing upon pupil feedback to engage pupils and inform subsequent planning. In this way pupils were able to talk through their experiences with teachers to ensure their learning was effective
28.	Whole school commitment to success at the end of KS2 with all subjects supporting the drive to improve pupil outcomes in English and Maths.
2012/2013	
29.	The project has refocused on earlier intervention with additional funding to support Year 5 pupils who are at risk of not achieving their challenging targets at the end of Year 6 in reading, writing or maths and / or two levels progress from the end of KS1. This will allow four terms to address these challenges.
30.	All nine non academy middle schools / primary schools with Year 6 pupils have engaged with this project.
31.	During the first half of the Summer Term 2012 schools reviewed Year 5 data and the targets for SATs and identified those pupils at risk of not achieving two levels progress and / or their challenging targets
32.	270 targeted pupils were identified across the nine schools. The cost is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £150 of targeted funding has been allocated per pupil pro rata • a lump sum of £1,000 to cover administrative costs. This totals £49,500 • Each school is allocated 4 days of School Improvement Professional (SIP) time to provide challenge and support. This costs £14,400 • Schools will be encouraged to look at working together to maximise the funding • The cost to date is £63,900
22.	Funding can be used at the school's discretion, for 1-1 support, small group work etc. It can also pay for additional teaching support during lesson time. The impact of this support will be evaluated by School Improvement Partners (SIPs) and the good practice will be shared across schools.
23.	Progress data for targeted pupils was collected at the end of the May half term and in July, and then will be collected and analysed regularly at the end of each half term until March 2013.
24.	Headteachers and senior curriculum managers are meeting their allocated SIP at the start of each half term to evaluate the impact of the funding and review overall data for targeted pupils. They will also review next steps.
25.	Results will be evaluated within the Council after each data collection and then in a summative way at the end of the year.

SUSTAINABILITY/NEXT STEPS	
26.	Sustainability will be achieved when, through the work of (i) Central Bedfordshire Teaching School Partnership (ii) a culture of school to school support and the (iii) expectations of leaders and teachers in middle schools work there is a consistent, year on year focus on embedding such approaches as the norm.
27.	Responsibility for embedding successful practice is increasingly owned by schools where a willingness is shown to share processes, accept challenges, offer support and to learn from each other. This is true within phases of and across phases. Targeted support has been effective in KS2 and this may now be replicated in other phases.
28.	In medium term, middle schools need to work collaboratively with their feeder lower schools to build professional trust and to ensure continuity and good progression is maintained from year 4 to year 6.
CONCLUSION – LEARNING TO TAKE FORWARD TO OTHER PROJECTS	
29.	Early intervention gives schools more time to plan the most effective support and draw upon previous experiences.
30.	School to school support with appropriate levels of challenge and support create scope and capacity within the local system to spread and embed good practice.
31	<p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific teaching interventions to resolve issues linked to subject knowledge barriers made a difference • 1 to 1 support and group work were strategies that pupils of all abilities found helped them. They reflected that this was often the most significant way they achieved real learning with time to ask specific questions • Assessment, tracking pupil progress meetings with challenge and solutions helped those pupils who were off track and were also effective strategies to support learning for all pupils.

Background Papers: (open to public inspection) None