

# **An update on progress following the Scrutiny Inquiry into Raising Attainment in Maths and English (April 2014)**

## **Appendix 2 – Further information for Recommendation 2**

### **Appendix 2a: Data on vulnerable Groups**

#### **FSM 6**

In 2013 Key Stage 1 attainment was still significantly lower for those eligible for Free School Meals than for those not eligible. The gaps, however, continue to be closed in all subjects. Analysis indicates that the gaps in Leeds are wider than those seen nationally.

At Key Stage 2 there remained significant gaps in attainment between those eligible for Free School meals and those who were not. Results for pupils eligible for Free School meals have remained static in Leeds. The attainment gap between FSM eligible and their peers is wider than that nationally. However, the percentage of pupils eligible for FSM in Leeds making 2 levels of progress is higher than the national figure for FSM eligible children.

For 2013 at KS4, the percentage of pupils not in receipt of free school meals at any point in the last six years achieving 5 A\*-C including English and Maths at GCSE or equivalent was 67.7% (En 72.8; Ma 77.7). For those pupils who were in receipt of free school meals at some point in the last six years the comparable figure is 36% (En 43; Ma 46.7). If we look at this in terms of progress in English from KS2 to KS4, 72% non FSM6 pupils made three levels of progress (NA 75%) compared to 48% FSM6 pupils who made three levels of progress (NA 57%). This suggests that whilst the gap between outcomes for FSM6 and non FSM6 pupils may have been established in the primary phase, the secondary phase does nothing to reduce the gap and, in fact, further widens it. The picture in Maths is similar: 76% of non FSM pupils made expected progress (NA 77%) compared to 46% FSM6 pupils (NA 54%). Not only is there a wide gap between the achievement and attainment of FSM6 and non FSM6 pupils in Leeds, it is also wider than the national gap. In 2013, FSM6 pupils constituted 33% of the total number of candidates. Clearly, addressing underachievement of the FSM6 cohort in English and Maths would considerably improve outcomes in the city as a whole. There are eighteen schools in the city where the achievement of FSM6 pupils compared to non FSM6 pupils for 5A\*-C including English and Maths is over 30% and these schools are spread geographically in all parts of the city, often next to a neighbouring school where the gap is considerably lower.

#### **Looked After Children Ever**

In 2013, the percentage of Children Looked After (CLA) achieving a level 2 or above was very similar to the dramatically improved figures for 2012 in reading, writing and mathematics. Key Stage 1 attainment for CLA is now either above or close to national.

At KS2 the percentage of Children Looked After (CLA) achieving a level 4 in mathematics declined 4 percentage points in 2013 but remained 11 percentage points higher than in 2011. Also the proportion achieving the expected level of progress compared to the end of Key Stage 1 in mathematics increased by 9 percentage points. The single benchmark for English was replaced by

separate measures for reading and writing. More Children Looked After achieved the benchmark level 4 in writing compared to 2012, while fewer achieved the benchmark in reading. The percentage achieving the expected level of progress improved by 3 percentage points in writing and decreased by 3 percentage points in reading. All three measures of progress are at or above national.

There were 72 looked after children in Leeds who sat exams in 2013. This is 0.9% of the total. In 2013, Leeds children in care gained 21% 5A\*-C grades including En and Maths at GCSE or equivalent compared to a national figure of 20%. The figure for non CLA in Leeds was 57%. Clearly, there is a gap between the achievement of looked after children in Leeds and those who are not looked after, but unlike the Ever 6 group above, this difference in attainment is not hugely different from the disparity seen nationally.

## **EAL**

In 2013 at KS1, levels of attainment for pupils with English as an additional language (EAL) were lower than for those with English as a first language in Key Stage 1 compared to Leeds and national figures, with a 13 % point gap in reading in Leeds. The gap between Leeds overall and national did not change in 2013.

In 2013, levels of attainment for pupils with English as an additional language (EAL) were lower than for those with English as a first language in Key Stage 2 compared to Leeds and national figures. The percentage of pupils with EAL achieving level 4 in English and mathematics is 9 percentage points lower than for those with English as a first language.

11% of children in Leeds taking level 2 exams in 2013 are believed to have English as an additional language. These children gained 50% 5A\*-C including Maths and English at GCSE or equivalent compared to the 57% achieved by their peers with English as a first language. In terms of progress of those pupils believed to have English as a first language, 64% made expected progress (NA 69%) compared to 71% with English as an additional language (NA 78%) in English. In Maths, the figures are as follows: expected progress made by pupils with a first language of English was 66% (NA 70%) compared to those pupils in Leeds with English as an additional language 63% (NA 80%). Results in Leeds are generally lower than for the national average but in English, this difference is not accentuated by the fact that some pupils do not have English as a first language. This appears to be more of an issue in Maths where the gap between those making expected progress and who have English as an additional language is wider than the one seen nationally.

## **Overlap of key cohorts**

Obviously, there is overlap between the cohorts who are in receipt of free school meals and, for instance, have English as an additional language. Further interrogation of the exam results for 2013 shows that there are some key sub-cohorts who are underachieving, most specifically white boys in receipt of free school meals.

## The overlap between vulnerable groups: results in Leeds 2013

Category	%A*-C English	% A*-C Maths
Non FSM Boys with English as a first language	66.8	78.3
Non FSM Boys English is NOT first language	60.2	75.5
FSM Boys with English as a first language	32.8	42.8
FSM Boys English is NOT first language	38.3	54.3
Non FSM Girls with English as a first language	81.7	78.6
Non FSM Girls English NOT first language	67.6	69.8
FSM Girls with English as a first language	52.7	47.2
FSM Girls English is NOT first language	50.3	57.3

	Non FSM Boys		FSM Boys		Non FSM Girls		FSM Girls	
%	5A*-C Eng	5A*-C Ma	5A*-C Eng	5A*-C Ma	5A*-C Eng	5A*-C Ma	5A*-C Eng	5A*-C Ma
<b>African</b>	63	72.2	37.3	52.9	79.6	71.4	48.4	57.8
<b>Bangladeshi</b>	84.6	84.6	33.3	33.3	75	81.3	58.8	52.9
<b>Black Caribbean</b>	56.7	66.7	38.5	38.5	65.2	65.2	68	64
<b>Chinese</b>	68.4	100	83.3	83.3	100	100	100	100
<b>Gypsy Roma</b>	14.3	14.3	9.1	9.1	20	20	21.4	28.6
<b>Indian</b>	74.2	87.9	63.6	81.8	88.2	82.4	85	75
<b>Kashmiri Pakistani</b>	48.1	61.5	24.1	37.9	54.3	65.7	55.6	55.6
<b>White</b>	66.8	78.9	31.6	42.1	82	79	50.6	46.3

## SEN

In 2013 at KS1 the attainment of pupils at School Action and School Action Plus improved in 2013 in all subjects.

At KS2 Attainment for SEN pupils remained lower than the national equivalent, however, as with FSM eligible children, the percentage of SEN children making expected progress was higher in Leeds than seen nationally.

In Leeds in 2013 amongst the pupils taking level 2 exams, there were 3% of pupils with a statement of SEN. Of these pupils 10% achieved 5A\*-C including English and Maths at GCSE and equivalent compared to 9% nationally. There were a further 17% of pupils who have been identified as SEN without a statement. Of these pupils, 23% gained 5A\*-C including English and Maths at GCSE and equivalent compared to 26% nationally. This was statistically significant in the authority RAISE online report. In particular, there was a 3% difference between local and national for the students of this cohort defined as School Action.

## Conclusion

The largest vulnerable group in Leeds, and arguably the one whose underachievement is most pronounced, is the FSM6 cohort, and specifically, white boys. To make progress in raising the numbers of children in Leeds achieving A\*-C in Maths and English, the barriers to learning faced by FSM6 pupils must surely be the top priority.

## **Appendix 2b: What are the underlying barriers to success for these children in Leeds?**

As is the case nationally, there are many families in Leeds which face multiple disadvantages rather than one or two. These might include: no parent in work; poor housing; lack of parental qualifications; mental health problems; one parent has long standing illness, disability or infirmity; low family income; or the fact that a family cannot afford a number of food and clothing items. All the available research suggests that these are complicating factors which means that children experiencing multiple disadvantage are far more vulnerable to multiple poor outcomes than other children, especially in English and maths.

In Leeds, there are 8 schools where 50% or more of pupils are in receipt of free school meals. The schools are: Swallow Hill, Carr Manor, City of Leeds, David Young Community Academy, Leeds East, John Smeaton, South Leeds and The Co-operative Academy. Of these 6 are requiring improvement or inadequate. This could be because they form part of a vicious circle, in that the problems faced by those schools, and the multiple disadvantage faced by their pupils, makes it very hard to succeed. It could also be argued that these are the schools that are most in need of improvement in Leeds and that one of the major barriers for vulnerable pupils in Leeds is that they go to the least well performing schools in Leeds. Furthermore, only one of them is a local authority school, making it hard for Leeds School Improvement to intervene and support these pupils.

In Leeds, there are considerable numbers of pupils who are of ethnic origin and are in receipt of free school meals. In Leeds, overall, boys eligible for free school meals have the lowest proportion of pupils achieving 5 A\*-C including English and maths, at 13%. Boys of Black Caribbean heritage have low levels of attainment, even for those not eligible for free school meals. For girls, the lowest attaining groups (with more than 10 pupils) are those of White British and Other Mixed heritage that are eligible for free school meals. Attainment is low for boys eligible for free school meals that are of Black Caribbean, Other Black, White British, Kashmiri Pakistani, Other Pakistani and Other Mixed heritage.

Absence, particularly persistent absence, is a key factor in the underachievement of vulnerable groups in Leeds. 8 per cent of pupils in Leeds secondary schools missed more than 15 per cent of school in 2012/13, slightly higher than in 2011/12 whilst persistent absence fell nationally, in statistical neighbours and core cities. Levels of persistent absence remain higher in Leeds, with the gap widening in 2012/13. In 2007, 10% of pupils in Leeds with attendance below 80% left school with no qualifications. Of pupils with less than 50% attendance in Year 11 only 1% gained 5 A\*-C at GCSE including English and Maths. The figure is 6% if the attendance is below 80%.

Another issue for Leeds is the lack of progress made at primary which impacts on progress at secondary. In 2007, of the 30% of children who did not achieve the expected level of 4 at KS2, ¾ did not achieve level 5 at KS3. Three quarters of pupils that did not achieve level 2 or above in reading or writing in Key Stage 1 did not achieve a level 5 or above in Key Stage 3 English. A similar relationship is also seen for maths, with 81% of those not achieving a level 2 in Key Stage 1 not achieving a level 5 in Key Stage 3.

Research carried out by Clifton and Cook in 2012<sup>1</sup> argues that for deprived pupils, “around half of the achievement gap we witness at age 16 was already present when these pupils started secondary school”, and that “even if the gap in attainment did not widen at all during secondary school, a substantial gap would still exist at GCSE as a result of inequalities from earlier in life.” Given that outcomes for vulnerable groups, especially for FSM pupils, are wider at KS2 in Leeds than seen nationally, it seems fair to assume that one of the barriers to their achievement at KS4 is the gap that is established during primary.

Changes in administration and budget constraints may also have had an impact of achievement for vulnerable pupils in Leeds. Cutbacks in public expenditure, the growth of academies with significant autonomy from the local authority, and an expectation that the local authority is both a champion of the most vulnerable but no longer a direct provider of school improvement services, are seen as significant complicating factors in the Brighthouse and Woods review undertaken in Leeds in 2011. Factors complicating both the move from Education Leeds back to the City Council and subsequent perceptions of education in the city have also affected progress. Changes in expenditure have arisen largely from changes to national funding regimes for key functions and services amounting to a total of £8m per year. National Strategies teams, School Improvement Partners, City Learning Centres, the Excellence in Cities Programme, Extended services, the Healthy Schools Programme and School Development work are some of the main areas affected.

In addition as a result of the formula which requires the reduction in central education budgets of £150 per pupil for every pupil attending schools, the Leeds school improvement budgets have been reduced by £2.95m per year.

Since 2011 the academies agenda has progressed to the extent that there are now 8 primary academies in Leeds and 17 of our 37 secondary schools are academies. Budgetary provision has been cut significantly and this has been accompanied by a switch in education funding from local authorities to schools.

---

<sup>1</sup> *A Long Division: Closing the Attainment Gap in England's Secondary Schools* (Clifton, Cook, 2012) pp.20-21.

## **Appendix 2c:**

### **What action is being taken to raise the achievement of vulnerable groups in Leeds?**

- The Leeds Learning Partnership (LLP) has focused on strategies to support pupil premium students through the regular senior leader briefing and the pupil premium Ofsted report findings have been shared with senior leaders. In addition, these issues have been shared with subject leaders through networks and conferences.
- School senior leaders and maths and English subject leaders have been alerted to the catch up funding that is available.
- The LLP has shared examples of good intervention practice and has facilitated the sharing resources and good practice findings/case studies from one to one tuition.
- The LLP has highlighted the findings of the Sutton Trust 'Teaching and Learning Toolkit'. A key strategy which was found to have best value for money in terms of impact on outcomes of FSM students was 'feedback' – the focus of current work through the LLP.
- The Closing the Gap team have a number of projects in primary schools such as Arooj (to focus on the reading and writing skills of Bangladeshi and Pakistani pupils); Language Rich Project (working with speech therapists and targeted at SEN pupils); Maths 4 All; Quality Plus Programme (Specialist Leaders of education focusing on effective teaching for pupils with EAL and the EMA Hub programme). There are also some initiatives in the secondary phase: a Higher Level Teaching Assistant (HLTA) from Lawnswood is seconded to develop the oracy of EAL pupils and will be working with Corpus Christi and Priesthorpe; an advanced Learner of English project piloted at Roundhay will address the paucity of pupils in their first and second languages.

### **What other actions should be taken by schools and the Local Authority?**

- Major consideration will continue to be given to improve the outcomes for pupils in receipt of free school meals, as these are a major underachieving group in Leeds. Within this group, boys underachieve considerably more than girls. Improvement could be focused on implementing strategies which support this particular group.
- To maintain the focus on attendance, one of our obsessions.
- Make even more effective use of the pupil premium & the application of best practice in support for ethnic minority groups and those eligible for free school meals.
- To further develop school to school partnerships including the further deployment of National, Local and Specialist Leaders of Education to support the attainment of vulnerable pupils.
- To continue to work with clusters to explore ways to involve parents, families and communities and provide them with information, advice and guidance.
- To continue to share national best practice with schools
- To expand the use of data sets, particularly its translation into classroom practice
- Develop a booklet of Leeds Case Studies and examples of ideas which have worked.

### **A summary of Pupil Premium strategies to be developed further:**

#### **Classroom teachers:**

- Seating plans, suitable pairings
- Have key words on literacy mats or on the walls
- Contact SENCO re. literacy interventions necessary with particular pupils
- Ask TA to rewrite difficult texts.
- Bank of historical novels which can be lent out to pupils e.g. Boy in the Striped Pyjamas
- Do a reading age test on a text before using it.

- Use sixth former/university student to mentor PP pupil and/or buddy up PP pupil (especially if attendance is an issue, then buddy can keep notes and help PP catch up)
- Give PP pupil some responsibility.
- Spend 15 mins with PP pupil at start of lesson if attendance has been a problem.

#### **Departmental leaders:**

- Contact parents as a group
- Data checks, tracking and monitoring of FSM/PP pupils and intervention decided as a department. Ensure PP data shared widely.
- Differentiate reading resources
- Paying for revision guides, subsidising school trips, summer schools, Saturday morning schools
- Organise peer mentoring from sixth formers or university students
- Speak to English department re making reading accessible to all e.g. PAFF, EXIT models
- More focus on feedback as this has been shown to be the most effective way of boosting pupil progress.
- Look at setting of PP pupils.
- Take departmental meeting time to discuss progress made by PP pupils and draw up/amend action plans on each one.
- Liaise with member of SLT responsible for PP.
- Create department homework club.
- Invest in Accelerated Reader.
- Make use of university schemes for PP pupils e.g. Access to Leeds (lower offers for university); Routes into Languages; Linguists into Schools (MFL).

#### **Senior Leaders**

- Designate a training day to discussion and support of PP pupils.
- Have a clear PP policy.
- Set up a 'bidding' system whereby staff make a business case for funding subject to specific outcomes.
- Have PP achievement as a Performance Management Objective for all staff.
- Make sure all staff aware of who oversees PP.
- Free breakfast clubs for PP pupils.
- Organise medical checks for hearing and vision in secondary (these currently take place in primary?)
- Ensure that short physical activity is encouraged every day.
- Put in place intensive literacy support with a particular focus on vocab building.
- Look at 'Growth Mindset' theories.
- Teach skills explicitly such as problem solving, processing, note taking, prioritisation and memory skills.
- Work with primary feeder schools to develop literacy and numeracy skills (secondary teachers to work with level 6 pupils in Year 6 and primary teachers working with lower than level 3 pupils in Year 7).

#### **Local Authority**

- Visit to other authorities (e.g. Leicester) where there has been some success in closing the gap for FSM6 pupils.
- Use schools in Leeds that have been successful in closing the gap to mentor/coach other neighbouring schools with a less successful record.