
REPORT TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS

EXECUTIVE BOARD: 22 AUGUST 2007

SUBJECT: Termly Update on Ofsted Inspections and Schools Causing Concern (Primary)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The report outlines the performance of primary schools from January to June 2007 and the action taken by Education Leeds to fulfil its responsibilities to the Executive Board and schools. Evidence is drawn from national and local performance data, monitoring activities undertaken by school improvement advisers and Ofsted reports on schools inspected since January 2007.
- 1.2 The public interest in maintaining the exemption of Appendix 2 on this subject outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information because Education Leeds has a duty to secure improvement and increased confidence in the schools concerned. This would be adversely affected by disclosure of the information

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The terminology 'schools causing concern' refers to those schools that have been identified by Ofsted as being subject to special measures or as requiring significant improvement and given a notice to improve. In addition, schools are also identified by Education Leeds (School Improvement Policy 2006) as needing immediate intervention and support due to them being a cause for concern which if not addressed would result in them being placed in an Ofsted category. Schools may also be a cause for concern due to temporary or short term circumstances that leave them vulnerable.
- 2.2 The new framework for the inspection of schools was introduced in September 2005 by Ofsted. Schools are now inspected every three years at very short notice. This tests the reliability of the monitoring, support, challenge and intervention processes used by Education Leeds and the school's preparedness and accuracy of their self evaluation.
- 2.3 The current Education Leeds Policy for School Improvement came into effect from April 2006 with a focus on the importance of school self evaluation and the support provided by Education Leeds based on an agreed partnership.

3.0 SUMMARY

3.1 Schools Causing Concern

3.1.1 There are currently four primary schools in an Ofsted category, three of which are subject to special measures (Grimes Dyke, Austhorpe, Miles Hill) and one which has received a Notice to Improve (Bracken Edge). Miles Hill closed in July 2007. An additional seven schools are considered to be causing concern according to the criteria in the Education Leeds School Improvement Policy (2006) (Brodetsky, Chapel Allerton, Fountain, Hugh Gaitskell, Quarry Mount, Micklefield and Woodlands). Little London and Seacroft Grange have recently been removed from this category following a review visit by school improvement advisers.

3.2 School Inspections

3.2.1 Since January 2007, 51 primary schools have been inspected. This includes HMI monitoring visits to schools in Special Measures or with a Notice To Improve. Of these 51 schools, six were judged to be outstanding, 23 good, 20 satisfactory and only two were found to be inadequate.

3.2.2 Education Leeds has five schools deemed by the DfES as being 'Hard to Shift', i.e. performing consistently below the floor target of 65% for three years in English and mathematics. Three of these schools have been inspected this academic year and have been judged satisfactory (Parklands, Woodlands, and Wykebeck). One (Harehills) is awaiting inspection imminently.

3.2.3 The schools in Ofsted categories are regularly monitored by HMI. The three schools in Special Measures (Austhorpe, Grimes Dyke and Miles Hill) have recently received satisfactory progress reports. Two schools with a notice to improve were inspected and judged to be satisfactory (Bramham and Hollybush). Manston St James, which was in a serious weaknesses category under the previous Ofsted inspection framework, was inspected and judged to be good.

3.2.4 There are no national comparability figures available at this time of year.

3.3 School Categories

3.3.1 The Education Leeds School Improvement Policy has been rewritten to reflect the Ofsted grades and criteria. All schools have engaged in discussion with an adviser to agree a judgement against the indicators in the policy and to agree an appropriate category for the school.

3.3.2 All schools have now entered into one of four 'partnerships', i.e. Leading Partnership (category 1), Learning Partnership (category 2), Focused Partnership (category 3), or Extended Partnership (category 4). Some schools have had their partnership status reviewed since June 2006 following Ofsted inspection or Education Leeds review. All schools will be reviewed with their school improvement partner during the summer of 2008. The current picture reveals 10% of schools (22) in category 1 – a leading partnership; 51.5% of schools (116) in category 2 – a learning partnership; 34% of schools (76) in category 3 – a focused partnership and 4.5% of schools (10) in category 4 – an extended partnership. This picture remains largely unchanged since the last report. (10% of schools in category 1, 50% in category 2, 35% in category 3 and 5% in category 4.)

3.3.3 This process has enabled Education Leeds to develop an accurate picture of all schools and to provide support to those most in need. Early intervention, additional support, task groups and the joint review groups have proved successful as can be evidenced by the small number of schools in an Ofsted category.

3.4 **The School Improvement Strategy**

3.4.1 Schools identified as category 4 and some in category 3, i.e. taking part in a focused or extended partnership, are provided with a personalised support package. All schools in category 4 are further supported by a task group, a joint review group and an evaluation officer. The evaluation officer role is to evaluate the impact of the improvement strategies against the key issues. This role is undertaken by the school improvement partner.

3.4.2 The task group is chaired by the school improvement adviser who coordinates and monitors progress against actions in the school action plan. The joint review group consists of representatives from the governing body, the school leadership team, the school improvement adviser and the school improvement partner. The joint review group evaluates the impact of strategies used and calls the school to account for its progress.

3.4.3 The support package offered to the schools is usually based around the Intensifying Support Programme (ISP) which is a National Strategies initiative to drive whole school improvement. This may be enhanced by consultant support for mathematics, literacy, ICT, and assessment. Further needs may be identified resulting in the school entering a partnership with another school to access good practice. Many schools are further supported by an advanced skills teacher (AST) or an advisory teacher from the Early Years Service.

4.0 **Recommendations**

The Executive Board is asked to consider the main findings in the report, the successes in our primary schools, and to note the strategies for improvement that have been developed to support future increases in achievement for all pupils, groups and schools.

Agenda Item:

Originator: Christine Halsall

Telephone: 2144068

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS

EXECUTIVE BOARD: 22 August 2007

SUBJECT: Biannual Update on Ofsted Inspections and Schools Causing Concern
(Primary)

Electoral Wards Affected:
ALL

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality & Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call-in

Not Eligible for Call-in
(Details contained in the Report)

1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 The report outlines the performance of primary schools from January to June 2007 and the action taken by Education Leeds to fulfil its responsibilities to the Board and schools. Evidence is drawn from national and local performance data, monitoring activities undertaken by school improvement advisers and Ofsted reports on schools inspected since January 2007.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 The terminology 'schools causing concern' refers to those schools that have been identified by Ofsted as being subject to special measures or as requiring significant improvement and given a notice to improve. In addition schools are also identified by Education Leeds (School Improvement Policy 2006) as needing immediate intervention and support due to them being a cause for concern which if not addressed would result in them being placed in an Ofsted category. Schools may also be a cause for concern due to temporary or short term circumstances that leave them vulnerable.

- 2.2 The new framework for the inspection of schools was introduced in September 2005 by Ofsted. Schools are now inspected every three years at very short notice. This tests the reliability of the monitoring, support, challenge and intervention processes used by Education Leeds and the school's preparedness and accuracy of their self evaluation.
- 2.3 The current Education Leeds Policy for School Improvement came into effect from April 2006 with a focus on the importance of school self evaluation and the support provided by Education Leeds based on an agreed partnership.

3.0 MAIN ISSUES

3.1 Schools Causing Concern

- 3.1.1 There are currently four primary schools in an Ofsted category, three of which are subject to special measures (Austhorpe, Grimes Dyke and Miles Hill) and one which has received a Notice to Improve (Bracken Edge). Miles Hill will close in July 2007. An additional seven schools are considered to be causing concern according to the criteria in the Education Leeds School Improvement Policy (2006). (Brodetsky, Chapel Allerton, Fountain, Hugh Gaitskell, Micklefield, Quarry Mount and Woodlands). Little London and Seacroft Grange have recently been removed from this category following a review visit by school improvement advisers.

3.2 School Inspections

- 3.2.1 Since January 2007, 51 primary schools have been inspected. This includes HMI monitoring visits to schools in Special Measures or with a Notice To Improve. Of these 51 schools, six were judged to be outstanding, 23 good, 20 satisfactory and two inadequate.
- 3.2.2 Education Leeds has five schools deemed by the DfES as being 'Hard to Shift', i.e. performing consistently below the floor target of 65% for three years in English and mathematics. Three of these schools have been inspected this academic year and have been judged satisfactory (Parklands, Woodlands, and Wykebeck). One (Harehills) is awaiting inspection imminently.
- 3.2.3 The schools in Ofsted categories are regularly monitored by HMI. The three schools in Special Measures (Austhorpe, Miles Hill and Grimes Dyke) have recently received satisfactory progress reports. Two schools with a notice to improve were inspected and judged to be satisfactory (Bramham and Hollybush). Manston St James, which was in a serious weaknesses category under the previous Ofsted inspection framework, was inspected and judged to be good.

3.3 School Categories

- 3.3.1 The Education Leeds School Improvement Policy has been rewritten to reflect the Ofsted grades and criteria. All schools have engaged in discussion with an adviser to agree a judgement against the indicators in the policy and to agree an appropriate category for the school.
- 3.3.2 All schools have now entered into one of four 'partnerships', i.e. Leading Partnership (category 1), Learning Partnership (category 2), Focused Partnership (category 3), or Extended Partnership (category 4). Some schools have had their

partnership status reviewed since June 2006 following Ofsted inspections or Education Leeds review. All schools will be reviewed with their school improvement partner during the summer of 2008. The current picture reveals 10% of schools (22) in category 1 – a leading partnership; 51.5% of schools (116) in category 2 – a learning partnership; 34% of schools (76) in category 3 – a focused partnership and 4.5% of schools (10) in category 4 – an extended partnership. This picture remains largely unchanged since the last report (10% of schools in category 1, 50% in category 2, 35% in category 3 and 5% in category 4).

3.3.3 This process has enabled Education Leeds to develop an accurate picture of all schools and to provide support to those most in need. Early intervention, additional support, task groups and the joint review groups have proved successful as can be evidenced by the small number of schools in an Ofsted category.

3.4 School Improvement Strategy

3.4.1 Schools identified as category 4 and some in category 3, i.e. taking part in a focused or extended partnership, are provided with a personalised support package (see below). All schools in category 4 are further supported by a task group, a joint review group and an evaluation officer. The evaluation officer role is to evaluate the impact of the improvement strategies against the key issues. This role is undertaken by the school improvement partner.

3.4.2 The task group is chaired by the school improvement adviser who coordinates and monitors progress against actions in the school action plan. The joint review group consists of representatives from the governing body, the school leadership team, the school improvement adviser and the school improvement partner. The joint review group evaluates the impact of strategies used and calls the school to account for its progress.

3.4.3 The targeted support package offered to the schools is usually based around the Intensifying Support Programme (ISP) which is a National Strategies initiative to drive whole school improvement. This may be enhanced by consultant support for mathematics, literacy, ICT, and assessment. Further needs may be identified resulting in the school entering a partnership with another school to access good practice. Many schools are further supported by an advanced skills teacher (AST) or an advisory teacher from the Early Years Service.

3.5 The Leeds Challenge

3.5.1 The Leeds Challenge is an initiative designed to bring coherence and cohesion to targeted support for schools. Many schools who find themselves in difficulties suffer from 'initiative overload'. The Leeds Challenge attempts to bring coherence to the school with the concept of 'the team around the school'. The school improvement adviser assigned to a school works with the leadership team to identify the barriers to progress and considers the most appropriate additional support. In addition to ISP and associated school improvement programmes, the school may be offered complementary support from other services from within Education Leeds and Leeds City Council. This will initially include the Early Years Service but will eventually involve a multi agency approach. Services within Education Leeds include school improvement advisers, Healthy Schools, Learning Communities, ArtForms, Inclusion, Extended Services, Ethnic Minority Support, etc. Schools will be supported in making connections between different support packages impacting on outcomes for pupils.

3.5.2 All schools in The Leeds Challenge are currently in the Intensifying Support Programme. Schools in The Leeds Challenge include the five schools designated as 'Hard to Shift'.

3.6 Intensifying Support Programme (ISP)

3.6.1 The vast majority of schools have been identified for ISP because of results at the end of Key Stage 2 which are below the national floor targets of 65% at Level 4 in English and/or mathematics. In addition we have identified a small number of 'stuck' schools where overall attainment is above floor targets but does not represent adequate progress for children and where 'intensive' support is required. Leeds receives funding for 20 schools each year but last year elected to fund 29 schools. Each school receives £2500 per year and substantial support from an ISP consultant, literacy, mathematics, Assessment for Learning and ICT. In order to monitor progress effectively and ensure rigour and pace, each school on ISP has been allocated a school improvement adviser as well as a school improvement partner. The aims of the programme are to accelerate progress, improve teaching and learning and establish key school improvement systems. Results at the end of Key Stage 2 showed strong improvement at the end of the first year but mixed results at the end of the second. Where the challenges facing a school are very complex and include high mobility, the benefits are not always seen in raw Key Stage 2 results. However this year (2007) schools in ISP made 7% improvement in English and 6% in mathematics compared to 1.4% overall improvement in all schools in English and 1.3% overall in mathematics.

3.6.2 Some of the main benefits of ISP have included:

- Vastly improved assessment, tracking and Assessment for Learning.
- Evidence of accelerated progress in all year groups.
- Improved subject leadership.
- Improved systems for monitoring and evaluation.
- An increased capacity to respond positively to change (including national agenda).
- Positive Ofsted inspection outcomes even when attainment and achievement is low.

3.7 Every Child a Reader Programme (ECaR)

3.7.1 Every Child A Reader provides literacy interventions of different degrees of intensity to six and seven year old children who require them, with the aim of ensuring that every child achieves age related expectations at the end of Key Stage 1 – other than a tiny minority who have a pervasive developmental disorder that was evident before they started school, or are very new to English at the time of their end of Key Stage 1 assessment. These interventions are provided in addition to day to day high quality literacy teaching designed to include all children and to promote achievement and progress for all. For some children, those with the most severe difficulties, intervention within Every Child A Reader will involve daily one-to-one Reading Recovery teaching as 'Wave 3' provision.

3.7.2 This programme began in Leeds 2006 with nine schools. Schools were selected from their Key Stage 1 performance data in reading and asked to submit a bid for funding towards employing a Reading Recovery teacher for 0.6 of a full time post. These schools received £15510 in 2006-7 and a further £13500 for 2007-8. The

Reading Recovery teachers were trained by a Reading Recovery teacher leader in Bradford over a period of 20 sessions throughout the year and have also had their work closely monitored and evaluated.

3.7.3 The programme has been extended to include a further seven schools in 2007-8 and we have appointed our own Reading Recovery teacher leader to begin training at the Institute of Education, London in September 2007.

3.7.4 This work is still in the early stages but impact is already being seen in individual children's reading levels.

3.8 Intervention Managers Programme

3.8.1 This programme was developed in Leeds using the national materials – 'Leading on Intervention' The aim of the programme is to develop the leadership and management of interventions in literacy and mathematics in primary schools through:

- Raising awareness of the personalised learning agenda.
- Using data to identify children at risk of falling behind age related expectation.
- Mapping provision across school against identified needs.
- Access to training for teachers and teaching assistants delivering intervention.
- Guidance on monitoring and evaluating the impact of intervention.

3.8.2 The programme was offered to all primary schools and has involved 137 schools this year. It has provided schools with the opportunity to develop the role of the intervention manager, access training in wave 2 and 3 provision and funding of £1500.

3.8.3 Some of the benefits of this programme have been:

- Strategic manager in place in each school with the overview of provision at waves 1,2 and 3.
- Improved use of data to identify children for intervention and provision mapping to organise interventions across school.
- Improved systems for monitoring and evaluating the impact of interventions.

3.8.4 In 2007-8 the programme will be offered to 50 new schools and the 2006-7 schools will continue to network through the leading intervention managers.

3.9 Literacy and Mathematics

3.9.1 All primary schools and SILCs have received funding of at least £1600 for developing the Renewed Primary Framework. Around 190 schools accessed training (3+2 day course) for their subject leaders in literacy and mathematics and they have plans in place to implement the new frameworks over 2007-8. Around 150 schools received additional funding and training in CLLD to support them with the implementation of the recommendations from The Rose Report about phonics. Plans for next year include further training for subject leaders, focused support for Year 3 and Year 5 teachers in targeted schools.

3.10 ICT

3.10.1 Over the last year the focus of ICT support at primary level has been on the

following priorities:

- Embedding the use of ICT across the curriculum to support effective teaching and learning.
- Supporting schools where ICT has been identified by Ofsted as an area for development.
- Supporting schools in developing self evaluation of their use of ICT.

3.10.2 The work of the primary ICT team in supporting schools to embed the use of ICT across the curriculum has focused on the group of around 90 schools engaged in the Primary Distributed Leadership for Learning Programme (DLLP). Each of these schools has had access to training and support for subject leaders focusing on the use of ICT across the range of foundation subjects. This training has been followed up with each school having up to six days bespoke, in class consultant support, focused on developing learning and teaching with and through ICT. This work is now coming to an end and a final evaluation will follow as part of the overall evaluation of DLLP.

3.10.3 Training on the use of electronic whiteboards has continued across the year as demand for this is still high. The ICT team has offered beginners, intermediate and advanced user training to teachers. Support for non teaching staff in ICT has also been offered to schools this year with around 20 schools accessing free, bespoke in school training.

3.10.4 Support for schools where ICT has been identified by Ofsted as an area for development is ongoing. These schools are offered strategic support from the ICT adviser and consultant support to work in class with staff on agreed actions to secure the improvement that is required.

3.10.5 Using BECTA's new Self Review Framework for ICT is a key way in which schools can take control of their development of effective use of ICT across the whole school. Since December 2006 the ICT team has been involved in engaging schools in beginning this process. At present just under a quarter of primary schools have begun this process and those schools not yet registered will be offered support next year.

3.11 Sustaining Success Programme

3.11.1 This programme has involved six high-achieving schools over the past 18 months. They receive £1000 per year to support them in working together to share expertise, pilot innovative ways of working and develop materials which can be shared with other schools. They are currently working with QCA on piloting new National Curriculum materials as well as exploring effective Early Years practice, the development of middle leaders and links with the business sector.

3.11.2 While much of this work is still at relatively early stages of development, some benefits include:

- Effective sharing of information at head teacher seminars.
- Use of these schools as Lead partners in the School Improvement Policy.
- The development of models of successful networking.

3.12 Primary Leadership Programme (PLP) 2003-2007

3.12.1 This national programme has run for the past four years. Around 150 schools have taken part. Schools have been identified in various ways. Data and information have been used to identify schools with low contextual value added, a new or inexperienced leadership team or complex school improvement issues. In addition, schools have been able to nominate themselves where developing a more distributed style of leadership is a priority. The aims of the programme have been to strengthen distributed leadership and contribute to raising standards at end of Key Stage 2 in English and mathematics. Each school has been allocated a primary strategy consultant leader (PSCL) who is an experienced Leeds headteacher as well as support from literacy or mathematics consultants. They have received up to £2000 each year for two years and have attended centrally-based training each term. Outcomes at Key Stage 2 have been mixed. Where there has been a good spread of schools involved, Key Stage 2 results have risen more sharply than those for all schools. Where the majority of the schools have been targeted because of low achievement, there has been less impact at Key Stage 2 although strong evidence of better progress further down school as most systems take time to show impact.

3.12.2 Some of the main benefits of PLP have included:

- Improved assessment and tracking (often using lessons learned from ISP).
- Partnerships between the PSCLs' schools and schools on the programme.
- Ongoing advice and support for new headteachers and vulnerable schools.
- An effective professional relationship between PLP schools and Education Leeds.
- Evidence that standards will continue to rise over the next few years.

3.13 Distributed Leadership for Learning

3.13.1 This programme was devised using funding from the National Strategy to provide bespoke support to Leeds schools. It was particularly aimed at schools not receiving support through ISP or PLP. The project ran for two years and came to an end this summer. The project had four strands: to develop the leadership skills of the deputy headteacher coordinating the work in school; to use the project as a vehicle for establishing distributed leadership; to establish ICT across the curriculum enhancing learning in all subject areas; to design a curriculum to meet the needs of the children. Schools were asked to ensure that the deputy headteacher was given full responsibility for the development and impact of the project. This ensured that deputy headteachers were given suitable strategic responsibility in preparation for headship. Leaders of literacy, mathematics, ICT and assessment as well as leaders of foundation subjects, were encouraged to develop the use of ICT to enhance learning within and between subjects. Excellence and Enjoyment provided the opportunity to take a fresh look at the curriculum and to design provision and learning experiences appropriate to the needs of the children and the community.

3.13.2 The main benefits have included:

- Improved curriculum provision which is innovative and exciting.
- Evidence of better use of ICT for learning and for management.
- Improved leadership skills of deputy headteachers and other leaders in school.
- Heightened awareness and growing confidence in schools to make the curriculum more accessible to their pupils.
- Increased networking between schools.

3.14 School Improvement Partners and School Improvement Advisers

- 3.14.1 Leeds has introduced school improvement partners (SIPs) to all primary schools during the summer term 2007. Each school will receive five days of interaction with a SIP including a termly visit with the leadership team, and an annual written report to governors. The SIP will also take on the role of performance management adviser to the governing body. SIPs have been appointed from within Education Leeds (all primary advisers have become accredited SIPs), and from serving headteachers both within Leeds and from other local authorities. Several SIPs are retired headteachers or education consultants.
- 3.14.2 Schools requiring targeted support will also be allocated the support of a school improvement adviser who will coordinate and monitor the support package for the school.

3.15 School Partnerships

- 3.15.1 As outlined in the Education Leeds School Improvement Policy, schools are increasingly working together in partnership to support their development. This partnership begins at headteacher level and extends to include support at all levels throughout the school including governors. The main benefits of this strategy are:
- Improved networking between schools in a range of ways, led by Education Leeds or initiated between schools independently.
 - Improved sharing of resources including staff.
 - Increased opportunities for learning from best practice.

4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL POLICY AND GOVERNANCE

This report informs the new school improvement policy and the development of a strategy for extending and developing partnerships which increase the capacity of all schools to raise achievement. The new inspection framework places additional pressure on schools and particularly on school leaders, who need support. The continued low performance of many minority and vulnerable groups means that tackling inequalities remains a very high priority for Education Leeds.

5.0 LEGAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Although attainment overall is satisfactory, many schools experience a high level of challenge and struggle to meet floor targets. The achievement of BME pupils also remains a cause for concern. These schools must remain a high priority when allocating resources. The School Improvement Partner programme, implemented in the summer term 2007, will add to the capacity to support school leadership.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

Central and school-based strategies, and a variety of partnerships and initiatives, have been successful in raising achievement in Leeds. However, further developments will be necessary if the momentum is to be maintained and Leeds is to keep pace with national improvements.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive Board is asked to consider the main findings for the report and note the strategies for improvement that have been developed to support future increases in achievement for all pupils, groups and schools.