



REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS

EXECUTIVE BOARD: 24 January 2007

SUBJECT: Annual Report on Standards in Leeds Primary Schools and Biannual Update on Ofsted Inspections and Schools Causing Concern

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The report outlines the performance of primary schools during 2005-6 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 September 2005.
- 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 will test 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 new 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.

2.4 A more detailed report is in the confidential part of this agenda (Appendix 2), under Access to Information Rules (10.4 1 & 2)

3.0 SUMMARY

3.1 Attainment and standards

3.1.1 Foundation stage

The proportion of pupils who met the 'expected' standard fell in all assessment foci in 2006 by between 3 and 7 percentage points compared to 2005. Results in Leeds in 2005 were consistently in line with, but slightly below, national results. The drop in the 2006 results could again be the result of better moderation and more accurate teacher assessment; continuing the trend of the last three years.

3.1.2 Key stage 1

Performance at Key Stage 1 in terms of level 2+ remains at levels seen in 2004 and 2005. However the main difference between Leeds and statistical neighbours can be seen at level 3. The apparent decline in performance at level 3 is due to more rigorous teacher assessment and improvement moderation.

3.1.3 Key stage 2

Performance at Key Stage 2 in terms of level 4+ remains at levels seen in 2004 and 2005. Statistical neighbour authorities have improved in the same time period, although national remains static. Level 5 performance has improved locally in 2006, mirroring improvements seen nationally and in statistical neighbour authorities.

3.2 Schools causing concern

There are currently four schools in an Ofsted category (two with a notice to improve and two subject to special measures). An additional six schools are considered to be causing concern according to the criteria in the Education Leeds School Improvement Policy (2006).

3.3 School inspections

During the academic year 2005-6, 44 Leeds primary schools were inspected. Eleven (25%) were found to be outstanding, 20 (45%) good, ten (23%) satisfactory, and three (7%) inadequate (i.e. two with notice to improve and one subject to special measures). This compares nationally over the same period with 9% outstanding, 49% good, 34% satisfactory and 7% inadequate. Leeds can be justifiably proud of having more schools in the good and outstanding category (70%) than all schools inspected nationally (58%). Leeds also has a good proportion of outstanding schools operating in challenging contexts.

3.4 School categories

The Education Leeds School Improvement Policy has been re written 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. 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). There are 10% of schools in category one, 50% in category 2, 35% in category 3 and 5% in category 4. 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.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL POLICY AND GOVERNANCE

- 4.1 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. LEGAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 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, due to be implemented in April 2007, will add to the capacity to support school leadership.

6. CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 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. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive Board is asked to:

- i) note the contents of the report
- ii) note the strategies for improvement that have been developed to support further increases in achievement for all pupils, groups and schools.

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS

EXECUTIVE BOARD: 24 January 2007

SUBJECT: Annual Report on Standards in Leeds Primary Schools and Biannual Update on Ofsted Inspections and Schools Causing Concern

<p>Electoral wards Affected:</p> <p>ALL</p>	<p>Specific Implications For:</p> <p>Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Women <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Narrowing the Gap <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Eligible for Call-in <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Not Eligible for Call-in <input type="checkbox"/></p>

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 The report outlines the performance of primary schools during 2005-6 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 September 2005.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 The terminology 'schools causing concern' refers to those schools that have been identified by Ofsted 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 will test 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 new 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 OVERVIEW OF 2006 PERFORMANCE AT FOUNDATION STAGE, KEY STAGE 1 AND KEY STAGE 2

3.1.1 2006 provisional school outcomes and benchmarks at Foundation Stage

Table 1: Percentage of Leeds pupils achieving 6+ points at the Foundation Stage 2004 to 2006, with national comparators

% pupils achieving 6+ points	2004		2005		2006	
	Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds (provisional)	National
Personal and Social Development:						Not published at Sept '06
Dispositions and Attitudes	90	90	87	90	84	
Social Development	86	85	81	83	79	
Emotional Development	83	83	78	81	74	
Communication, language and literacy:						
Language for communication and thinking	84	82	79	81	76	
Linking sounds and letters	64	64	63	63	60	
Reading	78	75	72	72	67	
Writing	66	64	59	61	56	
Mathematical Development:						
Numbers as labels for Counting	88	89	85	87	83	
Calculating	74	74	70	73	66	
Shape, space and measures	87	85	82	84	78	
Knowledge and understanding of the world	85	82	79	81	74	
Physical development	92	91	88	90	86	
Creative Development	86	84	81	81	76	

Leeds Data Source: NCER – KEYPAS

National Data Source: DfES Statistical First Release (SFR03/2006)

3.1.2 Statutory assessments of Reception pupils (5 year olds) took place for the fourth year in 2006. The Foundation Stage Profile consists of 13 separate "Assessment Foci" in which pupils score between 0 and 9 points. Provisional results indicate that the proportion of pupils who had reached most of the Early Learning Goals, i.e. gained 6 or more points in the assessment foci, varied between 55% of the cohort (Writing) and 87% of the cohort (Physical Development).

3.1.3 The proportion of pupils who met the 'expected' standard fell in all assessment foci in 2006 by between 3 and 7 percentage points compared to 2005. Results in Leeds in 2005 were consistently in line with, but slightly below, national results. The drop in the 2006 results could again be the result of better moderation and more accurate teacher assessment; continuing the trend of the last three years.

- 3.1.4 Two targets have been identified by Department of Education and Skills (DfES), which local authorities need to set for the cohort which will finish Foundation Stage in 2008.
- 3.1.5 **Target 1:** Improve young children's development by increasing the percentage who achieve a total of at least 78 points across the FSP with at least 6 points in each PSED and CLL scale.
- Percentage of pupils with a total score of 78 or over AND 6+ points in each PSED and CLL scale is 43%.
- 3.1.6 **Target 2:** improve the average FSP score of the lowest achieving group to narrow the gap between that group and the rest.
- Gap defined as the difference between the median of the lowest 20% of achievers and the median of the full cohort.
 - Median of the average FSP score of lowest 20% of achievers is 57
 - Median of the average FSP score full cohort of achievers is 88
 - Gap is 31 points.

Table 2 Percentage of pupils achieving point ranges in each AoL		Pupils		Not assessed		Working within the Stepping Stones		Working within Early Learning Goals		Working within and above Early Learning Goals		Working securely within Early Learning Goals		Working fully at and beyond Early Learning Goals	
		2005	2006	2005	2006	(0-3 SPs*)		(4-7 SPs*)		(4+ SPs*)		(6+ SPs*)		(8+ SPs*)	
						2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
Dispositions & Attitude	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.1	0.0	3.4	4.0	47.7	58.7	96.5	96.0	84.0	76.1	48.8	37.3
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	2.5	2.9	42.0	48.8	97.4	97.0	86.6	83.8	55.3	48.1
Social Development	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.1	0.0	6.5	7.4	59.2	71.0	93.5	92.6	74.6	67.4	34.3	21.5
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	4.7	5.0	55.0	62.0	95.2	94.9	81.3	78.8	40.2	32.9
Emotional Development	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.1	0.0	10.2	12.9	47.7	56.5	89.7	87.1	69.0	64.0	42.0	30.6
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	7.1	8.1	43.9	49.1	92.8	91.8	78.0	73.7	48.9	42.7
PSE Total	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	-	-	-	-	-	-	87.6	84.4	63.3	54.9	25.3	15.5
	Leeds			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	91.2	90.2	71.8	67.7	30.0	24.4
Language for Communication & Thinking	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.2	0.0	11.1	13.3	53.2	59.4	88.8	86.7	69.7	65.9	35.5	27.3
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	7.0	8.2	47.7	53.4	92.9	91.7	79.3	75.5	45.2	38.3
Linking Sounds & Letters	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.1	0.3	27.3	26.7	46.0	56.3	72.6	73.1	52.7	52.5	26.6	16.8
	Leeds			0.1	0.2	18.8	20.4	50.2	51.8	81.1	79.5	62.5	59.8	30.9	27.7
Reading	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.1	0.0	13.2	15.6	60.1	68.2	86.7	84.4	60.7	52.1	26.7	16.2
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	7.3	8.7	57.2	61.4	92.6	91.2	72.3	67.0	35.5	29.8
Writing	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.2	0.0	26.2	28.3	49.2	54.6	73.7	71.7	50.7	45.6	24.5	17.0
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	18.0	20.0	53.0	54.0	81.9	79.9	59.2	55.5	28.9	25.9
CLL Total	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	-	-	-	-	-	-	64.4	62.7	40.1	33.4	13.4	6.2
	Leeds			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	74.8	72.6	50.3	45.7	16.7	14.4
Numbers as Labels for Counting	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.2	0.0	7.6	8.5	54.0	66.8	92.3	91.5	78.8	74.2	38.3	24.7
	Leeds			0.1	0.5	5.0	5.1	48.3	55.8	94.9	94.4	84.8	83.0	46.7	38.7
Calculating	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.3	0.1	20.7	25.1	50.5	58.0	79.0	74.8	57.7	52.4	28.5	16.8
	Leeds			0.2	0.2	6.3	15.4	54.0	56.7	93.6	84.3	82.1	65.7	39.5	27.7
Shape, Space & Measures	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.3	0.1	9.7	13.4	59.2	66.3	90.0	86.5	73.2	66.7	30.8	20.3
	Leeds			0.2	0.2	6.3	7.7	54.0	61.2	93.6	92.1	82.1	78.0	39.5	30.9
MD Total	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	-	-	-	-	-	-	77.1	71.6	53.4	46.6	0.0	0.0
	Leeds			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.4	82.6	66.3	62.2	0.0	0.0
Knowledge & Understanding of the World	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.0	0.0	11.6	14.6	54.3	60.5	88.2	85.4	68.8	61.0	33.9	24.9
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	6.9	8.3	48.7	53.9	93.0	91.6	78.8	74.1	44.3	37.6
Physical Development	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.0	0.0	5.3	7.1	45.9	54.6	94.5	92.9	84.4	78.1	48.6	38.2
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	4.3	4.6	36.8	43.2	95.6	95.4	87.7	86.0	58.7	52.1
Creative Development	Sure Start Areas	1298	1091	0.1	0.1	5.8	8.9	63.9	68.9	94.1	91.0	72.0	62.7	30.2	22.1
	Leeds			0.1	0.1	4.2	5.3	55.5	61.7	95.6	94.5	80.5	75.9	40.1	32.8

3.2 KEY STAGE 1

3.2.1 Key Stage 1 Trends and Comparisons

2004-2006 Percentage of pupils achieving level 2 + at Key Stage 1

% pupils achieving level 2+	2004			2005			2006		
	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*
Reading	83	85	85	84	85	85	83	84	84
Writing	81	82	81	81	82	82	80	81	81
Mathematics	90	90	90	88	91	91	88	90	90
Science	90	90	89	87	90	89	87	89	89

2004-2006 Percentage of pupils achieving level 3 + at Key Stage 1

% pupils achieving level 3+	2004			2005			2006		
	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*
Reading	28	29	28	22	27	27	19	25	25
Writing	13	16	16	12	15	16	9	14	14
Mathematics	27	28	28	16	23	23	13	21	22
Science	22	26	27	17	25	26	13	24	24

3.2.2 Attainment of Pupil Groups

Percentage of pupils attaining level 2+: Looked After Children

	2004		2005		2006
	Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
Cohort size	55		34		39
Reading	45	54	65	57	55
Writing	44	48	62	52	52
Maths	60	64	74	64	67

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.2.3 Performance for looked after children (LAC) fell back in 2006 following rises in all subjects in 2005. However the attainment levels are above that seen in 2004.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 2+: Free School Meal Eligibility

		2004		2005		2006
		Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
Reading	Non eligible	86.5	88	88.6	89	88.0
	Eligible	66.7	70	66.5	70	67.3
Writing	Non eligible	84.6	85	86.1	86	85.1
	Eligible	63.9	66	62.2	66	61.8
Maths	Non eligible	92.3	93	91.7	93	91.6
	Eligible	80.1	80	76.3	81	75.2

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.2.4 The performance of FSM eligible pupils rose slightly in reading, but dropped slightly in writing and mathematics. This maintains the trend seen in 2005.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 2+: Special Education Needs

		2004		2005		2006
		Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
Reading	Action	47.1	55	47.6	57	44.9
	Action +	39.8	38	41.8	41	45.3
	Statement	24.5	27	19.5	28	25.8
Writing	Action	43.6	50	41.3	51	38.4
	Action +	31.5	32	34.9	34	38.5
	Statement	24.5	21	13.8	22	14.5
Maths	Action	70.2	74	62.4	76	59.1
	Action +	55.3	55	52.4	58	52.6
	Statement	28.8	32	20.7	33	19.4

Note: 2006 data is provisional

- 3.2.5 Performance of pupils on the SEN register is mixed. School Action Plus and statemented pupils have shown improvements in reading and writing. Performance in mathematics was less clear with School Action Plus pupils the only group to register an improvement in 2006.

KEY STAGE 1: percentage of pupils achieving level 2+

	Pupils	Reading			Writing			Maths			2005 - 2006 change			Difference from total 2006		
	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	reading	writing	maths	reading	writing	maths
Bangladeshi	97	84.5	73.0	79.4	77.5	73.0	76.3	88.7	83.8	86.6	6.4	3.3	2.8	-3.8	-3.5	-1.1
Indian	127	94.1	92.4	88.2	90.8	91.0	86.6	94.7	91.7	89.0	-4.2	-4.4	-2.7	5.0	6.8	1.3
Kashmiri Pakistani	118	79.1	71.3	78.8	72.1	67.0	74.6	79.8	74.8	86.4	7.5	7.6	11.7	-4.4	-5.2	-1.3
Kashmiri Other	8	66.7	75.0	75.0	66.7	75.0	62.5	100.0	75.0	75.0	0.0	-12.5	0.0	-8.2	-17.3	-12.7
Other Pakistani	275	75.7	79.8	72.0	68.2	77.0	67.6	82.5	84.5	77.8	-7.8	-9.3	-6.7	-11.2	-12.2	-9.9
Other Asian	55	81.0	71.4	80.0	73.8	69.0	74.5	83.3	85.7	89.1	8.6	5.5	3.4	-3.2	-5.3	1.4
Black Caribbean	87	82.6	83.3	81.6	77.2	79.2	73.6	87.0	85.4	81.6	-1.7	-5.6	-3.8	-1.6	-6.2	-6.1
Black African	115	66.7	67.2	63.5	63.0	64.8	60.9	74.1	72.1	72.2	-3.7	-3.9	0.0	-19.7	-18.9	-15.5
Other Black	47	79.7	72.2	87.2	76.3	75.9	78.7	89.8	83.3	85.1	15.0	2.8	1.8	4.0	-1.1	-2.6
Mixed Black African & White	24	85.7	63.0	100.0	76.2	59.3	95.8	85.7	74.1	100.0	37.0	36.6	25.9	16.8	16.0	12.3
Mixed Black Caribbean & White	124	82.1	71.3	77.4	78.9	67.8	66.9	90.2	83.5	79.0	6.1	-0.9	-4.4	-5.8	-12.9	-8.7
Mixed Asian & White	57	85.5	93.2	93.0	82.3	89.8	86.0	90.3	93.2	94.7	-0.2	-3.9	1.5	9.8	6.2	7.0
Other Mixed	75	78.5	87.5	82.7	73.4	81.3	72.0	88.6	93.8	84.0	-4.8	-9.3	-9.8	-0.5	-7.8	-3.7
Chinese	33	95.0	87.1	93.9	95.0	87.1	93.9	97.5	93.5	100.0	6.8	6.8	6.5	10.7	14.1	12.3
Other Ethnic group	75	71.0	69.9	73.3	68.1	67.1	64.0	91.3	82.2	74.7	3.5	-3.1	-7.5	-9.9	-15.8	-13.0
White British	6,136	83.9	84.8	84.9	81.2	82.0	81.9	90.4	89.4	89.3	0.1	-0.1	0.0	1.7	2.1	1.6
White Irish	27	88.2	96.2	85.2	91.2	92.3	77.8	91.2	92.3	77.8	-11.0	-14.5	-14.5	2.0	-2.0	-9.9
Traveller Irish Heritage	9	45.5	50.0	33.3	45.5	30.0	33.3	54.5	60.0	55.6	-16.7	3.3	-4.4	-49.9	-46.5	-32.1
Gypsy/Roma	8	45.5	60.0	12.5	36.4	60.0	12.5	54.5	70.0	12.5	-47.5	-47.5	-57.5	-70.7	-67.3	-75.2
Other White	90	84.2	93.2	80.0	82.1	88.3	75.6	93.7	92.2	88.9	-13.2	-12.8	-3.3	-3.2	-4.2	1.2
Info Not Obtained / Unknown	10	71.8	57.7	40.0	68.4	51.3	40.0	79.3	67.9	100.0	-17.7	-11.3	32.1	-43.2	-39.8	12.3
Refused	39	94.4	86.8	100.0	88.9	84.2	100.0	97.2	92.1	94.9	13.2	15.8	2.8	16.8	20.2	7.2
Leeds Total		83.1	83.5	83.2	80.0	80.6	79.8	89.6	88.2	87.7	-0.3	-0.8	-0.5			

3.2.6 Bangladeshi, Kashmiri Pakistani, Other Asian, and Chinese heritage pupils have shown improvements across all three subjects. There were falls for Indian, Other Pakistani and Black Caribbean pupils in all three subjects and the latter two of these groups remain below local authority levels of performance.

3.3 KEY STAGE 2

3.3.1 Key Stage 2 Trends and Comparisons

2003-2006 Percentage of pupils achieving level 4 + at Key Stage 2

% pupils achieving level 4+	2004			2005			2006		
	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*
English	78	78	75	79	79	77	79	78	77
Mathematics	75	74	73	75	75	75	75	76	76
Science	85	86	85	85	86	86	85	86	86

Note: 2006 data is provisional


2003-2006 Percentage of pupils achieving level 5 + at Key Stage 2


% pupils achieving level 4+	2004			2005			2006		
	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*
English	27	26	24	26	26	24	32	32	29
Mathematics	30	30	30	31	30	30	33	32	32
Science	42	42	41	46	46	46	45	45	44

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.2 Performance at Key Stage 2 in terms of level 4+ remains at levels seen in 2004 and 2005. Statistical neighbour authorities have improved in the same time period, although national remains static. Level 5 performance has improved locally in 2006, mirroring improvements seen nationally and in statistical neighbour authorities.

3.3.3 Key Stage 2 Trajectories





3.3.4 The gap between performance and school expectations remains above 6% in English and 10% in mathematics. School expectations show a drop in 2007. Performance is in line with Fischer Family Trust (FFT) 'B' estimates, but the challenge of moving to top quartile performance remains a stiff one in both subjects.

3.3.5 Floor Targets

Numbers and percentages of schools below Key Stage 2 floor targets

	<65% level 4+ English		<65% level 4+ maths	
	number	%	number	%
2003	49	21.0	59	25.3
2004	44	19.0	55	23.7
2005	35	15.8	48	21.7
2006	34	15.7	51	23.6

3.3.6 Following regular drops in the number and percentage of schools below Key Stage 2 floor targets, there has been an increase in 2006, with nearly a quarter of Leeds' schools below the floor target in mathematics.

3.3.7 Attainment of Pupil Groups

Percentage of pupils attaining level 4+: Looked After Children

	2004		2005		2006
	Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
Cohort size	77		77		66
English	31	40	44	42	34
Maths	36	37	40	38	36
Science	51	53	53	53	46

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.8 The performance of looked after children fell at Key Stage 2 in 2006 after rises were seen in 2005. Less than half of pupils in care achieved the level 4+ benchmark in the three subjects. In 2006 the local authority set a target of 39% of looked after children to achieve a level 4 or higher in both English and mathematics, provisional data indicates that 23% of pupils achieved this benchmark.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 4+: Free School Meal Eligibility

		2004		2005		2006	
		Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds	National
English	Non eligible	83.8	81	84.0	83	83.8	83
	Eligible	61.5	59	60.7	60	59.9	61
Maths	Non eligible	79.7	78	80.7	79	80.6	79
	Eligible	59.0	55	56.6	57	56.2	58
Science	Non eligible	89.2	89	89.1	89	88.9	89
	Eligible	70.3	71	70.4	72	70.0	73

Note: 2006 data is provisional

- 3.3.9 The performance of FSM eligible pupils fell slightly in 2006, continuing the decline seen in 2005.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 4+: Special Education Needs

		2004		2005		2006	
		Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds	National
English	Action	39.4	44	43.1	47	42.2	48
	Action +	33.7	26	35.1	29	33.9	30
	Statement	15.7	15	13.5	16	15.5	17
Maths	Action	39.9	46	42.6	45	42.1	47
	Action +	38.7	30	40.5	33	39.3	35
	Statement	16.9	17	11.8	17	13.5	19
Science	Action	61.5	68	62.8	70	61.9	70
	Action +	55.2	56	56.6	58	55.3	59
	Statement	27.6	32	22.1	32	24.8	34


Note: 2006 data is provisional

- 3.3.10 Statemented pupils have shown a rise in attainment levels in 2006 in all three subjects, but this is not the case for School Action and School Action Plus pupils, where attainment fell in all three subjects.

- 3.3.11 See attached sheet for attainment of Black and Minority Ethnic Groups.

3.3.12 Contextual Value Added

- 3.3.13 Analysis of performance in terms of value added at primary schools is currently limited to Fischer Family Trust (FFT) analysis as the DfES Value Added measure is not yet available. The table shows the percentile ranking of Leeds for subjects at Key Stage 2. The lower the percentile rank, the greater the progress that pupils make through the key stage. A number of 10 or smaller, places an authority in the highest 10% of all authorities; a number of 75 or greater, places an authority in the lower quartile.



3.3.14 Performance is between the 50th and 60th percentile since 2003, but the trend since the increase in 2003 is steadily downwards in both English and mathematics.

3.3.15 Overall, performance at Key Stage 2 is in line with FFT estimates, but has fallen back from being above estimate in 2004, to below estimate in 2006.

SBJ	Estimate-Actual Difference (%)			LEA Contextual Percentile Ranking			3 year trend
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	
English L4+	0.81	0.04	-0.51	43	58	68	↓
Maths L4+	1.22	0.65	-0.26	40	45	60	↓
Science L4+	-0.07	-0.62	-1.21	60	71	85	↓
English L5+	1.55	0.73	0.96	33	49	38	
Maths L5+	0.67	1.14	0.09	44	37	50	
Science L5+	0.83	1.08	0.30	48	42	48	
Mean Grade	0.01	0.01	-0.01	45	51	67	↓

↑	Significantly increase over 3 years	↓	Significant fall over three years
	Significantly above 3 year estimate		Significantly below 3 year estimate

3.3.16 Performance is falling in terms of level 4+ in all three core subjects, although it is in line with estimate in English, above in mathematics, but below in science and is now in the bottom quartile in terms of level 4+.

3.3.17 Contextual Value Added for groups of pupils

3.3.18 Contextual Value Added can also be used to evaluate the progress of priority pupil groups.

3.3.19

Pupil Group	English			Maths			Science			Trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	En	Ma	Sc
All Pupils	0.81	0.04	-0.51	1.22	0.65	-0.26	-0.07	-0.62	-1.21	↓	↓	↓
Boys	1.12	0.58	-0.33	1.38	0.02	-0.83	-0.37	-0.42	-1.22	↓	↓	↓
Boys - Lower	1.31	-0.05	-1.12	3.03	0.35	-3.38	-0.58	-1.66	-4.27	↓	↓	↓
Boys - Middle	0.39	0.56	-1.42	-0.14	-1.12	0.32	-0.92	-0.08	0.08			
Boys - Upper	1.76	1.34	1.69	1.04	0.83	0.79	0.58	0.69	0.81			
Girls	0.48	-0.50	-0.68	1.06	1.28	0.30	0.25	-0.82	-1.21	↓	↓	↓
Girls - Lower	-0.73	-3.28	-3.65	2.12	-1.18	-1.67	-1.69	-5.35	-5.46	↓	↓	↓
Girls - Middle	0.95	0.45	0.38	-0.43	2.45	0.98	0.96	1.01	0.34		↑	
Girls - Upper	1.10	1.05	0.88	1.74	2.22	1.39	1.29	1.34	1.05		↓	↓

3.3.20 Performance for both boys and girls is moving back towards estimates having previously been significantly above estimate. Performance in English is now in line with estimate for both groups, although low ability girls are now significantly below estimate. In mathematics, performance is above estimate, although this is mainly due to the performance of girls. Science is now below estimate, due in the main, to the performance of low ability pupils being significantly below estimate.

Pupil Group	English			Maths			Science			Trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	En	Ma	Sc
All Pupils	0.81	0.04	-0.51	1.22	0.65	-0.26	-0.07	-0.62	-1.21	↓	↓	↓
Bangladeshi	-3.94	-9.10	-6.29	-12.21	-2.60	-7.89	3.46	-3.47	-10.43			↓
Indian	0.19	-2.22	-6.13	-2.27	-5.82	-7.72	0.49	-0.93	-2.91			
Pakistani	-0.98	-4.22	-4.26	-2.78	3.02	-2.58	-2.40	-2.67	-3.94		↑ ↓	
Other Asian	-4.20	-0.41	-4.48	-1.36	-2.37	2.10	1.15	2.61	-1.25			
Black African	-0.76	2.82	1.13	5.58	5.21	6.05	-0.17	-0.51	2.14			
Black Caribbean	0.37	-1.92	-5.10	-3.26	1.17	-7.41	-1.12	-1.07	-4.97		↓	
Chinese	-2.38	3.17	-1.42	2.75	3.17	3.92	3.02	-0.65	1.25			
Any Other heritage	0.92	-5.30	-2.53	6.02	-3.10	0.77	2.57	-5.63	-0.26		↓	↓
White	1.08	0.46	0.11	1.69	0.69	0.19	-0.02	-0.44	-0.88	↓	↓	
No Information	0.24	2.32	-2.17	-0.78	1.75	0.20	-1.58	1.94	0.80			

3.3.21 In terms of black and minority ethnic (BME) groups, pupils of Asian origin are significantly below estimate in English and mathematics. Other groups are broadly in line with estimate in both subjects, although white pupils are moving back towards estimate in English and mathematics. Performance is more uniform in science, although overall, performance is significantly below estimate and the gap is widening, due mainly to the performance of white pupils.

3.3.22 Performance can be measured for other groups of pupils, based on free school meal (FSM) eligibility, special educational need (SEN) and whether a child is in the care of the authority. For all of these groups, the fact that they are a member of these groups is taken into account when their estimates are created, for example, the fact that a boy is eligible for free school meals and is a looked after child, is taken into account when the estimate is created to compare the actual result against.

Pupil Group	English			Maths			Science			Trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	En	Ma	Sc
All Pupils	0.81	0.04	-0.51	1.22	0.65	-0.26	-0.07	-0.62	-1.21	↓	↓	↓
FSM - No	0.76	0.63	-0.20	0.97	0.68	0.16	0.01	0.08	-0.74	↓		
FSM - Yes	1.08	-2.36	-1.80	2.21	0.52	-2.06	-0.40	-3.39	-3.18	↓	↓	↓
Looked After - No	0.89	-0.04	-0.53	1.23	0.62	-0.29	-0.04	-0.63	-1.17	↓	↓	↓
Looked After - Yes	-7.32	7.77	2.21	0.37	3.63	3.68	-3.76	0.13	-6.38	↑		
No SEN	0.20	0.17	-0.62	0.69	0.58	-0.36	0.01	-0.06	-0.53		↓	
School Action	2.33	-3.55	-2.22	1.35	-1.63	-1.06	-2.91	-4.66	-4.85	↓		
School Action Plus	6.21	2.96	3.14	8.01	6.52	2.88	2.90	-2.96	-3.59			↓
Statemented	3.50	6.46	4.88	4.23	2.59	0.50	3.25	2.95	-0.64			

3.3.23 There is a noticeable difference in the performance of FSM eligible and non eligible pupils. The performance of both groups is falling in English, although FSM eligible pupils are now in line with estimates, whilst their more affluent peers are still above estimate. Mathematics performance shows a similar story, and science now is more serious, in that non-eligible pupils are in line with estimate, but FSM eligible pupils are significantly below estimate and the gap to their estimate is widening.

3.3.24 Children in public care have performed in line with estimates in all three subjects, with a significant improvement in English. Pupils with greater SEN perform above estimate in English and mathematics and are in line with estimate in science. School Action category pupils are in line with estimates in English (although with a decline) and in mathematics. However, they are below estimate in science.

KEY STAGE 2: percentage of pupils achieving level 4+

	Pupils	English			Maths			Science			2005 - 2006 change			Difference from all pupils 2006		
		2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	English	maths	science	English	maths
Bangladeshi	87	71.4	74.6	78.6	61.4	74.6	72.6	84.3	80.3	77.6	3.9	-2.0	-2.6	-0.2	-2.8	-7.3
Indian	149	82.7	83.3	80.1	77.8	75.8	76.2	88.1	88.6	85.7	-3.2	0.4	-2.9	1.3	0.8	0.8
Kashmiri Pakistani	107	77.4	75.0	73.3	74.8	73.2	69.5	82.6	79.5	77.1	-1.7	-3.7	-2.3	-5.5	-5.9	-7.8
Kashmiri Other	7	87.5	83.3	85.7	75.0	100.0	85.7	87.5	100.0	100.0	2.4	-14.3	0.0	6.9	10.3	15.1
Other Pakistani	289	65.6	69.6	65.7	57.1	68.0	61.5	70.5	74.0	71.4	-3.9	-6.5	-2.6	-13.1	-13.9	-13.5
Other Asian	48	71.4	75.0	70.2	71.4	67.5	74.5	82.1	80.0	78.7	-4.8	7.0	-1.3	-8.6	-0.9	-6.2
Black Caribbean	104	68.6	73.7	71.2	57.1	65.7	61.5	77.5	83.8	75.0	-2.6	-4.1	-8.8	-7.6	-13.9	-9.9
Black African	147	61.5	72.6	65.9	66.2	64.3	55.1	67.7	71.4	70.3	-6.7	-9.2	-1.1	-12.9	-20.3	-14.6
Other Black	49	70.0	72.1	63.0	64.0	63.9	65.2	74.0	75.4	73.9	-9.1	1.3	-1.5	-15.8	-10.2	-11.0
Mixed Black African & White	17	92.9	64.0	87.5	85.7	61.5	93.8	100.0	68.0	81.3	23.5	32.2	13.3	8.7	18.4	-3.7
Mixed Black Caribbean & White	118	77.0	79.0	70.1	68.1	74.8	58.1	83.2	82.4	76.9	-8.9	-16.7	-5.4	-8.7	-17.3	-8.0
Mixed Asian & White	46	72.3	86.4	73.9	78.7	79.7	80.4	85.1	93.2	80.4	-12.5	0.8	-12.8	-4.9	5.0	-4.5
Other Mixed	70	74.7	72.8	80.6	82.7	70.4	80.6	86.5	77.8	88.1	7.8	10.2	10.3	1.8	5.2	3.2
Chinese	36	74.2	100.0	86.1	90.3	100.0	97.2	93.3	94.4	94.4	-13.9	-2.8	0.0	7.3	21.8	9.5
Other Ethnic group	69	70.0	55.7	61.3	68.9	54.1	64.5	75.0	62.3	71.0	5.6	10.4	8.7	-17.5	-10.9	-13.9
White British	6640	78.8	80.4	80.7	76.0	76.6	77.4	86.1	86.9	86.9	0.3	0.9	0.0	1.9	2.0	2.0
White Irish	41	87.9	94.1	90.2	84.8	94.1	92.7	93.9	94.1	97.6	-3.9	-1.4	3.4	11.4	17.3	12.7
Traveller Irish Heritage	11	66.7	100.0	10.0	50.0	66.7	10.0	60.0	100.0	30.0	-90.0	-56.7	-70.0	-68.8	-65.4	-54.9
Gypsy\Roma	13	30.8	41.2	30.8	30.8	35.3	30.8	38.5	41.2	61.5	-10.4	-4.5	20.4	-48.0	-44.6	-23.4
Other White	79	88.9	88.6	80.8	84.1	87.3	80.8	90.5	89.9	85.9	-7.8	-6.6	-4.0	2.0	5.4	1.0
Info Not Obtained / Unknown	17	76.5	43.7	76.5	70.2	46.5	76.5	77.6	50.7	76.5	32.7	30.0	25.8	-2.3	1.1	-8.4
Refused	36	86.4	92.3	83.3	72.7	85.0	83.3	95.5	92.5	97.2	-9.0	-1.7	4.7	4.5	7.9	12.3
Total		78.0	79.3	78.8	74.8	75.5	75.4	85.1	85.4	84.9	-0.5	-0.1	-0.5			

3.3.25 Performance of priority groups is mixed at Key Stage 2 in 2006, with no clear trends. The performance of pupils of Black heritage has fallen in all three subjects, and this is repeated overall for Asian heritage pupils. There were improvements for Bangladeshi pupils in English, but overall the trend is downwards.

3.3.26 **Attendance in Primary Schools**

3.3.27 **Summary Data**

3.3.28 The key attendance indicators for Leeds primary schools from 2001-02 to 2005-06 are shown in Table 1 below.

Key Attendance Indicators: Primary Schools

	% Attendance	% Authorised Absence	% Unauthorised Absence	Attendance Target
2001/02	94.03	5.51	0.46	94.0
2002/03	94.12	5.45	0.43	94.2
2003/04	94.52	5.08	0.40	94.4
2004/05	94.67	4.91	0.42	94.6
2005/06	94.31	5.26	0.43	94.8

3.3.29 Comparative attendance data for primary schools can be seen in Table 2. Figure 1 shows the trend in all primary schools.

Comparative Attendance Data: Primary Schools

	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06
<i>% Attendance</i>				
Leeds	94.10	94.50	94.67	94.31
Statistical Neighbours	94.22	94.53	94.59	94.28
National	94.19	94.51	94.57	94.24
<i>% Authorised Absence</i>				
Leeds	5.45	5.08	4.91	5.26
Statistical Neighbours	5.34	5.04	4.95	5.22
National	5.38	5.08	5.00	5.30
<i>% Unauthorised Absence</i>				
Leeds	0.43	0.40	0.42	0.43
Statistical Neighbours	0.44	0.43	0.46	0.50
National	0.43	0.41	0.43	0.46

Source: DfES statistical first release


Notes: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.30 After improving consistently in previous years, attendance in primary schools fell by 0.35% in 2005-06. This is equivalent to 27,000 school days. This drop in attendance also occurred nationally and in statistical neighbours. Attendance in Leeds primary schools remains slightly above the national figure and that for statistical neighbours.

3.3.31 The majority of the fall in attendance in Leeds occurred through an increase in authorised absence, with unauthorised absence only increasing by 0.01%, a lesser amount than the increase observed nationally and in comparative authorities. The DfES are currently investigating the reasons for this drop in attendance across the country. It has been suggested that a flu outbreak and a crackdown in primary schools of authorisations of holidays in term-time could have contributed to the increasing authorised and unauthorised absence.

- 3.3.32 The change to the new absence codes for recording pupil absence could also have impacted on attendance if there are some pupil activities which schools would previously have marked as 'present' – but which now need to be marked as 'absent'. Many Leeds schools changed to the new codes before the end of the last academic year, therefore this could have impacted on the rise in absence.
- 3.3.33 The drop in attendance means that the target of 95.1% for 2005-06 was not met for primary attendance. An increase in attendance of 0.7% is required in 2006-07 to meet the target of 95.0%.


Attendance in Primary Schools



3.3.34 **Primary Attendance by Wedge**

3.3.35 Figure 2 shows the variation in primary attendance by wedge. As can be seen in the chart, attendance is highest in the North West and North East. All wedges experienced a decrease in attendance in 2005-06, with the largest decreases in the East and North East.

Primary Attendance by Wedge



3.3.36 School Performance

3.3.37 Attendance of individual primary schools is provided in Appendix 3. Table 3 below shows school performance at primary level. The overall drop in attendance is reflected in the number of schools improving attendance and meeting their targets. Only 33% (75 schools) of primary schools improved their attendance in 2005-06 compared with 58% (129 schools) in 2004-05 and only 11 schools improved attendance by more than 1%, compared with 25 in 2004-05.

3.3.38 2005-06 has seen a significant decrease in the number of schools meeting targets. These have reduced from 114 (49%) in 2004-05 to 29 (13%) in 2005-06.

Table 3: School Performance

	Number of schools		% of schools	
	2004/05	2005/06	2004/05	2005/06
Schools with improved attendance	129	75	58	33
Schools meeting targets	114	29	49	13

3.3.39 Table 4 illustrates the impact achieved in those school targeted through the Behaviour Improvement programme (BIP).

Table 4: Attendance and Unauthorised Absence: BIP primary schools

	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06
<i>% Attendance</i>					
BIP primary	92.16	92.25	92.73	92.99	92.55
All primary	93.97	94.14	94.52	94.67	94.31
Difference	-1.81	-1.89	-1.79	-1.68	-1.76
<i>% Unauthorised absence</i>					
BIP primary	1.14	1.07	1.04	1.15	1.26
All primary	0.48	0.43	0.4	0.42	0.43
Difference	0.66	0.64	0.64	0.73	0.83

3.3.40 Twenty six schools have been receiving targeted support to improve attendance, unauthorised absence and exclusions, through the BIP. Twenty of these schools are primary schools. The table below shows that attendance is now 0.39% higher in BIP primary schools than in 2001-02 and that the difference in attendance between BIP primaries and all primaries has decreased slightly.

3.4 Overview of Ofsted inspections of Leeds Primary Schools 2005-6

3.4.1 The revised framework for the inspection of schools (section 5) came into effect in September 2005. Inspections are now shorter and more frequent and place greater emphasis on the school's evaluation of its own performance. The increased frequency enables parents to have a more up to date report and allows schools to receive a more frequent rigorous external appraisal of their performance. Schools are now inspected with two days notice. The short notice means that schools have to be in "a state of readiness". Most primary schools are inspected by two inspectors over two days.

3.4.2 With self evaluation at the heart of the inspection, the focus has moved from classroom practice to school leadership. The leadership of the school is judged by the rigour and accuracy of the school's self evaluation and the schools ability to act on the outcomes. Schools are expected to complete a Self Evaluation Form (SEF) which is scrutinised by the inspection team and used together with the PANDA to devise a pre-inspection commentary prior to visiting the school. During the inspection the team test out their hypotheses by tracking evidence trails around the emerging issues. The school leadership may be asked to undertake some of these activities with the inspection team so that the team can assess the leadership's ability to make accurate judgements.

3.4.3 Schools are judged to be in one of four categories overall: outstanding, good, satisfactory or inadequate. They are also judged to be in one of these categories for Achievement and Standards, Leadership and Management, Provision (i.e. teaching and learning, curriculum provision and Care Guidance and Support), and Personal Development. An unfavourable inspection results in a school being placed in Special Measures or being given a notice to improve.

3.4.4 Schools are judged not only on their current performance but also on their capacity to improve.

3.4.5 During the academic year 2005-06, 44 Leeds primary schools were inspected. Eleven (25%) were found to be outstanding, 20 (45%) good, ten (23%) satisfactory, and three (7%) inadequate (i.e. two with notice to improve and one subject to special measures). This compares nationally over the same period with 9%

outstanding, 49% good, 34% satisfactory and 7% inadequate. Leeds can be justifiably proud of having more schools in the good and outstanding category (70%) than all schools inspected nationally (58%). Leeds also has a good proportion of outstanding schools operating in challenging contexts.

- 3.4.6 Since September 2006 a further 24 primary schools have been inspected. Of these three (12.5%) was judged to be outstanding, eleven (45.8%) good, nine (37.5%) satisfactory and one (4.1%) inadequate (subject to special measures). There are no national figures available for this period. The school judged to be inadequate has made a formal complaint to Ofsted about the conduct of the inspection and of the evidence base used to make the judgment. We are awaiting the outcome.
- 3.4.7 During the year Ofsted moved to a system of 'Proportionate inspections' which aims to differentiate between schools. Data and other evidence is analysed and if a school is deemed to be successful they will be inspected for one day only. Two schools in Leeds have now had a one day inspection under this regime, both with a favourable outcome.
- 3.4.8 Although the picture to date is largely positive there are a number of schools due an inspection who are at risk of not achieving a favourable outcome. These schools may have a history of instability in staffing and leadership or may have persistently low standards, and complex contextual factors. Education Leeds officers are working closely with many of these schools in an attempt to pre-empt failure.
- 3.4.9 The new inspection framework has been received positively on the whole, but there are concerns that there is an inconsistency of approach between inspection teams that sometimes results in outcomes that schools and Education Leeds would dispute. Schools in challenging and complex circumstances may be disadvantaged by an overemphasis on statistical data by the inspection team. These schools often have difficulty convincing the team to take other aspects of school into account.
- 3.4.10 See annex for report summaries for schools inspected autumn 2006 (if published).

3.5 **The Education Leeds School Improvement Policy – categorisation of schools**

- 3.5.1 The Education Leeds School Improvement Policy has been re written to reflect the Ofsted grades and criteria. The policy includes a toolkit to help schools to self evaluate against four sets of indicators: Performance Indicators; The school's capacity to improve; Every Child Matters and Children at risk of not achieving the five ECM outcomes. All schools have engaged in discussion with an adviser to agree a judgement against these indicators and to agree an appropriate category for the school. 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). There are 10% of schools in category one, 50% in category 2, 35% in category 3 and 5% in category 4. 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 evidence by the small number of schools in an Ofsted category.

3.6 **Schools Causing Concern: category 4**

3.6.1 There are currently four schools in an Ofsted category. The two schools given a notice to improve are awaiting a re-inspection with HMI. Progress in both schools has been satisfactory and both schools will need to accelerate progress if a favourable outcome is to be achieved. There are two schools subject to special measures. One was inspected in May and is awaiting a monitoring visit from HMI. This school is also subject to a closure consultation and may close in July 2007. The school is making satisfactory progress overall but continues to demonstrate high levels of inadequate teaching. One school was inspected in October and has submitted a complaint regarding the conduct of the inspection and the evidence base used to make the judgment. However the leadership team, including governors, has made a quick response to the key issues. Each of these schools has entered into an Extended Partnership.

3.6.2 Detailed reports on these schools are provided in the annex

3.6.3 **Schools in Extended Partnerships: category 4**

3.6.4 There are an additional six schools that have entered into an Extended Partnership.

3.6.5 All schools in Extended Partnerships are supported through a major intervention programme such as Primary Leadership Programme (PLP) or Intensifying Support Programme (ISP). (See below). These schools are also supported through a task group consisting of school and Education Leeds staff who focus on developing each key issue in school. The governors are engaged in a joint review group (consisting of governors, headteacher and officers of Education Leeds) to support the monitoring process. As a school approaches the target date for removal from this category, officers from Education Leeds will conduct a review to confirm that school has overcome all barriers to success and has made good progress. The school will then engage in an exit strategy for one or two terms until new procedures are embedded.

3.6.6 Schools in this category frequently face many barriers to progress, some of which can be rectified in the short term while others are far more complex. Issues such as inadequate teaching and learning are resolved by either the weak teachers moving on or through a programme of professional development lead by the national strategies consultants and supported by the headteacher. However, many of these schools serve communities facing severe challenges such as poverty, unemployment, high mobility, deprivation, high turnover of staff and low attainment on entry to school. The quality and effectiveness of the head teacher is critical to the success of a school and where leadership is weak a turnaround is much more difficult to achieve.

3.6.7 Six schools have recently been removed from this category.

3.6.8 A more detailed report is in the confidential part of this agenda under Access to Information Rules 10.4 (1) (2).

3.6.9 **Schools in Focused Partnerships: category 3**

3.6.10 Although schools in category 3 are generally regarded as satisfactory, there are some who have inadequate elements. These schools are supported through a

Focussed Partnership which will provide a similar support package to those in category 4. Some of the schools in category 3 require challenge to become 'good' while others in this category require support to avoid becoming a cause for serious concern.

3.6.11 **Emerging and temporary concerns**

3.6.12 There are currently 14 schools that are beginning to show signs of vulnerability, displaying one or more of the following indicators: weak leadership including governance; inadequate teaching especially where this is not being dealt with by the headteacher; low attainment and poor value added; high rates of absence and/or exclusion; poor behaviour; high turnover of staff and/or unfilled vacancies; new or inadequate building issues; falling rolls; budget deficit. All of these schools will be further investigated and if necessary a review meeting will be held with the headteacher and chair of governors to reconsider the category of the school and the associated support package.

3.7 **The Education Leeds School Improvement Policy – School Improvement Strategies**

3.7.1 **Intensifying Support Programme**

3.7.2 There are currently 30 schools taking part in this two year programme which aims to raise standards in English and mathematics through a whole school programme of training and support. National strategy consultants and school improvement advisers work closely with staff on setting curricular targets, identifying target groups of pupils, improving assessment procedures and pupil tracking and improving the quality of teaching learning. Most schools in this programme improve at a faster rate than other schools (see section 1 above).

3.7.3 **Primary Leadership Programme**

3.7.4 There are 20 schools taking part in this programme which aims to build the capacity of the leadership team. School leadership teams take part in three central training events during the year and develop their own school focus around English and mathematics. Schools in this programme are supported by a local head teacher acting as a consultant leader. This consultant leader supports the school in developing leadership at all levels and often engages members of their own staff in the process. Schools in this programme generally improve at a faster rate than other schools. (See section 1 above)

3.7.5 **Leading Partnerships**

3.7.6 As part of the support and intervention strategy, all schools in category 1 enter into a Leading Partnership in which they can offer support for whole school improvement to another school. Many of the schools in category 4 and some in category 3 are entering into a partnership with a leading partner school. These typically provide support for leadership at all levels, teaching and learning, and assessment. They provide opportunities for teachers from both schools to visit each other to observe and learn from a range of practice. Education Leeds is in the process of developing training and support packages to support this initiative which will involve staff from both schools in developing coaching skills and the middle leadership role.

3.7.7 Literacy and Numeracy Strategies

3.7.8 All schools participating in ISP or PLP are provided with support from literacy and/or numeracy consultants. The focus for this support revolves around making appropriate provision for the needs of all pupils, using assessment data to inform well planned teaching and learning activities.

3.7.9 Headteacher recruitment

3.7.10 Leeds schools have experienced high turnover of headteachers in recent years resulting in 95 headteachers currently in post who have been appointed since 2004. There are 26 schools requiring a new headteacher either in January, April or September 2007 and this number is likely to increase. Not all of these are new to headship but this figure represents a change in the critical mass of experienced headteachers.

3.7.11 All new head teachers are invited to attend the Education Leeds new headteacher induction programme. This begins with a two day residential conference and is followed by half termly network meetings focussing on topics chosen by the new heads. A steering group of new and experienced heads lead by a school improvement adviser meets termly to review and plan the induction. All new headteachers are offered a mentor from the body of experienced heads and these mentors all undergo training. Most new headteachers settle into their new role well and are provided with additional support from their school improvement adviser. However the challenges facing new headteachers are many and a few new appointees experience severe difficulties in their first year. For this reason the induction programme is also open to headteachers in their second year.

3.7.12 All new headteachers are offered a Partnership Evaluation in their first term, which aims to provide a baseline view of the school in terms of teaching and learning, standards, personnel, governance and finance. This is conducted by officers from Education Leeds together with the new headteacher to moderate early judgements and to prioritise the issues to address.

3.7.13 Distributed Leadership for Learning Programme

3.7.14 This programme was developed by Education Leeds officers based on national strategy funding. The target group are deputy headteachers who are asked to lead a project on whole school across curricular ICT. One of the aims of this project is to develop the leadership skills of deputy headteachers as a preparation for headship. It is one of several strategies in place to encourage deputy headteachers to move into headship.

4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL POLICY AND GOVERNANCE

4.1 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

- 5.1 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, due to be implemented in April 2007, will add to the capacity to support school leadership.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 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

- 7.1 The Executive Board is asked to:
- i) note the contents of the report
 - ii) note the strategies for improvement that have been developed to support further increases in achievement for all pupils, groups and schools.