

Report for Scrutiny – 29th April 2014

This report has been compiled following the request from the Scrutiny Committee of School Improvement Strategy of 29th January 2014. The Headings in the report relate to the numbering in this request.

1. School Improvement Strategy

The strategy for school improvement is defined by the 'Securing School Improvement Protocol' this is attached as Appendix 1.

2. Schools and Categories

The Local Authority categorises all schools as defined by the Protocol in part 1. This is shared with Headteachers and Chairs of Governors and is **confidential** to the school. The table below summarises the number of schools in each category:

Category	Primary	Secondary	Special/PRU	Total
1	41	2	2	55
2		7	3	
3	10	4	1	15
4	1	0	2	3
Total	52	13	8	73

The major focus for the School Improvement Team is on the 18 Schools in category 3 or 4. Occasionally there may be schools which are graded as 'Good' by Ofsted but which are LA 'Category 3' as we believe further challenge is needed to secure a judgement of 'Good' in the future.

Ofsted Categories

The following tables compare the percentage of schools in Telford and Wrekin in each Ofsted category with other authorities in the West Midlands and with National averages as published in March 2014.

All Schools

Rank	Area	G or O▼	O Outstanding	G Good	R Requires Improvement	I Inadequate
1	Herefordshire 22276 pupils in 92 school(s)	85.5%	10.8%	74.6%	11.2%	3.3%
2	Worcestershire 73242 pupils in 221 school(s)	84.2%	18.5%	65.7%	14.7%	1.1%
3	Solihull 36605 pupils in 75 school(s)	81.5%	28.7%	52.8%	7%	11.5%
4	Telford & Wrekin 26085 pupils in 66 school(s)	80.9%	11.5%	69.4%	18.3%	0.8%
5	Birmingham 162005 pupils in 333 school(s)	78.2%	25.7%	52.5%	17.2%	4.6%
6	Shropshire 36893 pupils in 147 school(s)	77.5%	9%	68.5%	18.6%	3.9%
7	England 72 10532 pupils in 19250 school(s)	77.1%	21.2%	55.9%	19.4%	3.6%
8	Warwickshire 70706 pupils in 213 school(s)	76%	23.6%	52.4%	20.9%	3.2%
9	Coventry 48135 pupils in 97 school(s)	73.1%	17.9%	55.2%	22.3%	4.6%
10	Staffordshire 114674 pupils in 354 school(s)	72.5%	10.7%	61.8%	25.2%	2.3%
11	Sandwell 49533 pupils in 107 school(s)	70.6%	19.1%	51.5%	29.4%	0%
12	Dudley 45590 pupils in 97 school(s)	64.7%	13.4%	51.3%	26.4%	8.9%
13	Walsall 44055 pupils in 97 school(s)	64.4%	22.1%	42.3%	22.8%	12.8%
14	Wolverhampton 36186 pupils in 86 school(s)	62.8%	11.9%	50.9%	29.7%	7.5%
15	Stoke-on-Trent 33225 pupils in 81 school(s)	60.5%	12.9%	47.6%	28.1%	11.3%

Primary Schools

Rank	Area	G or O ^v	O Outstanding	G Good	R Requires Improvement	I Inadequate
1	Worcestershire 38427 pupils in 178 school(s)	86.3%	12.3%	74%	12.8%	0.9%
2	Sandwell 31613 pupils in 92 school(s)	84.3%	17.6%	66.6%	15.7%	0%
3	Herefordshire 12466 pupils in 77 school(s)	83.1%	12.3%	70.8%	16.9%	0%
4	Solihull 19655 pupils in 61 school(s)	82.7%	28.6%	54.1%	12.9%	4.4%
5	Shropshire 20639 pupils in 127 school(s)	80.5%	8.3%	72.2%	15.2%	4.3%
6	Birmingham 93995 pupils in 261 school(s)	80.2%	19.7%	60.6%	17.1%	2.7%
7	England 4137862 pupils in 16189 school(s)	79.5%	18.2%	61.3%	18.1%	2.4%
8	Telford & Wrekin 15040 pupils in 53 school(s)	78.5%	11.8%	66.7%	20.1%	1.4%
9	Dudley 26565 pupils in 77 school(s)	78.5%	10.1%	68.4%	18%	3.5%
10	Warwickshire 39351 pupils in 180 school(s)	75.3%	13.3%	62%	21.4%	3.3%
11	Staffordshire 61067 pupils in 287 school(s)	74.1%	13.6%	60.5%	21.5%	4.4%
12	Coventry 27980 pupils in 79 school(s)	70.1%	7%	63.2%	26.7%	3.2%
13	Stoke-on-Trent 21695 pupils in 68 school(s)	68.8%	14.9%	53.9%	20.7%	10.5%
14	Walsall 24345 pupils in 79 school(s)	65.3%	17%	48.3%	26.5%	8.2%
15	Wolverhampton 22040 pupils in 70 school(s)	61.5%	6%	55.5%	30.1%	8.3%

Secondary Schools

Rank	Area	G or O ^v	O Outstanding	G Good	R Requires Improvement	I Inadequate
1	Herefordshire 9810 pupils in 15 school(s)	88.5%	9%	79.5%	3.9%	7.6%
2	Telford & Wrekin 11045 pupils in 13 school(s)	84.1%	11.1%	73%	15.9%	0%
3	Worcestershire 34815 pupils in 43 school(s)	81.9%	25.4%	56.5%	16.9%	1.2%
4	Solihull 16950 pupils in 14 school(s)	80.2%	28.8%	51.3%	0%	19.8%
5	Coventry 20155 pupils in 18 school(s)	77.2%	33.1%	44.1%	16.2%	6.6%
6	Warwickshire 31355 pupils in 33 school(s)	76.8%	36.5%	40.2%	20.3%	3%
7	Birmingham 68010 pupils in 72 school(s)	75.4%	34.1%	41.4%	17.4%	7.2%
8	England 3072670 pupils in 3061 school(s)	73.8%	25.3%	48.5%	21.1%	5.1%
9	Shropshire 16254 pupils in 20 school(s)	73.7%	9.9%	63.7%	22.9%	3.4%
10	Staffordshire 53607 pupils in 67 school(s)	70.7%	7.3%	63.3%	29.3%	0%
11	Wolverhampton 14146 pupils in 16 school(s)	64.7%	21%	43.6%	29.1%	6.3%
12	Walsall 19710 pupils in 18 school(s)	63.3%	28.4%	35%	18.3%	18.4%
13	Sandwell 17920 pupils in 15 school(s)	46.4%	21.6%	24.9%	53.6%	0%
14	Dudley 19025 pupils in 20 school(s)	45.5%	18.1%	27.4%	38.2%	16.4%
15	Stoke-on-Trent 11530 pupils in 13 school(s)	44.9%	9.2%	35.7%	42.1%	13%

3. Schools Below Floor

KS2 Schools Below Floor

2013		% Meeting Floor Standard			
Centre	Y6 NOR	L4+ R/W & Maths	2 Levels of Progress Reading	2 Levels of Progress Writing	2 Levels of Progress Maths
National Threshold		60	91	95	92
Dawley Church of England Primary School	17	59	82	82	88
Ladygrove Primary School	40	55	82	92	64
Queenswood Primary School and Nursery	17	29	82	94	24
Wombridge Primary School	27	56	89	93	63
2012		% Meeting Floor Standard			
Centre	Y6 NOR	L4+ English & Maths	2 Levels of Progress English	2 Levels of Progress Maths	
National Threshold		60	92	90	
Millbrook Primary School	27	56	88	70	
Ladygrove Primary School	40	0	75	70	

NB In 2012 Ladygrove was below the floor because no data was recorded.

2011		% Meeting Floor Standard		
Centre	Y6 NOR	L4+ English & Maths	2 Levels of Progress English	2 Levels of Progress Maths
National Threshold		60	87	86
Millbrook Primary School	42	52	74	67
Queenswood Primary School and Nursery	13	46	77	62
Short Wood Primary School	60	37	64	62

KS4 Schools Below Floor

2013		% Meeting Floor Standard		
Centre	NOR	5+ A*-C Incl Eng & Maths	3 Levels of Progress English	3 Levels of Progress Maths
National Threshold		40	73	73
Lord Silkin/Lakeside	128	34	44	49
Phoenix	150	36	39	57

2012		% Meeting Floor Standard		
Centre	NOR	5+ A*-C Incl Eng & Maths	3 Levels of Progress English	3 Levels of Progress Maths
National Threshold		40	70	70
Phoenix	152	36	36	52

2011		% Meeting Floor Standard		
Centre	NOR	5+ A*-C Incl Eng & Maths	3 Levels of Progress English	3 Levels of Progress Maths
National Threshold		35	74	66
Sutherland	57	33	57	44

4. Key Stage 4 by School Type 2013

	School type	NoR	% of pupils making expected progress		% 5+ A*-C GCSEs (or equivalent) including En & Ma
			English	Maths	
Abraham Darby	Academy Sponsor Led	127	73%	78%	61%
Adams Grammar	Academy - Converter Mainstream	105	99%	100%	99%
Blessed Robert Johnson	Voluntary Aided School	105	78%	53%	50%
Burton Borough	Community School	203	77%	70%	71%
Charlton	Foundation School	225	65%	73%	60%
Ercall Wood	Foundation School	150	61%	65%	54%
HLC	Community School	173	68%	63%	47%
Lakeside	Academy Converter - MAT	128	44%	49%	34%
Madeley	Academy Sponsor Led	176	79%	50%	52%
Newport Girls	Academy - Converter Mainstream	56	100%	100%	100%
Phoenix	Academy Converter - MAT	150	39%	57%	37%
Sutherland	Academy Converter - MAT	104	50%	62%	50%
Thomas Telford	City Technology College	171	98%	92%	96%
Wrockwardine Wood	Academy Converter - MAT	159	62%	62%	57%
England All Schools					59%
Telford and Wrekin			68%	66%	59%
Academy		1005	65%	66%	57%
Maintained		856	69%	66%	58%
CTC		171	98%	92%	96%

All Academies are included in this data, this includes the two Grammar Schools which are selective and the Multi Academy Trust Schools which converted to Academy Status just before the exams.

5. Trend Data for Children in Care

Key Stage / Measure		2011 Telford and Wrekin	2012 Telford and Wrekin	2013 Telford and Wrekin	National 2013
Key Stage 2: Average Point Score	All	27.4	28.1	28.0	28.3
	CiC	NA	24.0 (11)	19.4 (15)	24.1
	Non CiC	NA	28.2	28.1	28.4
Key Stage 2: Reading, Writing and Maths Combined at Level 4	All	NM	NM	74%	75%
	CiC	NM	NM	13% (15)	45%
	Non CiC	NM	NM	75%	76%
Key Stage 4: Capped Average Point Score	All	345.0	351.0	348.7	338.3
	CiC	251.6 (5)	274.4(24)	246.8 (18)	231.0
	Non CiC	345.2	352.0	349.5	339.1
Key Stage 4: 5 A*-C including English and Maths	All	58%	61%	58%	60%
	CiC	0% (5)	46% (24)	22% (18)	20%
	Non CiC	58%	61%	59%	60%

Where NA recorded this data was not available.

Where NM recorded, this data was not measured

6. Predicted Outcomes for CiC 2014

All predictions below are based on current performance of students, not targets, and are therefore more conservative.

Key Stage 2 - Academic Year – 2013 / 14

- 26 children in current cohort of which 10 [39%] children have a statement of SEN
- 9 [35%] children expected to achieve level 4's for Reading , Writing, Maths
- 3 [11%] children are on the border [3a/4c] – additional interventions are in place to support these children and if they do achieve this would put us in line with National for 2013.
- 11 children are expected to achieve level 3's
- 3 children are not expected to sit the SATs tests as they are in Independent Specialist provision

Key Stage 4 - Academic Year – 2013 / 14

- 28 children in current cohort of which 7 [25%] children have a statement of SEN
- 6 [21%] children expected to achieve 5 A* - C including English and Maths GCSE (in line with National for 2013)
- 14 [50%] children expected to achieve 5 A* - G GCSE
- 18 [64%] children are expected to achieve at least 1 A* - G GCSE
- 4 children are in specialist provision

7. Role and Impact of Virtual Head

The Virtual Head has raised the profile of Children in Care in all schools; this has further engaged schools around the importance of additional support for Children in Care. In this role the Virtual Head is able to work with the School Improvement Advisers for those schools who have purchased the Core Package to ensure that the progress of Children in Care is on the agenda for termly meetings.

Changes to the Pupil Premium grant have enabled the Virtual Head to keep closer monitoring on how schools spend this to support Children in Care. It is now possible to stipulate conditions to the Pupil Premium and it is our intention to withhold payments to schools who don't meet these conditions from April 2014. The high profile of the Pupil Premium with Ofsted has ensured that training provided by the Virtual Head on use of Pupil Premium for Children in Care to narrow the attainment gap has been well attended.

There are now more productive relationships between the Virtual Head and social workers, both in and out of borough, to ensure that educational provision is high on the agenda when supporting young people or considering suitability of placements. The Virtual Head sits on the new Placement Stability Panel for Children in Care. There is also an expectation that the social care team consults the Virtual Head before any students changes care placement to consider the suitability of education placements.

There has been a marked increase in stability of educational placements. In addition, the Virtual Head regularly monitors the quality of the Personal Education Plans for Children in Care and provides training for both Social Workers and Schools where these are not of high enough quality.

There are strong links between the Virtual Head and the school based Designated teachers for Children in Care. The Virtual head has led training for both Designated Teachers and Designated Governors for Children in Care. Reviews of Governance in some schools indicate that there is a greater challenge from Designated Governors on behalf of Children in Care.

The effectiveness of the Corporate Parenting Team has historically been limited by the quality of tracking data presented by schools. There has been a focus from the Virtual Head on designing effective systems for recording this data. Attainment and Attendance data is now collected termly for all Children in Care. In borough provisions are good at responding to this and we have a comprehensive set of data. Out of borough provisions are improving at sending this data and this is now much more complete. Where specialist out of borough provisions are less good at returning the data the Virtual Head is working with the Commissioning team to build expectations into contracts.

Analysis of attainment and attendance data is used to challenge schools where appropriate support is not being used to drive up the attainment of Children in Care. The Inclusion Mentor is allocated to students particularly at key transitions such as when a child goes into care or changes school. With many factors affecting the attainment of children in care it is hard to measure with any certainty the impact of the Inclusion Mentor. However, feedback from Schools suggests that this work has a big impact on placement stability, emotional resilience within education and therefore attainment.

The Children in Care Specialist and the Children in Care Advisory Teacher have both left the service which means that the Corporate Parenting Team has been redesigned in the current re-structure. A new Children in Care Lead Teacher post has been created at a senior level and to further Inclusion Mentors will be appointed along with a Data Tracking Officer.

8. Trend Data by Ethnicity

Key Stage / Measure		2011 Telford and Wrekin	2012 Telford and Wrekin	2013 Telford and Wrekin	National
Key Stage 2: Average Point Score	All	27.4	28.1	28.0	28.3
	White British	27.6	28.2	28.1	28.5
	White / Black	27.2 (29)	27.9 (31)	28.1 (29)	27.7

	Caribbean				
	White / Asian	27.2 (14)	28.4 (21)	29.0 (19)	29.4
	Indian	28.2 (38)	28.0 (33)	29.6 (44)	29.6
	Pakistani	22.6 (53)	25.5 (39)	24.4 (57)	27.6
	Black African	24.6 (15)	26.4 (14)	30.5 (22)	28.1
Key Stage 2: Reading, Writing and Maths Combined at Level 4	All	NA	NA	74%	75%
	White British	NA	NA	75%	76%
	White / Black Caribbean	NA	NA	79% (29)	72%
	White / Asian	NA	NA	74% (19)	81%
	Indian	NA	NA	89% (44)	83%
	Pakistani	NA	NA	46% (56)	71%
	Black African	NA	NA	91% (22)	75%
Key Stage 4: Capped Average Point Score	All	345.0	351.0	348.7	338.3
	White British	343.9	348.6	347.3	340.1
	White / Black Caribbean	330.4 (35)	347.8 (41)	339.9 (39)	329.5
	White / Asian	351.6 (14)	344.9 (11)	352.7 (20)	357.7
	Indian	399.0 (39)	392.7 (49)	395.3 (46)	372.4
	Pakistani	337.0 (36)	342.6 (45)	311.4 (41)	341.1
	Black African	368.2 (7)	360.4 (18)	369.8 (12)	340.9
Key Stage 4: 5 A*- C including English and Maths	All	58%	61%	58%	60%
	White British	58%	61%	58%	60%
	White / Black Caribbean	46% (35)	56% (41)	51% (39)	54%
	White / Asian	57% (14)	55% (11)	55% (20)	69%
	Indian	85% (39)	78% (49)	78% (46)	75%
	Pakistani	50% (36)	47% (45)	39% (39)	55%
	Black African	43% (7)	56% (18)	58% (12)	61%

b) Measures to Address Performance at Key Stage 2

Action 1

All schools received an annual report from the School Improvement Service. This report is sent to the Chair of Governors and Headteacher, and is an agenda item on the Autumn Full Governing Body meeting. The report includes:

- a full evaluation of the school's performance;
- clear development points to secure improvements in performance;
- it is recommended that these development points are used to inform all performance targets for Headteachers and teaching staff.

Action 2

All schools causing concern (Category 3 under the School Improvement Protocol) have a half termly meeting at which the Headteacher and Chair of Governors are held to account for pupil progress. This includes:

- analysis of pupil progress data in each class, across each year group and key stage;
- analysis of judgements on the quality of teaching linked to pupil progress data;
- HR support and challenge for schools who are managing staff capability to secure good teaching;
- evidence of impact of actions taken to improve pupil progress;
- recommendations of support to secure good progress.

Action 3

Schools who have bought the Traded Service core package (92%) receive a termly adviser visit. Whilst this is the school's own agenda it includes:

- termly focus on pupil progress data and impact of actions taken to improve performance;
- data is analysed at class level and in some cases individual pupil level;
- actions are agreed to accelerate progress where needed and future meetings focus on impact.

Action 4

Schools that have vulnerable data also have the opportunity to receive support and challenge from their attached adviser. This includes:

- data analysis on a termly basis;
- evaluating outcomes of data analysis to write a termly improvement plan;
- evaluating the impact of actions taken to improve performance;
- governor representatives are also involved in some schools.

Action 5

An extensive range of courses are available for schools and governors to support them in raising rates of progress. These include:

- assessment updates;
- maths updates/network meetings;
- English updates/network meetings;
- whole school self evaluation using data;
- developing subject knowledge in maths and English;
- developing subject knowledge in grammar;
- developing subject knowledge in reasoning and communication;
- effective teaching of phonics.

Action 6

Extensive bespoke consultancy support which includes a focus on:

- all aspects of the teaching of English;
- all aspects of the teaching of maths;

- coaching senior leaders and middle leaders in monitoring the quality of teaching and impact on pupil performance;
- undertaking lesson observations to improve performance;
- undertaking scrutinies of pupils' books to identify strengths and weaknesses;
- undertaking interviews with pupils to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching on raising rates of progress;
- writing school improvement plans;
- evaluating the impact of measures taken to accelerate pupil progress;
- the governors' 'critical friend' role in raising achievement;
- strengthening governors' skills in evaluating pupil performance data.

The focus for support and challenge for schools is on those schools where data shows that there is underperformance and this leads to a Local Authority categorisation of 3 or 4. There is also support for schools through the traded service where schools buy this through either the core package or through bespoke consultancy sessions. There are therefore some schools with which there is limited engagement. Furthermore, processes which were expectations in the past, such as the LA collecting and collating schools targets, have been abolished by the current government. It is therefore not possible to predict or project likely outcomes for attainment. However, as always, the focus on those schools in category or where there is a relationship is always on increased student progress and this will therefore have a positive impact on attainment.

Appendix 1 – Securing School Improvement Protocol

Appendix 2 – Analysis of Trend over time at Key Stage 2