

Notice of a Meeting

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee Tuesday, 27 September 2011 at 10.00 am County Hall

Membership

Chairman - Councillor Ann Bonner
Deputy Chairman – Councillor Dave Sexon

<i>Councillors:</i>	Janet Godden Neil Owen M. Altaf-Khan	Marilyn Badcock Anda Fitzgerald- O'Connor Don Seale	Val Smith Nicholas P. Turner Michael Waive
---------------------	--	--	--

<i>Co-optees:</i>	Mr Chris Bevan 2 Vacancies	Mrs Sue Matthew
-------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------

Notes:

Date of next meeting: 8 November 2011

What does this Committee review or scrutinise?

- Services for children, young people and families; preventative services; child protection; family support, educational policy; youth service; youth justice;
- Primary & secondary schools; special education; pupil services; school transport; music service

How can I have my say?

We welcome the views of the community on any issues in relation to the responsibilities of this Committee. Members of the public may ask to speak on any item on the agenda or may suggest matters which they would like the Committee to look at. **Requests to speak must be submitted to the Committee Officer below no later than 9 am on the working day before the date of the meeting.**

For more information about this Committee please contact:

Chairman	- Councillor Ann Bonner E.Mail: ann.bonner@oxfordshire.gov.uk
Committee Officer	- Lisa Michelson, Tel: 01865 815673 lisa.michelson@oxfordshire.gov.uk



Peter G. Clark
County Solicitor

September 2011

About the County Council

The Oxfordshire County Council is made up of 74 councillors who are democratically elected every four years. The Council provides a range of services to Oxfordshire's 630,000 residents. These include:

schools	social & health care	libraries and museums
the fire service	roads	trading standards
land use	transport planning	waste management

Each year the Council manages £0.9 billion of public money in providing these services. Most decisions are taken by a Cabinet of 9 Councillors, which makes decisions about service priorities and spending. Some decisions will now be delegated to individual members of the Cabinet.

About Scrutiny

Scrutiny is about:

- Providing a challenge to the Cabinet
- Examining how well the Cabinet and the Authority are performing
- Influencing the Cabinet on decisions that affect local people
- Helping the Cabinet to develop Council policies
- Representing the community in Council decision making
- Promoting joined up working across the authority's work and with partners

Scrutiny is NOT about:

- Making day to day service decisions
- Investigating individual complaints.

What does this Committee do?

The Committee meets up to 6 times a year or more. It develops a work programme, which lists the issues it plans to investigate. These investigations can include whole committee investigations undertaken during the meeting, or reviews by a panel of members doing research and talking to lots of people outside of the meeting. Once an investigation is completed the Committee provides its advice to the Cabinet, the full Council or other scrutiny committees. Meetings are open to the public and all reports are available to the public unless exempt or confidential, when the items would be considered in closed session

If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named on the front page, giving as much notice as possible before the meeting

A hearing loop is available at County Hall.

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments**
2. **Declarations of Interest - see guidance note on the back page**
3. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 8)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 12 July 2011 (**CH3**) and to note for information any matters arising from them.

4. **Speaking to or petitioning the Committee**

5. **Director's Update**

10:15

Jan Paine, Deputy Director for Education and Early Intervention, will deliver the update on behalf of the Director.

The Committee is invited to receive the presentation which will be followed by a question and answer session.

6. **Select Committee Outcome and KS1 Report** (Pages 9 - 22)

11:00

The Committee will receive a report (**CH6**) on the outcomes resulting from the Select Committee style review held on the 5th of July 2011.

Roger Edwards, Senior Scrutiny Officer, and author of the report as well as Creighton Muirhead, 5-11 Standards & Progress Manager CEF will join for the discussion.

7. **Safeguarding Children**

11:30

Jim Leivers, Deputy Director for Children's Social Care will give an update on referrals, assessments and admissions to care etc. and further developments since November 2010 to include Unaccompanied Children Seeking Asylum, "Somebody Else's Child" and increasing responsibilities/pressures for the Council.

8. **Work Programme Refresh Discussion** (Pages 23 - 24)

12:15

The Committee will discuss existing topics and issues currently on the work programme

as well as suggest emerging items they would like to see included as part of the new schedule. The Committee is invited to determine which items are of highest priority, and the work programme will be refreshed accordingly for the November Meeting (CH8).

9. Forward Plan

12:45

The Committee is asked to suggest items from the current Forward Plan on which it may wish to have an opportunity to offer advice to the Cabinet before any decision is taken, together with details of what it thinks could be achieved by looking at any items.

INFORMATION SHARE

12:50

12:55 Close of Meeting

Declarations of Interest

This note briefly summarises the position on interests which you must declare at the meeting. Please refer to the Members' Code of Conduct in Part 9.1 of the Constitution for a fuller description.

The duty to declare ...

You must always declare any "personal interest" in a matter under consideration, i.e. where the matter affects (either positively or negatively):

- (i) any of the financial and other interests which you are required to notify for inclusion in the statutory Register of Members' Interests; or
- (ii) your own well-being or financial position or that of any member of your family or any person with whom you have a close association more than it would affect other people in the County.

Whose interests are included ...

"Member of your family" in (ii) above includes spouses and partners and other relatives' spouses and partners, and extends to the employment and investment interests of relatives and friends and their involvement in other bodies of various descriptions. For a full list of what "relative" covers, please see the Code of Conduct.

When and what to declare ...

The best time to make any declaration is under the agenda item "Declarations of Interest". Under the Code you must declare not later than at the start of the item concerned or (if different) as soon as the interest "becomes apparent".

In making a declaration you must state the nature of the interest.

Taking part if you have an interest ...

Having made a declaration you may still take part in the debate and vote on the matter unless your personal interest is also a "prejudicial" interest.

"Prejudicial" interests ...

A prejudicial interest is one which a member of the public knowing the relevant facts would think so significant as to be likely to affect your judgment of the public interest.

What to do if your interest is prejudicial ...

If you have a prejudicial interest in any matter under consideration, you may remain in the room but only for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the matter under consideration, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise.

Exceptions ...

There are a few circumstances where you may regard yourself as not having a prejudicial interest or may participate even though you may have one. These, together with other rules about participation in the case of a prejudicial interest, are set out in paragraphs 10 – 12 of the Code.

Seeking Advice ...

It is your responsibility to decide whether any of these provisions apply to you in particular circumstances, but you may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer before the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

CHILDREN'S SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 12 July 2011 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 12.45 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Ann Bonner – in the Chair

Councillor Dave Sexon (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor Janet Godden
Councillor Neil Owen
Councillor Marilyn Badcock
Councillor Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor
Councillor Don Seale
Councillor Nicholas P. Turner
Councillor Michael Waine

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Hutchinson (for the entire meeting)

Co-opted Members: Mrs Sue Matthew

By Invitation: Brenda Williams

Officers:

Whole of meeting Meera Spillet, Director for Children, Education and Families
Lisa Michelson, Scrutiny Officer

Part of meeting Sandra Higgs, Business and Skills Manager CEF
Janet Johnson, Children with SEN Manager CEF
Netta Bucket, Area Service Manager - EY (Southern) CEF

The Scrutiny Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and agreed as set out below. Copies of the agenda and reports are attached to the signed Minutes.

142/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS (Agenda No. 1)

Carole Thomson, Chris Bevan, Cllr Chapman (Cllr Tilley substituting) Cllr Hurchinson for Cllr Val Smith.

143/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE ON THE BACK PAGE

(Agenda No. 2)

none

144/11 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

Cllr Waine was in attendance

p. 6 Should say that it is important for a Management Board to be put in place

145/11 SPEAKING TO OR PETITIONING THE COMMITTEE

(Agenda No. 4)

none

146/11 DIRECTOR'S UPDATE

(Agenda No. 5)

Meera Spillet provided her regular update on the latest issues affecting the Directorate.

At several points during the presentation, the committee had discussions on items.

The topic of commissioning was discussed amongst the committee. Cllr Seale stated that the term commissioning can be confusing as it means different things to different people in different contexts. The Director defined it as a map of services and matching those services to purchasing. She emphasised the benefit of data led decisions. She went on to say that in a climate of limited resources it became increasingly important to use research and evidence to focus resources on achieving results.

The Director relayed some themes that emerged from a recent national conference she attended with other children's services directors. She related that there were national themes around culture change that were relevant to Oxfordshire. That the discussion pertained to shifting officers' thinking towards:

Outcomes not Targets

Evidence not Ideology

Culture not Structure

Cllr Godden voiced concern that this 'culture change' was meant to have taken place with the splitting of services several years ago, and that this does not seem to have happened.

The Director consented and stated that a change in structure does not necessarily bring desired culture change.

Cllr Waine stated that after 20 years of topdown directives from government, the shift is to local decisions. He asked about the interface between evidence based local decisions and funding decisions that are made nationally.

The Director acquiesced that this was a big question and that it was still unclear how this would play out nationally.

Sue Matthew commented that she had recently heard that Oxford University is partnering with the Children's Trust and that this was an exciting development.

Cllr Waine confirmed that it had taken place and that it had been in the works for a while.

Cllr Fitzgerald-O'Connor asked about the Sure Start Programme evaluation. Was it true that this evaluation did not have the expected outcomes?

The Director stated that the directorate was in the process of developing guidance on this evaluation. There are issues when trying to make a direct comparison as the levels of resource vary. Funding levels were scaled back in subsequent waves. She acknowledged that there was a need to better focus provision and the directorate is about to do a review for the county.

There was a discussion on the new provision of families approaching schools directly for admittance mid-year. There was a concern that families might not understand their rights if schools did not admit their child or understand the appeal process. There was also a concern regarding the ongoing consultation to increase the time allowed to file an appeal from 10 to 30 days. This could amount to a considerable amount of time for a child to be out of school. While the specific reason for this proposed increase was unknown, it was suggested by Cllr Fitzgerald-O'Connor that it could address some time pressures on parents to build an appeal.

The Director gave an update on the new Hub provision model. She confirmed to the chairman that the plan was on track for a timely delivery.

Cllr Godden voiced concerns that it was possible that confidence in the hub has not been high and that more outreach was necessary.

Cllr Waine commented that it was the ongoing involvement of councillors which was the crucial element.

Brenda Williams expressed anxiety that with only 7 hubs access could be difficult for some young people.

The director clarified that there will be 7 hubs and 6 satellites. She insisted that the directorate would ensure that young people would be made known of the activities and programmes and that it was designed to maximise access and utilisation in a restricted resource environment.

147/11 EDUCATION AND TRAINING: APPRENTICESHIPS, SCIENCE EDUCATION AND YOUNG PEOPLE NOT IN EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

(Agenda No. 6)

Sandra Higgs (SH), Business and Skills Manager for Oxfordshire County Council addressed the committee. She reported that while it was good news that apprenticeships were on the rise in Oxfordshire, there were other parts of the South East which were experiencing faster growth. She reviewed a few details on the data including the fact that hairdressing is the most popular apprenticeship, by far. As the manager, she indicated that she would like to see an increase in areas like engineering which currently ranks 8th for younger apprentices and not in the top 10 for older apprentices. Cllr Bonner asked about the number of apprentices who drop-off their scheme to which SH responded that it is less of an issue for OCC that, although we have fewer in number, our quality of those is actually higher.

Cllr Hutchinson remarked that it was important to draw the connection between the scheme and young people who are successful in being placed in a job.

SH responded that in many cases, the companies who utilise apprentices, have a tendency to keep the young people on in employment.

The committee discussed that some of the take up may have a gender component with fewer girls opting for engineering placements. It was mentioned that gender bias starts young and that there already exists a number of women in science events across the county to help address this.

Martin Dare-Edwards (MDE), the Chairman of the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (Oxon-LEP) joined SH at the table.

He spoke about his view that there was disconnect in what companies were looking for as far as qualifications are concerned, and what was being provided at Oxfordshire colleges. His read on what businesses are looking for goes beyond what can be a narrow skill set, as defined by the qualifications. Companies are more interested in an 'all-rounder'. He feels that colleges need to start to address a new sector and that they need to ensure students have 'combined skills'. A 'job-for-life' does not exist in today's job market in the same way that it once did. He spoke about the need for the country to feed the high tech sectors to keep the UK competitive and to ensure that high paying jobs continued to be created to support current standards of living.

Cllr Bonner commented that a primary component was essential.

Cllr Waine agreed adding that Science Oxford provides an excellent outreach to primary students.

Cllr Seale spoke about the importance of culture change in promoting apprenticeships. He felt that there needed to be better communication about the huge benefits of apprenticeships. Young people might not realise that some leaders and senior managers in companies such as BMW came in through the scheme and

not through a university route. He felt that in some cases for some industries, an apprenticeship scheme is superior to a university education. He asked what the committee could do to support the work.

SH agreed that a culture change was very important and pointed out that educating teachers on those points is important. She said that in fact, the number of young people interested in the scheme exceeded the opportunities and that outreach was needed with employers.

She added that in some cases, apprenticeships can be a route into university. It has been the case that a student who entered into a company as part of the scheme was later further trained at a university level, though at company expense.

MDE suggested that the schools could have an apprenticeship 'score' similar to the figures they report on university placements.

Cllr Turner expressed concern that businesses do not have enough information about how to set apprentices up.

Cllr Godden felt that the issue revolves around a mismatch to the National Vocational Qualifications (NVQ) where NVQ's are single skill oriented and a variety of skills are what companies are looking for. There is an incentive for young people to focus on acquiring NVQ's, which might inadvertently limit their options.

MDE agreed that companies are not hiring on NVQ's as they currently exist, for that reason. He suggested that a new qualification, focused on a mix of skills, could be established.

Sue Matthew suggested that councillors could connect with colleges to develop a new qualification if colleges were reluctant to engage directly with businesses.

Meera Spillet added that employers need to be engaged with any changes we may be considering.

Cllr Fitzgerald-O'Connor commented that employers feel that bureaucracy around Health and Safety and other hurdles make apprenticeships feel like too much of a hassle.

SH agreed that a negative perception around bureaucratic hurdles was prevalent. She explained that part of the current outreach was around overcoming these barriers and helping employers navigate the 'red tape'.

Cllr Bonner suggested that as this is an important topic the committee would want to stay on top of it. She indicated that she would like this included as part of the discussion on the year's work programme for the committee at the next meeting. She asked that once the Business and Skills Team is formed and up and running, that they return to the Committee in 6 months. At that time, the committee can consider a working group for further investigation.

148/11 SPECIAL SCHOOLS AND ADMISSION AT NURSERY AGE

(Agenda No. 7)

The committee received a presentation from Sean O'Sullivan (SO) the Headteacher at Frank Wise School.

The Committee discussed the data around children under 5 on Roll in Special Schools from 2007-2011.

SO commented that the figures suggest that identifying and addressing issues with children early can lead to better outcomes for an individual child. Beyond that, this approach can be less costly in the long run.

Several barriers to taking this approach were discussed. It was stated that there are political considerations, that parents views may differ wildly on the preferred approach for their child, and that educational professionals views may also differ.

Janet Johnson (JJ), Children with SEN Manager, joined the discussion to add that the number of admissions for 2 and 3 years olds has increased. This would indicate that students are being identified earlier.

JJ commented that there are, however, families who would like their children to stay in mainstream schools as long as possible. Adding that in some cases, these are very strong preferences.

Cllr Bonner thanked SO for his presentation and acknowledged his views.

SO thought that work could be done to popularise this provision (special schools) and promote the support that special schools can offer. He continued that work needed to take place to address any existing stigma and convince parents of the merits. He felt that what was needed was a cultural shift as a whole.

Cllr Bonner asked for specifics on what could be done.

SO listed that more can be done to celebrate achievements, that further cross learning between schools could take place, and that better joined up working should happen between areas. He also mentioned that linking in with the Early Intervention Hubs was important.

Cllr Seale concurred that there was a stigma issue and felt that a large part of it was down to the views of other children.

Cllr Waine commented that it was down to perceptions. Were special schools 'schools of last resort', or was there a consideration about what the schools actually have to offer.

Cllr Turner thought that even the name 'Special School' stigmatises (or can). Adding that at the end of the day it is the outcomes that matter most.

JJ commented that the evidence suggests that teacher competency is the key factor in achieving good outcomes.

Brenda Williams (COTO) spoke about current teacher demands in that they are higher than they have ever been in the past. Her view was that the requirements placed on teachers at mainstream schools are not possible within the current resources. She felt that the debate about inclusion, which has benefits, does not fully take into account the impact on those providing services.

Cllr Turner requested that this item come back in 6-9 months time once the hubs were in place.

Cllr Bonner said that this item could be part of the discussion scheduled for the next committee meeting in September.

149/11 FORWARD PLAN
(Agenda No. 8)

Information Share

Cllr Bonner reported on the recent Select Committee style review held the previous week on KS1 results. It was her view that it was an excellent meeting and inspirational to hear directly from ‘the front line’ the work that is being carried out on behalf of the young people in the county.

She said that there would be a report to the September meeting on the outcomes from the review.

Sue Matthew informed the committee about the upcoming Children’s Parliament scheduled for Wednesday, the 9th of September from 9.00 to 15.00 in the council chamber.

150/11 CLOSE OF MEETING
(Agenda No. 9)

The meeting finished at 12.50.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

This page is intentionally left blank

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee

Report of the Select Committee considering the performance of Oxfordshire children at the end of Key Stage 1 (Year 2)

Background

1. Results from tests taken in 2010 showed that overall schools in Oxford City scored lowest of all districts in England in Key Stage 1 (KS1) assessments. Following publication of these figures the then Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement asked the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee to review the Local Authority's approach to raising attainment at Key Stage One in Oxford, and to make recommendations accordingly.
2. The Local Authority was aware that there was underperformance in some of Oxfordshire's schools including some schools in the City of Oxford. Local Authority data has previously been used to compare performance against national and comparative neighbours and locally across three broad areas: Northern, Central and Southern parts of the county. This was the first time that the Department for Education produced tables showing results by Districts rather than at County level which brought this geographical issue more clearly into focus.
3. Underperformance in some City schools had been recognised and was one of the key drivers for the city schools re-organisation to a two tier system in 2003.
4. Officers reminded the committee that the problem of poor KS1 performance in some schools was not confined to Oxford City. In each of the District Council areas across the County, KS1 performance was recorded as poor in comparison with statistical neighbours; i.e. authorities deemed similar in nature for comparison purposes. Following further analysis of the data it was agreed that the review would look at the issue of raising KS1 performance across the whole of Oxfordshire.
5. The Committee chose to undertake the work through a one-off Select Committee style meeting. The meeting took place on July 5th 2011. A number of witnesses attended including officers from the Local Authority, senior staff from Oxfordshire schools and the present and past Cabinet Members for Schools Improvement.
6. In addition a number of papers were provided by colleagues from Oxfordshire, Warwickshire County Council and Bath and North East Somerset Council.
7. The committee also recognised that the Coalition government is planning to change the method of assessment at the end of KS1.
8. It is important to note that the Committee does not seek to apportion blame for the poor performance figures in some schools. Rather, members wish to identify what issues have hindered performance, what has helped to

improve performance in some schools; what is being done now and what more could be done to ensure all schools have high performance.

9. The purpose of the Committee's work could be summed up as seeking to answering the following questions:
 - i. What are the causes of poor performance?
 - ii. What are the reasons for varying success levels between schools with similar profiles?
 - iii. What is being done now to deal with the issue of poor performance?
 - iv. What more needs to be done so that performance levels of children at all schools be improved?

Select Committee Findings

Key Stage 1 Performance

10. KS1 is an early milestone and it is important not to ignore the influence of both Early Years Foundation Stage Performance (EYFSP) and continuity into KS2. By the age of seven, most children are expected to achieve level 2. In Oxfordshire schools are encouraged to use 2B+ as a measure of success. The most able children would be expected to reach Level 3. Children who are judged as Level 2C are within the expected range, but just below average. Less able children will be scoring at Level 1.
11. Compared with KS2 tests, evaluation at KS1 is much less formal. The KS1 Assessments last for less than three hours altogether. The results are not reported separately, but are used to help teachers assess children's work. KS2 performance is assessed on specified days through formal tests which are externally marked. It is possible for teachers at KS1 to assess on the side of caution; if that happens then contextual value added (CVA) looks better at KS2.

What are the causes of poor performance?

12. Eligibility for Free School Meals is strongly associated with low achievement. Other indicators related to low achievement, as measured in the immediate area round a pupil's home, are related to child poverty and include:
 - i. Levels of unemployment
 - ii. Single parent households
 - iii. Parents with low educational qualifications
13. However there are a number of examples across the county where schools from similar areas with similar demographic backgrounds perform very differently. That would suggest that there can be school related reasons other than social circumstances that contribute to poor performance.

14. The National Audit Office has suggested that there are four further main factors that could affect performance:

- i. Ineffective school leadership
- ii. Weak school governance
- iii. Poor standards of teaching
- iv. Lack of external support (i.e. from the local authority)

15. These weaknesses can be characterised as follows:

- i. A reluctance to recognise that there is a problem
- ii. Low expectations of children and a culture of blaming the children
- iii. A belief that the problems of their children or school are unique
- iv. Knowing that there is a problem but not knowing how to fix it
- v. Knowing that there is a problem but not having the courage to challenge, staff, governors etc with the problem
- vi. Keeping governors, the LA, partners and other schools at arms length
- vii. Presenting a poor situation in a favourable light

16. Other factors that could affect performance that emerged during the meeting were:

- i. A failure to recognise the importance of Early Years education in strengthening and developing the later performance of children
- ii. A willingness to accept the status quo and so fail to set high expectations for the school and pupils
- iii. A lack of determination in challenging poor performance and dealing with under performance

17. Evidence and contributions submitted during the review confirmed the above as the major causes of poor performance.

18. The committee considered a number of programmes and interventions and wanted to know which had evidence of best impact. The findings were as follows;

19. **Developing Successful Schools Programme (DSS)**. DSS is a structured programme aimed at securing school improvement, raising standards of attainment and accelerating pupil progress by;

- i. Securing an ethos of collaborative learning
- ii. Strengthening LA and schools' capacity for improvement
- iii. Supporting schools in improving teaching and learning & leadership and management

20. Out of 14 schools included in the first year of the programme, 13 showed improved rates of progress between KS1 and KS2 whilst attainment at KS1 improved to above the Oxon and National Average in 9 of these schools.
21. In the second year, 2 schools out of 13 that have been inspected have moved from Satisfactory to Good and 2011 results so far indicate similar improved attainment to 2010 and accelerated rates of progress.
22. The main lessons from the programme were identified as follows:
- i. Systems and leadership across the school must be good if teaching is to be good.
 - ii. There must be a clear culture of driving for improvement set by the Head teacher and governors.
 - iii. Good schools have a consistent and encompassing shared vision.
 - iv. Schools and early years settings need to have a focus on improvement to ensure every child receives the best education from the start.
 - v. The importance of developing core skills must be front of mind for all teachers.
 - vi. Expectations for all pupils and teachers must be set high.
 - vii. External challenge and support is vital in improving performance.
 - viii. A creative and engaging curriculum is very important.
 - ix. Collaboration within the school to ensure there is continuity and progression of learning between early years/foundation stage, KS1 and KS2 is vital.
 - x. Most teachers continuously improve provided that they are supported and encouraged. However where there is no improvement there should be effective and timely use of existing HR procedures.
 - xi. All schools are different – one size does not fit all.
 - xii. Challenge, both within the school and external, should be giving consistent messages – “Why can’t you be the best”?

23. Improving Schools Programme (ISP). The ISP is a national project aimed at improving schools that are falling below Government “floor” targets (i.e. schools falling below the government target of at least 60% of 11-year-olds getting level four in both English and maths tests and pupils making at least average progress between age seven and 11). The main focus of the ISP has been on supporting Head teachers to drive harder to raise KS2 attainment. However there is a clear link between improvement at KS1 and KS2 attainment levels; so the drive and determination of schools that improved at KS2 were reflected in their work at all levels including KS1. What is clear is that the most effective schools recognise the importance of raising attainment across the whole school.

There is some evidence that some headteachers underestimate the importance of the Early Years Foundation Stage in developing future

performance at KS1 and above. In some schools the least effective teachers are placed in Early Years rather than the strongest. Our most successful schools understand the importance of placing the best teachers in the early years classes to ensure that children have the best possible start.

24. Efforts should be made to ensure that Head teachers and Governors understand and value the very early years, including nursery, and put the necessary energy and effort into those levels.

What are the reasons for varying success levels between schools with similar profiles?

In order to answer this question the Committee heard evidence from schools that were in disadvantaged areas where the received wisdom would suggest that performance could be expected to be low but where they achieve more than other similar schools.

25. What became clear is that performance is good where challenge and expectations are high for all pupils. Pre-conceptions should be challenged and discarded with clear expectations set, explained and understood. Pupils should be given the confidence to understand that they can achieve more than they expect.

26. Members heard of one initiative that provided opportunities for children to gather experiences away from the school. The Committee saw evidence of the benefits that could come from this philosophy via **the “Extra Mile” Project** that had been implemented across a group of schools in Oxford.

27. While it is accepted that finances do not allow the level of external activity undertaken for the “Extra Mile” all the time in all schools; it is clear that any opportunities to broaden pupils’ horizons creates an atmosphere of expectation that can lead to improved performance.

28. Members heard also from the Headteacher of a larger than average sized City school. The school had a high in-year turnover of pupils (around 30%). Pupils come from a wide range of backgrounds with well above average numbers of children from ethnic backgrounds. Around 50% of pupils have English as an additional language. The Early Years Foundation Stage is in two Reception classes. The numbers entering the lower end of the school, including the Early Years Foundation Stage, are increasing considerably, despite limited accommodation.

29. In spite of these challenges results continue to improve significantly year on year. This is partly because the school with the support of the LA, has developed a curriculum that has raised the quality of teaching and increased pupils’ enthusiasm for learning.

30. The underlying principles of the school are:

- i. To develop broadly educated, creative children working together in groups

- ii. To increase the self-esteem of all children in the school

31. And teachers, governors, parents and pupils are asked to consider:

- i. What makes a successful learner?
- ii. What hinders learning?
- iii. What promotes learning?

32. The answers to these questions have led to the creation of a curriculum that enables children to develop each level of their skills before moving on to the next skill. Children are encouraged to learn and develop with the aim of releasing the potential of the whole child. Importantly, it all starts at the Foundation stage where experienced teachers are employed to work with the new children. At KS1 special groups are identified and given appropriate support. Active reading is supported by students from the University.

33. The quality of teaching has been improved by training, development, monitoring and running demonstration lessons. Support staff receive regular training and the expectations of all staff have been raised.

34. These are just two examples of how schools in disadvantaged areas of Oxfordshire are able to achieve great things through hard work, imagination, challenge, high expectations and strong leadership and challenge and support from the LAs officers. If they can do it then so can others. In addition to showing what can be done, this gives a clear indication of the importance of spreading best practice across the County.

Federations

35. The Committee next explored the benefits that could be achieved by federating schools. A federation is two or more schools agreeing to work together for the benefit of all pupils and their school communities. The Banbury Dashwood Federation is an example of a successful federation in Oxfordshire.

36. Members heard how Dashwood School had been in special measures. Once it had come out there was a need to secure the future and it was agreed that federation was the best way forward. The federation has an Executive Headteacher and two Operational Headteachers, one in each of the schools. There is one governing body with full responsibility for both schools.

37. A number of advantages of federation have been identified. There is a wider pool of staff expertise which both schools can tap into and schools can draw on each others experience with children at all age groups.

38. The learning experience can be broadened with, say, modern languages and performing arts' teachers from one school working with pupils from the other. There are things to learn on both sides for the advantage of all

pupils and students and joint training sessions have been undertaken and proved to be extremely productive.

39. There is also a strong business case for federation. Many of the daily aspects of running a school can be done in one central place by well qualified and experienced staff such as finance, health and safety, caretaking, ICT management and so on, leaving the Operational Headteachers to focus on teaching and learning and pupil and student progress and achievements in their own schools.
40. The federation has enabled some of the limited resources to be pooled with staff being employed across both schools. There are teaching assistants, ICT and finance staff, and some teachers employed to the benefit of both schools whom the individual schools would not have been able to afford.
41. These benefits have led to improvements in performance across the whole school.
42. Other collaborative arrangements can have equally strong benefits. Oxfordshire has a network of school partnerships. Where schools work well in close partnership better results have been seen through wider curriculum choice shared resources and sharing best practice, knowledge and expertise.

The role of Governors and the Local Authority

43. The Committee was told that the Secretary of State expects schools to become more independent and self improving. Schools and governors are already responsible for the performance of their school. Support will be available from the LA with School Improvement Officers focussing much more heavily on targeting resources where there is most under performance and helping schools to support each other. The positive elements of support programmes will be emphasised and made part of training programmes offered in schools.
44. The role of governors becomes even more important in providing the right balance of support and challenge within the school and across schools. They must be supported and trained; given the confidence to carry out their roles effectively.
45. The importance of the relationship between governors and headteachers was discussed in some detail. The committee concluded that some Governors need to recognise that their role is not just that of a friend of the school but of a critical friend. They are there to monitor, review and challenge. Good governors do not simply accept that the headteacher is the main provider of information and data and they are prepared to act courageously and challenge any poor progress and weak leadership.
46. But for all governors to be able to do that they will need the support of the LA which, among other things, should ensure that the information that

heads and chairs of governors receive are shared and understood by all governors. Members heard that steps are being taken to ensure that this happens by information in future being sent to the clerks to the governors rather than to headteachers.

47. Local Authority nominated governors have a hugely important role to play in ensuring that governing bodies act effectively. They should all receive ongoing training to ensure that they can play a leading role on their governing bodies and act as a conduit between schools and the LA.
48. It was explained that procedures already exist to deal with under-performing teachers and heads although it has not always been a sufficiently fast process and not all heads and chairs of governors have taken up the formal processes when or as quickly as necessary. The Secretary of State has announced that he will be bringing in new measures to speed up the removal of underperforming teachers and head teachers in the Autumn of 2011 and heads and Chairs of Governors should be encouraged to use these procedures if insufficient improvement is made following appropriate support and training.
49. Members wondered whether this might be a good time to review HR procedures and to remind heads, governors and others of what tools are available to them in dealing with less than effective staff. This should coincide with the new changes.
50. Support for heads is essential but they must be challenged especially where there is no evidence of ongoing improvement within a school. Such action is bound to be difficult and governors may not wish to undertake it. However they have a responsibility to the children in the school to ensure everything is done to provide them with the best possible education. Support was expressed for the aim to provide information to all governors to enable them to ask questions and provide robust challenge.
51. Some contributors felt that smaller, more strategic governing bodies could be more effective and recommended that all governing bodies should insist on having an annual presentation on progress and performance at their school.
52. The best schools understand the importance of parents in the education of their children and go to great lengths to include them in the schools plans and approaches. The vast majority of schools do engage with parents but efforts should be made to ensure that all schools recognise the benefits that can be gained and learn from each other what works best.

What is being done now to deal with the issue of poor performance?

53. Historically, many of the children starting in City primaries begin from a very low baseline i.e. with low recorded scores in the EYFSP and it takes beyond Year 2 for them to 'catch up' with their peers. However, statistics for 2010 suggest that EYFSP is much improved upon 2008 and it is in fact above the national average. The greatest improvement for this age group

has in fact been made in the Central area, i.e. the area containing the City. The performance of this cohort of children will be seen in the KS1 figures for 2012 and it is hoped that the improvement in EYFSP will be matched then.

54. A number of programmes have been implemented aimed at raising attainment generally. While none of them is aimed specifically at KS1 they all would be expected to have an effect across the whole of the school.

Improving Schools Programme (ISP)

55. This programme has been referred to in some detail earlier in the report. It has been delivered in 26 schools across the County, 14 of these in the City of Oxford, over the last two years.

56. There has been significant success in many of these schools, and schools such as Wood Farm, Bayards Hill and Rose Hill came above the floor target for the first time in 2010. However, the engagement and determination of a school's leadership to improve is crucial to the progress made and where this has been less rigorous results are less impressive.

Developing Successful Schools (DSS)

57. This is a programme designed to look at both teaching and management systems within schools in order to raise attainment of pupils and provide the tools to help a school move from being satisfactory to good. The benefits accruing from this programme have also been considered in some detail earlier in this report.

Communication, Language and Literacy Development (CLLD)

58. This programme builds greater quality and capacity in the teaching of early literacy through developing work on speaking and listening, strengthening leadership and management of early literacy and supporting schools and settings with phonics and early reading.

ECaR (Every Child a Reader), ECaW (Every Child a Writer), ECC (Every Child Counts)

59. ECaR comprises 1 to 1 daily reading sessions for children with the most significant reading difficulties delivered by trained 'Reading Recovery' teachers. These teachers also provide training for other adults who are then able to deliver other lighter touch interventions.

60. ECaW is provided for children in Years 3 and 4 aiming for them to achieve Level 3 writing by the end of Year 4.

61. ECC is designed to improve the mathematical skills of the lowest attaining Year 2 children (the lowest 5% in mathematical attainment) and includes those with Special Educational Needs.

Interim Executive Boards (IEBs)

62. IEBs have been established in schools where the governing body has been unsuccessful in ensuring that the necessary rigour is applied to challenging the school to improve. There is often resistance to this route but there is strong evidence that once an IEB is in place, progress of pupils accelerates.

What can be learned from others?

63. Part of the evidence considered by the Committee came in the form of written submissions from Warwick City Council and Bath and North East Somerset Council.

64. Warwick City now tops the statistical neighbour group that includes Oxford City. However, in the past Warwick had similar concerns over KS1 as there are currently in Oxfordshire. Bath and North East Somerset leads the table of comparators to Oxfordshire as a whole.

65. Both of these authorities put a great emphasis on challenge and action. For example in Warwick, headteachers and Chairs of Governors of schools where there are concerns are required to attend termly *'Review and Intervention'* meetings with the Local Authority to report on the progress being made by pupils. This has had a "massive impact" with significant gains being achieved at both KS1 and KS2.

66. Bath and North East categorises schools as *'Priority and Targeted'* and those schools receive consultant/lead teacher support as appropriate.

67. Schools in Warwick are required to produce Learning Improvement Plans rather than School Improvement Plans, (similar to the Raising Achievement Plan used in Oxfordshire) and schools are challenged strongly on low pupil progress right from the Foundation Stage.

68. In Bath, assessment for learning has a high profile within the LA and there is strong moderation of Key Stage 1.

69. A key part of the raising of expectations by headteachers of their pupils' attainment in Warwick has been the headteacher Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programme. This is a series of termly whole day meetings, financed by the LA last year but 'bought into' by all headteachers this year. It has become the vehicle by which the LA has been able to challenge headteachers to do better and to successfully change the culture around low attainment. Great stress was laid upon the headteacher's role in planning for improvements in learning, monitoring progress and evaluating the impact of provision.

70. In Bath, OFSTED outcomes are analysed, good practice identified and common areas for development inform future CPD and support.

71. Each of these successful authorities has adopted similar but different approaches to the issue of performance and attainment. The common thread that runs through their methods is leadership, challenge and action. They identify areas of concern early and then become closely involved with the heads and governors of schools that are causing disquiet.
72. They emphasise the need for high expectations and the need to “do better” – coming back to the question identified earlier in this report – *why can't you be the best?*

What more needs to be done? - Conclusions and recommendations

73. Reference was made by one speaker to the relatively recent past when there had been, “an air of complacency [about school improvement] in Oxfordshire”. The Committee was told by the past and present Cabinet Members for Schools Improvement that this view has been dispelled but that there is still room for improvement. The aim should be for there to be “no school below good in Oxfordshire”.
74. In summing up, it has to be remembered that local authorities do not manage schools. The LA's role is one of influence and encouragement to improve; it no longer determines how schools spend their money, what or how they teach, or how they are evaluated and assessed.
75. However the LA continues to have a major role in championing good outcomes for every child and must intervene when schools are seen to be struggling or at risk of becoming so
76. The Committee heard that around 70% of Oxfordshire's schools are currently judged “good” or better by Ofsted. They also heard that at Key Stage 1 the performance of Oxfordshire's schools throughout the County compared unfavourably to the County's statistical comparators.
77. Having said that, many examples of good practice exist and a number of those were described to the Committee. Furthermore there is a great deal of activity taking place aimed at improving performance and there are many signs of hope for the future.
78. However there is plainly no room for complacency and more needs to be done to ensure all schools reach the standard of the best. For example, none of the initiatives referred to above will achieve very much if they are simply put onto websites or written up in newsletters. The outputs should be formalised and ways found to effectively embed them into Oxfordshire's schools. The role of schools working together in partnership will be key to that and the LA has a strong role to play in facilitating that and making sure good practice is recognised, shared and adopted.
79. The main elements for success were shown to be:
- i. Effective school leadership
 - ii. Strong school governance

- iii. Excellent standards of teaching
- iv. Strong external support and challenge

80. Quite plainly those attributes need to be developed and maintained across the County. It was shown that the most successful schools expect the most of staff and pupils. They have high expectations and clear plans on how to achieve their aims. The question; *“Why can't you be the best?”* should be asked constantly.
81. There is no doubt that there would be benefits from the good schools supporting the not so good. Best practice in schools should be passed on by further developing federations or strengthening partnerships and collaborations between schools. Learning is more effective when passed on through the partnership and when schools challenge each other.
82. Whilst headteachers must lead they cannot improve a school on their own. Everybody; the head, governors, teachers, parents, children and the LA must be clear of their roles and what is expected of them in order to achieve more. Stronger and more courageous internal and external challenge of all underperformance in schools from governors, local authority governors and the local authority is required.
83. Earlier input, including formal conversations with heads and governors, when there are early concerns about progress should take place with time limits being set on improvement where schools are seen to be not achieving at the expected level.
84. More ongoing and improved governor training should be required for all governors and specifically LA governors with an increasing use of Interim Executive Boards where necessary to improve school leadership. There should also be earlier use of HR processes where progress remains unacceptable.
85. There should not be just concentration on deprived areas and obviously poor performing schools. Schools in more affluent places that should be doing even better should be targeted to ensure that expectations of high achievement are in place and realised. This would have the effect of bringing up the level of performance across the whole County. Given the reduced level of LA resources the importance of school to school and governing body to governing body support and challenge will become increasingly relevant.
86. Generally there should be an acceptance of only the highest standards with a minimum aim to be set that all children should be able to be within walking distance of a school that is at least “good” by the year 2013. In order to begin to work towards that aim the following recommendations are made.
87. The recommendations relate to the “main elements for success” identified during this review (as shown in paragraph 81 above). They will be sent to the Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement and the Directorate for

Children, Education and Families who will all be expected to respond to the Scrutiny Committee in December 2011.

Recommendations

Effective School Leadership

- 1. The importance of strong leadership, high expectations of pupils and staff, the achievement of excellent standards and the consequences of failing to achieve those aims should be made clear to everybody involved with Oxfordshire's schools.**
- 2. The Local Authority should broker further discussions with schools across the County aimed at increasing the number of federations and strengthening partnerships. The committee recommends that schools continue to build on and formalise existing partnerships and to develop other innovative collaborative arrangements including federation so that all schools can benefit by 2013.**

Strong School Governance

- 3. The interventionist role of LA governors on governing bodies should be made clear, appropriate training given and LA governors should be expected to produce six-monthly reports to Director on "their" schools; beginning in 2012.**
- 4. By April 2012 dates should have been agreed for heads, governors and LA staff to be given training in understanding the importance of the role of the "critical friend" and undertaking strong and swift action where it is required.**
- 5. HR processes should be reviewed in the light of national policy changes in October 2011 and implemented no later than April 2012 to ensure that they are sufficiently robust and capable of swift implementation. Training and information to be provided to head teachers and governing bodies.**

Excellent Standards of Teaching

- 6. Examples of best teaching practice should be recognised and shared more widely across all schools.**
- 7. Recognition of the importance of the very early years in making sure children have a good start must be more widely understood and the evidence of investing the best teachers in early years should be shared widely with head teachers, governors and parents.**
- 8. Accurate assessment of children's progress should take place at all stages and the practice of "erring on the side of caution" when marking at KS1 should be challenged.**

Strong External Support and Challenge

9. Formal meetings should take place between the Director of Children, Education and Families and headteachers and chairs of governors as soon as progress is seen to be causing concern. The meetings should result in a recovery plan being produced within six weeks and be followed by termly progress meetings.
10. If no progress is made within an agreed timescale, action should then be taken to change school leadership. Interim Executive Boards would be established to replace governors if no progress is demonstrated.
11. In order to improve the sharing of good practice across schools, governor partnership groups should be established supported by LA officers.
12. All successful initiatives, such as DSS and ISP, should be formally reviewed, shared and the practice embedded into Oxfordshire's schools.

Implementation and Monitoring

13. An improvement strategy should be sent to the Scrutiny Committee by December 2011 with a detailed implementation plan including names of those accountable for putting it into operation and specific actions and milestones for measuring progress.

Acknowledgements

88. The members of the Children's Services Scrutiny Committee wish to thank everybody who contributed to the select committee whether in person or by written submission.

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee 2011/12 Work Programme Suggested topics for discussion

Items which were previously decided to be included in the 2011/12 Work Programme

- **Educational attainment**
It was agreed that the new results would be brought to the Committee or discussion in November.
- **Addressing the skills gap in Science (NEETs link)**
The Committee continues to have an interest in further developing links between schools and the local science community. A specific piece of work has not been identified.
- **Free Schools and Academies**
This was added as a discussion item to keep the Committee abreast of the local implications for new national policies.
- **EDAS Restructure**
This topic was part of the previous work programme. It was thought that once the service was restructure was completed we could invite them back for an update.

Items on the existing work programme which are updates.

- **LAC: Attainment in English and Maths** - November
- **Anti-bullying** - February
- **Teenage Conception** - November

Members are invited to suggest further topics they would like to see considered as part of the 2011/12 Work Programme before the meeting to Lisa Michelson, Senior Performance and Review Officer.

Contact: lisa.michelson@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Phone: 01865 815673

Alternatively, members can bring topics directly to the committee meeting to introduce as part of the discussion.

This page is intentionally left blank