



“Gifted Children”

“Every Child Matters”

Review Group Members

Cllr Hilary Hibbert-Biles – Chairman

Cllr Deborah Glass Woodin

Cllr Melinda Tilley

Cllr Val Smith

Children's Services Scrutiny
Committee -
Scrutiny Review
of Gifted Children
26th September 2006

Democratic Services
CH011

Glossary/ Definition of key terms

This report is written as far as possible in plain English with the minimum of jargon. All acronyms are spelt out in full when they first appear and on several occasions elsewhere, but for the sake of clarity the meanings of those most frequently used are repeated here.

CPD	Continuous Professional Development
CYP&F	Children, Young People and Families Directorate
DfES	Department for Education & Skills
G&T	Gifted and Talented
IQ	Intelligence quotient
LEA	Local Education Authority
NACE	National Association for Able Children
NAGC	National Association of Gifted Children
NAGTY	National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth
OCC	Oxfordshire County Council
OfSTED	Office for Standards in Education
PLASC	Pupils Level Annual School Census
PGCE	Post Graduate Certificate in Education
RG	Review Group
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SATs	Standard Attainment Tests

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. <u>Executive Summary</u>	5
2. <u>Recommendations</u>	6
3. <u>Background</u> (Aims of the review and the review process; Context; Who do we mean by “Gifted Children?”; Development of the concept of “Giftedness in the UK”; The current position; The LEA’s policy and guidance in brief; LEA funding; The review group’s secondary research)	7
4. <u>The Review Group’s Secondary Research</u>	13
5. <u>Findings/Evidence</u> (Analysis and conclusions from review group visits; Schools; The “research view”; Identification and provision; The LEA; NAGTY)	13
6. <u>Conclusions</u> (General observations and conclusions)	25
7. <u>Concluding Remarks</u>	29
8. <u>Annexes</u>	

Children's Services Scrutiny Committee **26th September 2006**

Gifted Children

1. Executive Summary

1. The Children's Services Scrutiny Committee commissioned this Review during November 2005. The scoping document was approved by the Committee and then by the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group on the 14th November 2005. The Review Group (RG) has compiled this report and made recommendations based on its findings and analysis.
2. Our recommendations follow. We believe that the Review has achieved the objectives set out in the scoping document. The Review has been carried out having regard to "Every Child Matters" that Oxfordshire County Council has signed up to, and to the "5 national outcomes" derived from it and the Children Act 2004.

Being Healthy

Staying Safe

Enjoying and Achieving

Making a positive contribution

Economic well-being.

The main findings of the Review were:

- "Gifted Children" are a varied group in terms of academic ability. There is as much range of ability within the gifted group of pupils as there is outside among the peer school group.
- Every childSocial background and ethnicity do not determine whether or not a child falls within the "gifted" group.
- Children may be gifted in particular and in a variety of subjects, but the majority are gifted across the board.
- Therefore, identification of the gifted child and the means to doing so are important.
- There is a belief that teaching groups of similarly gifted children benefits all of them; also that gifted children have a positive impact on the level of achievement among peers of lower academic ability.
- There are problems about applying blanket definitions of gifted children as the abilities of them are not easily categorised.
- There has been some historical resistance to specialist provision for gifted children because it raises the notion of elitism. Hence, there has been some negativity towards identification of the gifted.
- There is a need for well-trained teachers who can recognise and provide for the gifted pupil and therefore, better and more

compulsory modules are needed in initial teacher training and continuous professional development.

- Talents and skills in sports and the arts are duly rewarded or acknowledged by schools, but academic achievements are not in the same way.
- There may be a need to regard and provide for gifted pupils in a similar way to those children who are defined as “special needs”.
- Ethos, expectations, culture and attitude are important in the school and the community environment surrounding the gifted child. Strategies need not be entirely focused around funding and central LEA resources; evidence from NAGTY emphasised the need for creating conditions to identify and nurture gifted children, training of teachers to have the appropriate skills and having the right environment.
- It is important that every pupil should have the means and accessibility to achieving their full potential.

2. Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED:

- 1. That the County Council should implement a specific programme in schools to identify, provide for and resource academically gifted children.**
- 2. That teacher training institutions should be RECOMMENDED that modules on gifted children should be compulsory rather than optional each year in the BA course and those doing the PGCE one year course should have at least one module.**
- 3. That the County Council should establish a central Gifted Co-ordinator post with responsibility for producing, managing and ensuring the implementation of the programme for gifted children. (Costs are referred to elsewhere)**
- 4. That to support the Gifted Co-ordinator post there should be advanced skills teachers in post for primary and secondary level with responsibility for gifted children.**
- 5. That the top 5% in every school, whilst not necessarily “gifted” as such require “stretching” and that a specific programme as recommended above is the principal means to do this.**
- 6. In SEN assessment processes the “gifted” are not properly acknowledged as having special educational needs. A legal duty for gifted children should be established so that they are regarded as SEN and to ensure that they receive personalized programmes.**

Supporting recommendations:

Every secondary school is required to have a “lead teacher” for gifted and talented, but in some schools this is a nominal rather than active role. The Review has recommended elsewhere that

there should be an advanced skills teacher for the gifted at primary and secondary level.

The LEA should issue a letter and guidance to all schools reinforcing the importance of providing for giftedness and that it should feature on school governing body agendas.

3. Background

Aims of the Review and the Review Process

3. This Review was included in the adopted Children's Services Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme during the Autumn of 2005. The Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Committee had considered research, information, themes and issues that might inform its future work and on the basis of these "Gifted Children" was identified as a topic for Scrutiny review. In particular, the Committee was interested in Oxfordshire schools' attainment levels; specifically achievement in terms of GCSE examination results. It was considered that a focus on the top end of the academic attainment range might be a means to improved results. The Committee appointed Councillors Hilary Hibbert-Biles, (Chairman), Melinda Tilley, Deborah Glass Woodin and Val Smith to undertake the Review.
4. The Review was planned in November 2005. The scoping document for the Review was endorsed by the Children's Services Committee on 3rd November 2005. The Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group formally agreed the Review on the 14th November 2005.
5. The Review's objectives and the specific tasks that the Lead Member Group set itself are in the scoping document. The Review Group is satisfied that so far as it has been able to, the objectives have been achieved.
6. The Review was carried out between November 2005 and September 2006 and included secondary and primary research, visits to schools and other establishments, and a series of interviews with key witnesses.

Context

7. The Review was concerned with raising educational attainment levels in Oxfordshire Schools by focusing on the higher end of the academic ability range rather than the lower level of ability, where there is nevertheless high need; the area of Special Educational Needs (SEN). It was carried out having regard to "Every Child Matters", that Oxfordshire County Council has signed up to and in particular the "national outcome(s)" of "Enjoying and Achieving" and "Making a positive contribution".

8. The Review intended from the outset to focus on the gifted and very able, children purely in terms of academic ability.

Who do we mean by “Gifted Children”?

9. The Review began by exploring the terminology – ie “gifted” children. There are a number of agencies and organizations that are active in the identification of and development of programmes for “gifted” children and they have attempted to define the group of children that they refer to, in their work. (Some of these agencies are listed in **Annex 4** including the locally based National Association for Able Children, the key and largest organisation for teachers supporting gifted children).
10. Taking one of these agencies as an example - the National Association of Gifted Children (NAGC): Its website reviews a number of factors in definitions of “Giftedness” that have been offered over the course of time and in research. This has included the measurement of intelligence that has dominated the debate about giftedness for the last 100 years including the need and desire to create valid IQ tests; also factors such as personality traits and environmental influences. These have of course changed over time. (For a summary of these factors please refer to **Annex 6**). NAGC’s definition, incidentally, refers to the top 2% of the child population from all social and ethnic backgrounds.
11. The Review Group considered that it is sufficient to acknowledge that there are many definitions of “giftedness” in use. In research over the last 100 years, 180 definitions of giftedness have been put forward. The RG considers that it is distinct from “able” and “talented”; let alone the differences in the methodologies for identifying children, training for teachers to identify and develop the pupils to achieve their maximum capabilities, and programmes that could be put in place in schools. (This is reflected in recent media debate as the comments at the end of the Review demonstrate.)
12. Because of this, the Review Group regarded it as critical to be clear about the group of children that it was referring to in the Review and to consistently apply this meaning. That is, the academically “gifted” child. Nevertheless, **the top 5% of children in academic subjects in each and every Oxfordshire school should be able to benefit from the challenge that the introduction of a local gifted programme and enrichment activities would present even if they are not “gifted” as such; this was a principle that the Review adhered to.** The scope of the Review at the outset was “to ensure that children whose potential is at the top end of the academic scale, have their needs identified at the appropriate time, (as early as possible) and that they are provided for and met throughout their schooling.”
13. The Review Group drew on evidence and information from schools, the Local Education Authority (LEA – the Children Young People and Families Directorate) and other agencies that referred to “gifted”, “talented”, “more able” and “able” children, but bore in mind the original remit of the Review.

Development of the Concept of “Giftedness” in the UK

14. As early as September 1999 “gifted and talented” was starting to appear as a key strand in the Government's “Excellence in Cities Programme”. However, by December 2001 an Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) report found that only “rudimentary” procedures had been used to spot potential high-flyers. Schools failed to be systematic and inclusive inspectors said, especially with students who did not fit the traditional academic mould. Pupils with clear evidence of performance were easily selected, but those who were very able but for instance, demonstrated poor behaviour, were in public care or in the process of mastering English as an additional language, often slipped through the net.
15. By this time there was a definition of gifted (including talented as well) children in place, being the top 5 to 10% of students. This definition has come to be broadly accepted by schools and local education authorities. However, among the Review Group there was a view that 5%, this being within the individual school and not across the pupil population at large - was quite a generous definition, because the Review had stated at the outset that it was concerned principally with academically gifted children and not talented ones.
16. In light of this, there was a view among the Review Group that it might be inappropriate to look at the top 5% in any one school as there could be situations where any individual school did not have a child in the top 5% of academically gifted children across the UK. The Group had earlier acknowledged and agreed the principle that the top 5% in each of Oxfordshire’s schools ought to be challenged and benefit from the introduction of an appropriate programme. Otherwise, the implication would be that a specific emphasis on strategy and resources for gifted children in Oxfordshire might only extend to some schools. (As “The Guardian – July 11 2006 stated, “the top 10% of gifted children at a selective grammar school is likely to have a vastly different profile to the top 10% of a struggling inner-city school”). Furthermore the RG thought that the measures in currency (from the Dept for Education & Skills) for measuring gifted outcomes might not be appropriate; this is explored in the Review.
17. It is worth noting here that in 2002, the Government set up the National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth (NAGTY), based at the University of Warwick and supported by Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, which had pioneered similar projects for gifted children in the US from 1979. Many more children than expected have subsequently become members of the academy, accessing online support throughout the school year. The Review goes on to discuss its findings from a visit to and evidence obtained from NAGTY.

The Current Position

18. When one considers who gifted children are it is interesting to scan areas of recent research; the subject has become very topical in recent months particularly!
19. For instance, there is evidence that there is a direct relationship between the number of bright children in a school and individual achievements.

David Jesson of York University, used government data to track the progress of 28,000 children who scored the highest marks in national curriculum tests of English and Mathematics at the age of 11. They represented the top 5 per cent from more than half a million pupils in England who take Key Stage 2 tests in primary schools each year. Professor Jesson found that nearly 6,000 pupils who took the tests in 1999 were admitted to 167 selective grammar schools and 5,800 went to 223 high-achieving comprehensives. The remaining 16,500 went into 2,407 comprehensives, many in urban areas, with lower overall achievement levels. His conclusion was that when the same students took their GCSEs many had effectively been lost, because schools failed to push them to reach their potential. Partly because of this, the concern and focus in the scoping and during the Review has been on the situation in Oxfordshire schools.

20. Professor Jesson found that success rates declined in line with the numbers of bright children in a school, and dipped sharply when there were fewer than five. Where 20 pupils from the most able 5 per cent were clustered together in a year group, each achieved an average of nearly seven GCSE passes at A* and A grade. But where there was just one child from this group in a school, he or she passed fewer than four GCSEs at these grades. **The broad conclusion that the Review Group takes from this evidence, is that gifted children thrive and reach their potential by working within similarly gifted peer groups.**
21. **In March 2004 David Bell, Chief Inspector of Schools, when addressing the National Association for Able Children in Education said that gifted pupils should be designated "special needs" and put on a register in the same way as those who have learning difficulties. This was an observation borne out and supported by several of the contributors to this Review and a recommendation has been made elsewhere.** *(This is discussed elsewhere and the legal position concerning "Special Needs" was considered in detail during the course of the Review).* Teaching Assistants could then be deployed to work with them on more challenging tasks as well as being used to help pupils with special educational needs. This was an interesting observation that the Review Group explores in more detail later on.
22. In his view Primary schools in particular, were failing to meet the needs of gifted pupils because few of them had a coherent policy. Even the best schools often did not provide them with sufficient challenge and support. Schools that catered most effectively were more likely to identify able pupils, place them on a register and provide each with an individual action plan. The Review wanted to find out when and where this was taking place in Oxfordshire.
23. To conclude on this section, the RG endorses this comment from the Daily Telegraph (16 June 2006) as representing its views: "Despite the Government's "gifted and talented" initiatives, the education system still lacks the fundamental cultural change that would make schools accept giftedness as a special need like any other. Lack of financial backing means that policies and documents whether produced by the Government, the local authority or the school, may have little impact on the daily experience of gifted pupils. Provision is very much down to individual

schools and teachers - a lot will be revealed by a school's answer to the question: 'How do you provide for your most able pupils'."

The LEA's Policy & Guidance in Brief

24. As this Review is focusing on provision in Oxfordshire's maintained schools, it is helpful at first to set out the LEA's position.
25. The LEA has produced or uses a range of documents that sets out its guidance and policy on gifted and talented children, as the terms are used alongside one another and in relation to funding. It is in the process of pulling together the guidance and policies in a handbook. At present, however, there is not a self-contained comprehensive guidance and policy document in place on Gifted Children.
26. Most of the current guidance (see bibliography) was produced between 2001 and 2003. In the past the LEA has had staff specifically for Gifted and Talented provision. A full time member of staff (Professor Deborah Eyre) left the Authority on 31 August 1996. A 0.5 consultant (Penny Hollander) left on 31 August 2004. The consultant post was OCC funded and a decision was taken not to replace her at a time of a moratorium on recruitment. The National Primary and Secondary Strategies have funded the employment of consultants to raise the achievement of all pupils in both sectors through the professional development of staff. It is now intended that the work among gifted and talented pupils will be undertaken by the Inclusion Team within the Educational Effectiveness Service.
27. Another policy document that was referred to the Group as a useful source of guidance and evidence for the Review was "Gifted & Talented Provision within English" which described a range of strategies and case studies in secondary schools in Oxfordshire. However, the Review Group understood that there were no similar documents for other academic subjects.
28. The Review was also referred to the "Secondary Gifted and Talented Coordinators Network Meeting" in the County working alongside and together with Westminster Institute. This is essentially a discussion forum, including addresses from teachers with particular areas of expertise relating to the gifted and talented child. (It is worth emphasizing the point that "gifted" and "talented" are used in conjunction with one another (and synonymously) among all of the LEAs from whom the Review obtained any documentation.)
29. Whilst primary schools were not currently required to have a Gifted & Talented Coordinator, they were being encouraged to have a "Lead Teacher" for G&T. **The Review Group considers that this should be the policy locally.**
30. Oxfordshire was in receipt of some Government Standards Fund money in conjunction with Oxford Brookes University (Oxfordshire's obligation was to pay approximately one third of the salary and to have 0.4 of a post

for one year); By the use of some residual Standards Fund Grant the Local Authority has established a part time post (0.4) in conjunction with Oxford Brookes University. For budgetary reasons this is time limited for one year. This had enabled the appointment of a lecturer/consultant, Elaine Duff, to support G&T provision in the County and to support the work of the professional development programmes at Brookes University. **The RG considers that this is still not sufficient to meet Oxfordshire's needs.**

31. The RG's attention was also drawn to the OfSTED self-evaluation during 2004. This had included detailed information on G&T performance that was no longer available given a new methodology for OfSTED reporting. The LEA had self- evaluated at grade 4 (satisfactory) at the time for its support to schools for gifted and talented pupils.
32. The Oxfordshire Quality Schools and Achievement Report 2004 addressed gifted children in the section on "Additional Educational Needs" where it stated that, based on OfSTED full inspections between Jan 2000 and July 2003, "progress made by gifted and talented pupils was good for those children under 5 and above those nationally and in similar counties, and very good provision was recorded at KS1". "At KS2, the proportion making very good progress is in line with national and similar authorities - no secondary schools required much improvement but **the proportion recording good or very good provision and progress needs to improve.**"
33. In terms of additional guidance that was available in Oxfordshire, partnerships of schools had drawn up their own policies for the more able, gifted and talented; for example, the Eynsham Partnership. (*This is available in the Members Resource Centre*).
34. The County Council also maintained international links in respect of Gifted & Talented provision. A series of exchange events had taken place, in particular with Williamsburg, Virginia in the United States. (Some of the work at Williamsburg is discussed in **Annex 7** covering indications to help in identification and programmes).

LEA Funding

35. In terms of funding for gifted children in Oxfordshire schools, up until the 2005/2006 financial year Oxfordshire in common with all LEAs, received a Standards Fund Grant for Gifted and Talented Summer Schools. This enabled four secondary schools a year (at a cost of £9000 each) to run a summer school for pupils from years 6 to 9. Each year schools applied to make use of this grant which was always fully used for this purpose. In Oxfordshire money from it had also been used to subsidize any pupils accepted for NAGTY summer schools. The grant had subsequently ceased as (in effect) it had been subsumed into the "General Schools Budget" (the Dedicated Schools Budget). All of the dedicated money had been (and would be) for secondary schools; at least until a primary register was required by the DfES of primary schools too (please refer to discussions on this elsewhere in the report). The LEA officers indicated

that if NAGTY (as had been suggested recently) was to put on summer schools locally, it would be minded to utilize any additional OCC money that could potentially become available to subsidize children going to local non-residential summer schools. **The Review Group suggested that the Government should be lobbied to reinstate the Standards Fund grant.**

36. To conclude regarding the LEA, there is and has been considerable activity around gifted and more so, of talented children; perhaps a little less recently as a consequence of less resources. The central structure with respect to the focus on these children is in the process of changing as this review is being written. However, previous resources have not exclusively focused on the gifted child, which is the RG's remit.
37. The Review Group visited West Sussex LEA and would hope that a similar model, where there is a central Co-ordinator for Gifted and Talented, with responsibility for producing an action plan that includes, for example, a "tracking" mechanism for identified gifted pupils, could be put in place (**see Annex 8**). The focus of the recently produced Oxfordshire Advisory Team for Inclusion Team Plan 2006/07 appeared to be on the SEN and Inclusion agendas rather than the Gifted.

4. The Review Group's Secondary Research

38. Before embarking on its detailed primary research and review activity, the RG had access to a range of background material and information from relevant agencies, organisations and websites relating to this subject area.
39. These included the websites for the Department for Education & Skills Standards site, the National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth, the National Association for Gifted Children, MENSA, Westminster Institute of Education and the Literacy Trust. We also had access (among other things) to a major Guardian newspaper feature on gifted children, an internal review of provision at Nottinghamshire County Council and scrutiny reviews undertaken by Havering Borough, Staffordshire and North Lincolnshire County Councils, which are summarised in **Annex 1**. (*The reader is referred to the Bibliography for a full list of documents referred to.*)

5. Findings/Evidence

40. When the Review embarked on its primary research and evidence gathering, it focused its investigations around a series of themes and questions. These were:
 - Whether there was an agreed definition of "gifted children" in place;
 - What the Government's position was in terms of policy and resourcing;
 - What requirements there were on LEAs and schools to make policies and/or make provision;

- What the best advice was from experts and key agencies in this area; and
 - How these were translated into practice if at all.
41. These informed the thoughts of the Group during their visits and “expert witness” interviews. During the visits to schools and the question and answer sessions to which the “expert witnesses” were invited, a basic framework of questions was used to help the RG focus its findings:
1. Have you a programme for gifted children?
 2. Have you a register of gifted children? (this is mandatory in secondary schools now and will be in primaries from 2007);
 3. Do you get any help, advice and funding?
 4. What are the elements/"sorts of things" in your programme, if you have one?
 5. How do you identify and provide for gifted children in the school? What would you like to do in an ideal world?
 6. What do your pupils' parents think? What do pupils think?
 7. Do you “track” children through school?

Analysis and Conclusions from Review Visits.

42. The RG undertook a series of visits and interviews to gather evidence in relation to the Review’s objectives.

Schools

43. Some schools had programmes in place for “gifted”, “talented” and moreover, “very able” children. In some instances this was in response to central government initiatives over recent years, such as “Excellence in the Cities”. But in others, there was a long-standing programme in place for more able children, eg Valley Road Primary School in Henley. The Headteacher had been proactive in developing a programme over a long period of time and used materials produced by NAGTY, independently of OCC’s recent development of policy and strategies around this area.
44. Significantly there had been no external support, resources or funding for the programme over the period of time that it had been in place, which was directed towards the “more able” children - by whom the school meant the top 10%.
45. In other instances this was not the case and the school’s approach and the group of children to whom the strategies were aimed was different; one school was part of the “excellence cluster” and received school cluster funding, putting it at the forefront in terms of provision. The Headteacher of this school considered that all of the options needed to be looked at to develop the more able or gifted child. It was not simply a matter of testing; there were lots of “measures of giftedness”. However, on probing this further it was reported that half of the pupils at the school had SEN; the Head therefore regarded selection as gifted or talented as

being broader than selection based solely on SATS. The Review Group was clear in its view that testing in terms of SATs (Standard Attainment Tests) and the DfES gifted and talented outcomes were not particularly valid means of identifying truly gifted children and they did not address provision for the gifted at all; but the fact that half of the pupils in this particular school were in SEN's highlighted the debate about identifying the top 5% in any school as gifted (*please see references to media articles elsewhere in the Review*).

46. The Headteacher drew attention to a view that bored, bright children could have special needs. This underlies thoughts among the review group about the discrepancy of resources for SEN compared to the resources for the "gifted" and the dangers of the latter "slipping through the net" and into SEN.
47. Similarly, the differences and confusion in terminology around the review topic. For example, at one school "gifted" and "talented" were not distinguished in terms of the specific focus put upon them or in strategies that mirrored the LEA and other LEAs. **But the school shared with other schools the belief that identification of, recognition of and provision for pupils (be they called gifted or talented) raised the standards of educational achievement for all in the peer/class group.**
48. **There is evidence from research for this. The ability of the gifted children to "raise the stakes" of a class of different abilities was accepted, but whether the gifted child's potential was maximised, is another matter. Some evidence towards the start of this Review report suggested that unless the whole classroom environment was right the gifted child might not flourish. However, among similar ability peer groups, it is accepted that performance can be raised.**

The "Research" view

49. Early on in its investigations, the RG had heard from Professor J. Geake who had outlined the neuro-scientific research on giftedness. According to him, there was a strong genetic component to intelligence – around 70 to 80% - which accounts for differences in brain structure which supports differences in brain functioning. Because a child's genes are a mix of its parents' genes, "ordinary" parents can produce a gifted child. However, if that child was not recognised as gifted, behavioural problems could follow further down the line; a conclusion that the RG supported and which was confirmed by the evidence that it heard.
50. The genetic element to giftedness links in an oblique way to social class/background and the connotations of "elitism" that there have been around giftedness. In neurological terms, the gifted child needed stimuli to upgrade and reach their full potential. In a professional, middle class, literary household for example, the child was open to the mix of the parents' genes and had the context to achieve their full potential, but this might not so easily occur if the child was brought up in a different social background, although the giftedness would eventually come to the fore.

In parallel with this, one needs to be aware of the accusations of intellectual elitism and gifted registers as being a sop to the middle class parent that pervade media coverage at this time.

51. Our attention was also drawn to the dilemma of the child who was stimulated in primary school (perhaps with or without a gifted programme), went on to secondary school and was then expected to study and achieve to a “norm” and hence became de-motivated.
52. The question of whether to separate gifted children has also been raised. There is a view that age should not be the criteria for what children are allowed to do; rather it should be ability. However, a parent that the RG spoke to supported the principle of children being taught in groups according to their ability, but was less happy about this grouping or setting being among older pupils because the younger child’s level of social/emotional development did not necessarily match their intellectual abilities. Consequently, in Oxfordshire children are not taught in different year groups if they excel in particular subjects, but there may be extension activities within the class and within those of the same age group.
53. Significantly Professor Geake discussed the political/philosophical debate about “bringing people up” to a certain level academically. This has always been regarded as commendable. But, it has been another matter to encourage people to fulfil their potential because this implies that there is **a wide range of potential levels of achievement between individuals, a view that the RG endorses.**

Identification and provision

54. We turn now to the issues of identification and provision for gifted children. It has been said elsewhere that the former is not necessarily achievable by SATS, attainment of “gifted outcomes”, IQ tests, but rather by what children do – eg in response to a question such as “Do you want to try something harder?”
55. We have referred elsewhere to there being no tried and tested means of identification; there is a range of ideas on how to do so and in **Annex 7** the Review discusses some of the advanced work in this area carried out by the William and Mary College, Virginia. The reader is also referred to the NAGC checklist for able pupils (2) (in the Bibliography) for examples of behaviour and learning style that distinguish the bright child from the gifted learner. For instance the bright child “knows the answers”; the gifted learner “asks the questions” etc.)
56. The RG strongly advocates efforts to more sympathetically meet gifted children’s needs by the current development of training programmes, as have been encouraged at Westminster Institute over the last 4-5 years. There is a view that children ought not to be labelled as such but programmes can be. There is another view that children know that they are bright whether or not they are told that they are. **Children who are**

gifted have particular learning needs and it ought not to be beyond schools to cater for these needs.

57. As to why this has not occurred, the RG heard that the greater degree of self determination financially for schools from the 1990s onwards had taken away some of the potential “levers” to the introduction of gifted programmes. However, the thrust of the Review is towards ensuring that schools have the evidence and can justify, with reasons, the use of resources for gifted programmes.
58. It is regrettable in these circumstances that Westminster Institute is the only organisation in which the BA Qualified Teacher status programme, provides a “specialist” pathway on the needs of the most able, ie what characterises them, what kind of challenges were needed and what sort of enrichment to provide. At PGCE level there was more of an element of choice, because people could opt to do work on the “more able”. It is an important point to note that in all of these programmes the focus tended to be on the recognition of potential rather than on the management of those who are already high achieving.
59. As to the important question of whether gifted children raised the levels of achievement of others in the classroom, Westminster staff supported the view that this was indeed the case. However, whilst this may be so, the RG questioned whether the gifted were actually able to achieve to their maximum potential within a class or with peers of very mixed abilities.
60. The RG was disappointed, given that Westminster was the national leader in teacher training and CPD for gifted identification and training, that whilst recruitment levels to its programmes were high, there was a relatively low level of take up from Oxfordshire; it was up to the individual’s choice of options available; they were not obliged to take up options related to the gifted, talented and so on.

The Local Education Authority

61. The Review has referred to the LEA’s policies and programmes earlier on in this report. In support of this secondary research, Geoff Jones, the current lead LEA Adviser discussed with Members the terminology that was used around this topic. In respect of “giftedness” and the various definitions of it, there was a debate about whether gifted children were the top 20%, the top 5%, the distinction between gifted and talented which was made by the DfES; (As he interpreted this, Gifted = exceptional ability in academic subjects, Talented = exceptional ability in performing arts, music etc.) In his view the continuous debate of attempted definitions had not taken anyone very far; one really needed to focus upon how individual schools observed the child and not the simplicity of forms of testing. (The Review Group disagreed with this and said that the “gifted” were normally in as small a percentage as the top 2% of pupils and that they needed to be identified by testing of some means and to be given their own programme to achieve their full potential).

62. He subscribed to a view that if a blanket 5% figure was used, one could reach a position where there were no children termed “gifted” in some schools and in those schools the potential for “giftedness” would be missed. Latest DfES guidance (July 2006) suggested that this might indeed be the case; a conclusion towards which the Review Group was sympathetic.

SEN

63. The RG also referred to SEN and the debate about why gifted children seemed not to be regarded in the strictest sense, as having special needs. The reason for this was that SEN involved a statutory assessment of the child’s needs and there was a statutory responsibility to make provision for those assessed as having SEN. Therefore resources and funding were drawn to SEN because it was statutory, whereas provision for the gifted was not. There had been legal challenges to this position when it had been claimed that exceptionally talented children had “special needs” and ought to be provided for financially. Discussion around this area raised the question as to whether there was a point at which the gifted child became the SEN child; ie showing disruptive behaviour problems and reaching the stage where they were eventually assessed by an educational psychologist. It was speculated that there might be rare cases where the gifted child, because of behavioural problems, ended up being statemented. (The legal position was discussed in detail; however, the case referred to above is not particularly helpful because it related to a parent seeking funding from the LEA to pay the fees to send his gifted child to a private school, because it was claimed that local state schools did not make provision or programmes for exceptional ability. Had Oxfordshire had a gifted programme in place, this would not have occurred).
64. According to Cllr Michael Waine the Cabinet Member for Schools, in some cases (and having given an example locally), there might be a strong case for putting the academically gifted child on the SEN register so that they could receive an “Individual Education Plan”. Schools also needed to be encouraged to accelerate gifted children through the curriculum to ensure that they were adequately challenged.
65. Research by Glasgow University suggests gifted pupils need support in a similar way to other special needs’ groups. Teachers are unable to focus on them because they are constrained by the curriculum and targets, according to the co-author of the research, M. Sutherland, teachers also needed to question their assumptions about what constitutes “intelligent”. Gifted pupils were not allowed to fail; “Teachers and the curriculum need to be more creative to incorporate these children,” she said. “But teachers aren’t allowed to fail either and are scared to try things out..... to be constantly told that you have done well means these children are not challenged and many switch off to learning at school and fail to fulfill their potential, despite being bright.” She and Christina Smith, the co-author of the research, also **found teachers tended to assume that gifted pupils would succeed with or without support with difficult tasks.**

In SEN assessment processes the “gifted” are not properly acknowledged as having special educational needs. A legal duty for gifted children should be established so that they are regarded as SEN and to ensure that they receive personalized programmes.

Performance Indicators

66. During the Review, Members attention was also drawn to “Gifted & Talented Outcomes” that had been produced by the DfES. The RG was keen to learn how Oxfordshire compared with other authorities (these are set out in **Annex 5** at the end):
67. The “Outcomes” included the following:
- * Level 3 and above in English, Maths and Science at the end of KS1
 - * Level 5 and above in English, Maths and Science at the end of KS2
 - * Level 7 and above in English, Maths and Science at the end of KS3
 - * 3+ GCSEs or equivalent at A*/A or equivalent
 - * Higher level attainment at 18 (expressed in terms of top UCAS points).
68. Oxfordshire performed above the national average but there was an expectation among the RG that it ought to perform even better against these outcomes, and that these outcomes were not adequate or sufficient indicators for the really gifted. **NAGTY had questioned Oxfordshire’s outcomes and prompted the Review Group to consider that the authority could do better.**
69. Oxfordshire County Council should aspire to higher attainment levels and that a means to facilitate this is a specific gifted programme.

It is RECOMMENDED that the County Council should implement a specific programme in schools to identify, provide for and resource academically gifted children.

Policy and Guidance

70. This has been described elsewhere in the report, principally in the section on “Current Position” and the LEA’s role. Nevertheless, in spite of what the RG had heard, in the current climate there was some concern that Oxfordshire might be “losing out” because it no longer had an individual with a specific G&T remit in the LEA’s employment. If funding was to become available or to be recommended by the Review, it was estimated that the full cost of an Adviser to lead on Gifted strategy and provision would be in the region of £73,000 (to include all on costs). At the moment, the LEA was incorporating gifted and talented work within the Inclusion Team of consultants and advisers (5.4 full time equivalents), with the intention being that across these fte, at least 1.0 fte would be dedicated to gifted and talented work.

71. The Review Group would prefer that there is at least one, central, dedicated Gifted Co-ordinator post

It is RECOMMENDED that the County Council should establish a central Gifted Co-ordinator post with responsibility for producing, managing and ensuring the implementation of the programme for gifted children;

72. (The cost of such a proposal has been estimated as approximately £73,000 and could be achieved if the newly implemented Advisory Team for Inclusion was re-considered to release the resources for an alternative structure.)

It is RECOMMENDED that to support the Gifted Co-ordinator post there should be advanced skills teachers in post for primary and secondary level with responsibility for gifted children.

Training and Development

73. Turning to the initial teacher training and CPD that was provided, the RG had not been overly impressed with the take up of courses and options concerned with the identification of and provision for gifted children. For instance, in initial teacher training, whilst training in teaching for SEN pupils was not compulsory, there was more emphasis on it that flowed from the statutory obligations regarding SEN. It was indicative of the Inclusion programme generally and the Team Plan for the Advisory Team on Inclusion, that SEN takes precedence. It was therefore a matter of giving gifted development a higher status for without the take up of training and development in this area, there was a danger of schools missing gifted children.

It is RECOMMENDED that teacher training institutions should be RECOMMENDED that modules on gifted children should be compulsory rather than optional each year in the BA course and those doing the PGCE one year course should have at least one module.

74. If there were not compulsory modules on gifted children in teacher training and development, teachers might work through their school career without the means of identifying such children. The RG is concerned that children who do not have “good” teachers can fall through the net. This is a risk, but “good” teachers ought to be able to identify children’s abilities.

LEA strategy

75. The RG was reminded of the problems in trying to find definitive tests and an accepted definition for “Gifted”. It was referred to work by D Kavanagh, previously an adviser with the LEA on “Assessment for Learning” which focused on allowing children to judge for themselves how well they were learning. The RG acknowledged this point of view but did

not wish to pursue it further. It was an interesting methodology and complemented the thrust of the William & Mary College, Virginia approach. Gifted children tended to achieve the "right" answers for tasks that were set, very quickly. In this approach, the next stage in the child's work should not be in terms of more of or harder work necessarily, but rather in setting them hypothetical problems where there were no right or wrong answers, hence allowing the child to hypothesise and offer opinions. Some children became very frustrated when there was no right or wrong answer. They could be distinguished from the genuinely gifted, who did not become similarly frustrated.

NAGTY

76. The Review Group acknowledged the value of visiting the National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth (NAGTY) and here sets out some of the summary points from the visit and from NAGTY's "Effective Provision for Gifted and Talented Children in Primary Education" - March 2006, produced on behalf of the DfES.
77. The Review Group turned to NAGTY as the acknowledged (ie by Government and as such, supported by it) source of expertise in and provision for, gifted children in the UK. The key points, guidance, evidence and recommendations across a range of areas including provision, identification, resources and training for teachers that NAGTY provided to the Review Group, have been summarized well in the above document, are supported by the outcomes of the visit and largely reflect the other evidence, findings and views of the Review Group. They are as follows:
78. In terms of attainment, there is continuing evidence of underachievement amongst the most able pupils in primary schools. Many primary schools have now recognised the particular needs of the most able pupils, but (and the Review Group confirms this) provision for them is frequently limited to additional events rather than developing the curriculum more closely to their needs.
79. Provision for gifted pupils does not usually need to be separate from overall classroom provision. (However, this was not a view that the RG entirely supported; it believed in grouping and setting and in appropriate instances, for children to be taught in different classes/age groups, as several witnesses to the Review had recommended and as practiced by West Sussex, with whom the Review benchmarked practice.
80. All children ought to receive a "personalised education". (Ie, all children ought to be able to receive the education that they need.)
81. In terms of guidance and definitions gifted (including talented in NAGTY's definition) is the term applied to those children who are achieving, or have the potential to achieve at a level substantially beyond the rest of their peer group; it relates to the upper end of the ability range in most classes. 'Gifted' means pupils who are capable of excelling in academic subjects such as English, History or Science, for example. Research suggests that as a group, they may be amongst the most under-performing. (This, no doubt, is a prime mover behind the establishment of NAGTY). Many

schools have reported that the presence of a vigorous gifted (also talented) programme increases performance across the board.

82. Provision for the gifted can also counteract disadvantage (this supports views expressed elsewhere by expert witnesses including Professor Geake). Gifted children master the rules, use a greater range of learning strategies, work at a level beyond that expected for their years, show intellectual maturity and produce original and creative responses. (These are the characteristics that the RG was informed of in evidence given throughout the Review). In terms of identifying these children, NAGTY believes that this should be a continuous, whole-school process. In the identification process, there should be a wide range of information. The key principles of identification should include providing an appropriate, challenging and supportive environment rather than on “labeling” children; there should be open communication between educators, pupils and parents/carers as part of the identification process. Being on the gifted and talented register does not automatically guarantee academic success - identification is a continuous process and should be systemized. Schools need vigilance for the ‘hidden gifted’ or under-represented groups, such as underachievers. The RG would endorse these features. According to NAGTY, identification should be based on a whole “portfolio” approach, meaning a range of techniques. The identified group should be broadly representative of the school’s population; although the Review Group would question this, particularly as latest media coverage suggests that in some schools there may not be any children falling into the identifiable “gifted” group. Teachers should be continually ‘talent spotting’.
83. Whilst Schools needed principles of good teaching, what is even more critical is a culture of high expectation. As Cllr Waine commented, there needed to be a whole culture and community change to celebrate ability. Ultimately the culture and environment in schools and in attitudes to giftedness, was all down to “challenge and expectation”. This theme was borne out from the evidence that the Group gathered from all its visits and interviews. For instance, in the classroom environment, effective provision for the gifted occurs in, when and where expectations are high yet the climate is supportive; where the teacher places an emphasis on everyone striving to achieve their best the most able will encounter levels of challenge that force them towards the limits of their understanding. Challenge can be achieved by adding breadth, depth or pace to the work...not more of the same when the child has completed the set work, as the RG found from its interviews with schools and parents. The tasks should be designed to develop the learning behaviours that ought to be nurtured. Challenge should therefore involve discourse and enable children to learn techniques for expressing their views.
84. In terms of assessment of giftedness, good quality assessment for learning is critical to effective provision for gifted children. Truly effective learning and teaching focuses on individual children, their strengths and their weaknesses. Therefore teachers should not see the gifted (and talented) as a homogeneous cohort – there may be as much variation in ability within the gifted group as between that group and all other

classroom peers, and this is a critical conclusion borne out elsewhere in the RG's investigations. Nevertheless, education for gifted and talented children should focus on both the intellectual and the social and emotional needs of the pupil (this too was borne out from speaking to "expert witnesses"). Schools' assessment policies should include a focus on the needs of the gifted and individual gifted pupils need to be tracked as they progress through the school.

85. Gifted and talented pupils ought not to be asked to devote significant amounts of time to assisting other pupils at the expense of their own learning, as this is counter-productive. This is quite critical, as the Review Group, from the outset was at least as concerned about the possibility of the gifted not maximizing their potential, as the ability of them to raise the performance of their class groups.
86. In the Classroom, unquestionably the most important resource is the teacher. But, quality, sophisticated resource materials can considerably enhance the process of providing for gifted children.
87. Critically, having regard to the context that informed this Review - high standards (and good attitudes) in a school are a key indicator of good provision for gifted children. Schools should know the level of attainment and achievement of their gifted pupils and how the performance of this cohort compares with other similar schools. Access to a broad and balanced curriculum is required. There may need to be greater flexibility in the national curriculum. (The LEA's role could be one of encouragement and challenge to the development of different curriculum models to KS3. There was a good case, given ability levels among children, for having KS3 truncated to 2 years and then moving on to KS4 and to taking GCSEs early). NAGTY considers that primary education, literacy and numeracy are the building blocks. For the curriculum subjects, the offer that is made to pupils should be "aspirational" and schools may need to supplement their subject expertise by using external specialists or working in partnership. (We heard for instance about the work of the Eynsham partnership and the experience and provision for a gifted child at Glory Farm School, Bicester.) There should also be enrichment opportunities outside of the normal classroom that enable children to develop specific skills. All gifted children should have access to suitable wider-schooling opportunities during their primary schooling. The best out of hours activities will complement teaching and learning in the school day.
88. The RG is particularly conscious that from 2007, primary schools will be required to identify their gifted and talented pupils in the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC). This has been mentioned elsewhere.
89. Points of transfer are of particular significance for gifted and talented; careful record keeping is important and effective communication between schools, staff, parents and pupils is essential. The Review was concerned about the gifted child transferring to secondary school and being "dumbed down" so to speak, to perform and achieve to a norm.

90. Therefore, there is a need for coverage of gifted provision in all school policies. There ought to be a named member of the governing body with special responsibility in this area. The Headteacher and leadership team also play a crucial role in championing the gifted. A named member of the leadership team in both the primary and secondary sectors (*and indeed from the governors, might be appropriate*) should be responsible for motivating and driving forward provision. In NAGTY's view, School Policy as a whole should encourage the atmosphere of high expectation, reflect national and local policy and 'best practice' and be part of the school ethos. Schools should focus on developing the child's intellectual and emotional development. Pupils may need support and the opportunity to spend time with others of like ability. **Gifted children will be happiest engaged in an educational programme that excites and challenges them. If this is not the case, poor behaviour can result.** All of the evidence suggests that this comes from having specialist programmes for the gifted. Of course, what makes children happiest is an important consideration and one must take account of whether this comes from specialist provision for their gift or being in classes with their peers/friends.
91. As the Review has emphasised elsewhere, effective professional development is critical; schools should ensure that every teacher in the primary school has the skills and confidence necessary to teach the gifted. Schools should plan to increase staff expertise in gifted and talented education as a continuous process. The lead professional within the school should play a key role in helping to design school training opportunities. The lead professional on gifted (and talented) education will themselves need high quality and regular continuous professional development (CPD). They may introduce new subjects, special groups, provide additional classroom resources, work with other schools, bring in experts and take children out of school etc.
92. A range of information resources can be used (the point being that not all resources and recommendations need to be financial ones) and schools should expect to be able to demonstrate their approach to providing for gifted pupils in school inspection.
93. Primary schools should work closely with the parents and carers to ensure that they are aware of the schools policy on gifted and talented provision and the role they can play in supporting their child's development. Parents will sometimes be the first to recognise that their child has particular gifts or talents.
94. In summary, the evidence and documentation from NAGTY struck a chord with the Review Group because the strategies were not entirely focused around funding, and central LEA resources and strategy – rather, they emphasised the need for creating conditions to identify and nurture gifted children, training of teachers to have the appropriate skills and having the right environment.

6. Conclusions

General observations and conclusions

95. Having considered all of the evidence, the Review Group's main findings and conclusions are as follows:
96. Some schools have programmes in place in spite of rather than as a consequence of LEA policies and strategies – eg Valley Road Primary School, Henley. Generally, schools seem to have a wider definition of the target group than the 2 or 5% at the top “academic” end (Valley Road, Pegasus, Oxford School).
97. There is a strong genetic component to giftedness; but social background, ethnicity and environment are not barriers to giftedness.
98. Identification tests/criteria are regarded as a problematical issue for everyone involved in this area. Tests of various kinds eg IQ, SATs etc are not well regarded as indicators. There are various options for identifying gifted children, among which are testing for intelligence, language, etc but there is a range of other measures and means to identify giftedness. There is evidence that identification, recognition and provision can raise standards for all; **it is accepted that the gifted group has the ability to raise the stakes in performance among the peer group, but there is also general acknowledgement that a programme for the gifted ought to be a normal and everyday feature with resources and attitudes to support this.**
99. There has been an historical and legal emphasis on provision for the lower end of the academic achievement scale, those in Special Educational Needs rather than the higher end of SEN. The Review Group considers that this ought to change; there are gifted children who can legitimately be assessed as SEN. The mindset of schools needs to change so that the “special needs” of children at the top level in attainment are acknowledged as much as those children with other special needs. All children ought to be able to reach their full potential regardless of background.
100. There is a need for more compulsory options in initial teacher training around identification and provision for the gifted. There is insufficient emphasis in teacher training and in CPD on taking up the options for identification of and teaching practice related to gifted children. There is clearly a need for well-trained teachers who could cater to all elements in a class. Historically, there has been some “negativity” about the notion of identifying gifted children.
The gifted child may only be identified by a talented teacher.
101. The RG has RECOMMEND that in initial teacher training, at least one module on the gifted child area should be mandatory; all schools gifted and talented coordinators should have programmes in place and work alongside NAGTY.

102. It has not always been absolutely clear what factors in focussing on the gifted, could make a difference in overall attainment, except so far as the Review Group is concerned, that if all children achieve to their potential it will improve overall attainment levels including those of the gifted among them.
103. As the report mentioned earlier, there could be situations where the 5% gifted element never occurs in an individual school, and this is now acknowledged in latest DfES guidance. The RG is of the view that the DfES performance indicators of gifted and talented outcomes are not appropriate for the group that the review is choosing to focus upon. The RG considered that there needed to be clarity in the definition of a “gifted” child – 5% across the board, in the LEA, or in any individual school? And what is the benchmark for measuring this? The definition needs to be accepted and widely understood (NAGTY’s definition is the preferred one) and the benchmark or measurement for giftedness needs to be high; certainly higher than the gifted and talented outcomes used as a means of measuring performance and identifying the gifted child.
104. The LEA has a strategy, resources, policies, guidance, views on T&D and provision (but the Review’s stance is that more is needed and of particular kinds). The NAGTY ideas about identification, focus, theories and provision largely accord with the main findings and conclusions of the Review Group. In addition, the RG feels strongly that within each school, more able children ought to be challenged towards greater achievement.
105. The Review wishes to draw attention to the changes in the current funding situation for gifted provision in schools and central LEA advisory co-ordination. There is not common ground between the Review’s view of the need to have a central co-ordinator, as opposed to the LEA’s view that the role could be spread among several people and should suffuse all advisory work, in any case. Therefore, it is important that the Review recommends what a post of a full-time G&T adviser should achieve and to have the proposal costed.
106. The RG is particularly concerned that Primary children and schools are missing out because of the current lack of provision in this area. The best techniques for identifying and providing for gifted children have been taken from the US, NAGTY and similar institutions active in this area; the LEA should take on board these techniques.

It is RECOMMENDED that the top 5% in every school, whilst not necessarily “gifted” as such require “stretching” and that a specific programme as recommended above is the principal means to do this.

107. In figures provided by NAGTY to the LEA the number of Oxfordshire secondary school pupils in February 2006 registered with NAGTY were as follows:
- 1424 from local authority schools
196 from independent schools
108. The Oxfordshire total is the 8th highest out of 149 listed local authorities. Compared with statistical neighbours, Oxfordshire is the 6th highest out of 14. In Oxfordshire according to NAGTY, schools are not identifying gifted children in the same numbers and proportions as other LEAs, which is contradicted by these figures.
109. Aspirations are critical among and between individual schools around the area of “giftedness”; all witnesses emphasised the importance of having high aspirations and it is a theme identified as critical by NAGTY in published material. Even in our West Sussex benchmark school, which had been in special measures in the recent past, aspirations and expectations were high. Of necessity, schools should have high expectations and it needs teachers to be sufficiently trained and aware, to raise the expectations. Higher expectation, attitudes and challenge in schools and the community regarding gifted children, are essential.
110. Here the Review repeats its main recommendations:

It is RECOMMENDED:

- 1. That the County Council should implement a specific programme in schools to identify, provide for and resource academically gifted children.**
- 2. That teacher training institutions should be RECOMMENDED that modules on gifted children should be compulsory rather than optional each year in the BA course and those doing the PGCE one year course should have at least one module.**
- 3. That the County Council should establish a central Gifted Co-ordinator post with responsibility for producing, managing and ensuring the implementation of the programme for gifted children; (Costings referred to elsewhere)**
- 4. That to support the Gifted Co-ordinator post there should be advanced skills teachers in post for primary and secondary level with responsibility for gifted children.**
- 5. To acknowledging that the top 5% in every school, whilst not necessarily “gifted” as such require “stretching” and that a specific programme as recommended above is the principal means to do this.**
- 6. In SEN assessment processes the “gifted” are not properly acknowledged as having special educational needs. A legal duty for gifted children should be established so that they are regarded**

as SEN and to ensure that they receive personalized programmes.

Supporting recommendations:

Every secondary school is required to have a "lead teacher" for gifted and talented, but in some schools this is a nominal rather than active role. The Review has recommended elsewhere that there should be an advanced skills teacher for the gifted at primary and secondary level.

The LEA should issue a letter and guidance to all schools reinforcing the importance of providing for giftedness and that it should feature on school governing body agendas.

111. Finally, when we looked at recent media coverage about giftedness, (because there will be a gifted register for primary schools next year) the RG noted, concluded and would recommend the County Council to take action in relation to those areas and issues within its responsibilities:
- It has been widely commented upon that the national programme (the DfES's for gifted and talented) is a bit "hit and miss";
 - There is agreement on several definitions of the "gifted" but not on how the definitions should be applied;
 - There is a difference in ability between those in the definitions given – for instance the top 2%, 5% or 10%;
 - It is acknowledged that there is a very different profile of the top 10% in a grammar compared to an inner city school;
 - One cannot simply rely on tests/performance measures;
 - There is a push to dispel the idea that gifted programmes were to attract parents and pupils from a particular social background;
 - The principle of access for all to gifted programmes is critical;
 - There is an important role for parents;
 - There are associations and connotations attached to calling a child "clever";
 - Levels of communication and support for gifted children need to be improved;
 - There are misguided assumptions that the gifted will do well regardless, and there is a need to focus on individual children's needs;
 - SEN and the statutory funding that it attracts; and the lack of statutory requirements around giftedness in schools.

- The greater capacity of independent schools to better assess a child's capabilities;
- There are "knock on" effects of being gifted for the child, family and peers.

7. Concluding Remarks

112. The RG is satisfied that it has achieved the objectives of the Review. Its recommendations are based on the evidence that could be gathered and assessed in the limited time available for this scrutiny to have an impact on the implementation.
113. We should like to thank all those who contributed to this Review and appreciate the commitment by all parties to improving the outcomes for the children, for whom we are responsible.

8. Annexes

Scrutiny Review Scoping Template

Review Topic (name of Review)	"Gifted Children".
Review Reference Code	CS___ <i>to be confirmed.</i>
Parent Scrutiny Committee	Children's Services Scrutiny Committee.
Lead Member Review Group (Cllr's involved)	Cllrs Deborah Glass Woodin, Hilary Hibbert-Biles, Val Smith, Melinda Tilley.
Member responsible for tracking (nominate one Cllr)	Chairman of the Lead Member Review Group – Cllr Hilary Hibbert-Biles. Tracking review – Cllr Deborah Glass Woodin.
Officer Support (Scrutiny Review Officer lead)	Julian Hehir, Scrutiny Review Officer.
Rationale (key issues and/ or reason for doing the Review)	<p>The Lead Group desires to ensure schools identify, nurture and achieve the full potential among gifted children and to establish whether there are programmes in place that enable such children to achieve this.</p> <p>The key issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the gifted child identified? What tests are applied? What is done to provide for the needs of the gifted child once identified? What facilities are provided for them in Oxfordshire? • The context for this is that attainment levels at GCSE for Oxfordshire are not as good as the LEA would wish. • The Review, given its focus, may help to ensure that results/attainment at GCSE improve. • This could have the knock on effect of providing real choice for a greater number of parents (who would choose to keep their children in the public sector) and improving standards of achievement for all children.
Purpose of Review/Objective (specify exactly what the Review should achieve)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure that children whose potential is at the top end of the academic scale, have their needs identified at the appropriate time, (as early as possible) and that they are provided for and met throughout their schooling. • To visit and to identify whether there are differences in strategy and practice in Oxfordshire Schools, for example between large urban and small village schools. • To identify from a range of schools, (a) school(s) that does/do have good programmes for gifted children and how, or whether, they are being implemented.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consequently, to identify the best strategies and programmes that are in place for gifted children in Oxfordshire Schools and to be able to recommend them across the LEA. • To make recommendations to the Cabinet on the outcomes from these objectives.
<p>Indicators of Success (what factors would tell you what a good Review should look like)</p>	<p>The Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will have identified (a) clear change/s that can be made to strategy, programmes and practice for gifted children. • will have identified local needs and wishes. • will have evaluated different ways of managing the education of gifted children. • will have formulated focused and achievable recommendations. • will have identified how provision/service can be improved.
<p>Methodology/ Approach (what types of enquiry will be used to gather evidence and why)</p>	<p>The Review will find out from a range of schools, what programmes exist and whether or not and how, they are being implemented by:</p> <p>A desk based review of papers; Site visits; Observations; Comparison with other authorities; (Possibly) commissioned research; Interviewing officers; Calling witnesses/experts to give evidence.</p>
<p>Specify Witnesses/ Experts (who to see and when)</p>	<p>Officers and advisors of the LEA. Children (eg one or some gifted children who have passed through the Oxfordshire education system with or without the benefit of a programme to meet their needs). Cabinet member. Teachers. Governors. Parents. Partners/businesses (eg organisations that offer specialised or additional education for the gifted child via school lobbying and contracts). <i>(Let TJC know that the review is in progress).</i></p>
<p>Specify Evidence Sources for Documents (which to look at)</p>	<p>Websites/organisations aimed at the needs of the gifted child. DfES Standards website. Other authorities' scrutiny reviews. OfSTED inspections (eg Nottinghamshire) & Notts post OfSTED review of gifted children. <i>(Others sources to be determined.)</i></p>

Specify Site Visits (where and when)	To a range of schools (<i>to be determined</i>) Jan – Feb 2006.		
Specify Evidence Sources for Views of Stakeholders (consultation/ workshops/ focus groups/ public meetings)	School visits. Witness interviews. Government guidance. LEA documents. Evidence from other reviews. Independently commissioned research outcomes on the topic.		
Publicity requirements (what is needed – fliers, leaflets, radio broadcast, press-release, etc.)	Low key, by way of the Scrutiny Committee & Co-ordinating Group and the published Work Programme.		
Resource requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Person-days • Expenditure 	15 days. £1,000 initially.		
Barriers/ dangers/ risks (identify any weaknesses and potential pitfalls)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School holiday periods (eg Xmas) may delay progress. • Potential for an over ambitious remit for the work. • Trying to cover areas and topics in too much depth. 		
Projected start date	Jan 2006.	Draft Report Deadline	End of March 2006.
Meeting Frequency	Every 3 weeks: 17 Nov 12.00, 13 Dec post Children's S Committee, 23 Jan 06 2 pm.	Projected completion date	End of June 2006.
When to evaluate impact and response	June/July 2007.		
Methods for tracking and evaluating	Member responsible for tracking with Scrutiny Review Officer, to prepare report for June/July 2007.		

ANNEX 1**Scrutiny Reviews at other Local Authorities**

Other Local Authorities have carried out scrutiny reviews covering the areas of gifted, talented and more able. The main features and outcomes of these reviews were as follows; (particular features are emboldened):

HAVERING BOROUGH COUNCIL**Scope**

- In scoping the review, identified the need to discuss work with staff within the LEA responsible for the gifted children area.
- Need for benchmarking by visiting other Councils was clear.
- Value of meeting and discussion with parents.
- Visits to schools to discuss programmes etc also valued.
- Research was commissioned from the equivalent of Scrutiny Review Officer.

Process

- Timetable was about 4 months.
- Careful and systematic review of documentation took place.

In terms of **Key Findings**:

- Felt that schools **should be able to draw on a well sign posted central provision**. SEN groups had meetings with LEA to share skills and information and it was felt that the same should happen for very able pupils.
- **Enrichment sessions were very important**, particularly as primary children approached secondary school, where levels of attainment and ability were reassessed.
- **Feeder primary schools should integrate more closely with secondary schools**.
- Parents felt that they would like **more feedback concerning the process of application and selection** and the progress of children on courses.
- **Very able pupils were not adequately “profiled”** (we assume that this meant getting a higher profile or similar) on the Internet.
- Some **LEAs produced materials that were sold elsewhere** and produced revenue.
- Unlike SEN, **teachers were not receiving discrete in service training** concerning the needs of the very able pupil.

Recommendations

- **A centralized resource information centre.**
- **Regular link meetings** for “very able co-ordinators”.
- **Challenge, support and monitoring** for schools.

- GBs should be **kept informed of LEA guidelines** and policies for the very able.
- Clusters to share resources.
- Schools to **provide parents with feedback** on their child's activity on request.
- **A database** to be enhanced, modified etc.
- Development of a website – promotion of very able achievements and opportunities within the LEA area.
- **Examine ways in which best practice materials could be produced** and marketed.
- LEA to look at **ways to secure funding**.

Background papers and appendices

- Similar to the materials that this review has listed.

Postscript

The review was carried out before 2003; by 2003 the DfES had produced guidance for schools and LEAs that indicated that **schools and the LEA should take the lead in identifying and supporting very able pupils** and that funding had been made available through “Excellence in the Cities”.

NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL

The Review's recommendations

- DfES pressed to implement **legislation to support needs of more able pupils** – with allocated funding.
- DfES to review equal opportunity and equal access to grant funding.
- LEA should develop a **cohesive approach, adjust and refocus** priorities...to **support the more able**.
- LEA urged to **appoint a “more able pupils co-ordinator”**.
- Every school should **identify a teacher as a “more able pupils co-ordinator”**.
- There should be a “more able schools partnership” with schools network.
- Seek **additional sources of funding** and sponsorship and to sustain good teaching techniques.
- Establish a **development plan** for more able pupils.
- Expand use of supporting ICT.
- LEAs and schools through a partnership, should **create a culture and ethos** to support more able.
- **Priorities and targets should be set** in the EDP (since replaced by the C&YP Plan).

STAFFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

- The review **acknowledged the similarity in needs between gifted and talented children and children with SEN** – recognizing flexibility of teaching and learning and presenting learning in a stimulating and motivating way are common to SEN and gifted and talented children.

- Recognition that developing gifted and talented children is based on good teaching practice.

Recommendations

These included:

- **Lobbying the Govt through Excellence in the Cities programme** to allow Staffs children to have the same chances as urban counterparts.
- **Increasing resources for gifted** and talented children.
- **Additional staff being available to support initiatives** in the Education and Lifelong Learning dept.
- Assessing whether the Council could **offer support to assist schools** in identifying pathways to funding.

Background

Acknowledged that the “EIC” guidelines provided much useful and usable information.

Features of the review work

It outlined various initiatives that the authority had taken in the area of the review since 1996; this was quite expansive.

The definition used for the review was to look into **provision for “exceptionally able pupils” - 5% could be described as most able and around half of these would be considered as exceptionally able.**

- The review (among other things) **focused on good practice** in primary and secondary schools;
- **whether parents were involved** in any of the work being undertaken with exceptionally able pupils;
- **whether or not** (and it was not always) that **accelerating a child through the school years was the best option;**
- the budget implications of identifying and making provision for gifted pupils;
- **activities** eg, an example was the **“lucky dip box” of tasks and activities** for use in reception classes;
- **summer schools;**
- **“challenge days”** arranged to encourage students to take risks with their learning;
- work on producing advice booklets for teachers on higher order reading and writing skills in years 5 and 6;
- SETPOINT to provide opportunities for young people to work on science and technology.

Conclusions

The Review concluded that it was pleasing that the Council was addressing this area of work and had designated an officer in post as a source of good practice.

Resource implications

This review did, at least, quantify these – direct funding for one session per middle and secondary school at a cost of £200 plus £160 for supply cover. For 69 schools this totaled £24,840.

Annex 2

List of Witnesses to the Review

The following list includes witnesses who were interviewed by the Lead Member Review Group and members/officers who attended informal witness sessions or provided written evidence to the Scrutiny Review Officer.

- Mrs Val Morgan – Headteacher, Valley Road Primary School Henley (together with G&T Co-ordinator).
- Chris Spring – Headteacher at John Blandy Primary School, Southmoor.
- Jill Hudson - Headteacher - Pegasus Primary School, Oxford.
- Sarah Sheckleton – Oxford Community School, Oxford.
- Professor John Geake – Westminster College, Oxford Brookes University.
- Hilary Lowe - Westminster College, Oxford Brookes University.
- Professor Deborah Eyre (and colleagues) – at National Academy of Gifted & Talented Young People.
- Geoff Jones – Lead Adviser – Children, Young People and Families Directorate.
- Richard Eves – Headteacher – Boundstone Community College, West Sussex.
- Jane Eves - Officer at West Sussex County Council
- Sandra Fredman – parent.
- Sharron Jenkinson – Lead Adviser – Inclusion - Children, Young People and Families Directorate.
- Mr & Mrs S. Hellyer - parents.

Bibliography

- BBC News – Gifted Pupil Register Under Fire – 10 July 2006.
- The Big Question. Do Bright Children Need To Be Taught Separately? Is it Good For Them?” – S Cassidy – Education Correspondent – The Independent – 12/07/06.
- Boundstone Community College, Lancing, W Sussex website.
- Buckinghamshire County Council – Able, Gifted & Talented Newsletter – Spring 2006.
- “Could do Amazingly” – J Crace – The Guardian – 11 July 2006.
- Cambridgeshire County Council – Gifted and Talented Strategy – October 2005.
- Commission for Social Care - Inspection of Children’s Services Oxfordshire County Council – July 2005.
- Cheshire Count Council – “G&T News” – Spring 2005.
- Dept for Education & Skills “The Standards Site” website – (incl references to “National Gifted and Talented sites”).
- “Differentiating Curriculum Strategies for the Teaching of Gifted & Talented Pupils” – The Oxfordshire International Education Bureau and The College of William & Mary Centre for Gifted Education Williamsburg, Virginia, USA – Sept 2003 and Sept 2006.
- The Eynsham Partnership – “Provision for the More Able, Gifted and Talented” – 2005.
- The Guardian – 8/11/05 – “Gifted & Talented” supplement.
- MENSA website.
- The National Association for Able Children website.
- The National Association for Gifted Children website.
- The National Association for Gifted Children brochure incl “Neglected Voices? – Engaging parents in the education of their gifted and talented children” – Executive Summary – 2006.
- National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth website
- NAGTY - Effective Provision for Gifted and Talented Children in Primary Education - March 2006, produced on behalf of the DfES.
- National Literacy Trust website.
- Nottinghamshire County Council – Draft Review of Gifted Children 2003.
- “Nurturing Beautiful Minds” – Jessica Kingsley - Daily Telegraph – 16 June 2006.
- Oxford Brookes University – Westminster Institute website – “Gifted & Talented Professional Development”.
- Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Draft Children & Young People’s Plan 2004.
- OCC – OfSTED Self-Evaluation 2004.
- OCC Teaching and Learning Strategies for Able Pupils, 2001.

- OCC - Teaching and Learning Strategies for More Able Pupils – Gifted and Talented, 2002.
- Oxfordshire LEA Statement Concerning Able Pupils, 2003.
- Oxfordshire LEA Guidance for Schools – More Able Pupils, 2003.
- Press cuttings (various).
- Scrutiny Reviews – North Lincolnshire, Staffordshire and Havering Councils.
- Secondary Gifted and Talented Co-ordinators' Network Meeting papers – April 2006.
- Staffordshire County (Support for Gifted & Talented Children), Havering Borough and North Lincolnshire County Councils Scrutiny Reviews of Gifted and More Able Children.
- Teachernet website – “Gifted & Talented Wise – Support for Gifted & Talented Education.
- The Times – 25/11/05 – “Brightest are failed by state schools” and Times online website.
- Valley Road Primary School, Henley, Oxfordshire website.

Annex 4

Agencies involved in gifted and talented identification and provision

National Association for Able Children

NACE is the key and biggest organisation for teachers supporting gifted children. It is based in Oxford. NACE is a lobbying organisation but also provides guidance and support for schools, as well as running the biggest national conferences for teachers in this area. Westminster Institute works in close partnership with them, particularly in CPD and more recently with them as accreditors of a framework they have developed for school self-evaluation in G&T, called the Challenge Award. This is the most widely used framework for evaluating and action planning re schools' provision for able children.

www.nace.co.uk

National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth

Founded by the Department for Education and Skills in 2002 and based at the University of Warwick. The academy began by focusing on secondary education before turning its attention to the primary sector in 2003. It works with headteachers and LEA advisers to shape the provision of additional support for gifted and talented pupils; this includes looking at training needs of staff and extra resources required. It also provides support for parents. Pupils can join the student academy and take part in a range of activities to complement their school education.

Contact: The National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth, The University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL. Tel: 024 7657 4213. Fax: 024 7657 4221. Website: www.nagty.ac.uk.

National Association for the Gifted Child

The National Association for the Gifted Child has a newsletter called 'Looking to their future' and a journal 'Flying High'.

Contact: NAGC, Suite 14, Challenge House, Sherwood Drive, Bletchley, Bucks MK3 6DP. Tel: 0870 7703217. Fax: 0870 7703219. Email: amazingchildren@nagcbritain.org.uk. Website: www.nagcbritain.org.uk.

Pullen Publications

Pullen Publications specialises in books for able pupils.

Contact: Pullen Publications, 13 Station Road, Knebworth, Herts SG3 6AP. Tel: 01438 814316.

The Support Society for Children of High Intelligence (CHI)

The Support Society for Children of High Intelligence provides support to parents, pupils, schools, LEAs and teachers around the country. It runs Saturday classes for gifted children in London and Derby.

Contact: The Support Society for Children of High Intelligence, PO Box 21461, London N6 6WW. Website: www.chi-charity.org.uk

Annex 5**Department for Education & Skills**

Oxfordshire compared as follows with national performance indicators – the so-called “gifted and talented outcomes”:

<u>Age 7</u>	National%	Oxfordshire%
Reading	23 - at level 3 and above	28
Writing	23	24
Science	25	24

Age 11

English	26 - at level 5 and above	34
Maths	30	31.1
Science	46	48.5

Key Stage 3

English	9 – at level 7 and above	9.8
Maths	25	27.5
Science	11	14.4

GCSE's at KS4

At A* A**	15	19.7
-----------	----	------

In general terms Oxfordshire is about 3% above each of the national averages.

Annex 6**National Association of Gifted Children – Website summary**

Intelligence - the measurement of intelligence has dominated the debate about giftedness for the last 100 years. In the first half of the 20th Century there was both a need and desire to create valid IQ tests to validate measurement. Lewis Terman (1877-1956) was the major proponent of this approach and carried out a lifetime study on a sample of people he had identified as gifted. He eventually found that there wasn't a close correlation between IQ scores and adult achievement and he concluded that "high intelligence was only a necessary but not a sufficient condition for highly able behaviour".

In the second half of the 20th century researchers questioned the reliance on IQ measures and searched for other factors that, together with intelligence, predicted adult gifted behaviour.

For instance, Personality traits - Witty in 1958, defined a gifted child as any child "whose performance in a potentially valuable line of human activity is consistently remarkable". This was far broader than any absolute IQ measure but it raised further questions. At what age did "performance" become assessable? What was meant by a "valuable line"? Was this absolute or relative to the culture it was in? How was "remarkable" assessed?

For the purposes of this Review, the most interesting outcome of such questions was that over 180 definitions of giftedness have been put forward. Types, grouped according to biological, anthropological, psycho-social, socio-cultural, cognitive or achievement orientated roots have been defined. "Giftedness" has therefore become complex and contentious.

Academic research came to focus much more on a greater understanding of adult giftedness, taking account of traits such as tenacity, overcoming setbacks, initiative and motivation - that go alongside intelligence measures in determining giftedness. To these were added interpersonal skills related to self-esteem, autonomy and self-confidence.

Very few highly successful individuals in any sphere are in the top 2% of IQ measures but the majority seems to fall within the upper 5% to 20% range. This indicates the role of personality traits in adults who show gifted behavior through their "creative productivity."

The lesson that can be learned from this and, in particular, as regards the "Excellence in Cities" initiative that is discussed below, is that flexible identification arrangements, relative to the particular school (or local authority area) rather than a national norm may in the long run, be more productive. (This is certainly the approach advocated by the College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia with whom the Oxfordshire Local Education Authority (LEA) works. The Review goes on to explore this principle in detail later on.

Environmental influences: These are influences on giftedness and include people - parents, teachers, peers, siblings; access to libraries, gifted programmes, various school structures; living in: urban, rural environments etc.

With regard to the area of Childhood Giftedness, some researchers have used the term "potentially gifted" in relation to primary children and pre-school children, and in so doing emphasized the very great importance of developing personality traits and managing environmental influences. They found that many young children who were two, three or more years ahead of their peers in some areas of cognitive development remained unexceptional in social development, and the resulting dis-junction could cause major problems in the pre-school years and beyond.

A very clear distinction has also been drawn (Renzulli) between "schoolhouse giftedness" and "creative-productive giftedness". The former includes all those who do very well at formal school learning and are identified for advanced programmes. The latter needed school programmes that encouraged individual research and enquiry, sought novel solutions and open-ended patterns of work.

It appears fair to say, that best practice in schools demonstrates that curricular experiences are structured to encompass a wide range of both teaching and learning styles.

“Differentiating Curriculum strategies”

In the evidence collated by the Review Group, there were 2 documents relating to workshops that formed part of the Local Education Authority’s international associations with the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia.

The first striking thing about these documents is that W&M College appears to be significantly more advanced than its UK counterparts in terms of theories about, identification, provision, modelling etc of programmes for gifted children. The first diagram in the 2005 material is an interesting model to glance at: “The education of gifted learners cycle”.

Until that stage, the Review had not come across any really clear models or techniques for moving from identification to provision to programmes, to evaluation of effectiveness. This was provided in the documentation. “Screening” processes were explained and case studies were given. It was apparent that there was a significant take up of the workshop from Oxfordshire teachers in 2003 and 2005.

Turning to some of the techniques being recommended. These included:

- Differentiated instruction.
- Types of provision within school (eg full time gifted classes, unlike provision within the class as appears to be widely recommended in the UK).
- Classroom options – (eg acceleration of content and process).

There is statistical validation of what kinds of provision have been demonstrated to work most effectively.

It was interesting (p13 of 2005 material) to look at the similarities and distinctions between the characteristics of the gifted and the characteristics of problem based learning.

The 2003 material for the LEA workshop was similar in many respects. Some assessment tools for the identification of the gifted were listed; eg “traditional” – intelligence tests, achievement tests; “non traditional” – creativity tests, “student portfolios” etc. These reflect the different emphases in ways of identifying gifted pupils, over time, as discussed on the NAGC website.

The documentation also provided models and programmes for gifted development.

Among the material was an article by Professor Van Tassel-Baska. It covered, succinctly, issues that the Review has sought to get to grips with, such as:

- The common problems of identification;
- The “elusiveness of giftedness”;

- The degree or extent of giftedness – eg the top 2% or even better – a “wide range of ability within a gifted population have to be tolerated”;
- Ability alone was not always sufficient;
- “Best practice” – There was a call for a new paradigm of identification;
- The “equity required” in the identification process in respect of selection, validation and placement of students.

Gifted and Talented Action Plan 2005...8

Jane Eves



Children and Young People's Services | Learning

Leading Learning in the Community

Target	How will this be achieved?	Action	Success criteria
<p>To raise standards of achievement and improve the quality of provision for gifted and talented pupils through providing high quality training and support</p>	<p>Increase G&T central training to include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early Years _Bright and Early (termly) • Termly network meetings • Training on the Quality Standards in network areas • Major Conference with national speaker- West Dean June 05 • Co-ordinators annual meetings • NQT and G&T -school based practical courses • Thinking skills in EY • Thinking Skills in Primary/Sec and across subjects • School based and locality based insets • Creativity INSET- creative T&L critical thinking <p>Support SIS in providing high quality consultancy through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular updates • Training and shadowing • Appointing ASTs -primary and secondary <p>Ensure links with NACE and NAGTY are developed with LA</p> <p>Encourage schools to build up awareness and membership of NAGTY</p> <p>Participate in the development of regional training programme (SEAGUL)</p> <p>Provide training for tracking pupils and analysing data</p>	<p>Liaise with EY adviser (Nov 05) Revise and update the data base of coordinators May 06 Ensure that all schools have information about the QS Jan 06</p> <p>Work with Strategy managers and consultants Appoint ASTs- Sept.05- Sept 06 Attend regional and national meetings</p> <p>Send regular NAGTY updates to schools- inform them of pupil membership May 06 Work in partnership with SEAGUL group to develop training modules June 06-7</p> <p>Work with SIS assessment advisers. Provide data session in annual conference</p>	<p>Provision for G&T remains nationally regarded</p> <p>EY practitioners increased knowledge and understanding of identification and provision</p> <p>100% useful/ very useful course evaluations</p> <p>90% of all schools will use the National Quality standards and self evaluation materials for G&T -2007</p> <p>Raised achievement and Attainment through active learning and thinking classrooms</p> <p>Consultants , ASTs& leading teachers will be confident to support G&T development Dec 06</p> <p>Staff and pupils benefit from highest quality materials</p> <p>All schools will use assessment manager or similar to track pupils</p>

Target	How will this be achieved?	Action	Success criteria
<p>Disseminate effective practice for G&T pupils which support school improvement</p>	<p>Develop the Able Pupil website on WSGFL to link to G&T Wise and other valuable G&T websites</p> <p>Relaunch the 'Able Times'</p> <p>Engage G&T co-ordinators in dissemination of best practice</p> <p>Set up research project into G&T in the Early Years Creativity Research Project and working party leading to outstanding teaching and personalised learning Sept 06-8</p> <p>Play key role in south east regional collaborative group(SEAGUL)</p> <p>Plan Conference with national speaker 2005/2007</p> <p>Launch a LA Handbook for G&T Sept 06 to provide up to date guidance and ideas to support schools and consultants</p>	<p>Deploy admin support and AST to support(Sept 06)</p> <p>Publish half yearly newsletter (Jan 06)</p> <p>Co-ords always disseminate at network meetings</p> <p>EY ASTs + G&T co-ord funded to research best practice in identification and provision in tracing progress</p> <p>Dissemination through working party and Conferences- West Dean / HTs/ networks/G&T</p> <p>Bid accepted by DFES for 2005/6</p> <p>Approach subject /phase advisers to support the publication</p>	<p>More schools accessing the website</p> <p>All schools access paper copies and e copies of G&T news</p> <p>More Co-ordinators confident and willing to disseminate at network meetings . Increased number of co-ords attending network meetings</p> <p>Research project completed Spring 07 and disseminated at conferences /website/ and Able Times</p> <p>OFSTED reports improved results- very good and outstanding T&L</p> <p>Six LAs engaged in collaborating and disseminating G&T work and income generation</p> <p>Impact seen in schools - 100% useful / very useful evaluations</p> <p>Accessible upto date knowledge and information for schools and consultants to support provision</p>

Target	How will this be achieved?	Action	Success criteria
<p>Develop and deliver innovative G&T programmes for pupils and staff</p>	<p>Develop pilot Advanced Learning Centres to raise standards and provide localised enrichment in underachieving areas- Boundstone ; Kings Manor ; Durrington</p> <p>Support schools in bidding for, running and delivering G&T Summer schools</p> <p>Continue to develop WS Enrichment programme to encompass marginalised pupils</p> <p>Participate in SEAGUL enrichment programme</p> <p>Create a hard copy (handbook) and electronic copy of materials and activities to support provision in the classroom</p>	<p>Bid for funding to support ALC</p> <p>Work with schools to develop challenging programmes</p> <p>Employ staff from different phases</p> <p>Support localised development</p> <p>Produce and disseminate Summer school booklet</p> <p>Develop strategies to make electronic access easier . JH</p> <p>WS pupils attend SEAGUL enrichment courses (NAGTY badged)</p> <p>Seagul bid requirements- SEAGUL co-ordinator intervisitations Sharing of resources on MOODLE</p>	<p>Raised aspirations of pupils; parents and teachers</p> <p>Raised achievement both qualitative and quantitative</p> <p>Ten successful summer schools providing a minimum of 300 places resulting in raised aspirations and achievement for G&T pupils (particularly underachieving pupils)</p> <p>Increased number of G&T pupils (including children with dual exceptionalities eg- aspergers) across the phases have access to enrichment opportunities leading to increased self esteem and achievement</p> <p>Links between teachers and pupils across the phases and across the SEAGUL collaborative July 06 Schools benefiting from Advisers developing and sharing resources</p>

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2005-06
FINAL EVALUATION – SUMMARY**

**5.7 Extend and improve access to enrichment programmes to raise achievement for gifted and talented pupils
Summary evaluation for the whole priority**

- The West Sussex Programme continues to expand with a wider range of venues and courses . 4,200 primary pupils have earned places on the wide variety of courses to cater for their interests ,gifts and talents. At secondary level, 1,200 gifted and talented pupils have attended courses in philosophy, the arts, sciences, languages , ICT and PE. More children with dual exceptionality eg aspergers /ADHD have benefited from attending courses. Evaluations from pupils, parents, teachers have reported qualitative impact particularly in self esteem and raising aspirations
- One hundred and fifty gifted and talented Y6/7/8 pupils attended our very successful West Sussex Summer schools funded by the DfES .Ten Summer schools are planned for 2006 offering a minimum of 300 places. The tracking of these pupils is an area for further development and has been built into the bids.
- Regional (SEAGUL) enrichment opportunities are extending and ten pupils have attended courses the first one hosted by West Sussex. Evaluations from advisers , pupils and teachers very positive. Twelve others have been accepted for the coming year.
- The pilot Advanced Learning Centre at Boundstone Community College to provide more localised , sustained enrichment has proved very successful. 80 primary and secondary gifted or talented pupils have attended courses in maths, dance and literacy .A manager has been appointed and courses in Latin, French, animation have recruited for the coming year. The impact has been measurable with the dance group winning the South East Regional finals of Rock Challenge and pupils from the other two courses working at significantly higher than expected levels. Most significant feedback is from parents, teachers and Headteachers who feel the ALC has raised aspirations and expectations. Quantitative data on pupils attending maths and literacy must be followed through with results of end of year tests.
- The Advanced Learning Centre at Kings Manor which was focused on providing enrichment for G&T Y5 pupils from the partner schools in geography was successful . Evaluations from pupils , parents and teachers was very positive and again succeeded in raising aspirations and a definite interest and improvement in pupils' local knowledge. Future development is being explored with DHT. Planning is underway for a further pilot at Durrington High School.
- Many of our Secondary schools are working with their partner schools to provide opportunities for their most able in their specialist areas eg The Weald , Angmering, Oathall, Steyning, Littlehampton,.
- All eligible schools have been personally informed about NAGTY (National Academy of Gifted and Talented Youth)membership and are more aware of the opportunities for gifted pupils.As a result more pupils have been accepted or an in the process of enrollment .Currently 401 pupils are enrolled or identified as members .

C:\Documents and Settings\jeer1670\My Documents\EDP Final evaluations\G&T Enrichment 5.7.doc