



## Report to The Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny Committee

5 December 2013

**Report of:** Executive Director Children Young People and Families

**Subject:** Attainment of Children Eligible for The Pupil Premium

**Author of Report:** Iain Peel Interim Director of Inclusion and Learning Services

### Summary:

The information presented has been requested by the Scrutiny Committee to enable it to scrutinise performance.

**Type of item:** The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	<b>X</b>
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	<b>X</b>
Other	

**The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:** consider this report and to provide views, comments and recommendations.

- Be aware of the attainment challenge for the City and the outcomes for pupils in receipt of pupil premium.
- Agree the scope of any further analysis or how this report can contribute to any further work Scrutiny may wish to undertake with regards to educational outcomes of children in receipt of pupil premium.

### Background Papers:

No background documents have been used to write the report. However some of the historic figures used in this report have been taken from Department for Education data sets.

**Category of Report:** OPEN

## 1. INTRODUCTION/CONTEXT

- 1.1 It is now almost two years since the introduction of the **pupil premium**, the coalition government's policy designed to support schools in boosting the attainment of disadvantaged children and to reduce the gap between this group and their more advantaged (non-free school meals) peers. The premium was initially set at £488 and paid to schools for every child on their roll eligible for free school meals (FSM). In April 2012 this amount increased to £600 and it is set to rise to about £1000 by 2014-15(2013/14 amount is £900). In April 2012 the premium was also extended to cover children who have been eligible for free school meals at any point in the last six years. The premium is also paid in respect of children who are currently in care, or have been in care within the previous six months, and there is also reduced premium funding to support the children of Service Personnel (the children of service personnel is £300). This decision followed evidence that children in these categories have consistently lower educational attainment than those who have never been eligible for free school meals.
- 1.2 This growing funding stream brings more accountability for schools to demonstrate how the money is spent and the impact that it has on the attainment of this disadvantaged group. In terms of external accountability around the use of Pupil Premium funding there are recently introduced new measures being included in the Department for Education's (DfE) Performance Tables for all schools, along with a sharper focus through inspection (Ofsted), thus bringing the impact of this funding stream under closer public scrutiny.
- 1.3 Table 1 shows the number of pupils in year 2, 6 & 11 eligible for FSM, which are the year groups that undertake internal/external assessments and these are reported. This table is provided to show an overview of the numbers eligible for the FSM element of the Pupil Premium.

**Table 1: Pupils in YR2, 6 & 11 by Free School Meal 6 (2012/13)**

FSM 6		
YEAR	Number of FSM 6	% of FSM 6
<b>Year 2</b>	<b>1788</b>	<b>30.4%</b>
<b>Year 6</b>	<b>1699</b>	<b>32.6%</b>
<b>Year 11</b>	<b>1635</b>	<b>29.9%</b>

The number of children who are Looked After (LAC) is covered in a separate report presented to Overview and Scrutiny on 05 December

2013. However, the number of service personnel children in Sheffield is small and less than 100 in all key stages across the city.

## 2 HEADLINES

### 2.1 Context:

#### **Free School Meals 'gaps' – Cross-phase Comparison: Sheffield 2010 / 2012**

There is no LA comparative data for the pupil premium cohort available so the FSM data has been used as a proxy; however, the pupil premium cohort is larger than the FSM cohort so whilst FSM pupils are part of the pupil premium cohort there are other pupils in this group who are not included in the analyses below.

This section compares the attainment of pupils receiving free school meals with pupils who are not receiving free school meals (FSM) and the gaps between the attainment of these two groups. Sheffield's performance is compared to national performance and that of other local authorities.

It should be noted that the data in the tables below relate to pupils claiming free school meals at the time of the January school census. This cohort differs from the pupil premium cohort in two respects: firstly, the pupil premium cohort includes pupils who have received FSM **at any point in the last 6 years** not just those who were eligible at the time of the January census; secondly, the pupil premium cohort also includes LAC pupils and service children and outcomes for LAC have been reported separately.

There are two main comparisons which can be used, namely:

- The achievement of those children claiming free school meals at the point of the January school census
- The achievement gap between those children claiming free school meals and those children who are not claiming free school meals.

Both of these indicators are important.

Tables 2-8 below show the achievement of those children who are claiming free school meals (FSM) at the time of the January school census. The comparison covers a three year period and shows data for 2010 and 2012 and demonstrates that outcomes for FSM children in many key stages improved faster in Sheffield during this period than nationally, in the core cities, statistical neighbours and metropolitan authorities.

Data for 2013 will not be available until later in the academic year when the DfE releases pupil level data to stakeholders.

**Table 2: Foundation Stage, 78+ including 6+ in PSED and CLL (FSM). This has been replaced by a new measure in 2013.**

There were 1,266 pupils claiming FSM in the reception year in 2012

	<b>% 2010</b>	<b>% 2012</b>	<b>% change 2010/2012</b>	<b>rank 2010</b>	<b>rank 2012</b>
<b>Sheffield</b>	38	48	<b>10 ↑</b>	-	-
<b>National</b>	40	48	<b>8 ↑</b>	78 / 148	64 / 150
<b>Core Cities</b>	39	48	<b>9 ↑</b>	5 / 8	4 / 8
<b>Stat. Neighbours</b>	38	45	<b>7 ↑</b>	6 / 11	2 / 11
<b>Met. Authorities</b>	39	46	<b>7 ↑</b>	21 / 36	11 / 36

Outcomes for children eligible for FSM in the foundation stage improved more rapidly than nationally and including core cities and other comparators between 2010 – 2012. There is a new Foundation Stage indicator in 2013 and FMS analysis will be undertaken when the data becomes available.

**Table 3: Key Stage 1, level 2+ reading (FSM)**

There were 1,352 pupils claiming FSM in Y2 in 2012

	<b>% 2010</b>	<b>% 2012</b>	<b>% change 2010/2012</b>	<b>rank 2010</b>	<b>rank 2012</b>
<b>Sheffield</b>	69	70	<b>1 ↑</b>	-	-
<b>National</b>	72	76	<b>4 ↑</b>	110 / 150	137 / 148
<b>Core Cities</b>	70	75	<b>5 ↑</b>	5 / 8	8 / 8
<b>Stat. Neighbours</b>	70	75	<b>5 ↑</b>	7 / 11	9 / 11
<b>Met. Authorities</b>	71	75	<b>4 ↑</b>	24 / 36	35 / 36

**Table 4: Key Stage 1, level 2+ writing (FSM)**

	<b>% 2010</b>	<b>% 2012</b>	<b>% change 2010/2012</b>	<b>rank 2010</b>	<b>rank 2012</b>
<b>Sheffield</b>	64	65	<b>1 ↑</b>	-	-
<b>National</b>	66	70	<b>4 ↑</b>	97 / 150	125 / 148
<b>Core Cities</b>	65	69	<b>4 ↑</b>	6 / 8	8 / 8
<b>Stat. Neighbours</b>	65	70	<b>5 ↑</b>	7 / 11	9 / 11
<b>Met. Authorities</b>	65	69	<b>4 ↑</b>	22 / 36	33 / 36

**Table 5: Key Stage 1, level 2+ mathematics (FSM)**

	% 2010	% 2012	% change 2010/2012	rank 2010	rank 2012
<b>Sheffield</b>	76	76	<b>0</b> ↔	-	-
<b>National</b>	80	82	<b>2</b> ↑	128 / 148	143 / 148
<b>Core Cities</b>	78	81	<b>3</b> ↑	7 / 8	7 / 8
<b>Stat. Neighbours</b>	78	81	<b>3</b> ↑	6 / 11	9 / 11
<b>Met. Authorities</b>	79	82	<b>3</b> ↑	30 / 36	34 / 36

Outcomes for Year 2 children improved in both reading and writing, and there was no change in mathematics between 2010-2012. However, the improvement was not as fast as seen nationally, in core cities, statistical neighbors or in metropolitan authorities.

**Table 6: Key Stage 2, level 4+ English & mathematics (FSM). This has been replaced by a new measure in 2013.**

There were 1,166 pupils claiming FSM in Y6 in 2012

	% 2010	% 2012	% change 2010/2012	rank 2010	rank 2012
<b>Sheffield</b>	50	63	<b>13</b> ↑	-	-
<b>National</b>	56	66	<b>10</b> ↑	102 / 122	86 / 149
<b>Core Cities</b>	56	67	<b>11</b> ↑	6 / 8	6 / 8
<b>Stat. Neighbours</b>	52	61	<b>9</b> ↑	6 / 11	3 / 11
<b>Met. Authorities</b>	58	67	<b>9</b> ↑	25 / 36	27 / 36

As seen in the Foundation Stage, outcomes for children eligible for FSM are improving more quickly between 2010 – 2012 than seen nationally, and faster than seen against other comparators. This is also seen within the national rankings where Sheffield improved to 86<sup>th</sup> nationally in 2012 and from 102<sup>nd</sup> in 2010.

**Table 7: Key Stage 4, 5+A\*-C inc. English & mathematics (FSM)**

There were 819 pupils claiming FSM in Y11 in 2012

	% 2010	% 2012	% change 2010/2012	rank 2010	rank 2012
<b>Sheffield</b>	24.5	30.3	<b>5.8</b> ↑	-	-
<b>National</b>	31.4	36.4	<b>5.0</b> ↑	121 / 150	105 / 150
<b>Core Cities</b>	28.7	33.3	<b>4.6</b> ↑	6 / 8	5 / 8
<b>Stat. Neighbours</b>	25.7	30.2	<b>4.5</b> ↑	6 / 11	7 / 11
<b>Met. Authorities</b>	28.8	34.5	<b>5.7</b> ↑	29 / 36	30 / 36

A similar picture is evident at KS4. Here outcomes for students eligible for free school meals have improved more quickly than seen nationally, in core cities, statistical neighbours or metropolitan authorities. This is also seen in national rankings where Sheffield improved to 105<sup>th</sup> in 2012 from 121<sup>st</sup> in 2010

**Table 8: Comparisons of gaps for FSM / non FSM children and the relative rankings nationally, against core cities, statistical neighbours and metropolitan LAs.**

	2010/2012 'Gaps'		National		Core Cities		Stat Neighbours		Met Authorities	
			2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
<b>Foundation Stage 78+</b>	17%	18%	39/149	57/150	3/8	4/8	5/11	6/11	7/36	10/36
<b>KS1 Reading</b>	14%	17%	43/149	114/148	4/8	7/8	3/11	8/11	7/36	34/36
<b>KS1 Writing</b>	16%	19%	50/149	108/148	4/8	7/8	4/11	9/11	11/36	29/36
<b>KS1 Mathematicss</b>	12%	15%	72/149	139/148	6/8	7/8	5/11	9/11	18/36	34/36
<b>KS2 English and Maths</b>	25%	18%	93/148	64/148	6/8	6/8	8/11	3/11	26/36	20/36
<b>KS4 5+ A-C EM</b>	28.8%	30%	69/149	85/150	6/8	5/8	5/11	7/11	18/36	23/36

The aim should be for the attainment of pupil premium children who are eligible for FSM to improve and at the same time for the gap between their non FSM counterparts to narrow because their rate of improvement is faster than that those not in receipt of free school meals. However, there is no universal agreement about what is most important i.e. gaps or attainment, and the London Institute of Education argues that the actual attainment is more important than the gaps.

Whilst the achievement of FSM Foundation Stage children has improved faster than national, the gap has not between these groups of children has not narrowed. However, the national ranking for the size of the gap in the Foundation Stage places Sheffield at 57<sup>th</sup> nationally (1 being the smallest gap and 152 being the largest). In this phase Sheffield remains a middle / top-third ranking local authority within its comparison groups and, on a national scale has far out-performed its Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) rank of 103/152. Between 2010–2012 at KS1, the gaps have widened across all three measures (reading, writing, mathematics), and the city is performing below its IMD rank of 103.

At Key Stage 2 (KS2) there is a positive picture when analysing the city's performance on the important English & mathematics level 4 combined measure. In national terms, against core cities and other metropolitan authorities Sheffield retained its relatively encouraging position between 2010 / 2012 whilst it rose markedly against its Statistical Neighbours to a rank of 3/11.

There has been some small slippage of 1.2% in the gap performance at Key Stage 4 (KS4), but this masks more subtle changes. City data shows that a greater proportion of the FSM cohort attained the critically important 5+A\*-C (English and mathematics) in 2012 than they did in 2010. However, the very significant rise in the performance of the non-FSM cohort across the city against this measure saw the deprivation gap widen.

The point above adds to the discussion about the relative importance of what is more important, i.e. the level of attainment of FSM and pupil premium cohorts, or whether the most important aspect is the size of the gap. It is becoming more widely accepted that the biggest determinant of 'the gap' is what happens in terms of the performance of the non-FSM cohort and it is this that explains why high attaining schools in affluent areas may produce large gaps whilst lower attaining schools in challenging contexts produce small(er) gaps.

## **2.2 A review of provision across Sheffield**

In spring 2013, the City Wide Learning Body and Birley Community College jointly commissioned a best practice workshop led by The Sutton Trust and approximately 65 schools attended. This workshop focused on the



research which The Sutton Trust had undertaken to measure the input which different strategies had on improving outcomes for pupil premium children. See appendix 1 for the Sutton Trust's Toolkit which schools can employ to improve outcomes for pupil premium children.

In addition, the Executive Director of Children's Services commissioned a review of provision across the city for children who were eligible for Free School Meals and children who were Looked After Children (LAC) to highlight learning points to individual schools and city wide learning points.

As well as analysis of the data, this report also looks at practice in schools in two key areas: leadership and management and the quality of provision found through review findings. Extracts of the summary report are shown below.

### **2.3 Leadership and Management to close the gap**

Since the introduction of the pupil premium as a discrete funding stream there is, not surprisingly, a heightened awareness of the FSM / LAC gap agenda in all schools. The premium can be a significant amount of funding – in excess of £300,000 in some schools in the city – and this, coupled with the public accountability for its impact, has forced schools to think carefully about how this key aspect is led and managed.

Schools in the review took a variety of approaches to the leadership and management of the strategy for improving outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. However, a recurrent theme in the secondary sector was for responsibility to rest with a nominated member of the senior leadership team or for responsibility to be shared amongst a team of senior staff. In all cases the views of the school's Business Manager was sought in terms of resourcing priorities. Fieldwork also demonstrated variations in the priority different schools gave to the FSM / LAC cohort and schools acknowledged that other 'more pressing' issues, usually around securing aggregated attainment improvement were the current focus for the school. Nevertheless, all schools cited 'narrowing the gap' for different pupil groups as a target in their improvement plans and to a greater or lesser extent this translated into a specific 'Pupil Premium Plan'.

Through the review the following emerged as strong and effective aspects relating to the leadership and management of narrowing gaps:

- A clear understanding of the current gap analysis by senior leaders and an ability to articulate this.
- Accurate identification of the FSM cohort which is widely shared with all subject leaders, Heads of Year and subject staff.
- An identified senior leader who has lead responsibility and accountability for improving outcomes for the FSM / LAC cohort. This responsibility is translated into a quantifiable target for that leader in the annual performance management process. In schools that were particularly

effective in narrowing gaps a FSM target was also a feature of performance management for other key, identified staff.

- A secure approach to tracking the progress of all pupil groupings across the school through termly data entries for each year group. In-year progress is monitored through the governing body. A particularly strong feature of best practice noted in some schools involved half-termly discussions with a focus on individual pupils who were eligible for FSM. Pupil progress meetings involved a range of staff including teachers, teaching assistants and attendance & inclusion staff.
- Governors were well informed and understood what the school is doing to support disadvantaged pupils and what impact different initiatives and interventions were having. Governors were very aware of what represented good value for money in terms of pupil premium spend.
- Senior leaders were both coherent and consistent in being able to articulate how the pupil premium funding is deployed to support FSM / LAC pupils through a range of additional resourcing and interventions. In the best schools senior staff were always willing to take difficult decisions when the impact of initiatives and interventions had limited impact.
- Schools meet the statutory requirement to report the use of pupil premium funding and the impact it has on its website. This is reported in comprehensive fashion.
- A separate pupil premium plan which is shared and then monitored and reviewed regularly by the governing body.
- A plan which is outcome driven with a focus on raising both attainment and progress especially in literacy and numeracy.
- An awareness of what the needs of the FSM cohort are in every year group with a focus that is not restricted to Year 6 in the primary phase or Year 11 in secondary schools.
- A clear understanding of the national research [Sutton Trust] and its implications for improving outcomes for disadvantaged pupils.
- A school that uses pupil premium funding on strategies that are proven to be effective in raising attainment and progress for the FSM / CLA cohort.
- Involvement of parents to support their child especially where attendance or persistent absence was an issue.

#### **2.4 Quality of provision to close the gap**

The introduction of the pupil premium as a discrete funding stream requires schools to use it judiciously to bring additionally to the provision for FSM / CLA pupils. There is also a clear requirement to demonstrate how the premium has been spent and the impact this has had. A particularly common feature of the review fieldwork was that schools, especially, but certainly not exclusively in the primary phase, had difficulty in disaggregating spending on the FSM / LAC cohort from wider school

spending. Again, this is not entirely surprising as schools frequently argued that some pupils who did not meet the eligibility criteria actually needed the extra support more urgently than some FSM pupils who didn't need anything beyond high quality mainstream provision.

Within Sheffield schools there is a wide variety of provision that has been facilitated through the pupil premium. In the best cases this has been used imaginatively and creatively to put sustainable structures in place that bring undoubted benefits for FSM / LAC pupils but will also support vulnerable pupils who may actually fall outside the FSM / LAC entitlement.

***Learning Points:***

The following points were identified through the review process are deemed to be examples of best practice to reduce outcome inequality for disadvantaged pupils:

- Pupil progress meetings involving a range of staff which raised awareness and improved accountability.
- A strong awareness of national research to underpin the deployment of staff and the adoption of effective intervention with demonstrable impact for pupils.
- The use of performance management to focus the work of senior and middle leaders and teaching colleagues with reference to improving outcomes for disadvantaged children.
- An identified senior leader with overall responsibility and accountability for a FSM strategy and narrowing the attainment gap was seen to be effective.
- Where governors are intimately involved in holding senior leaders to account for the spending of pupil premium funding and the outcomes for disadvantaged pupils.
- A particularly strong feature of primary provision was the effective partnership working with parents and the wider community to support FSM / LAC pupils.

### **3 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD?**

#### **3.1 Summary**

Analysis of the performance of disadvantaged children in Sheffield schools suggests that FSM children achieve well when compared to national rankings in the Foundation Stage, at KS2 and KS4, and that there is more work for schools to do in KS1. However, when looking at closing inequality gaps, it is important that schools maintain their focus on pupil premium children to ensure that gaps close further.

The answer to reducing the inequality gap for deprived children rests in schools and effective deployment of pupil premium funding, and the strategic approaches schools adopt towards provision are paramount.

### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 To note the challenge to reduce the inequality gap for deprived children and examples of high quality practice across the city.
- 4.2 Agree the scope of any further analysis or how this report can contribute to any further work Scrutiny may wish to undertake with regards to educational outcomes of children eligible for the pupil premium.

## APPENDIX 1 – SUTTON TRUST TOOLKIT

### Toolkit to improve learning: summary overview

<i>Approach</i>	<i>Potential gain</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Applicability</i>	<i>Evidence estimate</i>	<i>Overall cost benefit</i>
<b>Effective feedback</b>	+ 9 months	££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★ ★ ★	Very high impact for low cost
<b>Meta-cognition and self-regulation strategies.</b>	+ 8 months	££	Pri, Sec, Eng, Maths, Sci	★ ★ ★ ★	High impact for low cost
<b>Peer tutoring/ peer-assisted learning</b>	+ 6 months	££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng	★ ★ ★ ★	High impact for low cost
<b>Early intervention</b>	+ 6 months	£££££	Pri, Maths, Eng	★ ★ ★ ★	High impact for very high cost
<b>One-to-one tutoring</b>	+ 5 months	£££££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng	★ ★ ★ ★	Moderate impact for very high cost
<b>Homework</b>	+ 5 months	£	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★ ★ ★	Moderate impact for very low cost
<b>ICT</b>	+ 4 months	££££	Pri, Sec, All subjects	★ ★ ★ ★	Moderate impact for high cost

<sup>2</sup> Maximum approximate advantage over the course of a school year that an 'average' student might expect if this strategy was adopted – see Appendix 3.

<b>Assessment for learning</b>	+ 3 months	££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng	★	Moderate impact for moderate cost
<b>Parental involvement</b>	+ 3 months	£££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★★★	Moderate impact for moderate costs
<b>Sports participation</b>	+ 3 month	£££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★★	Moderate impact for moderate cost.
<b>Summer schools</b>	+ 3 months	£££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng	★★	Moderate impact for moderate cost
<b>Reducing class sizes</b>	+ 3 months	£££££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng	★★★	Low impact for very high cost
<b>After school programmes</b>	+ 2 months	££££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★★	Low impact for moderate cost.
<b>Individualised instruction</b>	+ 2 month	££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★★★	Low impact for low cost.
<b>Learning styles</b>	+ 2 month	£	Pri, Sec, All subjects	★★	Low impact, low or no cost
<b>Arts participation</b>	+ 1 month	££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★★★	Very low impact for moderate cost.

<b>Performance pay</b>	+ 0 months	£££	Pri, Sec Maths, Eng, Sci	★	Very low/no impact for moderate cost
<b>Teaching assistants</b>	+ 0 months	££££	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★ ★	Very low/no impact for high cost
<b>Ability grouping</b>	± 1 month	£	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★ ★ ★	Very low or negative impact for very low or no cost
<b>Block scheduling and timetabling</b>	± 1 month	£	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★ ★	Very low or negative impact for very low or no cost
<b>School uniforms</b>	± 1 month	£	Pri, Sec, Maths, Eng, Sci	★	Very low or negative impact for very low or no cost

This page is intentionally left blank