

**REPORT OF THE EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE  
2016/17**

**UNDER PERFORMING PUPILS**

Meeting Date: Tuesday 17 JANUARY 2017

This page is left intentionally blank

# Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

**1. The Education Select Committee met on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017 to conduct an Inquiry into Underperforming pupils. The Committee met again on 15<sup>th</sup> February to consider the recommendations.**

**Present:**

Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P. (Chairman)  
Councillor Neil Reddin FCCA (Vice-Chairman)  
Kathy Bance MBE, Julian Benington, (Alternate for Cllr Pierce 17/1) Kim Botting FRSA, Alan Collins, Mary Cooke, (Not 15/2) Judi Ellis (Not 15/2) and Ellie Harmer, Chris Pierce (Not 17/1).

Emmanuel Arbenser, Mary Capon (Not 15/2), Joan McConnell (Not 17/1), Tajana Reeves (Not 15/2), Alison Register (Not 15/2), Marlene Williams,.

**Also Present:**

Councillor Peter Fortune, Portfolio Holder for Education  
Councillor Tom Philpott, Executive Assistant for Education

**Witnesses**

Ms Jaki Moody Primary Education Advisor for English  
Ms Rachel Dunley Bromley Children's Project Manager  
Mr Kieran Osborne, Chairman Schools' Partnership Board  
Ms Mary Cava, Joint Head of SEN  
Ms Helen Priest, Head Teacher Bromley Virtual School

# Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

## **2. Inquiry Remit**

**To examine the reasons why some groups of pupils underperform and what might be done to improve performance.**

The Inquiry looked at the performance of pupils on Free School Meals (FSM) as compared to the rest of the school population, those with Special Educational Needs and Children Looked After by the Authority and what strategies for improving performance have been successful.

In advance of the meeting the Committee was provided with a range of written evidence including a report providing an overview of performance in Early Years, KS1, KS2, GCSE and A-Level, a report providing an overview of the outcomes of pupils with statements of SEND/EHC Plans, a report providing an overview of the education outcomes for LBB children in care, a report providing an overview of early years including information on families accessing children's centres and, an articles from October 2016, November 2016, and December 2016 editions of The Times Magazine. In addition to the information provided in the agenda the Committee were provided with supplementary information on transition from early years into schools and some further information about the pupil premium including a scholarly article about why it is so difficult to know about the impact.

# Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

## 3. Executive Summary

**Recommendation 1:** That further information be provided to the Education Select Committee concerning all the assessments carried out in pre-school settings before the end of the Foundation Stage, including the number of referrals for SEN as this is the group of children identified as not making the progress expected in the earliest stage of education.

**Recommendation 2:** That more action be taken to facilitate and improve information sharing between pre-school and early years settings in order to smooth the transition process.

**Recommendation 3:** That further work be undertaken to help all parents understand the importance of giving consent for professionals to contact pre-school settings.

**Recommendation 4:** That more work should be done to develop a standard protocol and pro forma for information sharing as children and young people progress through the education system.

**Recommendation 5:** That robust systems be established to support pupils as they transfer from primary to secondary school ensuring that accurate and correct information is shared between the schools in order to provide a seamless transition for pupils and support their progress and achievement.

**Recommendation 6:** That the Schools Partnership Board be asked to review support given to improving school standards in order to give all pupils every available opportunity.

**Recommendation 7:** That signposting to non-university education be expanded in order to ensure that students are aware of the variety of career opportunities available through vocational training and to support parity of esteem between vocational and academic education.

**Recommendation 8:** That the Schools Partnership Board be the vehicle for coordinating the provision of careers advice across the Borough.

**Recommendation 9:** That a review of the progress made in implementing the Committee recommendation in this and other reports published in the municipal year be published in April 2018

# Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

## 4. Bromley Pupils Achievement and Attainment

4.1 In written evidence to the committee Ms Jaki Moody, Primary Education Advisor for English reported:

4.1.1 For Early Years Foundation Stage (4-5 yr olds) - 56% of children eligible for free school meals (FSM) reached a GLD, against 78% of non-FSM, a gap of 22% compared to the national gap of 17%. The gap in Bromley has narrowed.

4.1.2 At Yr 1 Phonics screening (5-6 yr olds) the gap between FSM and non-FSM was 21%, which is greater than the national gap of 14%. The gap between FSM and non-FSM has been consistent except in 2015 when it narrowed.

4.1.3 At Key stage 1 (6-7 yr olds) the gap between FSM and non-FSM pupils in each subject has been broadly in line with national percentages over the past four years.

4.1.4 At Key Stage 2 (10-11 yr olds) the gap between FSM and non-FSM pupils in Bromley widened to 23%, which is greater than the national gap of 21%.

4.1.5 At Key Stage 4 (15-16 yr olds) when narrowing the Attainment 8 measure down to just pupils whose attainment was grade A\* to C in both English and mathematics, the gap between FSM and non-FSM pupils increases considerably to 31% (43% and 74% respectively). Tracking this cohort back to their end of KS2 attainment reveals that their attainment gap in the combined English and mathematics measure was 19%, meaning that the gap for this particular cohort has increased by 12% in five years when looking at the most comparable measures.

4.1.6 The New Attainment 8 measures were introduced in the summer 2016. This measures achievement across 8 qualifications, including English, Mathematics and 3 more GCSE or approved non- GCSE qualifications and 3 additional Baccalaureate qualifications. (The intention is produce a value added measure, which means that pupils' results are compared to the actual achievements of other pupils nationally with the same prior attainment).

4.1.7 The Attainment 8 also shows that Bromley's FSM pupils not only made less progress than Bromley's non-FSM pupils, they also made less progress than other FSM pupils nationally (-0.59 progress, with zero being the national average).

4.1.8 The Committee explored the accuracy of data in relation to the performance of pupils in receipt of free school meals (FSM) compared to the accuracy of other available data such as ethnicity, English as a second language and immigration status. The Primary Education Advisor for English confirmed that there was a range of data that could be used to track performance and different conclusions could be drawn when analysing different data.

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

4.1.9 The Committee was told that the new system of assessment that had been introduced in 2016. This had set tougher criteria and some pupils, *“especially those that had been struggling to meet expectations had not had sufficient time to adapt to the new assessment criteria in order to demonstrate improvement in performance”*. As a result of this, in 2016 there had been an increase in the gap between the achievement of pupils eligible for FSM and those that were not eligible. In 2015 the gap had narrowed. It was suggested a contributory factor to the gap at Key Stage 4 of 31% between those on FSM and those paying could be that levels of engagement were lower from families from lower socio-economic backgrounds. The increase in the gap at KS4 was a national trend which appeared to demonstrate that there needed to be a review of the support provided to young people from more disadvantaged backgrounds.

4.2 We were told by Mr Kieran Osborne, Chairman of the Schools Partnership Board, that the group that was the main cause for concern in relation to underperformance was white working class boys and many were identified as having special educational needs.

4.3 The Committee also considered whether there was a certain degree of complacency in that many boys were in families where one of more parents were self employed and expected to follow into the family trade whether or not they had exam passes. In the past several schools had been described by OFSTED as ‘coasting’. The Chairman of the Schools Partnership Board suggested that families categorised as “Just About Managing” (JAM) were struggling in terms of driving improvement. A programme designed to encourage aspiration and resilience was run at Hayes School and was aimed at families and children who could be described as JAM. It was a challenge for schools to raise aspiration however it was important that pupil premium funding was targeted at the pupils who would benefit the most.

4.4 The Committee considered the issue of the lack of male role models within schools and Members learnt that the Local Authority did not collect any data in relation to the profile of teaching staff within the Borough of Bromley as HR was now a sold service to schools. The Portfolio Holder reported that this had been raised with the Regional Schools Commissioner as no one body was responsible for collecting this data. Such evidence is available suggests that there is a large imbalance between the number of male teachers to number of female ones across both the primary and secondary sector. The School Workforce Survey (DES Nov 2015) shows that 84.8% of FTE in Primary schools are women and 62.4% FTE in Secondary. Overall (including support staff) 4 of 5 FTE staff are women.

4.6 Ms Rachael Dunley, Bromley Children’s Project Manager, explained that

4.6.1 The use of MOSAIC enables the Council to classify families into nationally recognised socio-demographic groups using national datasets and compare Bromley’s population with these groups.

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

4.6.2 The MOSAIC profiling shows that there are four 'MOSAIC Groups' of households over represented in high cost services; H, L, M, and O. These 4 Groups make up only 14.4% of Bromley's population and yet they are responsible for 42.8% of Children in Need cases, 68.8% of Child Protection cases, 54% of Troubled Family cases and 46% of Youth Offending cases. The data for Two Year Old Free Entitlement (TOYF) shows two further groups with an unusual over representation; I and J, but as these two groups are lower income households and TOYF criteria includes an earnings cap, this is not surprising.

4.6.3 Attainment data for Bromley for Early Years Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 has been profiled using MOSAIC. This shows that in Bromley there are four Groups that underperform in addition to the 'target' groups H, L, M and O; Groups A, I, J and K. Groups A and K make up only a very small proportion of the Borough's household population. Group I is more prevalent however Group J is significant as it makes up 14.3% of Bromley's households. This data shows that the groups identified (groups, H, L, M and O) as target groups for Early Intervention services due to their propensity to be households who are high risk and over represented in high cost services should be extended to include Group J specifically in terms of education under-performance. Group J is already identified as a target group for Two Year Old Free Entitlement. Full details of the MOSAIC profiling in relation to educational attainment are provided in Appendix.

4.6.4 Every person who uses the Children and Family Centres is logged as a unique individual when they register, and this enables them to use any of the six Children and Family Centres. Data on the number of registrations each month, the number of unique individuals using the Children and Family Centres each month, and the total number of visits (footfall) each month is collected. This provides a picture of the families who know about the service, those who use it as a one-off, sporadically or regularly.

4.6.5 The number of registrations continues to rise up from 9,029 in 2014/15 to 10,313 in 2015/16 and 8,967 as at the end of December 2016 which suggests that more than 11,000 registrations this financial year. Uses of the Children and Family Centre also shows a similar increase with footfall increasing from 81,733 in 2014/15, to 84,502 in 2015/16 and 59,352 as at the end of December 2016. Since the Bromley Children Project took over the management of the Children and Family Centres, and despite the reduction in the number of Children and Family Centre from 18 to six, the registrations and footfall are showing a distinct and steady increase.

4.6.6 Since 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014, in excess of 44,711 individuals have used Bromley's Children and Family Centres (44,711 individuals had addresses that could be profiled by MOSAIC) with each person attending the centres 7 times each on average. This profiling shows that the universal provision is accessed by households with children in Bromley but when compared the 'expected' level of engagement *if* the population of Children and Family Centre users were to



## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

match the population of Bromley, all of the key target groups (H, J, L, M and O) are overrepresented in the Children and Family Centre user population. This shows targeting of households with a propensity to be high risk high cost families is working.

4.6.7 The evidence shows that parents are willing to travel to children's centres if there is not one in their local area. This is especially the case to access specialist provision such as speech and language therapy. The services that are available at children's centres are well signposted by health visitors and other professionals. (Appendices 1 & 2 )

4.7 Mr Kieran Osborne, Chairman of the Schools Partnership Board reported that the aim of the Schools Partnership Board is to improve co-operation between schools with the aim of overcoming some of the silo effects that had developed between academies, multi-agency trusts, other agencies, and schools. The Board was looking to support the progress of all children in the Borough and was still in its infancy. There remain a degree of mistrust and uncertainty which would take time to overcome.

4.8 Ms Mary Çava, Joint Head of SEN:

4.8.1 There are currently 1,825 Bromley pupils with a statement of special educational needs or an Education, Health and Care plan. Just under one third of these pupils attend specialist provision. These pupils are assessed at Early Years foundation Stage (EYFS), at the end of KS1, KS2 and KS4, GCSE and Baccalaureate.

4.8.2 In the Early Years Foundation Stage (4-5 year olds) pupils are teacher assessed against a series of Early Learning Goals. Pupils are judged to have achieved a Good Level of Development if they have reached the expected standard in the primary areas of learning (personal, social and emotional development, communication and language and physical development) in addition to literacy and mathematics.

4.8.2 The percentage of pupils identified as receiving SEN Support and achieving the expected standard in 2016 was 30%, which is higher than the national average of 26% and a 7% increase compared to the previous year.

4.8.3 The percentage of pupils identified as in receipt of a statutory statement or EHC Plan and achieving the expected outcomes was 4%. This is in line with the national average but 2% lower than the previous year when the national average was exceeded in Bromley Schools.

4.8.4 The percentage of pupils at SEN Support who achieved the expected standard in the Year 1 Phonics assessment in 2016 was 58% which is 12% points higher than the national average. The percentage of pupils with a statutory EHC Plan or Statement was 15% which is 3% points lower than the national average of 18%.

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

4.8.5 At Key Stage 2 the achievements for pupils with SEN Support and with a statutory plan in 2015 were all above the national levels. At the time of writing national percentages were not available and data will be analysed when this is received.

4.8.6 Key Stage 4 (15-16 year olds) New Attainment 8 measures were introduced in the summer 2016. Again the 2015 results for Bromley children with a statutory plan or those working at SEN Action were above the National average.

4.8.7 Overall Bromley school pupils with special educational needs are performing above the national average across the range of school assessments carried out. In some areas performance is significantly better, in particular considerable achievements are noted in KS1, particularly at SEN Support level. The achievement levels for Reading at KS1 for those children with a statutory plan are a concern and will require further discussion and investigation.

4.8.8 Identification and diagnosis of SEN at an early stage is essential. Health professionals are trained in identifying additional needs and once identified they have a duty to contact the Local Authority so that parents and/or the pre-school setting can give whatever additional support is necessary. All such support is audited.

4.9 Ms Helen Priest, Head Teacher of Bromley Virtual School:

4.9.1 Virtual Head Teachers are champions and advocates for young people in care, working with schools to provide support and opportunities to improve performance and ensure that children looked after in an appropriate setting, make progress and have all the support they need. The Virtual School seeks to ensure that children living outside Bromley receive the same level of support as those living closer to home. The time spent out of school when a child changes placement is minimised by providing tuition at home if no school place is immediately available. Children Looked After (CLA) have historically under performed at school. Every local authority is required to have a designated Virtual Head Teacher. In Bromley, the Virtual Head Teacher is responsible for overseeing the education progress of approximately 292 children varying in age from 2 to 18 years old.

4.9.2 The School ensures that special educational needs are identified and addressed, funding assessments and supporting requests for statutory assessment as necessary, including when emotional or mental health is an issue.

4.9.3 For all young people in KS4 who are accessing an academic curriculum, regardless of their level of attainment or where they live 1:1 tuition and coaching is provided.

4.9.4 The Virtual School tracks and monitors the use of Pupil Premium funding, ensuring that schools target the allocation to individual academic or social and

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

emotional needs and top-sliced funding is used to provide additional resources and support, including text books and revision materials.

4.9.5 Support social workers with Personal Education Plans is provided and work closely with schools to monitor progress and maintain stability for students. Acting as corporate parents, the Virtual School ensure that students are completing coursework on time and are attending revision programmes in their school. Funding for additional revision programmes during the school holidays is available if they are requested.

4.9.6 Students are given access to the broadest possible curriculum and they are entered for examinations at the appropriate level. Support to ensure they are in school on examination days is also given.

4.9.7 At 18 the objective is to provide access to university visits and cultural experiences to build aspiration.

4.9.10 Children Looked After (CLA) numbers are very low and each tiny year group cohort has its own characteristics, with children joining and leaving (and sometimes re-joining) the group so it is hard, in general terms, to discuss trends. However, the 2016 outcome data for Key Stage 2 (11 year-olds) and Key Stage 4 (16 year-olds) provides illustrations both of what works well for children in care, enabling them to achieve academic success and, conversely, the barriers that prevent success, especially during adolescence.

4.9.11 At Key Stage 2 in 2016, 69% of Bromley CLA achieved National expectation\* across the combined measures of reading, writing and maths. This is against a National figure of 53% for all children and 59% for all London children. Initial indications are that Bromley CLA have significantly outperformed their peers in London and have done exceptionally well in comparison to other vulnerable pupils in Bromley. The 2016 KS2 cohort was the largest group of 11year-old CLA since we started recording this data. It was also the most stable group we've seen for some time, with most of the children having been in care and in stable foster placements for more than 2 years. Some have been in care for up to 7 or 8 years. Although the data sample is too small to demonstrate a significant pattern, the outcomes for this cohort show some correlation between length of time in care and progress between KS1 and KS2, with a pivot point at around 40 months.

4.9.12 There is no doubt that children placed in stable foster care during KS1 and KS2 can show accelerated progression from their starting point, even if they have identified SEN. The benefits to children of good relationships between foster carers and schools are clear and the support mechanisms are mutual, with both school and carer giving and receiving knowledge and advice. The Virtual School provides training for foster carers *and* designated teachers and feedback is positive, ensuring that research and best practice are disseminated.

4.9.13 Children who have experience early neglect frequently have poor

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

reading skills, in particular, they lack the skills of inference and prediction. Initial results from the TextNow pilot project support the supposition that training foster carers to become reading coaches has an impact on reading and comprehension skills. Foster carers have been encouraged to read with their children every day, asking questions about context, use of language in the text and what might happen next. The project needs developing but most children made significant gains in both word recognition and reading comprehension.

4.9.14 Similarly, such children find creative writing difficult. The lack of appropriate early stimulation and conversation means that they have gaps in their experience of the world around them and so have less from which to draw on in their writing. In Bromley, we have known for some time that creative writing is a weakness for CLA in grammar school entrance tests and KS2 SATs. The new assessment regime means that it is not yet possible to put into context this year's results, it is clear that fewer Bromley CLA met the expected standard in writing than any other area and that, despite some outstanding individual results, average progress between KS1 and KS2 was much smaller.

4.9.15 In complete contrast to the KS2 group, the outcomes for Bromley LA completing YR11 in 2016 show what creates barriers to success. This year, the YR11 reporting cohort was the smallest for some years at only 12 students. The tiny cohort means that the outcomes are 'statistically insignificant' but with 25% of those students (3 of 12) achieving the required 5 A\*-C including English and Maths, Bromley CLA are in the top 10% in the country and performing significantly above their peers across London.

4.9.16 Individual children in the GCSE group, however, have not performed so well and too many of them have reached the end of statutory school age without gaining any qualifications in English or Maths.

4.9.17 Using just the reporting group (children who were CLA continuously between 1st April 2015 and 31st March 2016), it is clear why academic success is hard to achieve:

- 9 of the 12 young people (75%) have a statement of SEN or and EHC plan
- 5 of them spent KS4 in residential children's homes or specialist schools outside Bromley.
  
- 7 young people in this group changed care placements at least once during YR11, and some of them several times.
- 4 of these young people have difficulty relating to and engaging with adult/professional support of any kind not just in terms of education. This is reflected in the number of placement changes they experience and results in periods of refusing to attend education.
- 2 students have extensive histories of offending behaviour and involvement of YOS.

4.9.18 Other factors that create barriers to academic achievement, historically,

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

include absence from school and unaddressed special needs. Poor school attendance is often so serious that students have been out of school for several months at the point at which they become CLA and re-engaging them is a complex and sometimes long-term activity, particularly if they have moved out of authority or if their experience of school has not been good.

4.9.19 Young people who become CLA during adolescence may have been on the edge of care for months or even years, experiencing neglect or family trauma. Poor attendance or other factors, such as poor behaviour, can mask special needs and prevent assessments being undertaken so children come into the care system and into the Virtual School with a range of unidentified needs. Despite the new SEN Code of Practice, it can still be difficult to persuade schools that social, emotional and mental health problems *are* special educational needs and that the statutory assessment process and an EHC Plan will protect a child now and until they are 25, providing support in the transition to post-16 education and beyond. It is essential that previous attainment is collected and reviewed by the Virtual School when child becomes CLA as it often shows an identifiable point at which they began to experience disruption and difficulties and their attainment began to dip. With analysis of this sort it often becomes clear that the student is in the wrong school or following the wrong curriculum or that they simply need additional support.

4.9.20 Any or all of these factors are exacerbated when children are placed at a distance from Bromley because a care or education placement is not available in borough. Working with professionals across 2, or even 3 authorities extends timescales and can involve many hours of phone conversations, emailing and travelling. The inability of the local authority to recruit and retain foster carers who can hold onto troubled adolescents and the lack of availability of good quality pre-secure residential provision in London has an impact on the outcomes for our most vulnerable children.

4.9.21 Around 30 16-18 year olds are currently pursuing apprenticeships with more children looked after being encouraged to embark on apprenticeship schemes.

4.9.22 Academies are co-operative, working with the external provider responsible for gather information in order to provide the relevant information. All schools in Bromley supply the data.

4.9.23 Adopted children remained the responsibility of the Virtual Head Teacher until the final adoption order is issued, with support being provided during the period of transition. The Government has indicated in a recent White paper that it wants to bring adopted children into Virtual Schools. This proposal significant implications on resources, more than doubling the workload of Bromley Virtual School. In addition to this there are also implications in terms of parental responsibility.

# Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

## 5 Strategies for improvement

### 5.1 Pupil Premium

5.1.1 The Committee noted the impact of the pupil premium. This is additional funding that schools receive for disadvantaged pupils to close the attainment gap, and increase social mobility. Research suggests that although those eligible for pupil premium may be higher attaining, this funding is more frequently focused on those who are lower attaining, especially those who may also have special educational needs.

5.1.2 Schools are held to account by OFSTED about how the pupil premium is spent and successful schools have an individualised approach for each pupil, track pupil progress, and evaluate the impact of any interventions which have been undertaken. Inspection reports state how well schools are making use of this funding to impact on disadvantaged pupils' outcomes.

5.1.3 We heard evidence about good practice in some Bromley schools as evidenced by recent OFSTED inspections which have resulted in a good or outstanding judgement for the school. However we were also told that this good practice is not yet embedded in all Bromley schools some of which have large gaps between outcomes for disadvantaged pupils and other pupils.

5.2 The Committee received details of the findings of the DfE report: *'Supporting the attainment of disadvantaged pupils: articulating success and good practice'*. (November 2015)

Key findings include:

5.2.1 Leaders in schools that were more successful in raising the attainment of disadvantaged pupils emphasised that there was no single intervention that had led to success. Rather, more successful schools appeared to be implementing their strategies in greater depth and with more attention to detail.

5.2.2 By comparing more and less successful schools, the study identified seven building blocks for success;

- i. Promote an ethos of attainment for all pupils, rather than stereotyping disadvantaged pupils as a group with less potential to succeed;
- ii. having an individualised approach to addressing barriers to learning and emotional support, at an early stage, rather than providing access to generic support and focusing on pupils nearing their end-of-key-stage assessments;
- iii. focus on high quality teaching first rather than on bolt-on strategies and activities outside school hours;
- iv. focus on outcomes for individual pupils rather than on providing strategies;

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

- v. deploy the best staff to support disadvantaged pupils; develop skills and roles of teachers and teaching assistants (TAs) rather than using additional staff who do not know the pupils well;
- vi. make decisions based on data and respond to evidence, using frequent, rather than one-off assessment and decision points.
- vii. have clear, responsive leadership: setting ever higher aspirations and devolving responsibility for raising attainment to all staff, rather than accepting low aspirations and variable performance.

5.3 The report also identified school characteristics which helped improve disadvantaged pupils' performance.

- i. There is considerable consistency between the characteristics associated with a school's level of success in the most recent year and improvement in schools' results over time. (But note that these are correlations and do not necessarily imply causal relationships.)
- ii. schools with higher levels of pupil absence had lower performance among disadvantaged pupils than schools with otherwise similar characteristics;
- iii. primary schools with disadvantaged pupils who had previously achieved higher results at Key Stage 1 had higher results for disadvantaged pupils at Key Stage 2. Similarly, secondary schools with disadvantaged pupils who had achieved higher results at Key Stage 2 performed better at Key Stage 4;
- iv. schools with a higher proportion of disadvantaged pupils were associated with higher performance among disadvantaged pupils (and schools with a lower proportion of disadvantaged pupils were associated with lower performance among disadvantaged pupils);
- v. schools with larger year groups overall (including both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils) were associated with lower performance among disadvantaged pupils;
- vi. primary schools with higher proportions of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) were associated with lower performance among disadvantaged pupils;
- vii. schools with a higher proportion of pupils from white British ethnic backgrounds were associated with lower performance among disadvantaged pupils;
- viii. schools located in certain areas (especially the South East, South West, East of England and North West) had poorer results, compared with schools in London or the North East;
- ix. rural secondary schools had lower results among disadvantaged pupils, compared with schools with otherwise similar characteristics.

5.4 In relation to school type, the study found that:

- i. Converter academies were associated with higher attainment among disadvantaged pupils at both primary and secondary level, and greater improvement over time at primary level;
- ii. there were mixed findings for sponsored academies, which were

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

- associated with poorer performance at primary level, but better performance and improvement at secondary level;
- iii. selective schools and Teaching Schools were associated with higher performance among disadvantaged pupils even after taking account of the influence of a high-performing intake and other characteristics that were associated with pupil progress.

5.5 The study found no evidence of a statistically significant relationship between positive performance among disadvantaged pupils and being a member of a Teaching School Alliance (TSA). Being a member of an academy group was not associated with performance at primary level, but there was a small positive relationship between disadvantaged pupils' performance among secondary schools that were members of a small academy group. (the analysis did not take account of the length of time a school had been a member of a TSA or part of an academy group.)

5.6 This study found that between one- and two-thirds of the variance between schools in disadvantaged pupils' attainment can be explained by a number of school-level characteristics. This suggests that schools' intake and circumstance are influential but they do not totally determine pupils' outcomes. **It therefore implies that schools have meaningful scope to make a difference.** The research went on to identify a number of actions associated with schools that were more successful in raising disadvantaged pupils' attainment – both in what they do and the way they do it.

5.7 More successful schools have been focusing on disadvantaged pupils' performance for longer and appear to have developed more sophisticated responses over time. Leaders in more successful schools said it had taken a period of around three to five years to see the impact of changes they had introduced feed through to pupils' results.

5.8 Taken together, the findings suggest that schools which have been more successful in raising the performance of disadvantaged pupils have put the basics in place (especially addressing attendance and behaviour, setting high expectations, focusing on the quality of teaching and developing the role of TAs) and have moved on to more specific improvement strategies. These schools were 'early adopters'. Schools that are earlier in the improvement journey are more likely to have smaller proportions of disadvantaged pupils and/or to have larger year groups. In order to make further progress, the research indicates that they need to support pupils' social and emotional needs, address individual pupils' learning needs; help all staff to use data effectively and improve engagement with families. Once these strategies are in place, the next steps on the improvement journey include focusing on early intervention, introducing metacognitive and peer learning strategies and improving their effectiveness in response to data on individual pupils' progress. Schools which have made the greatest progress in improving the attainment of disadvantaged pupils are in a position to set even higher expectations and to spread good practice through working with neighbouring schools as well as continuing to learn from and contribute to national networks.



## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

5.9 Overall, this research suggests that there is no ‘one size fits all’ solution to closing the attainment gap. Instead, a number of measures are required, tailored to each school’s circumstances and stage on the improvement journey. These measures include setting a culture of high expectations for all pupils, understanding how schools can make a difference, selecting a range of evidence-based strategies tailored to meet the needs of individual schools and pupils, and implementing them well.

5.10 The Committee has noted the findings of the DfE study and commends them to the School Partnership Board for consideration and possible dissemination to schools.

5.11 The Committee welcomed the targeting of support to the most vulnerable children and families using MOSAIC. All the research evidence and the experience of teachers and other professional staff shows that early intervention for those children from the poorest families is essential to preventing these children fall behind through their school career.

5.12 The Committee has asked for more information on all the assessments that are done in pre-school settings before the end of the Foundation Stage. This could include the number of referrals for SEN as this is the group of children identified as not making the progress expected in the earliest stage of education.

**Recommendation 1: That further information be provided to the Education Select Committee concerning all the assessments carried out in pre-school settings before the end of the Foundation Stage, including the number of referrals for SEN as this is the group of children identified as not making the progress expected in the earliest stage of education.**

5.13 The Bromley Children’s Project Manager told us that one of the challenges within her service was the sharing of information between pre-school and early years settings. The Committee noted that a number of schools were not aware that children were accessing the services that were available in children’s centres and this meant that pre-school and early years setting were working in isolation, unaware of interventions that were being put in place to support a child’s development. Parents have to give express consent for professionals to contact pre-school settings and this consent is not always given.

**Recommendation 2: That more action be taken to facilitate and improve information sharing between pre-school and early years settings in order to smooth the transition process.**

**Recommendation 3: That further work be undertaken to help all parents understand the importance of giving consent for professionals to contact pre-school settings.**

5.14 We were pleased to learn that the Bromley Children’s Project works

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

closely with health visiting teams and public health in the commissioning of future services. A new, initiative has been the use of health visitors to gather information on any pre-school or early years settings that children may attend and to seek parental consent for contact to be made with the settings. There is also a lot of positive work being undertaken with GPs in this respect.

5.15 The Committee noted that there was not a uniform process for sharing information as children and young people move through the education system. In relation to the transition between pre-school and primary we were told that it was not just about completing paperwork. The most valuable aspect of the transition process is when primary teachers visit pre-school settings. This enables pre-school settings to provide advice and assist with any behaviour issues that could arise including tensions between certain pupils, which would help smooth the transition to primary school.

**Recommendation 4: That more work should be done to develop a standard protocol and pro forma for information sharing as children and young people progress through the education system.**

5.16 The Chairman of the Schools Partnership Board told the Committee that the transition from Primary to Secondary schools did nothing to aid and support pupil progress. There is a long time lag between KS2 assessments in year 6 and the start of secondary education in year 7. There is also still a great deal that secondary schools can learn in terms of building on and developing what pupils learn at primary.

**Recommendation 5: That robust systems be established to support pupils as they transfer from primary to secondary school ensuring that accurate and correct information is shared between the schools in order to provide a seamless transition for pupils and support their progress and achievement.**

5.17 We were told by the Primary Education Advisor for English that there is evidence that if young people attend a school that is judged to be 'Good' by Ofsted they have a better chance of making progress, catching up, and keeping up. The evidence suggests that that in a good school pupils that are eligible for FSM and those that are not eligible for FSM performed equally well. There are a large number of schools in Bromley that had been judged by Ofsted as 'requiring Improvement' so one of the challenges for the Local Authority in relation to improving the performance of pupils is to drive an improvement in school standards thus giving all pupils every available opportunity.

**Recommendation 6: That the Schools Partnership Board be asked to review support given to improving school standards in order to give all pupils every available opportunity.**

5.18 London is now one of the few capital cities where performance outstrips the rest of the Country. This is partially as a result of the 'London Challenge' programme but also the influx of skilled immigrants, additional funding, and the

## Education Select Committee – 3rd Report Underperforming Pupils

---

quality of teaching and learning. Bromley was performing well as an outer London Borough however the challenge was to now match the performance of the inner London boroughs.

5.19 The Committee considered the challenge of improving the aspirations of those indigenous groups who do not understand and appreciate the value of a good education. We agree with the Chairman of the Schools Partnership Board that it is important to lay the foundations in the early years, developing and establishing aspirations, resilience and the importance of family involvement. Great progress is being made in the early years and the challenge is to ensure that the aspiration remains with the young people and their families when they are in their early teens. Another important factor is to ensure that there are also exciting and viable options for young people who do not want to, or cannot afford to go to university. In recent years an emphasis had been placed on university education however, there has to be clear aspirations for those pupils who were not interested in pursuing a university education. More needs to be done to develop pathways for these young people including New Apprenticeships which are currently being developed nationally.

**Recommendation 7: That signposting to non-university education be expanded in order to ensure that students are aware of the variety of career opportunities available through vocational training and to support parity of esteem between vocational and academic education.**

5.20 The Committee considered the provision of careers advice and heard that the quality of provision varies across the Borough. Whilst it is clear that careers have a big part to play in raising aspiration, schools need to place a value on the careers service. We support the view of the Chairman of the Schools Partnership Board that the Board could be the vehicle for co-ordinating the provision of careers advice across the Borough.

**Recommendation 8: That the Schools Partnership Board be the vehicle for coordinating the provision of careers advice across the Borough.**

**Recommendation 9: That a review of the progress made in implementing the Committee recommendation in this and other reports published in the municipal year be published in April 2018**

This page is left intentionally blank

MOSAIC PROFILE FOR BROMLEY

MOSAIC Groups are categorised from A to O. They are ordered based on their use of public services and loosely ordered in terms of affluence with O being the least affluent Group. Groups B and C are the most affluent Groups.

The most prevalent Groups in Bromley are Group D (21.8% of Bromley’s households) and Group B (19.2% of Bromley’s households). Neither of these Groups put a large strain on public services. Group J is the largest of the less affluent Groups in Bromley’s population.

Table 1(below) shows the Populations of High Cost and High Risk Services in Bromley compared with Bromley’s Household Population by Mosaic Group. The following colours represent how under or over represented each Group is in their respective population compared with Bromley’s population as a whole. Please see Appendix 3 for full pen profiles describing the dominant features of these Groups that are over represented.

Mosaic Groups		Households in Bromley	Percentage	Low	Medium low	Medium high	High	Very High
				CIN Households Num (%)	CP Households Num (%)	TF Households Num (%)	YOS Households Num (%)	Eligible for TYOF 2016/17 Num (%)
A	Country Living	1045	0.8%	6 (0.9%)	7 (1.1%)	1 (0.2%)	6 (0.9%)	7 (0.7%)
				High	High	Low	High	Medium Low
B	Prestige Positions	26403	19.2%	58 (8.9%)	17 (2.6%)	28 (4.3%)	56 (8.6%)	33 (3.1%)
				Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
C	City Prosperity	8060	5.9%	13 (2%)	7 (1.1%)	9 (1.4%)	29 (4.5%)	41 (3.8%)
				Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
D	Domestic Success	30037	21.8%	142 (21.8%)	68 (10.4%)	106 (16.3%)	139 (21.4%)	153 (14.2%)
				Medium Low	Low	Low	Medium Low	Low
E	Suburban Stability	4354	3.2%	21 (3.2%)	17 (2.6%)	14 (2.2%)	24 (3.7%)	13 (1.2%)
				Medium High	Medium Low	Low	Medium High	Low
F	Senior Security	13015	9.5%	9 (1.4%)	5 (0.8%)	10 (1.5%)	3 (0.5%)	27 (2.5%)
				Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
G	Rural Reality	349	0.3%	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.3%)	5 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	4 (0.4%)
				Low	High	Very High	Low	High
H	Aspiring Homemakers	7080	5.1%	46 (7.1%)	95 (14.6%)	60 (9.2%)	57 (8.8%)	86 (8%)
				High	Very High	Very High	Very High	High
I	Urban Cohesion	8120	5.9%	13 (2%)	6 (0.9%)	12 (1.8%)	18 (2.8%)	82 (7.6%)
				Low	Low	Low	Low	High
J	Rental Hubs	19708	14.3%	93 (14.3%)	66 (10.1%)	106 (16.3%)	63 (9.7%)	217 (20.2%)
				Medium Low	Low	Medium High	Low	High
K	Modest Traditions	1450	1.1%	4 (0.6%)	2 (0.3%)	7 (1.1%)	9 (1.4%)	2 (0.2%)
				Low	Low	Medium High	High	Low
L	Transient Renters	769	0.6%	15 (2.3%)	39 (6%)	31 (4.8%)	17 (2.6%)	8 (0.7%)
				Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	High
M	Family Basics	7352	5.3%	150 (23%)	211 (32.4%)	193 (29.6%)	167 (25.7%)	245 (22.8%)
				Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High
N	Vintage Value	5214	3.8%	12 (1.8%)	6 (0.9%)	1 (0.2%)	5 (0.8%)	20 (1.9%)
				Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
O	Municipal Challenge	4744	3.4%	68 (10.4%)	103 (15.8%)	68 (10.4%)	58 (8.9%)	136 (12.7%)
				Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High
Total		137700	100%					

**TABLE 1: Populations of High Cost and High Risk Services in Bromley compared with Bromley's Household Population by Mosaic Group**

Table 1 compares the population of Bromley with the population of various LB Bromley services such

as: -

- Child in Need (CIN) households,
- Child Protection (CP) households,
- Troubled Family (TF) households,
- Youth Offending (YOS) households, and
- Eligibility / claiming Two Year Old Free Entitlement.

This comparison demonstrates that some Groups are over represented in the service user population when compared with Bromley's residents.

Four MOSAIC Groups particularly stand out in the table above:

- H – Aspiring Homemakers
- L – Transient Renters
- M – Family Basics
- O – Municipal Challenge

These 4 Groups make up only 14.4% of Bromley's population and yet they are responsible for;

- 42.8% of CIN cases,
- 68.8% of CP cases,
- 54% of TF cases and
- 46% of YOS cases.

It is worth highlighting that the L Group makes up only a very small proportion of Bromley's population (769 households, 0.6% of all Bromley households).

The Two Year Old Funding data (TYOF) has also been added in to investigate whether there are unusual variances in the population of those eligible for and claiming the earnings related element of

free childcare. Groups I and J are unusually overrepresented (in addition to the four Groups identified above) which makes sense given the fact that households categorised as Groups I and J are generally on lower incomes.

**FULL PEN PROFILES FOR TARGET MOSAIC GROUPS IN BROMLEY****Group H – Aspiring Homemakers**

Aspiring Homemakers are younger households who have, often, only recently set up home. They usually own their homes in private suburbs, which they have chosen to fit their budget.

**Core Features**

Aspiring Homemakers are typically younger families, couples who are yet to have children, and singles in their 20s and 30s. A good number are setting up homes for the first time. Couples can be married or more likely co-habiting, and where there are children they are usually of nursery or primary school age.

Homes are likely to be semi-detached and terraced properties, modest in size but with three bedrooms and mostly owned; three-quarters of Aspiring Homemakers are in the process of buying their house with a mortgage.

Most Aspiring Homemakers are driven by affordability when it comes to choosing where to live. They select either modest priced housing on newer estates, larger homes in better value suburbs that give them more space, or the least expensive homes in popular suburbs.

The majority of Aspiring Homemakers are in full-time employment with a few part-time workers. The starter salaries they earn mean that most can manage their household budgets, but outgoings can be high so they appreciate the benefits of buying and selling on auction sites. Unsecured loans can help with larger purchases.

They own smartphones, are keen social networkers, manage their bank accounts online and download a large number of apps.

**Public Sector**

Aspiring Homemakers have a lower than average need to rely on the state for financial assistance.

Aspiring Homemakers are in reasonable health. Only a small proportion, around a fifth, of people smoke, and those that do are more likely to be light smokers. While it is rare for them to drink every day, they do consume alcohol regularly, with nearly a third of this Group having a drink two or three times a week. They are one of the poorest Groups with regards to eating five portions of fruit and vegetables a day and although they are more active than people in general, they are on the whole less so than some other better-off young people and working families.

Crime is lower than average where Aspiring Homemakers live, and they perceive fewer problems than the population in general with anti-social behaviour in their local communities. They feel safe in the suburbs and on the new estates where they live and worry less than average about being a victim of crime.

They know a reasonable amount about environmental issues, without being especially knowledgeable, but are not always inclined to be particularly green at home.

## **Group J – Rental Hubs**

Rental Hubs contains predominantly young, single people in their 20s and 30s who live in urban locations and rent their homes from private landlords while in the early stages of their careers, or pursuing studies.

### **Core Features**

Rental Hubs represent an eclectic mix of students and young people with budding careers and more mundane starter roles. They live in urban locations in housing that attracts many young people, and most have yet to settle down with a partner or in a home of their own.

Rental Hubs are usually found in or close to the centres of the UK's major cities. They are four times more likely than average to rent their home from a private landlord, with a minority purchasing their homes as a first step on the housing ladder.

Homes are purpose-built developments of small flats or older terraces. Around half of Rental Hubs have been at their address for two years or less.

In addition to students, those in Rental Hubs work in administrative and technical roles or are climbing the corporate ladder in professional or managerial roles. A smaller proportion works in lower supervisory jobs or in service roles in bars, restaurants or hotels, particularly in London.

Having grown up in a digital environment, these people are used to accessing news and information via their digital devices and Rental Hubs have a very high level of smartphone ownership. The internet is the first port of call for information; they are very active on social networking sites and spend a lot of time online. They are less likely to spend much time watching television.

They are generally ambitious, keen to further their positions and adventurous in trying new things. They are likely to take note of an organisation's ethical and environmental credentials.

### **Public Sector**

While the young people in Rental Hubs are more likely than most to say they would pay more for environmental goods or make lifestyle changes to benefit the environment, in reality their green credentials are limited. They are less likely than the norm to recycle, save on energy and water use or re-use items.

People in this group have a relatively low financial dependency on the state, apart from a few who access Job Seeker's Allowance.

Being young, they are in good health; there are more smokers among them than average, but most tend to be light smokers. They do tend to drink, but are not the most frequent drinkers and they try to keep in shape, being more likely than most to play sports.

The urban and student areas where they live have a far higher crime rate than average, with robberies twice as often reported here. People are more likely to have issues with anti-social behaviour, especially noisy neighbours and rowdy behaviour. However, Rental Hubs' fear of crime is in marked contrast to this; they worry less than the population in general about being a victim of crime.



## **Group L – Transient Renters**

Transient Renters are single people who pay modest rents for low cost homes. Mainly younger people, they are highly transient, often living in a property for only a short length of time before moving on.

### **Core Features**

Households in this Group are typically aged in their 20s and 30s and are either living alone or homesharing. Very few people are married and there are few children.

Properties are often older terraced properties, primarily rented from private landlords with a few social landlords. They include some of the lowest value houses of all, and with tenants moving on quickly and paying low rents, private landlords are often not inclined to invest in improvements.

Many work full-time, however their lower skilled jobs mean that incomes for Transient Renters are often limited. Others may be trying to improve their situation by studying for additional qualifications.

This Group are the most reliant on their mobile phones, saying they couldn't manage without them. They are the most prolific texters, and frequently check social networks and download music. They have the lowest use of landlines.

### **Public Sector**

The generally young singles and homesharers in this Group have high levels of dependency on the state for support, in particular with benefits to help them find employment or to supplement their low incomes.

Levels of poor health are higher than average, and this Group contains the highest proportion of people who smoke. They enjoy a drink, although they are by no means the most regular drinkers. However, they are the least likely of all to follow health advice around eating enough fruit and vegetables. This Group is more likely to take part in sport than keep fit by other forms of exercise, although they are not especially active at either.

This is the least environmentally conscious Group of all, and with other challenges to face, comparatively little focus is given to helping the environment.

Crime is above average where Transient Renters live and they are one of the Groups most likely to experience issues with anti-social behaviour. As a result, the fear of crime within this Group is also higher than amongst the population in general.

## **Group M – Family Basics**

Family Basics are families with children who have limited budgets and can struggle to make ends meet. Their homes are low cost and are often found in areas with fewer employment options.

### **Core Features**

Typically aged in their 30s and 40s, Family Basics consists of families with school age children, whose finances can be overstretched due to limited opportunities, low incomes and the costs of raising their children. In addition to younger children, some families also

continue to support their adult offspring. While many households are headed by a couple providing two incomes, a small proportion are lone parent households.

Homes are typically low value and may be located on estates or in pockets of low cost housing in the suburbs of large cities and towns. They are usually three bedroom terraced or semi-detached houses, often dating from between the wars or from the 1950s and 1960s. Most people have lived in the area for many years.

A proportion of the working families have pushed themselves to buy their low cost homes, but more than half rent their home from social landlords.

Limited qualifications mean that people can struggle to compete in the jobs market, and rates of unemployment are above average. Employment is often in low wage routine and semi-routine jobs. As a result many families have the support of tax credits, but significant levels of financial stress still exist.

Families will take budget holidays to give the children an opportunity of getting away. Red top newspapers are popular sources of information.

They send a large number of texts every day and are keen social networkers.

### **Public Sector**

Living on tight budgets, the often overstretched families in Family Basics depend on higher than average levels of financial assistance from the state. They are one of the most likely Groups to need to top up their incomes with Income Support.

With other priorities to focus on, this Group is one of the least likely to recycle or re-use items or particularly try to save energy or water. Their level of environmental knowledge is also lower than most.

The areas of low cost housing where Family Basics live have a crime rate that is just slightly higher than average, but these residents are more than twice as likely to feel that anti-social behaviour is a problem in their neighbourhood. Their fear of being a victim of crime is also higher than the norm and they are the Group with the least confidence in the police and in the Criminal Justice System.

Poor health is more common here than amongst the general population, with people more likely to smoke and less likely to follow a healthy diet, exercise or play sport to keep in shape. Parents in this Group do enjoy a drink, but do so less often than many others.

### **Group O – Municipal Challenge**

Municipal Challenge are long-term social renters living in low-value multi-storey flats in urban locations, or small terraces on outlying estates. These are challenged neighbourhoods with limited employment options and correspondingly low household incomes.

#### **Core Features**

People in Municipal Challenge are typically of working age. There are some families with children, but most are singles.

Many have been renting their flats for a number of years. These are often multi-storey or high-rise blocks built from the 1960s onwards. Those in houses on estates have been settled there for a long time.

These neighbourhoods suffer from high levels of unemployment, and incomes can be particularly low. Those in work tend to be in manual or low level service jobs. People are the most likely to be finding it difficult to cope on their incomes and they often receive benefits.

Municipal Challenge contains the highest proportion of people without a current account. They have a low take up of financial products but may use short term finance occasionally. Given their income and urban location, car ownership is very low.

Generally, ownership of technology is not high, but mobile phones are important and are the preferred means of contact. On average they spend more time watching television than they do on the internet and they prefer making purchases in local shops than buying online.

## **Public Sector**

Living in areas of high levels of unemployment and with low incomes, Municipal Challenge are in need of a high degree of financial assistance from the state. They are the most likely Group to access Job Seeker's Allowance, Income Support and benefits related to disability and incapacity.

Some have health issues, and levels of poor health are only higher among the very elderly. Significantly more people than average smoke and Municipal Challenge are the most likely – over two and a half times as likely in fact – to be heavy smokers. While they drink less than average, they also have amongst the lowest levels of exercise and fewer than average follow a healthy diet.

They live in areas where the level of crime is high, although not always the very highest. Common crimes are across the board, from public disorder through to robbery and violent crime. Municipal Challenge are the most likely to think crime and anti-social behaviour has increased a lot and is a big problem in their neighbourhood. They are also the most likely to be worried about being a victim of crime.

The environment and trying to be green is not really a concern for this Group.

