
Report to: Cabinet

Date of Meeting: 5 November 2015

Subject: School Performance Review – Final Report

Report of: Head of Schools and Families

Wards Affected: All

Is this a Key Decision? Yes

Is it included in the Forward Plan? Yes

Exempt/Confidential

No

Purpose/Summary

Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Children's Services) determined to review the performance of secondary education in Sefton given the difference in Ofsted outcomes between primary and secondary schools particularly in the south of the borough. This report concludes the review of the School Performance Working Group and makes recommendations to continue improving standards in secondary schools. The recommendations were agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Children's Services and Safeguarding) at its meeting on 22 September 2015.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Cabinet approves the recommendations for continued improvement in secondary school standards, as set out in paragraph 6 of the report, together with the required resources as set out in paragraph 7 of the report.

How does the decision contribute to the Council's Corporate Objectives?

	<u>Corporate Objective</u>	<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community	√		
2	Jobs and Prosperity	√		
3	Environmental Sustainability		√	
4	Health and Well-Being	√		
5	Children and Young People	√		
6	Creating Safe Communities		√	
7	Creating Inclusive Communities	√		
8	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening Local Democracy	√		

Reasons for the Recommendation:

The report concludes the review of the School Performance Working Group and makes recommendations to continue improving standards in secondary schools.

What will it cost and how will it be financed?

(A) **Revenue Costs** – the costs included in the report could be funded from closing schools balances. These are finite however and are used particularly to meet the costs of school closures, which can be considerable. See further comments below.

(B) **Capital Costs** N/A

Implications:

The following implications of this proposal have been considered and where there are specific implications, these are set out below:

Legal: The local authority has a statutory duty to ensure the quality of educational provision in its area and has statutory powers of intervention in local authority maintained schools.	
Human Resources: N/A	
Equality	
1. No Equality Implication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Equality Implications identified and mitigated	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Equality Implication identified and risk remains	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact on Service Delivery: N/A

What consultations have taken place on the proposals and when?

The Chief Finance Officer has been consulted and can confirm that the additional resources identified within the report could be accommodated from within the Closed Schools Reserve Account but would advise caution in the use of this reserve.
(FD 3864/15)

When a school closes, its balances, whether positive or negative, become the responsibility of the Council. These balances are held in an earmarked Reserve Account to support:

- residual mothballing commitments for closed sites;
- mitigating the Council against any financial liabilities from future school closures or forced academy conversions where the Council would be liable for a closing school deficit;
- strategic organisational changes within the school phase sectors that would improve school outcomes and support the overall long term viability of the Sefton school sectors.

The Closed Schools Reserve had a balance at the end of 2014/15 of £2.3m This is limited funding and if used to support the recommendations in this report, will not be available for other education purposes. Current commitments against this reserve

include the costs of demolishing the former Beach Road school (£0.262m); and costs arising from the possible closure of St Ambrose Barlow Secondary school, estimated to be around £0.550m, which has yet to be decided. There are also serious budget pressures emerging across other schools in both the Maintained Secondary and Primary sector giving cause for concern. Members are therefore asked to exercise caution in the use of this reserve.

The Committee was asked to note that Academies receive Education Support Grant a proportion of which is to fund school improvement activity.

The Head of Regulation and Compliance has been consulted and comments have been incorporated into the report. (LD 3147/15)

Are there any other options available for consideration?

No

Implementation Date for the Decision:

Following the expiry of the “call-in” period for the Minutes of this meeting.

Contact Officer: Mike McSorley
Tel: 0151 934 3428
Email: mike.mcsorley@sefton.gov.uk

Background Papers:

There are no background papers available for inspection.

1. Background

1.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Children's Services) determined to review the performance of secondary education in Sefton given the difference in Ofsted outcomes between primary and secondary schools. The difference in the south of the borough was more marked and of particular concern.

1.2 The scoping document for the review set out the terms of reference and objective as:

To examine the reasons for the disparity between the performance of Sefton schools in the primary and secondary sectors as evidenced by statistics published within Ofsted's annual report 2012/13 on Education, Children's Services and Skills. (These statistics show Sefton as having 94% of primary age pupils attending a "good" or "outstanding" school (in the top 5 L.A. areas nationally), but only 56% of secondary age pupils attending a "good" or "outstanding" school (which is in the lower quartile nationally).

The objective is to understand the Local Authority role in school improvement in the current landscape, the emerging Sefton Education Strategy and the Government's aspiration for a sector-led School Improvement System by 2016.

If possible, to consider and make recommendations to the Cabinet/Council on measures to improve the performance of schools in the secondary sector.

1.3 The purpose of this report is, therefore, to report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee the outcome of the review for agreement and to recommend to Cabinet the actions and resources needed to sustain improvements which have begun to happen since the review began. These are detailed in the report.

2. Review Process and Issues

2.1 The Working Group was set up and met with Officers on several occasions to review a range of information on the performance of schools in Sefton. This included the inspection outcomes for all schools, Department for Education performance data on absence, progress in all subjects and attainment at key stages.

2.2 The Working Group agreed to seek information from the secondary schools on what they thought the key concerns and ways forward were and resolved to meet representatives from the sector to discuss these as part of the review.

2.3 The Working Group also considered a range of comparative data on other local authorities across the region and statistical neighbours, as well as the outcomes from other initiatives such as the London Schools Challenge.

2.4 During the course of the review, updated school data became available and this was shared with and considered by the Working Group.

3. Key Issues and Concerns

3.1 The Working Group identified a number of key issues and concerns as follows:

1. **Inspection outcomes** – the Committee decided to undertake this review because of the number of poor Ofsted judgements in secondary schools over the preceding 12 months and a dramatic reduction in some of the outcomes, particularly in the south of the borough (two schools went from outstanding to special measures at their most recent inspection).

At the time of commencing the review, 94% of primary age pupils attended a “good” or “outstanding” school (in the top 5 L.A. areas nationally), but only 56% of secondary age pupils attended a “good” or “outstanding” school (which was in the lower quartile nationally). Drilling down into the data for secondary schools painted an alarming picture for some parts of the borough and the percentage of pupils attending a good or better secondary school in South Sefton was 28%; in North Sefton 55% and in Central Sefton 81%.

However, despite this picture, the GCSE outcomes for secondary schools in Sefton remained one or two percentage points above the regional and national averages (5 A*-C including English and maths).

2. **Transitions and progress in secondary schools**– there was a general feeling that transitions between primary and secondary schools could be improved, although there was no particular evidence that this was the case. The DfE data did show that the generally excellent progress made by pupils in primary schools was not always continued in secondary settings and this was reflected in some of the poor Ofsted judgements. Progress in maths and English lagged behind the national average, but maths progress is a particular concern, with only 58% of pupils making expected progress against the national figure of 66%.
3. **School improvement resource** – the local authority has statutory duties in relation to promoting high standards in schools and among other providers, so that children and young people achieve well and fulfil their potential as defined by section 13A of the Education Act 1996. This includes support for schools causing concern as set out in Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006. Local authority school improvement services are now subject to a separate inspection by Ofsted. The resource available to local authorities had been significantly reduced over the preceding 5 years due to government policy and austerity measures. In Sefton the school improvement resource reduced from £3.5m to £500,000 between 2010 and 2014.
4. **Government policy** – the policy of the coalition government was for a self-improving school system to be in place by September 2016. This would involve autonomous schools, with academies being the norm (either individually or as part of chains), being responsible for their own improvement, using processes that they choose, and drawing support from wherever they decide.

The government wanted to drive up school standards and introduced a raft of measures and initiatives to facilitate this:

- **changes to performance tables and floor targets** - for GCSE 5A*-C moving up to 40% and for KS2 L4+ in reading, writing and mathematics to 55%;
- a **transformed school curriculum** supported by rigorous assessment and qualifications;
- **initiatives to improve teaching quality** that emphasise school-based learning delivered through Teaching Schools; and
- **the ratchetting up of Ofsted standards** to give a much stronger focus on teaching quality and pupil behaviour. Coasting schools currently rated satisfactory and whose performance has been flat for a number of years are the target.

Officers raised the point that there has been a considerable time lag between reducing local authority resource and the sufficiency and maturity of the alternative model of sector-led improvement through teaching schools to be able to provide the required support.

5. **School funding** – school funding reform changed the way in which schools were funded and meant that funding was allocated on the basis of a nationally prescribed set of factors. Funding is now linked more to pupil numbers and schools with lower pupil numbers generally have less funding to invest in improving standards. In parts of Sefton there are surplus pupil places and this has created an unhealthy competition between schools for pupil numbers and means that collaboration between these schools is sometimes difficult.
6. **Progress and outcomes for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds** – the Committee was presented with data on the KS4 attainment gap between free school meal pupils and non-free school meal pupils. The gap in Sefton was 28.4% in 2014 and although marginally lower than the regional average of 29.5% it is greater than the national average of 26.7%. This is also a challenge for all secondary schools and one which Ofsted look to when they inspect, given the additional pupil premium funding which is given to schools.
7. **Data quality/timeliness** – there is a vast amount of data available to compare the performance of schools. This is all in the public domain via the DfE or Ofsted and much of it is available in a variety of different formats in reports for professionals, parents and governors. The concern was that nearly all of the data was out of date by the time it is publicly available. For example, the DfE KS4 performance tables which use data and outcomes from the 2012/13 academic year were not published until early 2014. There was concern from secondary schools and the Working Group that there was no more up to date data readily available.

4. Actions and Improvements

4.1 During the course of the review a number of ongoing actions were taking place which have contributed to some considerable improvements since the review commenced.

1. **Teaching School Alliances** – a considerable amount of work has been put in by Council officers, schools and collaboration on a regional footprint to develop

a local teaching schools model. Sefton now has four teaching schools; one led by a primary school, two secondary-led focusing on secondary improvement (working together as the “North Sefton Coastal Teaching School Alliance”); and one led by a special school focusing on the improvement and development needs of special schools and supporting SEN in primary and secondary schools. More is said later in the report about how the Council can support these alliances, particularly the secondary school alliance, to draw down external funding and develop a sustainable model of support for schools. There is also an ever-maturing regional network which can be tapped into as required.

2. **Sponsored academies** – government policy is for failing schools to become academies and three secondary schools in Sefton are now sponsored academies. The local authority worked closely with each of these schools to select sponsors with the right track record, capacity and culture to ensure that these schools continued to improve once they became academies.
3. **Sefton’s “Schools Targeted Intervention and Improvement Service”** has been redesigned following on from a number of budget reductions to re-focus on intervention and schools in most need. The service has developed close working relationships with the teaching school alliances and has supported regional working and collaboration. The team work collaboratively with our Ofsted link inspector and have facilitated generic and bespoke training sessions for schools around the Ofsted framework and inspection process.
4. **Schools Causing Concern (SCC) process** – this panel considers reports, data and risk assessments on schools and determines which schools are put on the SCC protocol. The protocol is a vehicle for directing school improvement support to schools which need it. The process is holistic and considers progress, outcomes, leadership, finances, governance, SEN and HR issues. Academies are considered and concerns regarding them are passed to the Regional Schools Commissioner who has responsibility for academy standards.
5. **Family support workers and school attendance** – a common feature of the secondary schools which received poor inspection outcomes was below average levels of attendance by pupils. Discussion with schools identified a range of issues, some of which were beyond the scope of the schools to address and resolve. An innovative way forward was developed with the schools which involved a detailed attendance action plan to affect the culture of schools towards attendance, effectively introducing a zero tolerance approach to pupils being late for school and being late for lessons because of the disruption to the whole class. Schools had identified some of the challenges they faced and the local authority agreed to pilot a number of family support workers based in the most affected secondary schools. The family support workers are linked to the Troubled Families Programme and work with schools and other agencies to unpick the often very complex and challenging circumstances which prevented some young people from attending school regularly. These workers also helped with the integration of pupils back into school when they have been absent for a long period of time.

6. **Virtual Headteacher** – prior to it being a statutory requirement to appoint a virtual head teacher for looked after children, Sefton recognised the need for this post to focus on the outcomes for the looked after children (LAC) cohort. Sefton developed an innovative model by creating a virtual school with a virtual governing body to support the virtual head teacher. The virtual governing body comprises representatives from the local authority, DCS, Cabinet Member and sector support. Government has provided pupil premium for looked after children managed by the virtual head teacher to support the education of looked after children and overcome some of the particular barriers they face. Liaison between social workers and schools has greatly improved and tracking and monitoring systems help the virtual school oversee the educational progress of looked after children.
7. **Specific school interventions** – the local authority has exercised its statutory powers to intervene in failing schools:

Hillside High School

- Change of HT and senior leadership
- Development of school improvement action plan
- Governing Body replaced by IEB selected by the LA
- School leadership restructure
- LA funded Family Support Worker to improve attendance
- Brokerage of support packages identified in action plan
- Working with DfE to convert to a sponsored academy

St. Michael's High School

- Development of school improvement action plan
- LA funded Family Support Worker to improve attendance
- Brokerage of support packages identified in action plan
- Working with DfE to convert to academy sponsored by the Diocese of Liverpool

Savio Salesian College

- Development of school improvement action plan
- LA funded Family Support Worker to improve attendance
- Brokerage of support packages identified in action plan in conjunction with the Archdiocese.

Litherland High School

- Change of HT and senior leadership
- Development of school improvement action plan
- Governing Body replaced by IEB selected by the LA
- School leadership restructure
- LA funded Family Support Worker to improve attendance
- Brokerage of support packages identified in action plan
- Working with DfE to convert to a sponsored academy.

5. Feedback and lessons from elsewhere

- 5.1 **SASH response** – the Working Group met with secondary headteachers and asked a series of questions to which they responded as follows:

Q1 Primary to secondary transitions – how is this done; what makes for effective transition?

Most schools follow similar procedures with the intention of ensuring transition is smooth and progress and learning are not disrupted:-

- ~ Visits by secondary school year 7 co-ordinator and SENCO to discuss pupils transferring with primary SENCO and year 6 teachers.
- ~ Identify most able, those with SEN, CLA, Ever6, vulnerable students, who may require additional support.
- ~ Transfer data, including KS2 outcomes, used to group pupils.
- ~ Pupils put into forms prior to transition day(s) which are intended to be reassuring and ensure pupils are ready for secondary school in September.
- ~ Meetings with new parents prior to transition and early in autumn term to reassure and identify and resolve issues quickly.
- ~ Peer support and summer schools for identified cohorts.
- ~ Madcos, Capital, Southport Learning Partnership etc. all discuss primary/secondary curriculum developments on a regular basis.
- ~ Shared 'best work' across from primary to secondary.
- ~ Secondary staff teaching and co-teaching primary classes.
- ~ Secondary taster lessons.
- ~ Sports partnership.

Q2 Role of parents and families in supporting pupils and the school – what impact does this have?

A concerted effort is made to build relations on both a formal and informal basis, especially with 'hard to reach' families.

- ~ Parents may be signposted to outside agencies for additional support or offered parenting classes.
- ~ Formal activities include information events to explain the curriculum, marking policies etc. and to show parents how they can support their children.
- ~ Use of parent portals.
- ~ Most schools employ a team of support staff to help parents, including home visits.
- ~ Regular contact with parents including Parentmail, e-mail and newsletters.
- ~ Form Tutors and Heads of Year/House establish good relationships with families.
- ~ Focus on early intervention and preventative work.

The impact varies from extremely effective to minimal.

Q3 Use of data, self-evaluation and progress monitoring – how is this done?

Schools believe they use data effectively and have accurate and insightful systems for self-evaluation and progress monitoring.

A wide range of data is captured including:-

- o Attendance
- o Punctuality
- o Behaviour

- Reading ages, literacy, numeracy
- CATs
- Attitudes to learning
- Rewards
- Attainment
- House points
- RAISEonline, FFT and transition matrices are used. Transition matrices, in particular, are used to monitor the progress of individual children.

Mid-year entrants can be more difficult to settle.

Schools hold regular reviews with middle leaders which result in action/improvement plans.

Governors monitor school improvement.

Schools work collaboratively and employ external quality assurance.

Q4 *What would help to improve school performance?*

An authority-wide SIP with a proven track record who has headteachers' trust and respect.

Q5 *Does competition amongst schools have an impact on the way schools work together/performance?*

Falling rolls mean that there is inevitably competition for a diminishing number of students and this is worsened by the opening of new schools. However, schools in Sefton do work collaboratively.

Q6 *How should we develop a school-led system of improvement?*

Through a geographically accessible, secondary-led Teaching School Alliance.

Q7 *If you are an academy, what help, if any, are you receiving from the Department for Education?*

- Sponsorship, capital maintenance funds and bids.
- Discussions re. performance.

5.2 **Regional school improvement network** – under the auspices of the Northwest Association of Directors of Children's Services, a regional school improvement network has been established. The purpose of the group is to provide a North West sector-led approach to improvements in the area of school improvement and the wider education agenda. This group has been valuable in sharing learning and best practice amongst Authorities. Sefton has been able to draw on the expertise of all local authorities in the region as part of this process.

5.3 **Peer challenge process** – as part of a sector-led approach to improvement, Sefton was involved in a peer challenge process around the issues of school standards, inspection outcomes and the way forward. Sefton has been able to have challenging discussions about the concerns raised by the Committee and based on peer experience, some ways of tackling them. The relevant elements have been included in the recommendations for this report.

5.4 **London schools experience** – whilst the London Schools experience was virtually unique and benefitted from significant additional resource, there are a number of lessons from the success of this project which are portable and can be applied elsewhere. These include:

1. The importance of data and data literacy – up to date data and high quality data analysis is key to powerful accountability and well targeted school improvement resource. Effective use of educational data is a key instrument for improvement. It is even more important in austere times to ensure scarce resource is efficiently and effectively targeted.
2. Developing a Culture of Accountability – high performing schools are characterised by a culture of performance and accountability. The importance of data and performance metrics in enabling dialogue and challenge about effectiveness at every level in schools, academy chains and local authorities.
3. Practitioner-led intervention and professional development – supporting greater accountability in the use of outstanding practitioners (National Leaders in Education (NLEs), Specialist Leaders in Education (SLEs), National Leaders in Governance (NLGs), teaching schools etc. to improve performance. Sector-led improvement driven by the sector, with imposed top-down intervention used as a last resort.
4. Strong Leadership – shared and collaborative leadership and system leadership by all stakeholders, political leaders and policy makers, school leaders and governors and individual leadership in the classroom. This involves transformational leadership driven by moral purpose and translated into effective leadership action through challenge, support, recognition, development of exceptional talent, and taking responsibility for change to deliver success.

The conclusion of a review into the London schools experience was that there is no ‘magic bullet’ for school improvement but that it is a combination of initiatives which together make a difference.

6. **Recommendations for continued improvement**

6.1 **Summary of improvements to date:** the situation in Sefton secondary schools has improved since the Committee commenced its review and whilst the GCSE outcomes are still broadly in line with regional and national averages, the inspection outcomes have improved. The most recent report showed that 71% of secondary pupils now attend a good or outstanding school. Although the figures have improved due to inspection, they also reflect the fact that the new sponsored academies are classed as new schools and, therefore, do not have a current Ofsted grading (until they are inspected after 18 months). There is still a significant journey ahead and as well as the work and interventions highlighted in the report above which will continue, there are some key actions, detailed below, which will consolidate improvements made to date and drive further improvement in school standards going forward.

6.2 **Adopt the Education Strategy** – Committee received a presentation on this at the meeting on 31 March 2015 and the full document formed part of another report on the agenda for its meeting on 22 September 2015. The strategy is intended to define education in Sefton through a common vision, how important

education is and how we will all work together to make sure all pupils in Sefton get the best possible education.

To achieve this vision the strategy identifies the following five key priorities:

1. Ensure good leadership and governance across all educational settings in Sefton
2. Ensure that barriers to participation and progress are addressed
3. Ensure children are ready for school and to move on to the next stage of their lives
4. Ensure that all settings and pupil progress are at least good
5. Ensure young people leave education with the skills and opportunities to continue achieving.

The strategy sets out why these priorities are important, how they will be achieved and how this will be monitored.

- 6.3 **Create an Education Partnership Board** – this was included in the presentation to the previous meeting of the Committee and will be the group which owns the strategy and will be responsible for its implementation. There is currently no forum for bringing together representatives of all of the different groups and sectors.

The Sefton Education Partnership will play a key role in implementing our shared vision and delivering the key aims. The Partnership will build on and enhance existing working relationships in the education sector and will be an autonomous organisation accountable to the whole education community in Sefton.

Membership will reflect all of the key stakeholders and will include the Lead Member for Children's Services (Cabinet Member – Children, Schools and Safeguarding) and the Director for Children's Services.

The full membership is proposed as:

- Lead Member for Children's Services
- Director of Children's Services
- Chair of SASH
- Chair of SAPH
- Primary school representative
- Secondary school representative
- Special School Representative
- Early Years representative
- FE representative
- Chair of Sefton Governors' Association
- Representative from the Liverpool Archdiocese
- Representative from the Diocese of Liverpool
- Higher Education representative
- Employers' representative
- Representative from Training providers.

- 6.4 **Support the Teaching School Alliance** - to ensure immediate impact and ongoing sustainability, the secondary teaching school alliance needs some initial

pump priming funding. The immediate need is for resource to support secondary schools around leadership, English, mathematics and narrowing the gap for pupils from deprived backgrounds. The proposal is for the local authority to provide funding from the schools contingency fund for two years as set up funding to pump prime the secondary teaching school alliance. During this time, the alliance will work towards becoming self-funding through external grant and traded income from schools.

- 6.5 **Create a Dedicated Data post** – the need for better data gathering and interpretation will be critical to the success of the above strategies. The lessons from the London Schools project, feedback from other local authorities and the Peer Challenge process indicate that this is vital to timely intervention and efficient deployment of resource. The proposal is to create a dedicated post to perform this role for a period of two years with a view to it becoming self-funding in conjunction with the teaching school alliances. This post will involve working with LA departments and schools to analyse a range of pupils' data and outcomes and create timely reports for all LA and schools stakeholders.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 Sefton has a Central Closed Schools Reserve which has been accumulated over the years from the balances of schools which have been closed and this currently stands at £2.3m. There are commitments against this resource in 2015/16-2017 of around £0.812m, and Members are asked to note the comments made within the consultation section of the report above, regards the possible future pressures on this funding. Notwithstanding, Members are asked to consider the use of £250,000 from this Reserve to fund the initiatives indicated in 6.4 and 6.5 above, as these could be accommodated within the funding available. Such a decision however would reduce the level of the contingency for supporting possible budget pressures going forward.

- 7.2 The detailed breakdown is as follows:

1 Data Analyst Post Indicative grade F £20,253 - £22,937 per annum

Maximum total for two years £45,874

2 Leadership Support: External SIP (School Improvement Partner)

Under 5.1 above, Q4, schools reported that an Authority-wide School Improvement Partner (SIP) with a “proven track record who has headteachers’ trust and respect” would improve schools further. Using current Ofsted grades, it is suggested that pump-priming would enable:

- Schools currently judged good or better (10): one visit per term
- Schools currently judged less than good (9): two visits per term.

A review of cost charged by Sefton and other LAs would suggest that £500 per day is the going rate.

Maximum total for two years £84,000

3 Subject specific Support

Under a true system-led model for school improvement, existing school staff would be deployed to support those in other schools. Whether they are Specialist Leaders in Education (SLEs) that have been through an assessment and accreditation process, or middle leaders in schools, the daily rate would be similar. Currently, teaching schools are charging £350 daily rate for SLEs (costs agreed with the Learn and Lead partnership of nine Merseyside and Cheshire local authorities). As Sefton's recently-accredited teaching schools develop their offer, they will be able to appoint SLEs for English and mathematics. For schools currently judged good or better (10): one visit per term from an English SLE and a mathematics SLE would cost £21,000 per annum. Schools currently judged less than good (9), the two visits per term per SLE would cost £37,800 per annum.

Total for two years £117,600

- 7.3 Given that academies receive school improvement funding directly from Government, it is expected that the teaching school Alliance will negotiate contributions from academies to offset some of the above cost.
- 7.4 Similarly, teaching schools can bid for funding for school improvement through the National College and it is anticipated that there will be some external funding which will support the model and potentially offset some of the cost.
- 7.5 The Teaching School Alliance will need to develop the model into a traded service which is fully funded through charging schools and external income within a two year period when the pump priming funding comes to an end.

8. Summary and Conclusion

- 8.1 The School Performance Review has been an extremely challenging one for the Committee given the range and complexity of the issue, the wealth of information presented to the Committee and the inter-relationship and interaction of a wide range of factors.
- 8.2 The position has evolved since the Committee began their review following intervention in failing schools.
- 8.3 The proposed way forward is based on the local input from the Committee and the secondary sector as well as feedback from the regional peer challenge process and national initiatives.
- 8.4 The review proposes a range of initiatives which will provide a strategic direction for education improvement, governance oversight and monitoring. In addition, there are initiatives to deliver focused school improvement support where most needed and a suggested delivery model which is funded (subject to Cabinet approval) and sustainable (subject to achieving schools buy-in).
- 8.5 It is suggested that the Committee should ask Officers to report back annually on school improvement (when the DfE publish their validated data report in the New Year) and on the implementation of the initiatives outlined in this report.