

ASSESSMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE TOPIC REVIEW

* -sections to be filled in by the proposer of the topic

***Subject of Proposed Review:-**

Pupil Premium - narrowing the attainment gap for Kent's vulnerable learners

***Reason for the Review:-**

(see Note 1 below)

To review performance standards
Issue highlighted via previous review
County Council priority

***Issues to be covered by the Terms of Reference:-**

Impacts of Pupil Premium in Kent at every stage - is it doing well for vulnerable learners?
How is it spent and is it value for money?
Has it been used to support children who need it most?
Is it closing the attainment gap in Kent?
How is the evidence collected/collated?
Is FSM (Free School Meals), reliant on parental input/economic factors/funding etc. a reliable way to identify those who would benefit?

***Scope of the review:-**

All schools for data analysis
Identify and focus on schools that significantly outperform national standards

***Purpose and objectives of the Review:-**

Identify impacts of Pupil Premium in narrowing the gap for Kent's vulnerable learners
To identify successful best practice in order to share with others to narrow the attainment gap for vulnerable learners.

Proposer of the review- (Please print name and sign)

SHELLINA PRENDERGAST

S. Prendergast

To be completed by the Directorate/Cabinet Member(s)

Are there any reasons why this review should not be put forward for inclusion in the work programme for 2017/18? (see Note 2 below)

No. This Select Committee is timely and will contribute to the national focus on Vulnerable Learners.

Theresa May, in June 2017, reinforced the national priority of securing higher levels of social mobility by stating: "I want to make Britain a country that works for everyone.....when it comes to opportunity we won't entrench the advantages of the fortunate few. We will do everything we can to help anybody, whatever their background, to go as far as your talents will take you."

How will the review contribute to corporate objectives and priorities?

KCC's Strategic Statement 2015-20 'Increasing Opportunities, Achieving Outcomes' has three strategic outcomes at its core. CYPE is the Directorate responsible for achieving the outcome 'every child and young person in Kent gets the best start in life'. In order to achieve this outcome, CYPE's Vision and Priorities for Improvement details the priorities and targets for improvement, which have been built in partnership in schools and other stakeholders

The stark contrast in learner outcomes requires an urgent prioritisation of the support for vulnerable learners in Kent in order to ensure that the aspirations 'Vision and Priorities for Improvement' 2017-20 are achieved.

Accordingly, one of CYPE's key strategic priorities in 2017-18 is to narrow the achievement gaps, particularly for vulnerable learners. This Select Committee provides us with the opportunity to review our 'Vulnerable Learners Strategy' which has at its core the objective of narrowing achievement gaps and promoting greater social mobility.

A key policy has been the introduction of the Pupil Premium (currently worth £58m in Kent), with the expectation that this funding will be used effectively to raise attainment for pupils who are eligible for free school meals and thereby close achievement gaps between these pupils and their peers. The Pupil Premium has promised much but so far in has delivered relatively little improvement in Kent and nationally. CYPE is focussing on this challenge and the Vulnerable Learners Strategy is our vehicle to move this agenda forward in Kent in a more significant and joined up way.

How will this review have an impact on KCC policy development and/or help to influence national policy?

It will support:

- The continuing focus on improving outcomes for vulnerable learners, particularly pupils with SEN, Children in Care and children's eligible for Free School Meals.
- It will enable us to determine the extent of the gaps, assess where progress is being made, and why, where additional focus is needed and what will make the difference. This data analysis will be longitudinal and enable an assessment against comparable neighbours.

- A focus by schools and other public agencies supporting schools, on vulnerable learners to ensure more effective, targeted support and investment for intervention programmes, including Education Endowment Foundation projects that reduce the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers, more rapidly.
- The relentless ambition of all senior educational leaders in Kent to ensure good progress and high expectations for vulnerable learners to achieve better outcomes in narrowing the attainment gap at pace.
- The identification and dissemination of good practice in schools and strategies that are having some impact in narrowing achievement gaps and promoting greater social mobility.
- The growing body of knowledge of 'What Works' in diminishing the differences between disadvantaged pupils and their peers.

How will this review add value to the County Council and residents of Kent?

Education is the greatest opportunity young people have to achieve life-long benefits. At present these benefits are greater for some and far too limited for others, often through no fault of their own.

Improving outcomes for vulnerable learners has been a priority for a number of national bodies and government departments. Sutton Trust research reveals the current state of low social mobility in the UK and the disproportionate representation of the most affluent in our universities and professions. The economic cost of this inequity to the country, and the impact on the life choices of young people, is considerable unless change occurs.

KCC, as champion and advocate for children, young people and families, aims to ensure there is a high quality range of support, and opportunities, to enable vulnerable learners to become confident individuals, effective communicators, successful and responsive citizens, to remain healthy and to achieve the educational and life outcomes which they deserve.

The Vulnerable Learners Strategy brings together in one document all the actions we are taking in partnership with schools to improve outcomes for vulnerable and disadvantaged children and young people.

This Select Committee Review will add weight and focus to inform the Strategy moving forward.

Does the review need to be completed within a specific timeframe? If yes, please give details:

Any additional comments from the Portfolio Holder/Corporate Director:-

Portfolio Holder's Signature:-



Corporate Director's Signature:-pp Patrick Leeson

Contact Officer:- Patrick Leeson	Date:- 25 August 2017
---	------------------------------

Notes

Note 1 - Possible reasons for the review

1. Key public issue, identified by
 - Member contact with constituents/member surgeries
 - Contact with key representative bodies/forums
 - Media coverage – Public interest issue covered in local media
 - Focus groups/citizens panels
2. Issue highlighted via previous reviews
3. Issue recommended to another body e.g. Cabinet, Scrutiny Committee, a Cabinet Committee, Directorate or an external body.
4. Poor performing service i.e.:-
 - High level of complaints/dissatisfaction with service
 - Performance standards poor/below target – (evidence from PI's or benchmarking)
 - Identified through external review/inspection (OFSTED/Audit etc)
 - Budgetary overspends
5. Key reports or new evidence published
6. County Council priority
7. Central Government priority/New Government guidance or legislation published

Note 2 - Possible reasons why a review should not be added to the work programme.

1. Issue being examined by
 - Cabinet
 - Scrutiny
 - Officer Group
 - another internal body
 - an external body
2. It has been the subject of a topic review by other Councils from which details of best practice can be obtained.
3. New legislation or guidance expected.

4. **NB:** Before suggesting that a review should not be included in the work programme the following should be considered:-

Could consideration of this issue 'add value' without causing unnecessary duplication, for instance by:

- i) Looking at this issue in conjunction with another group,
- ii) Through appropriate timing of the topic review,
- iii) Through considering another group's findings rather than duplicating the same/or similar activity.