

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

SELECT COMMITTEE - PUPIL PREMIUM

MINUTES of a meeting of the Select Committee - Pupil Premium held in the Stour Room - Sessions House on Tuesday, 21 November 2017.

PRESENT: Mrs L Game (Chairman), Mrs C Bell, Mrs P T Cole, Mrs T Dean, MBE and Mr J P McInroy

ALSO PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr G Romagnuolo (Research Officer - Overview and Scrutiny), Mrs K Goldsmith (Research Officer - Overview and Scrutiny), Mr A Ballard (Principal Democratic Services Officer), Stephanie Broom (Appeals Team Administrator) and Ms L Adam (Scrutiny Research Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

16. Ashley Crittenden, Headteacher, West Borough Primary School
(Item 1)

1. The Chairman welcomed the two guests; Ashley Crittenden and Paula Martin to the Select Committee meeting and invited all those present to introduce themselves.

2. Ashley Crittenden explained that she had been the Headteacher at the West Borough Primary School for the past 11 years over which time the school had gone from struggling with numbers to being full and oversubscribed. This year the school had been asked to take on an addition class of children due to the need within the local area. The addition of a nursery attached to the school had helped service and support a socially deprived area. The school was passionate about their children and wanted every child to achieve well and have a positive outlook of school.

3. Paula Martin made the Committee aware of her role as the Assistant Headteacher and the schools SENCO. Her role also covered responsibilities for children with additional needs, Pupil Premium, attendance and student and family support.

4. The Chairman asked for comments on how vital the early years of education were. Ashley Crittenden explained that the nursery had grown from the changes - being more flexible with the hours offered to parents. This had led to the nursery becoming full and had benefitted from a highly qualified teacher leading the provision with SENCO experience. It had become essential to tap into families at an early stage and with a children centre attached to the site, they could work in partnership to identify needs for the transition period for moving into school. They also had children eligible for the early years Pupil Premium which

formed part of the school's overall strategy although it did not see them as two separate entities.

5. The Chairman requested a breakdown of the nursery's early years Pupil Premium. Ashley Crittenden informed the Committee that they had only just been allocated the funds and the overall Pupil Premium budget was £143,800 and of that £1,500 was for the early years Pupil Premium. Some of that money was identified for children with sensory issues and funded a new sensory room.

6. The Chairman enquired how the Pupil Premium had been used as some schools use it on an individual basis with others using it for the school as a whole. Ashley Crittenden commented that funds had be used to benefit the many at the school and children were tracked to help identify any barriers they might have had. They also looked at what had worked well and those that had measurable impacts on children so a decision could be made whether to continue. Paula Martin commented that it was looked at as a whole school picture; they identified the needs of the children across the school and looked at it through pupil progress meetings.

7. The Chairman asked whether making the parents motivated and interested made a difference when deciding on how the money was to be allocated. Ashley Crittenden gave an example of when Pupil Premium was first introduced some of the things the money had been used for were still continuing. The main concern was for the wellbeing of the child and parents; money could be allocated to simply allow the child to get to school on time and have a breakfast. The school carried out workshops for those parents on areas such as phonics and maths. The school had a Pupil Premium champion and one of the areas that had been identified were children not reading at home, and they were now working closely with parents on how best to support them. Other areas of success had been employing a behaviour and safeguarding manager and their role was to ensure behaviour within the classroom were exemplary within a conducive environment. Through the Pupil Premium funding they had been able to second a teacher to look at the schools behaviour policy and change the approach across the school with making children more aware of their own responsibilities.

8. The Chairman asked if the school involved early help. Ashley Crittenden stated that they had a Family Liaison officer and there had been a shift from previous years in terms of how help had been requested. In the past it had been the school approaching the parents to see if they could benefit from any early intervention or help but now families were coming to the school directly. There was an ethos within the school for parents to feel comfortable in asking for help.

9. Mrs Bell commented that there were thirty eight languages spoken at the school and asked how this was managed and whether the Pupil Premium was used for communication? Ashley Crittenden stated that it was very varied and there had been a shift in the community as they were now seeing a larger pool of Eastern European families. The school had become specialist in knowing what good practises to use for children with addition languages. The school had a teaching assistant who had been able to support teachers and there hadn't been many children who had been eligible for funding through the Pupil Premium.

10. Mrs Cole asked whether more money for the early years in nursery would be beneficial; and what key aspects had helped the school such as the Sutton Trust Tool Kit. Ashley Crittenden responded that in terms of staffing they were now stable. Over time they had worked hard to engage with families by meeting them on an individual basis through home visits prior to them starting the nursery/reception. This helped build a good level of understanding around expectations at the school and would often lead to questions around entitlement to any additional funding. When universal free school meals were introduced the school suffered as not many parents applied. The school therefore adapted their admission booklet and requested a national insurance number and date of birth to be provided. This allowed staff to check the child eligibility for free schools meals and if they were eligible, additional support could be provided. Making parents feel comfortable that the school was a positive place through regular meetings went a long way to provide good relationships. Ashley Crittenden felt that a good working partnership with the school governors was paramount as they could tap into the governor's knowledge and experience to hold the school to account. The governors would regularly monitor Pupil Premium through meeting three times a year. The Committee were informed that in relation to early years, it was difficult to say if more funding would have made a difference due to the flexible hours that children attended.

11. Mrs Dean commented that the school had used the Sutton Trust tool kit and wondered what interventions they had not found effective. Ashley Crittenden had stopped using 1-2-1 tutoring as she found the majority of children worked better within a group situation or mixed ability groups.

12. Mrs Dean asked for comments on virtual schools and the difficulties these may have for looked after children. Ashley Crittenden stated that they did not have any looked after children but both herself and Paula were designated leads along with three other trained teachers. One of these teachers would be specifically for Looked After Children.

13. Mrs Dean asked for further details about the specialist staff appointed for behaviour and what their role was. Ashley Crittenden explained that it had originally been under a secondment for a term and they had spent the term watching and talking to children and families to see what was working and what constituted good behaviour. Launching a new behaviour system along with the core values, it allowed children the responsibility for their own behaviour. She would be available at play/lunch time and would spend time with children who were struggling within the class room and help them with re-integration. There had been children at risk of exclusion - which she worked with – resulting in exclusions reducing to zero. Due to the overall success of the role, new responsibilities had been taken on such as attendance role which had links with behaviour.

14. Mrs Dean made reference to the school being well resourced and asked how it had been achieved. Ashley Crittenden commented that as a school they were careful on how they spent their budget, a large amount went on staffing who they valued and allowed to progress. The school building had been brought up to

standard and previously funds were allocated to converting an old shelter to a music room which benefited the whole school.

15. Mrs Dean enquired how many children had passed the Kent Test to which Ashley Crittenden confirmed 29 sat it with 45% passing.

16. The Chairman enquired whether the Sutton Trust tool kit was recommended to which Ashley Crittenden commented that they valued it and used it as a reference.

17. The Chairman questioned to what extent had the Pupil Premium funding been effective in narrowing the attainment gap between vulnerable children and their peers. Ashley Crittenden confirmed that it had been very effective when accessing an additional £140,000 which was a significant amount of money and had allowed them to access resources such as the behaviour and safeguarding member. It was also very important to acknowledge that the attainment was cohort specific.

18. Mrs Bell enquired if the Pupil Premium had helped close the gap in terms of results. Ashley Crittenden confirmed it had - as the previous year their Pupil Premium children in Key Stage 2 cohort out performed in comparison to all other children nationally.

19. Mrs Dean enquired how they raised the standards for those schools who were not achieving. Would schools clustering be a good strategy? Ashley Crittenden stated it would be interesting to see how that school worked with other schools already as that was often the barrier. Kent had provided a good tool kit which the school had accessed, and they would have been able to purchase someone to come into the school to do a Pupil Premium check to see what was working. As a school they had always been open to new ideas and have to adapt to change.

20. The Chairman thanks both Ashley Crittenden and Paula Martin for their valued input into the session and for answering Members questions.

17. Viki Butler and James Brooke, Vice Principals, The Canterbury Academy
(Item 2)

1. The Chair welcomed the Select Committee Members and the two guests: James Brooke and Viki Butler to the Select Committee meeting and she invited all those present to introduce themselves.

2. James Brooke and Viki Butler gave members a printed handout presentation which is appended to these minutes.

3. James Brooke explained that the school had expanded 3 years ago with its sixth form now up to 600 students. With the changed curriculum and splitting sides with Chaucer, Riverside and Phoenix House, the school have been able to

increase timetable to 6:00pm with twilight lessons becoming available for sixth form.

4. The Chair asked the location of Canterbury Academy within the City. James Brooke explained that they were an Academy trust along Kent Medical Needs School that's under Kent County Council, Canterbury primary, a nursery school, high school and sixth form with lifestyle fitness and the Kent Adult Education on site.

5. A member commented on whether the school was for students all the way through till leaving education. James Brooke explained that the Chaucer school closed years ago and the site was taken on to get the community back. Barton Court were to be moving on site in a few years so they'd need to find an alternative site for sixth form and some students with learning needs.

6. Q. Is there a separate unit or unit specialist in Autism?

A. Since changing under Kent County Council to have provision for Speech and Language needs, there has been registered interest for ASD in primary schools to continue and for it to continue in secondary to combine for independent ASD.

7. A member commented on the closing and retracting of schools in the area and because the school offer so much in sixth form, how were they managing.

8. James Brooke explained that a few years ago they had looked at staffing of teachers to become more flexible on the timetable so that they could work till 6pm for twilight teaching. James Brooke mentioned that vocational learning was linked to Simon Langton Girls and Boys Grammar School in order to support teaching and to work with their staff. James Brooke mentioned that they are fully inclusive and flexible as 60% of students are from other schools that have left year 11.

9. Viki Butler explained that the school attracts students which is why they are successful. KS4 in particular were students decide what subjects they want to do and can be provided with support, courses and opportunities.

10. Q – Are you an Academy trust?

A – Within the trust: Canterbury Primary School, City View nursery and Wincheap Primary, which have their own DFE number. Canterbury high school and the sixth form also are DFE registered under multi-Academy. All centres are separate and a decision was made to not permanently exclude children in area since 2011. James Brooke confirmed the idea being that if a child was naughty, they'd find alternative provision to get the support that they need.

11. A member asked if students would remain in the PRU.

12. Viki Butler explained it wasn't the case because of reintegration, which meant that students can go back in mainstream in year 10 or 11 and equally the

success is reintegrating into sixth form. They have a bespoke curriculum on site such as Hair and beauty, construction or a catering college.

13. James Brooke explained that if a student isn't getting their needs being met in mainstream then they give them 5 week respite provision and will remain on the school roll. The school would take it from statistic point of view to give the child a decent education and wrap around support which is needed

14. A member commented upon looking on the schools website for GCSE's and A level results and if they do 'I' GCSE English and maths? In response, James Brooke stated it was back in 2016.

15. Q- are there lots of children doing qualifications onto A level?

A- In 2016 it was the last year 'I' GCSE's were available for year 11 students and that in 2016 'I' GCSE was deemed a qualification that would count on the league tables. In 2017, every school and child had to learn from the new specification from the Department of Education which grades from 9-1. In order for a child to count on statistics, they had to do the new maths and English qualification.

16. A member commented on what was an I GCSE

17. James Brooke explained that it was a GCSE ran by Cambridge

18. Members commented on what was the 9-1 grading.

19. James Brooke explained that every child has to do 100% in their Maths, English Literature and Language exam whereas under the old format they could've done 60% English and 40% coursework. James Brooke mentioned that it was a different entry to sixth form being in November, February and June. James explained that if a child had failed at grade C in 2016 in the I GCSE they could've been part of sixth form via the old specification, however a child entering a year later would have to sit the new curriculum exams.

20. Q- Do you think the new system is exam based, harder for pupil premium children?

A- The new exam structure is more challenging for all students. There are some Pupil Premium students that are bright and academic & who will manage the new system. Pupil Premium students but should dealt with on a case by case basis as children have different needs.

21. James Brooke discussed with members the 4 pillars they follow and that they believe every child is good at something and to find their talent. James Brooke explained how sports play a huge role in rebuilding children and sixth form progression. It was confirmed by James Brooke that the school was oversubscribed with a PAN of 210 but were working with 220 and 225 in most year groups. The school has links with the Phoenix house and Grosvenor PRU and work with the high school and primary in the East Kent area.

22. Members were referred to page 2 of the presentation which explained the Chaucer site and the provision there for sport and performing arts. James Brooke explained that the sixth form is catered for with practical learning activities.

23. James Brooke explained that Canterbury Academy and sixth form required improvement from their October 2015 OSTED report, so went back to basics and stripped their leadership and management in terms of teaching and learning. James Brooke explained that the Department of Education and OFSTED asked the school to carry out an external review in 2015. An executive Headteacher in Kent came to the school to provide clear areas of development, progress and attainment.

24. Referring to the review, Viki Butler explained how they track and monitor their spending. The school created a provision map that could be shared with shareholders, OSTED, parents and directors of the school to review the allocation of finances.

25. It was confirmed that the allocation of money depended on the need of the child; adopted, military child or with free school meals. This review was carried out three times a year to understand if there were inconsistencies of spending and has been tailored to hold staff accountable for spending money.

26. Viki Butler explained how children who were disadvantaged could access the curriculum and the school could employ additional staff to work with small groups of 4 and 5 children. Breakfast club, after school club alongside English and Maths are tailored to the needs of children to create a bespoke programme of support.

27. The difficulties that are an ongoing challenge are the persistent absences of Pupil Premium children that are not at school so cannot learn and the main focus. 70% of students that would attend the clubs would like to be Pupil Premium. With homework and breakfast club being available provides wrap around care and supports the vulnerable learners to engage in the expectations of the setting.

28. Viki Butler explained the introduction to the 2nd year of using the PASS survey were all mentors and head of year could look at their students on the computer programme to provide support. Less than 35% of the school body makes up Pupil Premium which is well above the national average. It ranged from children in care, free school meals, adopted and military children.

29. It was confirmed that it can become difficult for the school to rely upon parents of adopted children to declare and provide information in order for the school to put into place provisions and support for that child.

30. James Brooke referred to the data and outcomes within the presentation. The school presents the data 3 times a year to directors and stake holders. A teacher's appraisal depends on the report of disadvantaged and non-disadvantage students where their progress gap is no greater than 15% between students.

31. Members were referred to the top of page 6 and James Brooke explained the outcomes on how the data analysis has been positive between the progresses of Pupil Premium students and non-Pupil Premium at the end of KS2, being above the National Average across the UK.

32. James Brooke explained that KS3 data is done in a similar table for subjects in KS3 and SK4, with a clear breakdown on progress of students in classes and year groups. James Brooke explained that year 7 made good progress and should be making two sub level grades per academic year.

33. Teachers will gather data of 20 students who are underperforming to provide support and if additional teaching assistants are required. James Brooke explained that the school is deliberately over staffed in English, Maths, Science and Humanities. Children underperforming are taken off timetable for intervention. In addition, drop down days were at the end of term so that it would not affect the students learning. Purple pens were used to identify the students own strengths and weaknesses from assessments.

34. James Brooke referred members to page 7 regarding the KS4 data that's presented to OFSTED highlighting the breakdown of Pupil Premium students and non-Pupil Premium students. James Brooke commented on the dip between 2016-2017 resulting in the new specification of maths and English.

35. Members were referred to page 8 of the presentation highlighting students that didn't achieve grades. James Brooke explained that since 2011 they haven't permanently excluded students but placed them into Riverside or Phoenix house instead.

36. A member commented on the dismissal of permanent exclusion by stating that schools in Kent may do the same. James Brooke confirmed that this was how they'd support their students as 66 of their students were disadvantaged being above national average. James Brooke explained that progress is priority and teachers will be aware of their students' needs and to look at strategies.

37. Viki Butler explained the schools collective trends, improvements and the success across the Academy within primary and secondary. The school identified parental engagement to overcome barriers to put provision in place for learners. It was confirmed that funding was used to support Pupil Premium students through coaching and engaging families to understand their views and challenges. Achievement for the programme was to bring parents back on board and engage.

38. A member referred to OFSTED at a local primary that weren't helpful but had hoped that the support would continue for Canterbury Academy. The use of KELSI was noticed and the Member asked Viki Butler to comment on how the money was spent, primarily if it was on year 11 or across the school.

39. In response, Viki Butler explained how they recognised in 2015 that they could be doing more to support year 9, 10 and 11.

40. A Member commented that parental involvement should be encouraged with a view to talk to parents who do not understand the curriculum.

41. In response, James Brooke confirmed that the traditional evening meeting that took place twice a year was discarded and replaced with 1:1 evening meeting once a year. There needed to be more tools and prompts for parents to support their children with their homework, revision and exam busters. The schools biggest priority for students was to make sure they have a positive destination post 16. Students will come in with different needs and life scenarios and some students have come in as part of the specialist resourced provision.

42. The Chair asked if there was anything the Kent County Council could do to help improve? Viki Butler commented that the support continues because if there was to be a budget cut then those vulnerable learners would be lost because there wouldn't be the money or the staff to continue to offer amazing support.

18. Sue Beauchamp, Head Teacher, Two Bridges PRU, serving Tonbridge, Tunbridge Wells and South Sevenoaks
(Item 3)

Sue Beauchamp (Head Teacher, Two Bridges Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)) was in attendance for this item.

The Chair welcomed Sue to the Committee and declared an interest as her grandchild attended a Pupil Referral Unit.

Sue began by explaining that she was the Head Teacher of Two Bridges Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) which served Tonbridge, Tunbridge Wells and South Sevenoaks; she had previously been a Senior Leader in three secondary schools in London and the North West Kent PRU. She reported that she had been the Head Teacher of the Two Bridges PRU since 2014 and had brought together Key Stages 3 & 4 and moved the unit to a temporary and then permanent purpose-built site which was fit for purpose and made the students feel valued.

She stated that Two Bridges ran a primary intervention programme for students in Key Stage 1 & 2 across 75 primary schools which the unit charged for. Two Bridges also supported all local secondary schools and worked with Key Stage 3 students, who spent 14 weeks at the unit, before reintegrating to mainstream school which the unit did not charge for. The school also supported up to 40 Key Stage 4 students in Years 10 & 11 whilst they completed their GCSEs before transitioning to college or apprenticeships; the unit invoiced the schools of the Key Stage 4 students for the £575 and £900 Pupil Premium. The unit had an average of 105 – 110 students over the academic year but only had 60 students on dual roll at any one time.

Q – If a student is eligible for pupil premium, does the unit receive it directly?

Sue explained that the unit had a dual roll with the school from which the student had been referred from. The school received the pupil premium funding and the unit invoiced the school.

Q – How do you spend the pupil premium?

Sue reported that 47% of students were eligible for Free School Meals; from the students who attracted pupil premium funding, the unit received approximately £12,000 a year. She provided the Committee with a report which detailed the interventions to support pupil premium students. The interventions included:

- the use of the pastoral manager to provide additional tutoring and transition support;
- the provision of attendance support to help students settle in by collecting them from home during their induction period and providing early morning calls;
- the use of Alfiesoft to identify gaps in learning on arrival to the unit
- the use of resources to support SEND students;
- the purchase of sports equipment and food tech resources to promote a healthy lifestyle;
- visits to socially related experiences such as the Globe Theatre London, Tonbridge castle, Art Galleries and most recently Tonbridge School for a Harry Potter experience.

Sue stated that in terms of impact, the provision of attendance support and engagement with students and their families had improved the attendance of Free School Meals students from 67-70% in a mainstream school to over 80% in the unit; the unit's overall attendance had been 90.2% in the previous academic year. She reported that all Year 11 students in the previous academic year had moved onto a college or apprenticeship after completing their GCSEs with the unit. She noted that 88% of students received 5 passes in GCSEs grades A –G. The unit was working to reduce the attainment gap between its students and their mainstream peers; there was currently a two grade gap but the unit was aiming to reduce it to 1.5 by the end of the year and ambitiously down to a single grade gap going forward.

Q – Do you use the pupil premium funding as a whole?

Sue explained that if the funding was used as a whole and allocated proportionally. If the unit bought a resource used by all students and 40% of those students attracted pupil premium funding then 40% of the cost of the resource would be paid through the pupil premium funding. She noted that there was a risk of missing opportunities or not achieving best value if the funding was individually targeted.

Q – Should the criteria for Free School Meals be broadened?

Sue stated that the students of families who did not quite qualify for Free School Meals were the most challenging; often one or both of the parents/stepparents were in work and had minimal contact with the student. She reported that whilst it was difficult for the unit to develop a relationship with these parents, staff were happy to meet them later in the day if more convenient. She noted that students from affluent families where both parents worked long hours, and were not always available to support them, faced similar difficulties.

Q – How do you support your students to get them into college or apprenticeships?

Sue noted that in addition to the strategies outlined in the pack, students used the Lexia programme to improve their reading skills; students required a reading age of 14 for GCSEs. The programme demonstrated to students that by doing tasks little and often made a difference to their learning. Students grades improved from 1-3 to 5 which enable them then to go onto college. Sue explained that all the courses that students do at Two Bridges School have a pathway into college. She would not allow a course to go

ahead if it does not have both progression and transition possibilities into college or work.

Q – Are schools doing enough to support students to stay in mainstream education?

Sue highlighted the West Kent Learning Federation which provided a positive forum for schools to discuss potential referrals and creative ways of making learning engaging for students. She noted that the unit's primary outreach programme had been very successful and enabled school staff to implement effective strategies, such as Forest School, within their own mainstream schools.

Sue noted that when she first started at Two Bridges, there was only one female student in Key Stage 4 in comparison to 45 boys; 40% of the students are now girls.

She stated that schools were invited to come and visit the unit and see the interventions provided which had resulted in an improvement to the referrals made by Head Teachers. In addition the mainstream schools are represented on the management committee of Two Bridges which ensures the school understand which students are most appropriate to refer for this support.

Q – What issues bring students from grammar schools to the unit?

Sue explained that students from grammar schools were high ability but often had drug, rather than family, issues. The unit worked with charities such as the Kenward Trust and Addaction to support them and, where appropriate, encourage students to make a contract with the unit about their drug usage.

Q – Do you work with Challenger Troop?

Sue stated that the unit had previously worked with Challenger Troop but had decided to end the contract as the military ethos did not always work with students especially where Primary Head Teachers had identified that the military ethos could not be applied in their schools.

Q - How do you support students to transition?

Sue reported that staff help students to find a course and assist them with their application form. The unit only provided subjects which had a pathway for further study at college such as food tech, sport and small animal care. Most Year 11 students left with 5 – 7 GCSEs. and all had September guarantees and took up those places.

Q - How have you made your school outstanding?

Sue noted that an Ofsted inspection was due; in advance of this the unit's management team had confirmed her judgement that the unit was outstanding. She gave three key reasons for this judgement. The first was her passion and drive for improvement. The second was the staff who were the most hardworking that she had ever worked with; candidates were invited to a trial day at the unit before being invited to interview. Thirdly the premises were fit for purpose and created a welcoming environment for students.

Q – What can KCC do to improve the effectiveness of the pupil premium?

Sue highlighted a successful scheme whereby new teachers from Bennett and Mascalls Schools visited the unit for the day which had been positively received; it made staff aware of the unit and challenged their preconceptions. She stated that it was important that interventions to enable children to remain in school should be built into training

programmes. She noted the societal impact of students going onto college and the work market.

She suggested that KCC should open up apprenticeships specifically for pupil premium students; it was even more difficult for students who had not followed a traditional education path to access these. She noted that she had employed a former student to work with younger students before they started an apprenticeship. She reported that the unit helped students prepare for work experience and apprenticeships by providing clothes or information about what to wear and taking them on visits in advance so that they knew where to go.

Q – How do you encourage schools, particularly academies, not to make inappropriate referrals?

Sue stated the importance of schools working together in a forum to consider referrals and carrying out strategic planning. She noted that her staff were working with the pastoral team at Hayesbrook School to suggest interventions to be implemented and tested over six –eight weeks before a referral was considered. She noted that a number of areas, such as Swale and Maidstone, had moved away from such collaborative forums to a different system where each school was allocated a number of places at a PRU each year and allocated students to these places as and when they felt appropriate.