

CABINET

15 November 2016

Title: Education Strategy 2014-2017 and Schools' Annual Performance Review 2015/16	
Report of the Cabinet Member for Educational Attainment and School Improvement	
Open Report	For Decision
Wards Affected: All	Key Decision: No
Report Author: Jane Hargreaves, Commissioning Director Education	Contact Details: Tel: 020 8227 2686 E-mail: jane.hargreaves@lbbd.gov.uk
Accountable Director: Jane Hargreaves, Commissioning Director Education	
Accountable Strategic Director: Anne Bristow, Strategic Director Service Development and Integration	
Summary The report reviews performance in relation to the two overarching objectives of the Education Strategy 2014-2017 – outcomes in national tests and examinations and Ofsted judgments. It sets out key actions and proposals to meet these objectives and maintain a strong family of schools in the context of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Council's ambition and aspiration for further raising outcomes for the children and young people who live here• National policy as set out in the March 2016 White Paper 'Educational Excellence Everywhere' Central to this is a proposal to develop a School Improvement Partnership with local schools. This would help them to take on some of the functions set out in the White Paper and support the drive to improve outcomes for all the children and young people of this borough.	
Recommendation(s) The Cabinet is recommended to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Note the performance against the overarching objectives within the Education Strategy 2014-17, as set out in section 2 of the report;(ii) Endorse the priorities for 2016/17 as set out in section 3 of the report;(iii) Reaffirm the Council's commitment to continuing the strong partnership with all schools in the Borough to achieve the best possible outcomes and opportunities for children and young people;	

- (iv) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Service Development and Integration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Educational Attainment and School Improvement, to progress the proposals for a School Improvement Partnership between the Council and the Borough's schools; and
- (v) Note the performance of schools in national tests and examinations as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

Reason(s)

Supporting the best possible outcomes for children and young people is central to the Council's vision and priorities. Working together as a family of schools, in partnership with the Council to share objectives and actions, makes the best use of the capacity of schools to support others and collectively improve outcomes for children and young people.

1. Introduction and Background – Education Strategy 2014-2017

1.1 In November 2014, Barking and Dagenham schools and the Council agreed the Education Strategy for 2014-2017. The two overarching objectives for education are:

- for all of our children and young people to have a place in a good or outstanding school or early years setting; and
- for them to have the best possible life opportunities by the time they leave school with reaching national and then London averages as key milestones.

1.2 This report reviews performance in relation to the two main objectives of the strategy and updates Cabinet on key developments in the local and national context over the past year. It proposes a response to the White Paper proposals which will both support schools and help maintain and continue the improvements in outcomes for children and young people.

1.3 Performance is reviewed annually by headteachers at their summer conference and priorities are agreed for the coming year. This is in the context of:

- i) a growing borough with a new secondary school – Greatfields – opening from 1 September 2016, Goresbrook School opening its secondary provision and Eastbury Community and Eastbrook School opening primary departments in new buildings
- ii) continued growth in numbers, with particular pressure on schools' funding from the growth in numbers of children and young people with high needs;
- iii) An Education White Paper which:
 - a. Sets out a timescale for a fully academised system by 2022; and
 - b. Further limits the Education duties and powers of the Director of Children's Services by removing duties relating to school improvement;
- iv) new primary and secondary testing and assessment and a further increase in expectations for achievement in Key Stage 2 and GCSE.

2. Performance

2.1 This section sets out performance in relation to the two main objectives.

Objective 1 - A place in a good or outstanding school or early years setting for every child and young person

2.2 At 31 August 2016 the proportion of schools judged good or outstanding was 86%, -1% above the national average for the first time, with 7 schools moving from requires improvement to good. Performance was still below the London average of 89% but the gap is closing. We have an ultimate target of 100% of schools good or better with the 90% target for 2016/17 as the next milestone.

2.3 There were 11 full Ofsted inspections in 2015/16. After very heavy inspection activity between 2012 and 2014 of over 80 inspections and HMI visits, the last two years have seen a lighter level of inspection.

2.4 Table 1 below shows the schools which were inspected between September 2015 and July 2016 and the outcomes.

School	Previous	Latest	Comment
Southwood Primary	3	2	
Beam Primary	2	2	Outstanding leadership recognised
Godwin Primary	3	2	
Monteagle Primary	3	2	
Parsloes Primary	3	3	
Dorothy Barley Infant	3	2	
Village Infant	3	2	
Ripple Primary	3	2	
Dagenham Park CofE	3	2	
Eastbrook	3	3	Good leadership
Tuition Centre/Alternative Provision	2	3	

Key

1 = Outstanding

2 = Good

3 = Requires Improvement

4 = Inadequate

2.5 Overall 2015/16 has seen solid improvement in Ofsted inspection outcomes with a group of schools which had worked in strong partnership with the local authority moving from Requires Improvement to Good. The quality of leadership is key to improving schools and was recognised as Outstanding in Beam Primary and Good at Eastbrook even though the overall judgments remained the same as their previous inspection.

2.6 The Alternative Provision/Pupil Referral Unit arrangements were inspected in June and judged Requires Improvement from a previously good judgment. The Alternative Provision includes provision for excluded pupils, and some pupils on the

edge of permanent exclusion from mainstream school, home tuition and the attendance unit and oversight of some college placements. Much of this provision is strong and changes have been made to strengthen leadership in the weaker area of provision to address the recommendations. A monitoring board is in place to oversee rapid improvement.

- 2.7 Currently 6 schools with inspection judgments are judged Outstanding. This has not changed over the course of the year. Whilst inspectors are recognising and giving credit for outstanding leadership it is proving very difficult on the new tougher framework to make inroads into our target of 20% or 12 schools judged Grade 1 – Outstanding overall.

Objective 2 – Exceeding national standards and then London standards

- 2.8 Summer 2016 saw a strong set of primary results across all age groups. The 2016 assessments for 7 and 11 year olds were the first which assessed children against the new more challenging national curriculum introduced in 2014. As a result of these changes figures for 2016 are not directly comparable with previous years. Barking and Dagenham's performance improved in relation to schools nationally and in London in most areas. Most notably by the end of the primary phase, our 11 year olds are in line with London for the first time on the new headline indicator. Headline results for each age are set out below:

Primary

- Early Years Foundation Stage (age 5) – the percentage of children achieving a good level of development is above national for the second year running.
- Key Stage 1 (age 7) – Barking and Dagenham children are above national in reading, writing and mathematics.
- Key Stage 2 (age 11) – This is a particularly strong set of results with Barking and Dagenham children above national and in line with London for meeting the expected standard in all areas except reading which is a shared priority for improvement. In all areas apart from reading, performance is above national for the proportion of children working at a higher standard.

Secondary

- **Key Stage 4 / GCSE results** – The new Progress 8 measure was published for the first time this year as a key performance indicator which tracks the progress of all pupils. It will be used by the DfE as the main indicator for intervention by the Regional Schools Commissioners. The local authority performed strongly on this indicator achieving a Progress 8 score of 0.16, in line with London and above national.
- For the A*-C in English and mathematics measure overall LA results have increased by 3% to 59% and remain in line with the national but below London. In English the A*-C improved by 4% to 76%, 6% above the 2016 national (70%). Results in mathematics also improved to 64%, 1% below the 2016 national (65%). There has been a significant improvement in the performance of the higher attainers with the A*/A in English increasing by 5% to 18% (2016 national 10%). Maths has also seen an improvement in A*/A of 1% to 18% (2016 national 19%). The EBacc has risen by 2% to 22%, closing the gap to the 2016 national average (23%) to within 1%.

- **Key Stage 5 / post 16 school results** – While early national A Level pass rates have remained similar to last year there has been a rise of 2% at A*-C to 78% which has moved in line with the national for the first time. A*-B remains unchanged at 47% but the A*-A has fallen by 1% and the gap to national remains stubbornly challenging. However, the overall improvement in higher grades and the increased number of entries means that higher numbers of students have the opportunity to study at the more competitive universities.

2.9 The performance of groups

2.9.1 2016 performance data for different groups is currently only available at KS2. Headline attainment for all groups was strong with most significantly above the national and none significantly below. However, progress made by pupils with SEN and those entitled to free school meals (FSM) was below the national and remains a priority for improvement. Data for other Key Stages will become available during the course of the autumn term.

2.10 Looked After Children

2.10.1 As Corporate Parent the Council has a particular responsibility to support and promote the best possible outcomes for children and young people in its care. One of the mechanisms for doing this is through the Virtual School. The early results are set out below. Results for Looked After Children are provisional until 31 March 2017 when cohort numbers are finalised.

2.11 KS2 Results

2.11.1 This year's cohort of students was smaller than last year at 18 compared to 25. It is a stable cohort of students with only one student arriving during the academic year. The KS2 test results show that 63% of eligible students met the expected standard in Reading, Maths and Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling (GPS).

KS2	% Met expected standard - National	% Met expected standard – all LBBDD	% Met expected standard – LAC LBBDD
Reading	66	64	63
Writing	74	79	Not yet available
Maths	70	76	63
GPS	72	77	63
Combined	53	57	63

2.11.2 31% of Year 6 students have a statement of special educational needs which is up from 22% last year. 7 pupils were educated in borough (40%) including 1 student in a maintained special school. Of the other 11 students, 8 were in maintained out of borough schools (45%), 1 received tuition via the Virtual School (5%) and 2 were in Independent residential placements (10%).

2.11.3 This is a very pleasing set of results as all students who had achieved level 2 (expected level) at the end of KS1 went on to meet the expected standard at KS2. In addition to this, 2 students who had achieved a mix of levels 1 and 2 at KS1 met the expected standards.

2.12 **KS4 Results**

- 2.12.1 The official validated results for looked after children at GCSE are published in April 2017 when the cohort is fixed. Of the unvalidated results that we have received so far for the eligible cohort, 20% of students have achieved A*-C in both maths and English - the new headline performance indicator 33% achieved A*-C in English and 26% in Maths.
- 2.12.2 This was a smaller cohort of students than last year. There were 47 students (compared with 57 last year) with 20 students arriving during KS4. Of these students 3 were unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC), who have English as an additional language. 30% had an EHC plan compared to 36% last year. Of the 47 students 16 were educated in borough, 13 of whom were in mainstream education, one had home tuition, 1 was in alternative provision and 1 was in a special school. Of the 29 students educated outside the borough, 21 were in mainstream education, 2 received home tuition, 1 was in a secure unit and 4 were in independent schools.
- 2.12.3 Students were supported in various ways by the Virtual School, including 8 students receiving 1:1 tuition, mainly for maths and English. The advisory teachers supported students with poor attendance, poor attainment and those at risk of permanent exclusion by setting up alternative provision, specialist mentoring and various online support packages.
- 2.12.4 There was a high level of need and mobility within this cohort of students. Some students had a range of vulnerabilities including mental health issues. While the results as a whole could be seen as disappointing as we haven't managed to close the gap to all children, there are some results which stand out. One student who achieved below average results at KS3 went on to achieve 9 GCSEs grade A*-C. Another student who attended 5 different secondary schools achieved 2 C grades for English language and literature and a D in maths. This has enabled her to go on to sixth form to take the course of her choice.
- 2.12.5 Some key priorities for this academic year are to support more students using 1:1 tuition, to get unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC) into an appropriate educational placement as quickly as possible, to reduce fixed term exclusions by working closely with schools and foster carers and to improve attendance at KS4.

2.13 **Post 16 Participation**

- 2.13.1 From 1 September 2016 the main headline measure of performance changed to a combined measure of those not in education, employment and training (NEET) and unknown. The headline figure for the November to January average % of 16 or 17 year olds who are NEET or not known between 2015 and 2016 fell by 1.2% to 8.5% compared with a national fall of 0.9%. From June 2015 to June 2016 participation for this age group rose by 0.6% to 90.4%. An increase of between 32 and 144 young people in education, employment and training is needed to reach the national and London averages respectively. Over the same period, not-known's fell to 189 (3.5%) which was below the London average of 3.7%. Improving performance in this area remains a priority.

2.13.2 In 2014 the number of young people progressing to university increased by 56 (7%) to 853 with 170 (20%) of these young people winning places at the more competitive top third of universities. In 2015 the number going to university dropped slightly to 837 reflecting the smaller numbers leaving in Year 13 in schools but the proportion of these going to top third universities increased to 22% or 185 students.

3. Priorities for 2016/17 and beyond

3.1 The core priority is to maintain improvement towards the target of all schools at least 'Good' with an increasing number 'Outstanding'. Particular areas of shared focus continue to be primary reading, secondary maths, supporting potential high attainers and those with SEND.

3.2 Alongside this is supporting the Council's ambition for all of its young people as set out in its response to The Growth Commission. The following four areas have been identified as ones where the Council can use its resource and influence to support schools and young people.

- Recruitment and supporting retention of teachers and school leaders
- Driving community ambition and aspiration – helping families to support successful outcomes for their children
- Supporting more young people to go to Higher Education at 18+
- Increasing participation in Education Post 16 – reducing NEETs and securing pathways to employment for young people

3.3 A major priority for most schools is how they respond to the March 2016 Education White Paper. This also has particular significance for the Council and its ambition for young people. Section 4 below sets out a proposed response.

4. Responding to the March 2016 White Paper – Educational Excellence Everywhere

4.1 Since the publication of the Education White Paper in March 2016 headteachers and governing bodies have asked the Council to support them in responding to the two main proposals:

- Moving to a fully academised system by September 2022 with most schools in multi-academy trusts (MATs);
- Removal of local authority duties and powers for schools improvement in favour of schools having sole responsibility (with consequent removal of the Education Services Grant).

4.2 The new administration has supported the overall direction of the White Paper, but has indicated an easing of the timescale and a willingness to explore models for how schools and local authorities might work together to support school improvement.

4.3 For both strands there is a strong will across schools to work with the Council to plan a sensible and measured approach, which as far as possible supports the local family of schools continuing to work together for the benefit of all children and young people.

Moving towards a wholly academised system

4.4 Local Authority advice to schools is as follows:

- Do not rush – take time to explore and understand the options and their implications
- Choose your partners wisely; do not be isolated and test out the partnerships before taking irrevocable steps.

4.5 Headteachers have requested local authority support for the intelligence gathering and a road map has been drafted to include meetings, presentations and surgeries for those wanting to find out about academy status.

The removal of local authority powers and duties for school improvement in favour of schools having responsibility

4.6 The Cabinet member and officers have listened to headteachers and governors, and looked at how other councils with similarly strong partnerships with schools are responding. As a consequence of this the local authority has developed a proposal to help schools to take on the school improvement function and duties of the Council, through the creation of a formal school-led school improvement partnership – a legal entity.

4.7 It is recommended that the Council should bring forward options for the future that will continue to drive school improvement. This could include mechanisms for:

- Sharing performance data;
 - Brokering school to school support where it is most needed;
 - Maintaining access to a small pool of trusted school improvement professionals for external support and challenge;
 - Oversight of any resources which are shared – such as through Schools' Forum;
 - The partnership needs to start modestly and focus on its core purpose.
- However, the structure would be in place for it to develop and take on additional services in a phased way as agreed by schools and the Council.

4.8 There are a number of ways in which this could be achieved but experience elsewhere suggests that to be successful in the future schools must play a pivotal role.

5. Options Considered

5.1 **Do nothing and try to maintain current arrangements** – This is no longer viable option. If the Secretary of State's proposals are enacted, then both duties and the Powers of the Director of Children's Services (DCS) will be removed. As it stands the DCS has no school improvement powers over academies. Under these circumstances maintaining current arrangements is unlikely to be either viable or to have any impact.

5.2 **Cease school improvement arrangements** – This is an option, but likely to be a high risk one whilst there is still much to achieve in terms of schools' and the Council's ambitions for all its children and young people. The current school

improvement arrangements have demonstrable impact and are supported by schools of all types.

- 5.3 **Move to trading on a fully commercial basis** – This is an option which may be viable. Maintained schools currently get a core service free. Some academies pay for core school improvement from the Council. Increasingly all schools will need to purchase more of their school improvement support as the Government moves to a fully academised system with local authority duties and powers removed. What this option does not do is support schools to take on the leadership of school improvement across the local family of schools.
- 5.4 **Set up a formal school improvement partnership with schools on a legal basis to take on core school improvement functions and maintain a collective responsibility for improving outcomes for all the children and young people who are educated here** – This is the proposed option for the following reasons:
- i. It allows all schools, community faith based, academies and free schools to be a member so no one needs to be isolated;
 - ii. It supports schools to take on the leadership of school improvement in a phased and supported way; and helps to avoid fragmentation;
 - iii. It allows the Council to continue to work with all schools who choose to join.

There are a number of ways of achieving this and these need to be further explored jointly with schools over the next few months in order that the authority and schools can take informed evidence based decisions about the best future arrangements.

Appendix 2 sets out a high level diagram of the partnership.

6. Consultation and Development

- 6.1 The Cabinet Member and senior officers have been talking informally with headteachers about the White Paper since its publication. Views have been sought at headteacher meetings and at their annual conference.
- 6.2 Governing bodies are also being asked for their views about in principle support for a formal legal school improvement partnership at their Autumn term meetings. Informal soundings indicate general support for the principle and a willingness to be involved in the developments.
- 6.3 Following Cabinet's decision it is proposed to work with a group of headteacher representatives, alongside Council officers and external support to further shape and develop the proposals. A consultation event for headteachers and governors will be held in January and governors asked to consider the proposal at Spring term Governing Body meetings.
- 6.4 Cabinet will be asked to agree the final proposal in Spring 2017.

7. Financial Implications

Implications completed by: Katherine Heffernan (Group Manager Finance and Investment)

7.1 There are two main financial risks:

- i) The use of the removal of school improvement statutory duties as a reason for the removal of the Education Services Grant (even though these are only a proportion of the Council's statutory duties for education).
- ii) The move to a national funding formula, now delayed until 2018. It was announced in July that the second phase of consultation would be delayed until Autumn 2016 and a new funding formula delayed until 2018. Key risks for these two measures are:
 - an overall reduction in funding available to schools in Barking and Dagenham;
 - the separation of the Schools' Block from High Needs and Early Years Blocks – both of which are under pressure – removes the potential to vire between blocks and leaves the risk squarely with the Council;
 - a new Central block within DSG that will include the residual ESG. There are likely to be increased restrictions around the level and nature of Central expenditure which poses a risk to the centrally retained element of the DSG Schools' Block (IRO £1 million supports the Community Music Service, Trewern and Advisory Teachers);

7.2 Educational Services Grant in 2016/17 is £3.4m and the DfE have announced their intention to reduce this to around £0.6m funding within Central Block DSG by 2018/19. The DfE have indicated that there will be an element of transitional protection to reduce the loss of grant in 2017/18, but no further details have been received to date. The full extent of the cuts and changes to DSG funding will not be known, probably until Autumn 2017.

7.3 Shortly after the July MTFs update report was presented to Cabinet, the Department for Education announced further changes to the Education Services Grant. The MTFs had already assumed a reduction of £1.4m for 2017/18. However, following announcements made in Summer it is likely that all of the Education Services Grant will be cut from 2017/18. The DfE will be transferring £0.6m of the grant to the Dedicated Schools Grant which will effectively ring fence this grant solely for the purposes of Education. The DfE have indicated that there will be an element of transitional protection to reduce the loss of grant in 2017/18, but no further details have been received to date.

7.4 In LBBD's budget, ESG is treated as a corporate funding source and is not specifically ring fenced to education. A reduction of £1.4m in ESG has already been built into the MTFs. To mitigate the transfer of £0.6m into the DSG, corresponding income from the General Fund for statutory education expenditure will be also transferred into the DSG. The net impact of these changes is a further grant decrease of £0.8m to the Council General Fund which is being managed as part of the overall MTFs.

- 7.5 Despite the reduction in national funding some level of investment in School Improvement at least in the early years of the model is likely to be needed if the Council's ambitions are to be achieved.
- 7.6 However these proposals aim to manage the impact of the reductions and mitigate funding risk as far as possible over the medium term by putting in place a structure and model which:
- i) encourages schools to take collective responsibility for key resources;
 - ii) starts modestly and can grow as required;
 - i) can accommodate a mix of duties commissioned by the Council and schools' funded activity.

8. Legal Implications

Implications provided by Assaf Chaudry (Lawyer – Corporate Legal)

- 8.1 The report sets out the Council's response to the challenges of the March 2016 White Paper and has proposed a setting up of an Improvement Partnership as a legal entity. The Council has powers to participate in a range of legal entities with partners. There are a number of ways of achieving this.
- 8.2 Local Authorities have the following powers to participate in external bodies

Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972

The *section 111* power was introduced to improve the discharge of functions and enables the authority:

....."to do anything (whether or not involving the expenditure, borrowing or lending of money or the acquisition or disposal of any property or rights) which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of any of their functions.".....

This power permits the Council to participate in and even establish separate entities, provided the particular action is not prohibited in any other enactment, and the Council is of the opinion that doing so will improve the discharge of the particular functions.

Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 (the general power of competence)

The general power provides that "A local authority has power to do anything that individuals generally may do" (section 1(1)).

The power is not limited by the need to evidence a benefit accruing to the local authority's area, as the well-being power is. Nor is it limited in geographical scope. However, existing and future restrictions contained in legislation continue to apply. The restrictions and limitations will have to be considered in some more details when the option is refined.

- 8.3 The Council is presently considering a number of legal entities including:

Companies limited by shares

The most common form of company used in practice is a company limited by shares. A company limited by shares can either be a private company or public company.

Companies limited by guarantee

Companies limited by guarantee are normally incorporated for non-profit making functions. A company limited by guarantee has many of the same characteristics as a private company limited by shares.

Charitable Interest Organisation

This is a new type of corporate style vehicle. It has a simplified regulatory system in that it is only regulated under Charities Commission

Community Interest Company (CIC)

This is a limited liability company designed for social enterprises that wants to use its profits and assets for the public good. A CIC has the specific aim of providing a benefit to a community and must use its income, assets and profits for the community it is formed to serve.

A CIC can be structured as either a company limited by shares or by guarantee, but it must satisfy a community interest test.

- 8.4 Subject to the consultation and options assessment legal services may need to revise the legal implications. The council has the experience and capacity to set up and manage the legal processes of setting up an improvement company.

9. Other Implications

- 9.1 **Risk Management** – Risks are two-fold – both financial from anticipated national cuts and to the Council's ambition for improved outcomes for young people – from the removal of school improvement duties for councils. See section 5 above for mitigation of financial risks. Re the risk to outcomes this is mitigated in two ways:

- i) through the proposed school improvement partnership – which seeks to maintain a collective responsibility for outcomes, including for the most vulnerable, across the family of schools. It places the current expertise of local authority school improvement advisers directly at the service of schools to support continued improvement;
- ii) through a Council sponsored programme of the four priority work streams to support schools in their core business of improving outcomes for children and young people.

There will be a further examination of risks as part of the options appraisal.

- 9.2 **Staffing Issues** – In order to minimise risk to the new partnership it needs to start modestly, with few a short-term or seconded posts. Education has adopted a prudent approach to school improvement staffing in recent years, including buying in ad hoc support for core work. Staff and professional associations have been briefed on the broad proposals for education. The detail and implications for individuals will be worked through with them over the coming year.

- 9.3 **Corporate Policy and Customer Impact** – The proposals represent an important opportunity to improve outcomes for all children and young people in the face of considerable risks from national policy – particularly to more vulnerable individuals and groups. The actions to maintain a family of schools working in partnership with the Council, with a collective focus on safeguarding the interests of all children and

young people in the community attempts to mitigate the risks which come from a schools system which is at once fragmenting and centralising.

- 9.4 **Safeguarding Children** – As set out in 7.4 the proposals aim to mitigate some of the risks to vulnerable children and young people from the removal of school improvement duties and move to a fully academised system.
- 9.5 **Health Issues** – As set out in 7.4 the proposals aim to support collective responsibility for children's wellbeing. To date there has been strong support for schools for promoting health for example by schools' forum support for school games coordinators and by high levels of success in the Healthy Schools Programme. A schools' led school improvement vehicle forms the best chance of maintaining any collective support for health.
- 9.6 **Crime and Disorder Issues** – As set out in 7.4 above the proposals aim to support a collective responsibility for children and young people. Relations with the police are generally positive and the secondary schools value highly the community police officers based in their schools. Any model which maintains the family of schools is likely to have benefits for joint work to prevent crime and disorder.
- 9.7 **Property / Asset Issues** – There are no immediate property issues. As the proposals develop, accommodation will need to be considered and potentially the future of the Trewern Outdoor Education Centre which is owned by the Council.

Public Background Papers Used in the Preparation of the Report:

- **Assessment and Reporting arrangements 2016**, Early Years Foundation Stage, Key Stages 1 and 2. <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/standards-and-testing-agency>
- **School performance Tables 2016 Statement of Intent**. This explains the measures that will be included in the official DfE tables published in the Autumn term: http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/performance/download/Statement_of_Intent_2015.pdf
- **The Ofsted Inspection handbook September 2016** refers to how data are used as part of inspection, particularly paragraphs 76 – 79 on pages 24 – 25: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-from-september-2015>
- **DFE Statistical data:** <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-education/about/statistics#latest-statistical-releases>

List of appendices:

Appendix 1 Summary of results Summer 2016

Appendix 2 School Improvement Partnership model