

Rutland County Council Education Strategic Plan 2015-18 (outline)

DRAFT OUTLINE

Version: v1 280815

Based on vE

File: *Education Strategic Plan Outline v1 280815*

Contents

1. Purpose	3
2. Context: past and present performance.....	3
2.1 Schools, Settings, Adult Learning Performance Analysis	3
2.1.1 Early years settings' review.....	3
2.1.2 Schools' Review.....	3
2.1.3 Statutory Inspection Review	3
2.1.4 Academic Performance Summary Review	3
2.1.5 Adult Learning Performance Review	5
2.2 Service Performance Review	5
2.2.1 School Improvement Impact Review	5
2.2.2 Whole Service Review.....	5
3. Vision.....	7
3.1 Emerging elements of the vision for education.....	7
4. Priorities.....	8
4.1 Whole learning system priorities	8
4.1.1 WHOLE SYSTEM PRIORITY ONE: RAISE IMPACT THROUGH CONNECTEDNESS – OUTSIDE RUTLAND- INSIDE RUTLAND	8
4.1.2 WHOLE SYSTEM PRIORITY TWO: RAISE IMPACT THROUGH WHOLE SYSTEM LEADERSHIP ..	8
4.2 Whole education service priorities	9
4.2.1 EDUCATION SERVICE PRIORITY ONE: RAISE IMPACT ON VULNERABLE LEARNERS THROUGH INTELLIGENT, REFLECTIVE PRACTICE	9
4.2.2 EDUCATION SERVICE PRIORITY TWO: RAISE INFLUENCE ON LEARNING PROVIDERS	9
4.2.3 EDUCATION SERVICE PRIORITY THREE: RAISE THE SENSE OF DIRECTION AND INVOLVEMENT	9
5. Strategic Actions	10

1. Purpose

The Education Strategic Plan indicates the intentions of the Council to improve the provision of education in Rutland from 2015-2018. It takes into account the broad context of current performance and the Council's ambitions for the future. The Plan indicates what the Council intends to do in order to achieve its ambitions.

The Plan is a living document. It is regularly reviewed and updated in the light of context changes and progress towards targets.

2. Context: past and present performance

2.1 Schools, Settings, Adult Learning Performance Analysis

2.1.1 Early years settings' review

Statutory inspection gradings of settings (not including childminders) are as follows: Outstanding 10; Good: 23; Requires improvement: 3; Inadequate: 1.

Outcomes in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile are good and improving. In 2015, 75% of children gained "Good Level of Development" (GLD); 15% above national average.

The GLD for disadvantaged children has risen from 41% to 66%, however, this is 9% lower than the LA average for all children.

GLD gap disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged children: 9%

2.1.2 Schools' Review

Rutland schools are either state (21) or independent (3). Of the state schools, 12 are academies and 9 are LA maintained. Of these, 4 are expected to become academies in 2015-16, possibly more. A free school will open in autumn 2015, offering post 16 selective education.

All secondary schools are academies. One secondary school also operates Rutland County College (RCC). Approximately 20% of pupils in the three secondary schools opt to continue learning at RCC. The remaining 80% make options elsewhere.

2.1.3 Statutory Inspection Review

Current schools' gradings are as follows: Outstanding: 4; Good: 12; Requires improvement: 5.

Predicted gradings, based on the new OFSTED framework (effective September 2015) and current Education Services' knowledge of schools are: Outstanding: 1; Good: 14; Requires improvement: 4 (of which 2 are at risk of inadequate; Inadequate: 2.

2.1.4 Academic Performance Summary Review

(Analysis from early years to end of KS2 is based upon performance to 2015. At KS4 and above, analysis is based upon performance to 2014.)

Year 1 phonic assessment rose to 81.6% (8% above 2014 national average).

A more detailed analysis of schools' and settings' performance is available from Education Services. The detailed analysis is presented to the Education Performance Board in late autumn each year.

Phonic gap PP and non-PP children: 3%.

KS1 results show a continuing gentle rise in reading, writing and mathematics compared with previous years. This has remained between 1% and 4% above (“significantly above”) national average over the last four years. In the key benchmarks the following apply:

Level 2b+ 2015: Reading - 85%; Writing - 74%; Maths - 84%.

Pupil Premium gap: Reading – 13% below non-PP; Writing – 21%; Maths – 15%.

KS2 results show a rise in 2015. In the previous two years, attainment in L4 (reading, writing, maths combined) were below the national average (6%; 8% below, respectively). At 83% in 2015, this is a rise of 12% over the previous year and almost 4% above the national average (2014). The gap between PP and non-PP children is lower than at KS1. In previous years, this indicator showed Rutland to be substantially below national averages.

Level 4b+ 2015: Reading – 82.1%; Writing – 88.3%; Maths – 79.3%.

Pupil Premium gap: Reading – 10.1% below non-PP (12% national gap); Writing – 6.6% (16% national gap); Maths – 8.6% (13%).

There is substantial variation in and between primary schools. Achievement of expected progress by pupils varies between 50% and 100% both within and between schools.

KS4 results to 2014

Free schools meals children in cohort ranged between 9% and 16% across the three schools.

Key indicators show a fall in outcomes at KS4 in 2014, despite remaining above national averages. Results in 5 GCSE A*-C including English and maths: 62.7% (56.6% national). This shows barely any improvement since 2011 and a substantial fall in 2014 from the 2013 position (8.1% above national average).

The gap between disadvantaged pupils and others is greater in Rutland than in England in general and growing. On this key indicator, the gap between PP and non-PP pupils rose from 21% in 2012 to 49.4% in 2014 (national figures: 26%; 27%, respectively).

Girls outperform boys substantially. On this and other indicators, girls performance was 14% higher than boys. Boys were 1% above the national average for boys; girls were 6% above.

The performance gap for children with SEN is wider than the national average. The gap between pupils with SEN and those without in 5 A*-C including English and maths is 48% (45% nationally).

There is considerable variation in and between schools, as shown over the last five years. In this indicator, one school’s performance varied more than 18 percentage points over 12 months. The difference in performance of children between schools was as great as 23 percent. In one school, English results in 2014 were in the lowest quartile whilst maths and science outcomes were in the top quartile. During the same year science was in the lowest quartile in one school whilst in the highest quartile in another school.

The level of overall improvement is low and inconsistent. Over the four year period to 2014 no school has sustained a pattern of more than 5% improvement in this key indicator and one school has declined by 5%.

Post 16 results within Rutland have shown improvement but are below average. About 20% of Y11 students from Rutland secondary schools continue post 16 in Rutland County College. The results have shown a gentle improvement. Average points score remains slightly below national average.

Provision post 16 and curriculum choices post 14 are a cause for concern. The curriculum options available within Rutland post16 are limited and substantial numbers of students opt for both academic and vocational study outside Rutland. Some young people may make study choices that are not in their best interest at age 14 and then at 16.

2.1.5 Adult Learning Performance Review

Learner outcomes are good in adult education – as confirmed by OFSTED in the 2015 inspection. Success and completion rates are significantly above national averages. No significant differences are found between the achievements of different groups of learners.

Provision is made in partnership with Peterborough College. Having gained “good” in its inspection, the service may now offer a wider range of training options. Outcomes and efficiency have improved.

2.2 Service Performance Review

2.2.1 School Improvement Impact Review

An internal overall evaluation of the impact of interventions by the School Improvement Section over the last 12 months indicates:

- 6 primary schools have moved from the “red” category to “amber”.
- 4 primary schools have moved from “amber” to “green”.
- 4 primary schools have remained “green”.
- 2 primary schools have remained “red”.
- 1 primary school has moved from “green” to “amber”.
- 2 secondary schools have remained “amber”.
- 1 secondary school has remained “green”.

2.2.2 Whole Service Review

In preparation for the Education Strategic Plan, the Education Services undertook a whole team review. The key findings are as follows:

- **The quality of early years provision overall is high** and the support for settings is considered by settings to be of good quality.
- **Adult learning has faced a major reconfiguration** and relocation following its OFSTED judgement as “requiring improvement” 18 months ago. The service gained “good” in its OFSTED inspection in summer 2015. This has included outsourcing the Adult Skills Budget in partnership with Peterborough Regional College.

The full analysis is available from the Education Services.

Green: outstanding/

Amber: good

Red: RI/inadequate

- **School performance is very variable** and even the larger schools show considerable oscillation. Very small schools are particularly susceptible to variation.
- **A substantial number of schools are underperforming** (and some early years settings). Some of these have shown either little/slow improvement or have been unable to sustain improvement once support has been concluded.
- **Skills and knowledge levels are high** across the Education Services generally. However, retention of staff has been low.
- **Processes for most services are in place.** However, a number of services currently outsourced need review, e.g., governor services, or establishment, e.g., organisational services (pupil place planning, education structure planning).
- **The impact of LA services is growing but needs to increase**, e.g., school improvement, SEN, especially on underperforming schools.
- **The services need to increase their influence** upon schools and other partners/settings to effect enduring change.
- **A more joined-up approach across the Council's services** and with schools is required. At present, Council services work directly with schools and are not coordinated.
- **Many schools work alone**, have poor levels of collaboration with others and duplicate effort and responsibility. Relationships are varied, occasionally tense. Past experiences influence unduly present decision-making.
- **Education leadership as a system is poor.** A clear sense of purpose is needed to unite the schools as players in the team game of education.
- **Connectivity with and between Rutland schools, education service** and those in other counties is low. Likewise to centres of education excellence and thought-leadership. Remaining up-to-date is a challenge.
- **Intelligence and data analysis need to be more effective** and smoother in operation.
- **Education Services are responsible for change** in key areas and have a clear sense of responsibility for driving this.
- **The LA must continue to increase the schools' accountability** for standards and adopt bold procedures that will address this.
- **A clear, shared strategy and vision are required** to raise ambition, coordinate effort and resources and provide direction.
- **SEN processes are in place and effective.** The largest, recurring difficulty in the statementing/EHC plan process is the quality of documentation from schools. This is damaging for children.
- **SEN processes face challenges;** health service, in particular, struggles to complete requirements.
- **SEND reforms are progressing** and statutory deadlines are being met.
- **The number of statements is high** compared with national averages and geographical and statistical neighbours.
- **Intelligence is low;** SEN is not easily able to report on: value for money, impact of interventions; exit reporting; analysis of interventions.

Some further processes may need consideration. These include:

Governor services

Pupil place planning

Legal

Data intelligence

Organisational

- **SEN require processes which enable reflection and learning:** entry and exit criteria for interventions, contracts for interventions including agreement over outcomes, size of intervention and responsibilities, clarity over joint outcomes/goals that can be measured.
- **KPIs not clear in SEN** – but are required. The small size of SEN cohort makes comparisons and benchmarking difficult.
- **SEN services need to increase their influence.** Schools do not always act upon the advice and recommendations. Schools may be using other educational agencies.
- **Inclusion services require processes to foster outcome-based activity.** These will ensure scaling; evaluations; judging according to exit criteria and entrance criteria. These will be outcome-based and generated by settings/schools, parents and RCC.
- **Inclusion services need better monitoring processes.** At present, it is hard to gather and analyse reliable information; numbers of exclusions; causes, length, experience of young people during exclusion; trends over time and schools.

3. Vision

The ESP draws upon an analysis of past and present performance (above) and a picture of future performance, or vision. The vision is set within the Council’s ambition for Rutland:

“A great place to live, learn, work, play and visit.”

The vision is also set within the context of an increasingly devolved and diverse education system in England. Schools are increasingly independent of local government and manage themselves alone or in partnerships, e.g., multi-academy trusts. The role of local government in this diverse pattern will reflect local aspirations and needs.

The need for system leadership remains and will reflect the differing expectations of councils, schools and parents. Genuine dialogue and action – over time - between all players will be needed to enable a vision to emerge which is meaningful and achievable. It will not be a one-off statement written hurriedly but embody considerable reflection over time.

3.1 Emerging elements of the vision for education

Elements of a vision for Rutland education are emerging. An emerging ambition is:

“The highest achieving County in England by 2018”

Some key elements of the vision were identified by the Education Services team, as one of the contributors:

- One single vision known to all – and communicated
- Inclusivity/competition tension – children must be welcomed and supported
- Parents must feel involved – and exercise choice
- Education is about becoming human – not just achieving academic outcomes
- Communication
- One joined-up authority/ partnership
- Zero tolerance of under-performance
- Accountability

These key elements are likely to reappear in the continuing dialogue between players in education in Rutland. At present, these form key elements of the vision and help shape the priorities for the Strategic Plan.

4. Priorities

Two clear sets of priorities emerge from the work with settings, schools, elected members and members of the education service. The first, overarching set of priorities apply to the whole learning system in Rutland and beyond.

4.1 Whole learning system priorities

WHOLE LEARNING SYSTEM: Strategic Priorities for Rutland Learning System

- RAISE IMPACT THROUGH **CONNECTEDNESS** – OUTSIDE RUTLAND- INSIDE RUTLAND
- RAISE IMPACT THROUGH **WHOLE SYSTEM LEADERSHIP**

4.1.1 WHOLE SYSTEM PRIORITY ONE: RAISE IMPACT THROUGH CONNECTEDNESS – OUTSIDE RUTLAND- INSIDE RUTLAND

The first is to raise impact by increasing the connectedness of the total system. Schools, settings and other providers need to be better connected with each other, both informally and formally.

By informally, is meant that all the providers in Rutland engage with each other, learning from and enhancing each other. The Education Collaboration Programme referred to in the Policy and the Strategic Plan is one of many means by which this can be achieved.

By formally is meant entering into formal partnerships or mergers. Many schools and settings are too small to be both effective and efficient. For example, the leadership management and accountability demands in a small school are in many ways the same as for a large school. Across many small schools this leads to high levels of duplication, wasted effort and burn-out; this problem is then compounded by difficulties in recruiting head teachers and good governors. Formal arrangements may include merging schools, joining a larger academy chain, merging academy chains.

Many settings and schools have very limited connection beyond the County or nearby - with schools or places of educational excellence. The priority is to raise ambition and achievement by improving connectivity with the broader system.

4.1.2 WHOLE SYSTEM PRIORITY TWO: RAISE IMPACT THROUGH WHOLE SYSTEM LEADERSHIP

System leadership in Rutland is a challenge. Many Rutland schools are well-led. However, isolation and fragmentation, with many settings and schools working alone, are typical of the broader system. There is no clear direction or unifying vision for Rutland education and many head teachers and chairs of governors complain of working alone and having no-one to turn to. Where it is clear that collective decisions need to be made the level of dialogue between interested parties is sometimes poor. Individual organisational or personal interests may dominate.

This priority will encourage system-wide action across Rutland in which the whole system benefits and builds a common sense of shared purpose. Action will be reviewed in the light of its impact on, for example, raising expectations of learners across Rutland (and beyond); attitudes of children and parents in other schools or colleges; widespread sharing of good practice; best outcomes for learners wherever they learn; impact later on in the broader system.

4.2 Whole education service priorities

WHOLE EDUCATION SERVICE; Strategic Priorities for the Education Services

- A. RAISE IMPACT ON VULNERABLE LEARNERS THROUGH INTELLIGENT, REFLECTIVE PRACTICE
- B. RAISE INFLUENCE ON LEARNING PROVIDERS
- C. RAISE SENSE OF DIRECTION AND INCLUSION

Three priorities were identified by and for the whole education service on Monday 18 August 2015. These will drive action to improve education and form the core of the Education Strategic Plan. Up to four key levers have been identified for each priority; these suggest the focus of action to achieve the priority.

4.2.1 EDUCATION SERVICE PRIORITY ONE: RAISE IMPACT ON VULNERABLE LEARNERS THROUGH INTELLIGENT, REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

1. Create intelligent, learning system via processes which deliver:
 - a. Definition (and client understanding) of support/intervention;
 - b. Expected and actual outcome;
 - c. Measurement of impact and evaluation;
 - d. Learning from practice;
 - e. Inclusivity;
 - f. Value for money.

4.2.2 EDUCATION SERVICE PRIORITY TWO: RAISE INFLUENCE ON LEARNING PROVIDERS

1. Raise impact on underperforming providers.
2. Ensure easy intelligence systems.
3. Ensure better connectedness of providers.
4. Ensure accountability incl. outsourced provision.

4.2.3 EDUCATION SERVICE PRIORITY THREE: RAISE THE SENSE OF DIRECTION AND INVOLVEMENT

1. Ensure one, inspiring vision and ambition shared and known by all (incl. zero-tolerance of underperformance).
2. Act as one joined-up organisation of many parts.
3. Ensure effective, easy communication.
4. Ensure inclusion – children (esp. SEN, vulnerable), parents.

5. Strategic Actions

A series of actions is now identified for each of the priorities above, using the key lever points as a framework.

To be added shortly once evaluated and approved by Head of Education.

DRAFT OUTLINE