

Committee(s)	Dated:
Education Board	12 January 2017
Subject: Examination Scrutiny Meetings	Public
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Information
Report author: Jeanne Barnard	

Summary

Scrutiny meetings for the City of London Academies were held in November 2016, in accordance with the City of London Corporation's accountability framework. These meetings provided an opportunity for the City Corporation to ensure each academy has effective processes in place to analyse their exam results. It also provided the opportunity for the academies to outline strategic actions for improvement, and risks their schools are facing. There were some common themes among the academies regarding risks around recruitment, specifically of Maths and Science teachers. The Education Unit alongside the City of London Academies Trust are working on a joint approach to support academies with recruitment.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. As part of the City of London Corporation's accountability framework, the Education Unit convened exam scrutiny meetings for the City's primary academy and secondary academies in November 2016.

Current Position

2. Scrutiny meetings were attended by the four City academies: The City Academy Hackney (co-sponsored by KPMG), the City of London Academy Islington (co-sponsored by the City University London), the City of London Academy (Southwark), and Redriff Primary.
3. Each meeting was attended by the relevant head teacher and Chair of Governors, to represent their schools. Representatives from the City Corporation included the Chair of the Education Board, Education Strategy Director, and the Education Policy Officer. Representatives from the co-sponsors were also present at the relevant meetings. Each school presented their key successes arising from the 2016 examination results, areas of improvement and strategic actions to address these, targets for 2017, and risks. Academies were also invited to identify areas where the City Corporation could provide further support.
4. Following the meetings it was suggested finance and budget risks should be added as a separate item on the agenda for future meetings.

5. Overall, the results from the academy schools were very strong, with particularly strong Progress 8 scores. A brief summary of the matters discussed at each meeting follows.

The City Academy Hackney:

6. Key successes for Hackney included an excellent Progress 8 score, which placed the Academy 7th in the country for progress. It also celebrated its best ever results in Maths and English in GSCE at 82%. The average attainment score was a B, which provides students with the opportunity to get into any school for 6th form they choose.
7. An area for improvement is the 6th form. This was the first year Hackney offered A levels. Scores sit around national average, however the Alps score was in the bottom 25% of the country. Therefore the school will be focusing on improving performance at the 6th form level. This includes aligning internal assessment better with external exams, addressing issues in writing skills, and helping students deal with the pressure of A levels.
8. In terms of risks, Hackney is facing a deficit in its account from the previous school year. To mitigate this, budget control will be an on-going focus. The school is also working with its co-sponsor, KPMG, on a recovery plan to break even at the end of the year. The recruitment of Maths and Science teachers was also identified as a risk for the school.

The City of London Academy Islington (co-sponsored with The City University London)

9. Successes for Islington include a Progress 8 score of 0.81 at GSCE level, which places it 15th in the country and 6th in London for progress. It also had very strong results in English, with 93% A* to C. At A level, Islington had a 99% pass rate, with an overall grade of a D+. It also performed very well in vocational subjects, with an average grade of Distinction*.
10. An area for improvement at both GSCE and A level is Science. The schools expressed a lot of concern for their Science department, and recruiting strong teachers will be crucial in this area. The school will also focus at increasing progress for higher attaining students, and retention from year 12 to year 13 for its 6th form.
11. The school will continue its mentoring and tutoring programmes to support students. It will also maintain a culture of 'nothing less than the best' by setting aspirational targets. It will also make use of Student Impact Reports to track the performance of underachieving students. Appointment of curriculum leads in various subject areas will also support better teaching.
12. A major risk factor for the school is recruitment and retention of staff, especially Science and Maths teachers. It is also facing financial pressures, which has already resulted in cuts to staffing numbers, intervention programmes, and reductions in back office support. Islington is also facing a deficit, and is considering how to manage this.

The City of London Academy (Southwark)

13. Key successes for Southwark include increasing its EBacc score from 17% in 2015 to 27% in 2016. Student attainment at GSCE has also entered the top 10% of schools, and the school is ranked 4th for attainment in Southwark.
14. Areas for improvement include lifting the achievement of the most able students. Progress 8 scores were also below target, and will be a particular area of focus.
15. Actions to improve performance include embedding quality first teaching, linking appraisal targets with students' achievement, and improving teaching at key stage 3. An ambitious progress 8 target has been set (increased from 0.3 to 0.5). This score will be reached through observing teaching and refining methods at key stage 4.
16. Risk factors for the school include pressure on its budget due to the Fairer Funding formula, and the CoLAT top slice. It also identifies the recruitment of Maths and Science teachers as an on-going risk.

Redriff Primary Academy

17. Redriff primary achieved very strong key stage 1 results, including a 84% pass rate in Phonics, which is above the national average. Reading, Writing and Maths scores were also above national average. Performance at key stage 2 was also very strong, with attainment scores across all key stage 2 subjects above national average. Progress scores were also very strong, with 2.5 for Reading and 5.2 for Writing.
18. The main area for improvement for the school is Maths. Redriff had a -0.09 progress score for Maths at key stage 2. To address this, the school will continue the roll-out of its Maths Hub, which will be in its second year in 2017. It is also exploring investing in a Maths Mastery Programme. A year 5 and Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) teacher will also be receiving specialist Maths training, and the school will ensure Maths interventions enable children to make accelerated progress.
19. Risks faced by the school include unstable numbers at EYFS. There has also been a lot of pressure on staff, with two teachers moving to Galleywall. The school is also facing changing demographics, with increasing number of EAL and Any Other White Background students.

Strategic support for the academies regarding recruitment

20. All the academies noted concerns around recruitment, in particular recruiting quality Science and Maths teachers. The Education Unit and CoLAT are working with the academies to explore ways to address the challenges around recruitment. Proposals are being discussed with the schools, with an aim to provide some level of central support. We are also exploring ways the City Schools can support each other through sharing best practice and sharing resources.

Conclusion

21. The scrutiny meetings were a useful exercise to gain insight into the successes and challenges the schools are facing. Overall, the City Corporation academies have performed very well, with very strong results across all the academies.

Areas of improvement have been identified, with all schools identifying strategic actions to improve their performance in areas of concern. The Education Unit and CoLAT are working with the schools to explore ways to address risks around recruitment, particularly of Maths and Science teachers.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Examination results 2016 and 2017 targets for City Academies
- Appendix 2 – Scrutiny meetings protocol
- Appendix 3 – Glossary of terms for examination results

Jeanne Barnard

Education Policy Officer

T: 020 7332 1432

E: jeanne.barnard@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Examination results 2016 and targets for 2017The City Academy Hackney

Key stage 4 outcomes:

Yr 11 2016	%EM	%EBACC	Att 8	Prog 8	Rank
National Av 2016	59	23	48.2 (D+)	0	50
Targets 2017	90	70 (55)			
Actual	83	43	59 (B)	1.03	1
Target	85%	55%	B+	1.3	1
Predicted	79%	56%	B-	1.1	1

A Level outcomes:

	No of Students	Av Pts Sc/ A level	Av Grade	At Least 3 A Levels A*-E %	% Students AAB in 2 facilitating subjects	Progress Av A level grade above Av	Alps Score	Percentile Rank
National Averages	NA	216	C+	78	15			
Targets 2017							3 (4)	Top 20% (Top 30%)
Actual 2016	69	211	C+	96	12		7	Top 75%
Predicted Jul 2016		229	C+			0.3	4	Top 30%
Target Nov 2016		240	B			0.2	3	Top 20%

The City of London Academy Islington

Key stage 4 outcomes:

Yr 11 2016	%EM	%EBACC	Att 8	Prog 8	Rank %
National Av 2016	59	23	48.2 (D+)	0	50
Targets 2017	55	30	40	0.3	20
Actual 2016	68	31	54.3 (C)	0.81	1
Target	63	29	C	0.88	
Predicted	55-60	23	C+	0.7	

A Level outcomes:

	No of Students	Av Pts Sc/ A level	Av Grade	At Least 3 A Levels A*-E %	% Students AAB in 2 facilitating subjects	Progress Av A level grade above Av	Alps Score	Percentile Rank
National Averages	NA	216	C+	78	15			
Targets 2017	41	28.4	C	49%	2%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual 2016	55	24.65	D+	40%	0%	-0.03	N/A	N/A
Predicted Jul 2016		200	C-			0.2	4	Top 30%
Target Nov 2016		189	D+			0.2	4	Top 30%
Actual 2015	37	188	D+	41	3	-0.13	5	

The City of London Academy Southwark

Key stage 4 outcomes:

Yr 11 2016	%EM	%EBACC	Attainment 8	Progress 8	Rank
National Av 2016	59	23	48.2 (D+)	0	50
Targets 2017	80 (82)	40	59 (C+)	0.3 (0.5)	30
Actual	78	27.1	57.3 (C+)	0.16	40
Target	75	28	C	0.2	
Predicted	77	23	C+	0.2	

A Level outcomes:

	No of Students	Av Pts Sc/ A level	Av Grade	At Least 3 A Levels A*-E	% Students AAB in 2 facilitating subs	Prog Av AL above Nat Av	Alps Score	Percentile Rank
National Av 2016		216	C+	78%	15%			
Target 2017	150	30.2	C+	55%*	12%	0.2	3	Top 20%
Actual 2016	147	211	C	52.8%	11%	0.07	4	Top 30%
Predicted Jul 2016		218	C-			0.2	3	Top 20%
Target Nov 2016		200	C-			0.2	3	Top 20%
Actual 2015	73	210	C	68	5	0.1	4	Top 30%

*There are more students currently on mixed pathways of vocational and academic subjects

Redriff Primary Academy

Key stage 2 data:

Reading	National Expected	National High Score	Redriff Expected	Redriff High score
2016	66	19	88	29
Target 2017			82	30

SPAG (Spelling, punctuation and grammar)	National Expected	National High Score	Redriff Expected	Redriff High score
2016	72	23	77	23
Target 2017			80	30

Maths	National Expected	National High Score	Redriff Expected	Redriff High score
2016	70	17	75	21
Target 2017			80	30

R,W&M	National Expected	National High Score	Redriff Expected	Redriff High score
2016	53	5	63	15
Target 2017			65	20

Writing TA	National Expected	National High Score	Redriff Expected	Redriff High score
2016	74	15	92	50
Target 2017			82	50

Scrutiny Meetings Draft Protocol 2017

Background

1. The Education Board and CoLAT have an agreed accountability framework for all City schools and academies.
2. At the Education Board on 5th September 2015 it was agreed that for co-sponsored academies accountability and scrutiny would be carried out by the CoLAT on behalf of the sponsor in order to ensure the sponsor discharges its responsibilities in a simple, co-ordinated and efficient way across all academies.

Timing

3. The meetings will take place early in the second half term which should give enough time for schools to analyse their internal data with governors and assimilate the outcomes of the RAISE report.

The Panel

4. The panel will include the Education Board Chairman and Deputy Chairman the Director of CCS, CoLAT CEO, and where appropriate a co-sponsor and LA representative.

Academy Representation

5. The Academy will be represented by the Principal and Chair of Governors.

Outcomes

6. To reduce workload the panel will only require the analysis that has already been provided to governors.

This would normally include a review of statutory outcomes against targets, predictions and national averages at KS2, KS4 and A level. For 2016/17 this will be:

KS2	KS4	A Level
Reading	English and Maths A*-C	%age A*-A
Writing	5A*-C Eng + Maths	%age A*-B
Mathematics	English Baccalaureate A*-C	%age A*-E
SPAG	Attainment 8	Av Pts Sc
Reading, Writing and Maths	Progress 8	Av Pts Sc (+Vocational)
Relevant RAISE data	Relevant RAISE data	Relevant Alps/Alis data

7. In addition the school will be expected to draw the panel's attention to any pertinent data which supports their evaluation of the strengths and areas for improvement.

Agenda

8. The meeting will follow the broad agenda outlined below:
 - i. Strategic analysis of successes and areas for improvement
 - ii. Strategic actions to improve performance
 - iii. Targets for 2017
 - iv. Risk factors

Glossary of examination results terms

Attainment	Attainment measures the achievement of a pupil across 8 qualifications including mathematics (double weighted) and English (double weighted), 3 further qualifications that count in the English Baccalaureate (EBacc) measure and 3 further qualifications that can be GCSE qualifications (including EBacc subjects) or any other non-GCSE qualifications on the DfE approved list.
Progress 8	Progress 8 aims to capture the progress a pupil makes from the end of primary school to the end of secondary school. It is a type of value added measure, which means that pupils' results are compared to the actual achievements of other pupils with the same prior attainment.
Alps score	Alps measures the performance of a student at Level 3 against their predicted performance based on their GCSE achievement. The students' prior achievement is calculated from their GCSEs. The Alps score then takes a snapshot of the performance at a school against national benchmarks.