

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Thursday 28 June, 15.00 – 17.00

Location: London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London, SE1 0AL

Contact Officer: Hannah Barker

Telephone: 020 7934 9524 **Email:** hannah.barker@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Declarations of interest
3. Notes of last meeting and matters arising
4. London Post-16 Education Trajectories Review - For discussion
Paper and presentation – Phil Rossiter, MIME Consulting, Dr Lynne Rogers and Professor Ann Hodgson, University College London Institute of Education
5. ESF Youth Programme: Performance and future - For information
Verbal – Tawhid Qureshi, Greater London Authority
6. Mayor's Skills Strategy - For discussion
Presentation – Nadine Collins, Greater London Authority
7. Regular updates:
 - Raising the Participation Age (***Paper - Peter O'Brien***) - For discussion
 - Policy update (***Paper - Hannah Barker***) - For information
8. Any other business

Blank Page

Notes

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Date	22 February 2018	Venue	London Councils
Meeting Chair	Gail Tolley		
Contact Officer	Hannah Barker		
Telephone	020 7934 9524	Email	hannah.barker@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Present

Gail Tolley	Association of London Directors of Children's Services
Tim Shields	Chief Executives London Committee
Michael Heanue	LEAP officer
Caroline Boswell	Greater London Authority (GLA) (for Joanne McCartney)
Mary Vine-Morris	Association of Colleges (AoC) London Region
Dr Caroline Allen OBE	AoC/NATSPEC
Yolande Burgess	London Councils
Denise Donovan	Department for Work and Pensions (for Derek Harvey)
Laraine Smith	AoC / Further education college representative

Officers

Peter O'Brien	London Councils Young People's Education and Skills Team
Hannah Barker	London Councils Principal Policy & Project Officer, Children's Services

Apologies

Cllr Peter John OBE	London Councils Executive member for Business, Skills and Brexit
Cllr David Simmonds	London Councils Shadow Executive member
Zeena Cala	Education and Skills Funding Agency
Paul Wakeling	AoC / Sixth form colleges

1 Welcome, Introductions and apologies

- 1.1 The Chair invited attendees to introduce themselves and noted the apologies for absence.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed Laraine Smith, who has joined the Board as a further education college representative from the Association of Colleges.

2 Declarations of interest

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

3 Minutes of previous meeting and actions arising

- 3.1 Open actions from previous meetings were discussed and the following updates given:
 - 3.1.1 Yolande Burgess reported that discussions have already begun on the 2018 Higher Education Journey for Young Londoners, and the group will look at evaluating the impact of the maintenance grant in this version.
 - 3.1.2 Michael Heanue highlighted that the paper on Institutes of Technology in London is ready and will be circulated to the group imminently.
 - 3.1.3 Yolande Burgess said that the action regarding asks and offers for Dame Asha has been postponed due to the pace of recent changes, including the release of the government consultation on the implementation of T levels. This will be revisited once the government's position is clearer.
 - 3.1.4 Yolande Burgess picked up the action relating to a new foreword for London Ambitions under the London Ambitions update later in the meeting.

4 Annual Statement of Priorities

- 4.1 Gail Tolley thanked Peter O'Brien for a thorough and helpful piece of work. She suggested that it would be useful to streamline the paper to reduce its length and thereby encourage as wide a readership base as possible.
- 4.2 Peter O'Brien briefly talked through the structure of the report and invited comments from the Board.
- 4.3 Tim Shields suggested that the schools funding challenge, the wider funding challenges, and the impact of Brexit on labour market challenges, could have more prominence in the report.
- 4.4 Michael Heanue clarified that the point on page 10 regarding the devolution of the education and skills budget should just read 'the devolution of the skills budget'.
- 4.5 Caroline Boswell said that it would be useful to separate out the strategic asks and major calls for change from the more technical points.
- 4.6 It was agreed by the Board that the report should consist of a main section, with the priorities and aspirations clearly stated, and then appendices to provide more information on specific areas and include the graphs and diagrams for those with greater interest in the detail.
- 4.7 The Board was asked to submit any further comments by 8 March.

Action: Peter O'Brien to incorporate Board's suggestions regarding the Annual Statement of Priorities into the final version, including referencing the City for All Young Londoners

5 Transforming children's and young people's mental health: a green paper

- 5.1 Hannah Barker talked through the key points raised in the London Councils response to the mental health green paper.
- 5.2 Gail Tolley suggested that London Councils should add a response to questions 14 and 15 in the consultation, regarding looked after children and children in need.
- 5.3 Caroline Allen highlighted that it is important that the mental health teams consist of appropriately qualified people, and that the reforms are implemented in a professional and appropriate manner. She also referenced concerns about CAMHS and its failure to respond to the current level of need and keep up to speed regarding training and

professional codes. She suggested the green paper was an opportunity to look again at this aspect of the system.

- 5.4 Tim Shields emphasised the importance of linking the response to funding challenges, especially in schools. He also referenced recruitment of Designated Leads for schools and talked about the need for a different approach in schools and colleges of different sizes. He asked about the link with virtual schools and how the proposals would help looked after children.
- 5.5 Caroline Boswell said that the green paper had also been discussed at the London Health Board, which has commissioned a questionnaire for schools on this. This will be shared with the boroughs soon. Caroline suggested that the Mayor's response might reference London Councils response.
- 5.6 Yolande Burgess spoke about the importance of distinguishing between mental health issues and wellbeing issues.
- 5.7 Mary Vine-Morris suggested that more reference could be made in the response to colleges. She agreed with the point about the lack of ambition in the proposals and the urgency of the issue.
- 5.8 Tim Shield also made a point about the need to consider transitions between school phases, which are often a difficult time for children and young people.

Action: Hannah Barker to incorporate Board's suggestions regarding London Councils mental health green paper response into the final version

6 Work plan monitoring

Raising the Participation Age:

- 6.1 Peter O'Brien talked to the latest report on NEET and Not Known figures, circulated with the papers for the Board. Neither the annual combined NEET and Not Known report nor the quarterly NEET report had been published since the last meeting, but Peter did not suspect that there would be major changes in London's overall position.
- 6.2 Gail Tolley highlighted that for many local authorities tracking young people might be an area looked at for cutbacks in the next budget reviewing process.

Policy update

- 6.3 Hannah Barker talked to the policy update paper, summarising relevant policy developments since the last meeting.

A City for All Young Londoners

- 6.4 Caroline Boswell said that the Mayor's vision for education would be published before purdah and would be out for consultation. Its key strands would be: best start; opportunities for all; and the voice of the young person.
- 6.5 Caroline also highlighted the new Young Londoners fund announced by the Mayor the previous week, with a focus on reducing knife crime.
- 6.6 Mary Vine-Morris suggested that it would be helpful for the Mayor's vision to reference the Young People's Education and Skills Board's Annual Statement of Priorities.

Action: Caroline Boswell to ensure that the City for All Young Londoners references the Young People's Education and Skills Board Annual Statement of Priorities

ESF update:

- 6.7 Peter O'Brien highlighted that London Councils has not been provided with any meaningful performance data showing the impact that the London ESF Youth Programme is having in each borough.
- 6.8 Peter said that, while actions to prevent NEET and to re-engage young people who are NEET through outreach have been working well, the later strands of the programme are not working so well. The careers clusters that the GLA are managing are also performing well.
- 6.9 Peter also talked through the support that had been provided by the Young People's Education and Skills team, including holding forums with providers and local authorities to look at what is working well and what could be improved.
- 6.10 Mary Vine-Morris said that the provision that is coming to an end will be a big issue, and Gail Tolley suggested having a longer discussion item about this at the next meeting.

Action: Item on performance and the future of the ESF Youth Programme to be put on the agenda for the next Board meeting

London Ambitions:

- 6.11 Yolande Burgess reported that the All Age Careers Task and Finish Group had a first meeting in the diary (16 March). This will look at how to build on the work that has been done around careers for young people to develop the all age strategy. This would be a good hook for a refresh of London Ambitions.
- 6.12 Yolande also mentioned an event being held on 9 March to showcase the work of the London Ambitions careers clusters.

Action: Information about Careers Clusters event to be circulated to Board

7 Any other business

- 7.1 Gail Tolley thanked Caroline Boswell on behalf of the Board for the insightful contributions she has made to discussions and the items she has brought to meetings during her time as a member of the Board. Caroline is now moving on from her role at the GLA, and Gail wished her all the best for the future on behalf of the Board.

Item 3(a) - Actions and Matters Arising from 22 February 2018 Young People's Education and Skills Board meeting

ACTION POINTS	ACTION OWNER	STATUS	UPDATE
Peter O'Brien to incorporate Board's suggestions regarding the Annual Statement of Priorities into the final version, including referencing the City for All Young Londoners	Peter O'Brien	Closed	Reference to the expected publication included in the Annual Statement of Priorities
Hannah Barker to incorporate Board's suggestions regarding London Councils mental health green paper response into the final version	Hannah Barker	Closed	Board's comments incorporated in final version of response
Item on performance and the future of the ESF Youth Programme to be put on the agenda for the next Board meeting	London Councils	Closed	Agenda item 28.6.18
Caroline Boswell to ensure that the City for All Young Londoners references the YPES ASOP	Caroline Boswell	Closed	City for All Young Londoner's not yet published and on hold.
Information about Careers Clusters event to be circulated to Board	London Councils	Closed	Email 26.2.18
ACTION POINTS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING(S)			
<i>From 16.11.17:</i> Yolande Burgess to see whether the University of East London can look at the contribution of the removal of the maintenance grant to the numbers of young people going to university, and analyse the number of young people by ethnicity choosing to stay in London for higher education.	Yolande Burgess	In progress	Incorporated into the plans for the Higher Education Journey of Young Londoners 2018 publication
<i>From 16.11.17:</i> Michael Heanue to share London view of Institutes of Technology with London Councils to circulate to Board members	Michael Heanue	Open	
<i>From 6.7.17:</i> Michael Heanue to work with Yolande Burgess to draft a set of 'asks and offers' on technical education for Dame Asha on behalf of the Board	Michael Heanue/ Yolande Burgess	In progress	To be considered alongside the consultation on T-Levels
<i>From 23.02.17:</i> YPES to work with GLA to secure a fresh Mayoral foreword to London Ambitions	Yolande Burgess/ Michael Heanue	In progress	To be put to the Skills for Londoner's task and finish group on the all age careers strategy (16.03.18)
OTHER MATTERS ARISING			
DECISIONS TAKEN BY CHAIR TO BE REPORTED			

Blank Page

Young People's Education and Skills Board

London Post-16 Education Trajectories Review

Item 4

Date: 28 June 2018

Contact: Yolande Burgess

Telephone: 020 7934 9739

Email: yolande.burgessr@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary	<p>This paper provides an overview of the London Post-16 Education Trajectories Review, a jointly commissioned project between London Council and the Greater London Authority.</p> <p>Colleagues from MIME Consulting and University College London Institute of Education, will present interim findings from the review at the Board meeting</p>
Recommendations	<p>Board members are asked to discuss the interim findings from the trajectories review and provide a steer on any further areas for investigation within the overall framework of the project.</p>

1 Background

- 1.1 In December 2017 proposals were sought for quantitative and qualitative research to explores the education and employment trajectories of young people in London following their GCSEs.
- 1.2 The purpose of this work is to fill an evidence gap in the pathways young people from different backgrounds in London pursue following school, including which subjects they study and institutions they attend.
- 1.3 Following a tendering exercise, MIME Consulting, in partnership with University College London Institute of Education (UCL IoE), was appointed to undertake the research.

2 Objectives and outputs

- 2.1 The overarching objectives of the research are to:
 - Conduct quantitative and qualitative analysis to better understand the pathways of young people in London from GCSE through to further study and employment; and
 - Produce practical recommendations for how the 16 to 18 education and skills landscape could be reformed in London to deliver improved learning and employment outcomes for all young Londoners.
- 2.2 The research team will produce a report assessing the current picture of provision for 16 to 18 London learners, including:
 - A map of provision across the capital and beyond
 - A set of recommendations for education and skills providers, London and local government and central government
 - A presentation summarising the key findings and recommendations of the report

- A road map for implementation of the recommendations.

2.3 There are three phases to the project:

- **Phase one:** desk research and secondary data quantitative analysis of published data
- **Phase two:** analysis of matched data of the National Pupil Database and the Individualised Learner Record
- **Phase three:** qualitative research to explore the experiences and better understand the needs of young people who undertake a three-year study programme.

2.4 Colleagues from MIME Consulting and UCL IoE will present interim findings to the Board from phases one and three and will update Board members on the on-going challenge with accessing data from the Department for Education to complete phase two.

2.5 The full specification for the project, setting out the context, objectives, scope, requirements, methodology etc. is attached at Appendix A.

2.6 The evidence on young people's learning pathways will be used to inform our thinking on the development of T Levels and the proposed transition year for learners that are either undecided about their post-16 path or are not yet ready for a Level 3 programme of study.

3 Recommendations

3.1 Board members are asked to discuss the interim findings from the trajectories review and provide a steer on any further areas for investigation within the overall framework of the project.

1. Summary

- 1.1. The Greater London Authority, in collaboration with London Councils, is inviting proposals for a data analysis and qualitative exercise, which explores the education and employment trajectories of young people in London following their GCSEs.
- 1.2. The overarching objectives of the research are:
 - to conduct quantitative and qualitative analysis to better understand the pathways of young people in London from GCSE through to further study and employment; and
 - to produce practical recommendations for how the 16-18 education and skills landscape could be reformed in London to deliver improved learning and employment outcomes for all young Londoners.

2. Context

- 2.1 London's schools have seen a transformation over the past 15 years and GCSE results in London are now the best in the country. However, the capital fails to sustain this progress in post-16 education. Inner London ranks second-lowest among the English regions for average points score at Level 3 among 16 to 18-year-olds in state-funded provision. While the capital includes some of the highest performing local authorities for A-Level and applied general qualifications in the country, it also includes some of the poorest performing local authorities for these qualifications. With tech level performance, outer London outperforms all regions except the North West, yet inner London ranks in the middle.¹ And London also has the worst post-16 catch-up rate in maths in the country and some of the worst catch-up rates in English.²
- 2.2 The Mayor is committed to creating a new agenda for education and skills in the capital that improves outcomes for all young Londoners and prepares them for life and work in a global city. To help achieve this, the Greater London Authority would like to get a clearer understanding of what is driving patterns and trends that underpin post-16 education choices and performance in London.
- 2.3 The Greater London Authority, in collaboration with London Councils, is inviting proposals for a data analysis and qualitative exercise, which explores the education and employment trajectories of young people in London following their GCSEs. The purpose of this work is to fill an important evidence gap on the pathways young people from different backgrounds in London pursue following school, including which subjects they study and institutions they attend, their progress and outcomes, and ultimately, their education or employment destinations. We want to better understand the patterns and trends by socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity and among young people with special educational needs and disabilities.
- 2.4 This research comes at an important moment for the skills system in London. The Government has committed to devolve the Adult Education Budget (AEB) in London to the Mayor from 2019/20, subject to a series of readiness conditions. In preparation for devolution, the GLA is working with London Councils and the sub-regional partnerships of boroughs³ to develop a London Skills Strategy. This will set out priorities and measures to improve education and skills provision in London for people aged 16+, with a focus on technical/vocational skills and adult education. Consultation

¹ DfE (2017) '[A level and other 16 to 18 results: 2016 to 2017 \(provisional\)](#)'

² Impetus PEF (2017) '[Life after school: Confronting the crisis](#)'

³ Central London Forward, Local London, South London Partnership and West London Alliance

and engagement events will take place throughout the remainder of 2017, with approval of the final strategy by Spring 2018. The Mayor's [Skills for Londoners Taskforce](#) have strategic oversight of the development of the strategy.

- 2.5 The research will therefore seek to support the development and implementation of the London Skills Strategy. Should the Mayor formally accept the devolution deal on offer from the Government, the GLA will work with London Councils and the sub-regional partnerships of boroughs to develop an AEB policy funding statement, followed by a commissioning strategy. While devolution concerns the funding and accountability for post-19 further education, the Mayor is committed to a holistic and strategic approach to skills in London, which gives consideration to progression pathways from school and into further, higher and technical education, apprenticeships and/or sustained employment. This research will therefore seek to inform preparations ahead of AEB devolution as part of wider plans for skills in London, including developing the rationale for greater strategic influence or devolution of funding and policy levers in 16-18 provision in London.

3. Research objectives

- 3.1 The overarching research objectives are to:

- Conduct quantitative and qualitative analysis to better understand the pathways of young people in London from GCSE through to further study and employment; and
- Produce practical recommendations for how the 16-18 education and skills landscape could be reformed in London to deliver improved learning and employment outcomes for all young Londoners.

- 3.2 The research is also expected to:

- Provide evidence on outcome and progression patterns for London students at and below Level 3, including:
 - Progression into further academic learning
 - Progression into further technical learning (including apprenticeships, traineeships and supported internships)
 - Progression following two- and three-year periods of study post-16
 - Re-sit rates for qualifications
 - Drop-out rates across courses and institutions
- Provide a clear picture of current delivery of the subject sector areas under the proposed 15 technical education routes, as outlined in the post-16 skills plan
- Provide a clear picture of the performance of groups of students and institutions re-taking Level 2 English and/or maths post-16
- Inform the GLA's policy position on the delivery of the Government's proposed 'transition year' and how this could improve outcomes and progression pathways for young people leaving school without achieving Level 2.

4. Scope

- 4.1 The research should cover:

- 16 to 18-year-old London residents, wherever they access their learning

- All types of providers delivering education and training to those learners, including schools and school sixth forms, Sixth Form Colleges, General Further Education Colleges, Independent Training Providers, and University Technical Colleges
- Provision delivered in 2010/11 through to 2015/16.

5. Requirements/Proposed Methodology

5.1 We propose that this research is broken down into three phases:

5.2 Phase 1: Undertake desk research and secondary data quantitative analysis of published data to provide a complete picture of the London education and skills system post-16, identifying patterns and trends among groups of young people, institutions and subjects. This should include:

- The total number of students in London by institution, subject and level of study, including:
 - The volume of delivery under the post-16 technical pathways by provider
- Patterns within 16-18 participation, attainment, and progression of learners in academic and technical education. This should include:
 - The number and percentage of students who a) start b) achieve qualifications by sector subject area
 - The number and percentage of learners who progress from Level 2 to Level 3
 - Progress and outcomes at different institutions, grouped by those with similar intakes in terms of attainment
 - Analysis of which subject sector area pathways deliver the best progression from Level 2 to Level 3
 - Analysis of which pathways deliver better progression and outcomes for those who attain below Level 2/do not attain a qualifications
- The attainment and progress of students re-taking Level 2 English and/or maths. This should include:
 - The number and percentage of those who a) start b) achieve Level 2 English and/or maths
 - The number of attempts taken to achieve English and/or maths
 - The number and percentage of those who a) start b) achieve a Level 2 functional skills qualification
 - The number and percentage of students who progress from Level 2 to Level 3, following retake(s) in English and/or maths or a functional skills qualification
 - Analysis of outcomes at different institutions in London on Level 2 English and/or maths re-takes or a functional skills qualification
- Patterns of drop out and 'churn' in post-16 education across academic and technical pathways. This should include:
 - The number and percentage of students who drop out of key stage 5 by sector subject area and type of institution
 - The number and percentage of students who switch courses/start a new qualification, without completing a previous course/qualification, during this phase

- The number and percentage of students who switch institution during this phase
- The number and percentage of students who are Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET)

Where possible, this data should be assessed longitudinally, by institution type, subject, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, lower level attainers, and whether a student has a special educational need or disability.

Suggested data sources for phase 1 include:

- The Skills Funding Agency's statistical first releases
- The Skills Funding Agency's Datacube – Subject Sector Area volumes (2015/16)
- The Individualised Learner Record
- The National Pupil Database
- The Department for Education's FE and Skills Geography data tool - <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/fe-data-library-further-education-and-skills>
 - Part/Ach (all), E&M Part/Ach, App Starts/Ach (Learner Volumes - 2011/12 - 2015/16)
- The Department for Education's FE Skills – Participation and Achievement (Volumes by geography/equality/diversity – not by age)
- MIME Consulting/London Councils - London specific destinations data (2014-15) and <http://www.intelligentlondon.org.uk/>

5.3 Phase 2: Undertake analysis of matched data of the National Pupil Database and the Individualised Learner Record from GCSE through to post-16 outcomes and post-19 destinations in London.

This analysis should aim to provide a stronger understanding of the trajectories of young people from different backgrounds and with different needs in London from GCSE to employment. The analysis should include findings on which groups of Londoners are more likely to continue to make good progress post-16 and which groups are more likely to drop off a trajectory towards an expected outcome. The analysis should be broken down by institution type, subject, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, lower level attainers, and whether a student has a special educational need or disability. Where possible, this data should also be assessed longitudinally.

For phase 2, the contractor should make a linked data request to the Department for Education, following the award of contract.

5.4 Phase 3: Undertake qualitative research to explore the experiences and better understand the needs of young people who undertake a three-year study programme. In particular, we are interested in the experiences and needs of young people who are on or have completed a three-year study programme because they changed course or had to start their course again.

To conduct this research, we suggest identifying providers with proportionally higher than average numbers of 18-year-olds at the beginning of an academic year, as a proxy for students on three-year programmes of study.

The findings of this qualitative research will help to inform the design of three-year study programmes and approaches to what a post-16 transition year could look like in London.

6. Deliverables

- 6.1 A report assessing the current picture of provision for 16-18 London learners, including:
- A map of provision across the capital and beyond
 - A set of recommendations for education and skills providers, London government and central government
 - A presentation summarising the key findings and recommendations of the report
 - A road map for implementation of the recommendations

7. Timeframe

- 7.1 The timeframe for this work is as follows:

Activity	Due
Invitation to tender issued:	w/c 06/11/17
Tenders received:	08/12/17
Tenders assessed:	w/c 11/12/17
Clarification meeting:	w/c 18/12/17
Contract award:	w/c 18/12/17
Work to commence:	w/c 01/01/18
Interim report	w/c 05/03/18
Final report:	w/c 07/05/18

- 7.2 Note: To meet the above timeframe, a linked data request will need to be made to the Department for Education soon after the contract is awarded.

8. Reporting and Management

- 8.1 The contractor will be managed by Sarah Waite in the Economic and Business Policy Unit at the Greater London Authority.

9. Payment Model

- 9.1 The contract price will be split between:
- 30% upon completion of the Phase 1 findings/interim report to the project team.
 - 50% upon completion of the final report, including recommendations.
 - 20% (final payment) following presentation to the GLA, London Councils and Skills for Londoners Taskforce.

10. Quotation Evaluation

- 10.1 Award of the contract will be subject to a competitive quotation process and requirements outlined in this brief, and will take into account cost, quality and experience.

10.2 Bidders must provide the following information in their tender responses:

i. A methodology statement which sets out as a minimum:

- Your understanding of the aims and objectives of the project and how it interacts with the current policy context (including the work underway to prepare for devolution of the Adult Education Budget to the Mayor in 2019/20);
- The approach that will be used to deliver each of the project's requirements;
- The proposed method for identifying relevant datasets, gathering and analysing data and lead in times (where these need to be acquired);
- A detailed delivery plan with milestones for each stage of the project.

ii. Delivery resources and expertise:

- Details of relevant experience in delivering similar projects and identification of where project staff will add value. Bidders will need to demonstrate an ability to work with relevant datasets, such as the National Pupil Dataset and Individualised Learner Record;
- A full CV of all the project staff that will work on the project;
- If applicable, which elements of the brief will be attributed to which consultant or employee;
- An itemised project resourcing schedule.

iii. Project management

- Project management arrangements;
- Details of internal quality systems and mitigation of risk, including an explanation of any constraints that may affect the effective achievement of the study's aims.

iv. Project Costs:

- A breakdown of the costs including daily/hourly rates, time spent on tasks, expenses, VAT;
- Confirmation that the project will be delivered on a fixed price costing.

10.3 Proposals should be returned to Sarah Waite at sarah.waite@london.gov.uk no later than midday on Friday 8th December 2017.

11. Criteria

11.1 The contract will be awarded on the basis of the tender that will provide the highest quality within budget. The bids will be evaluated against the following criteria (please ensure these are addressed within your proposal).

Criteria	Score
Methodology	30%
Delivery Resources and Expertise	25%
Project Management	10%
Overall clarity of the submission	5%
Cost	30%

11.2 The evaluation will initially be based on the written responses; however, we may wish to interview individuals to further clarify details on the above criteria.

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Raising the Participation Age (RPA) - Participation Report **Item: 7a**

Report by:	Peter O'Brien	Job Title	Regional Commissioning Manager
Date	28 June 2018		
Telephone	020 7934 9743	email:	peter.obrien@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary	This paper provides information on London's position with regard to Raising the Participation Age.
----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Recommendations	Board members are asked to note the content of the report.
------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

1 Background and introduction

- 1.1 This paper provides Board members with information on London's position with regard to Raising the Participation Age (RPA). All young people are required to continue in education and training until their 18th birthday (RPA does not apply if a young person has already attained a level 3 qualification).

2 Published data

- 2.1 The Department for Education has decided to stop publishing quarterly and termly NEET statistics and has yet to publish the annual NEET scorecard for 2017. The Department plans to publish last year's local authority/regional scorecards and September Guarantee data 'very soon', and then publish this year's local authority/regional scorecard and a new amalgamated NEET and Participation publication in September. The new publication will replace the annual and quarterly reports that the Department currently publishes.
- 2.2 The Office for National Statistics will continue to publish quarterly NEET estimates at a national level, but these are not intended to provide breakdowns at local or regional levels

3 NEET and Activity Not Known

- 3.1 New reporting arrangements have made changes in the NEET and 'not known' Scorecard this year. Previously the headline measure was the local authorities' NEET rate; but now DfE has introduced a new headline measure which combines authorities' NEET rate with their not known rate. The published annual report is overdue, but monthly updates are available through NCCIS and the December 2017 position is shown in Figure 1.
- 3.2 Local authorities are ranked according to the combined total of NEET and 'not known' and rated in five colour-coded bands ('quintiles') – the top 20 per cent of authorities in the country are rated 1 (dark green).

Figure 1: 16 -17 year olds by academic age NEET and not known by national quintiles, April 2018 (From NCCIS)

	Academic age 16-17						
	NEET	NEET %	Not known	% not known	NEET and NK	% NEET and NK	Quintile
ENGLAND	32,504	2.9%	32,311	2.9%	64,815	5.7%	
LONDON	3,230	1.9%	4,837	2.8%	8,067	4.7%	
Barking and Dagenham	214	3.8%	35	0.6%	249	4.4%	2
Barnet	129	1.7%	128	1.7%	257	3.4%	1
Bexley	94	1.6%	92	1.5%	186	3.1%	1
Brent	110	1.5%	124	1.7%	234	3.1%	1
Bromley	134	2.0%	69	1.0%	203	3.0%	1
Camden	81	2.6%	44	1.4%	125	4.0%	2
City of London	-	0.0%	-		-	0.0%	
Croydon	220	2.4%	378	4.2%	598	6.6%	4
Ealing	83	1.1%	78	1.1%	161	2.2%	1
Enfield	113	1.4%	513	6.2%	626	7.6%	5
Greenwich	117	2.0%	113	2.0%	230	4.0%	2
Hackney	101	1.9%	105	2.0%	206	4.0%	2
Hammersmith and Fulham	29	1.2%	16	0.7%	45	1.9%	1
Haringey	107	2.0%	430	8.1%	537	10.1%	5
Harrow	62	1.2%	54	1.1%	116	2.3%	1
Havering	105	1.8%	79	1.3%	184	3.1%	1
Hillingdon	166	2.4%	212	3.1%	378	5.5%	3
Hounslow	146	2.6%	151	2.7%	297	5.3%	3
Islington	44	1.3%	84	2.5%	128	3.8%	2
Kensington and Chelsea	30	2.2%	31	2.2%	61	4.4%	2
Kingston upon Thames	50	1.6%	48	1.6%	98	3.2%	1
Lambeth	94	1.7%	484	8.7%	578	10.4%	5
Lewisham	127	2.1%	206	3.4%	333	5.5%	3
Merton	58	1.5%	61	1.6%	119	3.1%	1
Newham	137	1.7%	186	2.3%	323	3.9%	2
Redbridge	132	1.8%	106	1.4%	238	3.2%	1
Richmond upon Thames	55	1.9%	46	1.6%	101	3.5%	1
Southwark	85	1.6%	283	5.4%	368	7.0%	4
Sutton	75	1.7%	80	1.8%	155	3.5%	1
Tower Hamlets	162	2.9%	198	3.6%	360	6.5%	4
Waltham Forest	78	1.3%	87	1.5%	165	2.8%	1
Wandsworth	57	1.4%	282	7.2%	339	8.6%	5
Westminster	35	1.4%	34	1.4%	69	2.8%	1

4 Recommendation

4.1 Board members are asked to note the content of the report.

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Policy Update

Item 7b

Date: 28 June 2018

Contact: Hannah Barker

Telephone: 020 7934 9524

Email: hannah.barker@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This paper outlines the key changes affecting 14 to 19 policy since the last Young People's Education and Skills Board.

Recommendation Board members are asked to note the information in this paper.

1 Local government elections and London Councils

- 1.1 The local government elections on 3 May brought about several changes in political leadership in the London boroughs. London Councils updated its [political map](#) with an at-a-glance London overview and individual borough breakdowns.
- 1.2 The London Councils Annual General Meeting (AGM) following the elections took place on 5 June 2018. Councillor Peter John, Leader of Southwark Council, was elected as the new Chair of London Councils. Councillor Georgia Gould, Leader of Camden Council, has been confirmed as the new Executive Member for Skills and Employment and the Chair of the Young People's Education and Skills Board. Councillor Nickie Aiken, Leader of Westminster Council, was confirmed as the new Executive Member for schools and children's services (with responsibility for education, children's social care and safeguarding) and member of the Young People's Education and Skills Board.
- 1.3 The confirmed list of the London Councils Executive members can be found [here](#).
- 1.4 The full list of councillors in the [London Government Directory](#) has been updated to reflect the results of the London local elections. Council leaderships and executives will be updated following each council's AGM.

2 Government response to the consultation on Implementation of T Level Programmes

- 2.1 The government has responded to the consultation on the Implementation of T Level Programmes. The response can be found [here](#).
- 2.2 The government has made a number of changes and commitments in reaction to the responses received. Key developments are:
 - **Minimum entry requirements:** There will be no minimum entry requirement imposed, as the government believes that providers are best placed to decide on whether to admit a student onto a level 3 programme.
 - **Maths and English for students who have not yet achieved level 2:** This will be funded in addition to the hours required for the technical elements of the programme.

- **Grading:** There will be an overall Pass grade for the T Level, but it will still include a six point grading scale for the core (A*-E) and a three point grading scale for each occupational specialism (Distinction, Merit, Pass).
- **Progressing to academic routes:** Progressing to an academic route after completing a T Level would likely require students to undertake some sort of bridging provision to acquire additional knowledge and skills. Once T Level content is finalised, the government will work with Higher Education providers to identify where bridging provision might be needed.
- **UCAS points:** Respondents said that allocating UCAS Tariff points to T Levels would support progression and the government is working with UCAS to explore this option.
- **Reviewing Level 2 and 3 qualifications:** The government will review qualifications that currently attract government funding for post-16 study; more details about this review will be published shortly. There will also be a review of the non-GCSE qualifications available for pupils aged 14 to 16.
- **Support for providers:** The main challenge identified in the consultation was making sure that staff have sufficient expertise, as providers will need to upskill current teaching staff and recruit additional skilled staff. The government will work closely with the sector to develop a programme of support to help providers prepare for the delivery of T Levels. This includes an investment of up to £20million to improve the quality of teaching over the next two years.
- **Pace of roll-out:** There were several responses highlighting the overly ambitious pace of roll out. Therefore the government has decided to extend the full roll-out of T Levels beyond 2022. The first T Levels will still be available from 2020.
- **Funding:** Several responses were received highlighting the funding challenges and high costs of implementing and running T Levels, but the government has committed no further funding other than the £500million announced some time ago. The response highlights that the government expects to fund different T Levels at different rates to reflect the cost of delivery (e.g. for the use of specialist equipment) and for variations in the number of additional taught hours.
- **Support for employers:** Several responses raised concerns over the capacity of some employers and providers to offer industry places. The government is putting in place a programme of support, including investing funding in building the capacity of providers through the Capacity and Delivery Fund; issuing clear guidance; and offering a support and advice service for employers.
- **Format of industry placements:** There is a recognition that the format of industry placements will need to be flexible. While the minimum requirement of 45 days in a placement has been retained, the government will allow providers to work with employers to determine if this is best delivered through day release, a single 3-month placement, or a number of blocks at different times during the programme, potentially with different employers.

2.3 The main conclusions that the government derived from the responses that were received are as follows:

- There is a need for greater clarity relating to the positioning of T Levels in the education system, including their identity and target audience in relation to A levels and apprenticeships.

- T Levels need to be rigorous, and add value for employers, as well as be inclusive of students with additional needs.
- There is support for simplification of the existing qualifications system but only where this is employer-led and does not leave gaps in valuable provision.
- Assessments need to enable progression and demonstrate rigour, whilst being consistent and inclusive.
- There was confusion about what 'threshold competence' means. This requires greater clarity (especially as it could mean something different in each pathway) as well as ensuring employers can be confident that a student completing a T Level would be at least as valuable for industry as a learner completing a level 3 apprenticeship.
- T Level industry placements are a vital component of T Levels but will be highly ambitious and challenging to deliver on a national scale, requiring considerable effort to mitigate inequality of opportunity.
- A transition offer will be valuable but, where possible, should be a more open and inclusive proposition as opposed to being specifically linked to T Levels.
- There is general support for an 'in-year' funding model.
- T Levels will require a strong supportive infrastructure network, extensive marketing and time for the benefits to be realised, measured and promoted.

2.4 Young People's Education and Skills replied to the original consultation and we are pleased that the government has taken on board most of our comments. However, the government's response to the consultation has not addressed the central question of for whom are T levels intended and how will they sit with Applied General Qualifications.

3 Education Select Committee Inquiry into School and College Funding

3.1 The Education Select Committee is conducting an [inquiry into school and college funding](#). The deadline for written submissions was 30 May 2018. London Councils submitted a response to the inquiry, which is attached as Appendix A.

3.2 London Councils' submission to the Education Select Committee's inquiry focused on the impact of increased costs in schools and colleges in London and how the funding system could be improved to mitigate the impact of constrained budgets. London Councils believes that it is vital that the Treasury invests additional funding in the school system in the next Spending Review to ensure that:

- No school or college loses funding in real terms over the course of this parliament.
- Local authorities have sufficient high needs funding to be able to provide appropriate provision for all pupils with special educational needs and disabilities.
- London boroughs and their partners are able to plan sufficient places to meet the rising demand for school and college places.

3.3 In addition to extra investment in the school system London Councils is also calling for a number of policy changes to ease the pressure facing school and college budgets, including:

- Reverse the policy decision to reduce funding for full-time 18 year old students, in order that colleges and schools can fully support young people to achieve their potential.

- Continue and expand the government's investment in adult retraining, and the scheme should respond flexibly to local circumstances and economies.
- Protect the pupil premium and provide an area cost adjustment, to address the differences in the cost of living for London, in line with other education funding streams.
- Introduce a higher earnings threshold for Free School Meals eligibility to ensure that disadvantaged London school children are not penalised by the new criteria.
- Increase funding for English for Speakers of Other Languages in London and consider flexibility in funding to effectively target support.
- Allow local authorities maximum flexibility to transfer funds between the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) blocks to ensure greater accountability and enable local authorities and schools to balance their books.

4 Education Select Committee Inquiry into Special Educational Needs and Disabilities

- 4.1 The Education Select Committee is also conducting an [inquiry into Special Educational Needs and Disabilities \(SEND\)](#). London Councils has drafted a response to the inquiry. In its current form, the draft covers the issues highlighted below.
- 4.2 Local authorities have worked hard to meet the deadline (31 March 2018) for transition of statements to Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs). In order to ensure that local authorities can meet the statutory timescales for assessment and deliver EHCPs that are of a high quality on an ongoing basis, London Councils is calling on the government to:
 - Incorporate SEND Grant funding into council funding streams on an ongoing basis.
- 4.3 26 out of 31 London boroughs spent more than the amount allocated through the high needs block of the DSG in 2016/17, creating an aggregate 'funding gap' across these 26 boroughs of £100million. Therefore London Councils is calling on the government to:
 - Provide an immediate injection of funding into the high needs budget to compensate for the existing shortfall.
 - Provide real terms funding per pupil for high needs allocations, taking into account future growth in the number of pupils with SEN.
 - Continue to allow local authorities to transfer funding between the schools and high needs blocks of the DSG.
- 4.4 Demand for dedicated SEND places in London is increasing, and creating school places for children with SEND costs an average £69,055 per place (around three times as much as a mainstream school place). Therefore London Councils is calling on the government to:
 - Ensure basic need funding and any additional capital funding for SEND takes into account the actual cost of delivering new SEND places and expected demand.
 - Work with local authorities to create new special free schools in areas of high demand for SEND places.
- 4.5 Non-inclusive behaviour in the mainstream schools sector, including refusal to admit children with SEND, and inappropriately off-rolling, is affecting the provision that families are choosing and, in many cases, resulting in further pressure being placed on the high needs budget. Therefore London Councils is calling on the government to:

- Work with Ofsted to ensure that the Ofsted framework appropriately recognises inclusive practice.

5 Government review into school exclusions

- 5.1 The Department for Education has commissioned Edward Timpson to lead a review into school exclusions. The deadline for written submissions to the call for evidence was May 2018. London Councils submitted a response to the call for evidence, which is attached as Appendix B.
- 5.2 London Councils' submission highlighted the need for the review to consider off-rolling and admissions practices alongside formal exclusions, to fully understand the picture for pupils with SEND navigating the school system. Our response emphasised the fact that non-inclusive admissions practices are linked both to school funding pressures and accountability measures. We suggested that Ofsted could play a role in this agenda by taking the inclusivity of a school into account when undertaking school inspections and forming judgements.

Blank Page

► Education Select Committee: School and College funding inquiry

► A response from London Councils and ALDCS and the Association of London Directors of Children's Services (ALDCS)

London Councils and ALDCS represents London's 32 borough councils and the City of London. It is a cross-party organisation that works on behalf of all of its member authorities to make the case for powers, freedoms and resources to best serve the needs of London's residents and businesses. The Association of London Directors of Children's Services (ALDCS) is the London professional network for Directors of Children's Services and the regional branch of the Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS).

1. Introduction

- London Councils and ALDCS welcome the focus of the Education Select Committee's inquiry into school and college funding. This is an area of significant concern for London local government, given the current pressures facing school and college budgets and the recent introduction of the National Funding Formula.
- London Councils and ALDCS have collated considerable evidence of the scale and impact of funding pressures on schools and colleges, and would be happy to give evidence at the Committee hearings.

2. Summary

- London Councils and ALDCS' submission to the Education Select Committee's inquiry into school and college funding focuses on the impact of increased costs in schools and colleges in London and how the funding system could be improved to mitigate the impact of constrained budgets. London Councils and ALDCS believe that it is vital that the Treasury invests additional funding in the school system in the next Spending Review to ensure that:
 - no school or college loses funding in real terms over the course of this parliament
 - local authorities have sufficient high needs funding to be able to provide appropriate provision for all local pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)
 - London boroughs and their partners are able to plan sufficient places to meet the rising demand for school and college places
- In addition to extra investment in the school system London Councils and ALDCS are also calling for a number of policy changes to ease the pressure facing school and college budgets, including:
 - Reverse the policy decision to remove funding for 18 year olds in level 3 courses in order that colleges can fully support young people to achieve the best qualifications
 - Continue and expand the government's investment in adult retraining, and the scheme should respond flexibly to local circumstances and economies
 - Protect the pupil premium and provide an area cost adjustment, to address the differences in the cost of living for London, in line with other education funding streams.
 - Introduce a higher earnings threshold for Free School Meals (FSM) eligibility to ensure that disadvantaged London school children are not penalised by the new criteria
 - Increase funding for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) in London and consider flexibility in funding to effectively target support
 - Allow local authorities maximum flexibility to transfer funds between the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) blocks to ensure greater accountability between schools and enable local authorities and schools to balance their books

3. The Department for Education's priorities for the Spending Review

School revenue funding

- We welcome the Secretary of State for Education's additional £1.3 billion investment in the schools budget in 2018/19 and 2019/20. The funding will be vital in supporting London's schools to build on their current performance and continue to improve standards.
- However, London's schools will receive the smallest proportion of this funding. 67% of schools in London will receive the minimum (0.5% per pupil) funding increase in 2018-19, compared with just 35% of schools across the rest of England. Fourteen London boroughs will see more than 90% of their schools receive the floor of 0.5% per pupil in 2018-19.
- The National Audit Office (NAO) forecasts costs pressures of 1.6% in 2018-19 taking into account inflation, increased pension contributions and other additional costs. However, only 27% of London schools will receive an uplift of 1.6% from the recently announced allocations, compared to 56% in the rest of England. We estimate that the cost of meeting these budgetary pressures for every school by 2019/20 would be £406m nationally, including £99m for London.
- London Councils and ALDCS recognise that London schools are generally better funded than schools elsewhere in the country, reflecting higher costs in London, but London's school improvement success demonstrates clearly that this investment is well spent. London has the highest percentage (94%) of Ofsted-rated good or outstanding schools in the country as well as the best results at key stage 2 (67% received the expected standard) and GCSE (48.9% at attainment 8). The government needs to invest similar levels of funding in schools elsewhere in the country, along with support and leadership, to replicate this improvement journey nationwide.
- London Councils and ALDCS have serious concerns that the shortfall in real terms funding risks halting the excellent progress in school improvement that London's schools have made over the past twenty years. London Councils and ALDCS surveyed 400 head teachers across London for our *Talking Heads*¹ report. Many have already had to take drastic measures to balance their budgets: 47% of secondary schools have reduced the breadth of the curriculum, 70% of primary schools have cut the number of Teaching Assistants and 63% of all schools have reduced spending on learning resources.

¹ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/our-key-themes/children-and-young-people/education-and-school-places/talking-heads>

Education Select Committee: School and College funding inquiry

- These measures are already having a detrimental impact on teacher recruitment and retention, as more pressure is put on classroom teachers to cover additional work. Over 70% of school leaders in the capital believe that further funding cuts will result in negative outcomes for pupils.
- Budgetary pressures in schools are creating a reduction in the amount of support available for children with SEND in schools, resulting in schools requesting more financial assistance from the local authority to support pupils that they may previously have had the resources to support. Colleges are facing similar financial constraints and subsequent impact on the level of SEND support they are able to provide. We have also seen evidence that funding pressures are resulting in some schools taking a less inclusive approach to supporting children with SEND, including showing resistance or refusing to admit certain pupils, or taking pupils off the school roll informally.
- The decision by the Department for Education's to reduce the funding available to local authorities to spend on schools, through the Education Services Grant (ESG) and now the Central Schools block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) has put further pressure on schools, as local authorities are having to charge for services to schools that they have traditionally been able to provide for free.
- London Councils and ALDCS will be calling for the government to commit sufficient additional revenue funding in the Spending Review to ensure that no school loses funding in real terms over the course of this parliament.

Funding for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

- The reduction in support for SEND children available in schools is particularly challenging at a time when local authorities in London are already dealing with the triple pressure of managing SEND budgets during a period of rapid growth in the general child population, an exponential increase in the prevalence of SEND rates and significant shifts in types of need. London Councils and ALDCS' analysis reveals that in 2016/17 the amount spent on high needs was greater than the amount allocated through the high needs block of the DSG in 26 out of 31 boroughs creating an aggregate 'funding gap' across these 26 boroughs of £100 million (£3.9 million per borough).
- Between 2013/14 and 2016/17, high needs allocations to boroughs increased by 2 per cent, the number of pupils with Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans increased by 10 per cent, budgets

increased by 13 per cent and actual spend increased by 16 per cent.² This demand is set to increase, particularly as the general child population continues to grow in London.

- Meeting this substantial shortfall had a major impact on the wider schools funding in 2016/17 including around £46 million being diverted from other blocks within the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and boroughs having to draw on £20 million of reserves. However, these mechanisms are not sustainable in the long term. The loss of flexibility introduced with the cap on transfers between the DSG blocks and pressure on reserves and other funds will make it increasingly difficult for local authorities to be able to find ways to balance their high needs budgets. It is vital that the government commits additional funding to enable local authorities to provide appropriate provision to meet the rising demand for SEND places.
- The rising demand for SEND places is also putting significant pressure on demand for SEN transport. London Councils and ALDCS' analysis revealed that in 2016/17 the London boroughs were overspent on their SEN transport budgets by £1m per average.

School capital funding

- London Councils and ALDCS estimate that approximately 67,000 additional school places will be needed in London until 2022/23 which will cost an estimated additional £1 billion between 2019/20 and 2022/23, through a combination of expanding existing schools and creating new free schools to meet demand for places. This pressure will be felt particularly for places at secondary and special schools across London.
- London Councils and ALDCS call on the government to ensure that it commits sufficient funding for the London boroughs to meet the rising demand for school places with sufficient provision.

College funding

- Similarly, colleges are facing a number of significant financial challenges including: increasing pension contributions (the Department for Education (DfE) increased Teacher Pension Scheme contributions from 14.1% to 16.48% in 2015 and may make further increases to take effect from

² Based on 24 boroughs providing full time series data

April 2019) and increasing inflation without additional funding, and reduced income from apprenticeships since the introduction of the Apprenticeship Levy. London Councils and ALDCS urge the government to invest sufficient additional revenue funding to ensure that no college loses funding in real terms over the course of this parliament, in line with our funding ask for schools.

- Demand for college provision is expected to rise in the next few years as the increase in London's child population works its way through the education system. This is particularly significant in light of Raising the Participation Age, which legislates that all young people must remain in education or training until the age of 18, resulting in more young people remaining in the education system. London Councils and ALDCS are calling on the government to provide more capital funding to ensure enough places are created to meet this rising demand for college places.
- From 2014/15, the government decided to cut the funding rate for full-time 18 year olds in schools and colleges. Many of these students spend their first year catching up on learning in order that they can achieve a good level 3 qualification over the following two years. The reduction in funding therefore disincentivises schools and colleges (the impact on colleges is more than seven times greater than the impact on school sixth forms, confirmed in the DfE's Impact Assessment) from providing this extra support to more vulnerable learners who are more likely to be in need of three years to secure their qualification. Students who are not supported in this way are likely to only achieve a Level 2 qualification, thereby reducing their long-term employment prospects. If colleges decide to continue to offer a third year of education for students who are struggling, this puts additional pressure on their budgets.
- The government's T Level proposals include a 'transition year' for young learners who need extra support before they start their two year T Level programme. This shows that the government acknowledges the importance of flexibility in further education courses – if they are supporting this flexibility then they should fully fund it.
- London Councils and ALDCS are calling on the government to reverse the policy decision to remove funding for 18 year olds in level 3 courses in order that colleges can fully support young people to achieve the best qualifications and enhance their employment options.

Education Select Committee: School and College funding inquiry

- There continues to be a high and unmet need for ESOL in London. 210,000 working-age adults in London cannot speak English well and around 25,000 cannot speak English at all³. Public spending on ESOL has been reduced by 60 per cent since 2009. Funding changes have most affected people in low paid work, women with childcare responsibilities and those with low-level English literacy and language skills⁴. Over half of providers - rising to two thirds of colleges - report that they struggle to meet demand for ESOL at all levels⁵. The government should increase funding for ESOL in London and consider flexibility in funding to effectively target support.
- Adult retraining will be vital if London is to meet its future training needs once the UK has left the EU and in order for Londoners to effectively deal with the impact of future automation and disruptive technologies on skill demands. London Councils and ALDCS welcome the announcement of the National Retraining Scheme, with initial funding of £64m. This investment needs to continue and expand, and the scheme should respond flexibly to local circumstances and economies.

4. The Spending Review cycle

- London Councils and ALDCS do not have a view on whether the Spending Review is the best mechanism for determining overall expenditure for schools and colleges. However, it is important that whatever mechanism is used with whatever timeframe, funding keeps up with real terms costs. For example any increases in pay awards need to be covered in funding allocations. Allocations also need to be announced with enough time for schools and local authorities to plan their own budgets.

5. Targeted funding

- London Councils and ALDCS support the allocation of pupil premium funding as an additional means for schools to support disadvantaged pupils. It is important that this additional funding is retained to help narrow the gap in outcomes between pupils.

³ 2011 Census

⁴ Department for Business, Innovation & Skills (2011) 'English for speakers of other languages: equality impact scheme'

⁵ GLA (2017) 'London Adult Community Learning Review Report'

Education Select Committee: School and College funding inquiry

- However, there is an inconsistency between deprivation funding within the National Funding Formula and deprivation funding channelled through the pupil premium outside of the formula. Whilst deprivation factors based on free school meals (FSM) within the National Funding Formula will be area cost adjusted, the pupil premium grant based on the same criteria is currently distributed through a flat per pupil rate. A pupil premium without an Area Cost Adjustment for London means that it will have less of an impact for disadvantaged children in London. London has some of the most deprived areas of the country and it is important that pupils in these areas get a fair allocation of the pupil premium to enhance their educational attainment. London Councils and ALDCS believe that the pupil premium should be protected and adjusted for area costs, to address the differences in the cost of living, in line with other education funding streams.
- Free school meals eligibility is used to determine additional funding for schools through the pupil premium. The flat threshold for free school meals eligibility introduced recently as part of changes relating to the roll out of Universal Credit does not take into account the higher levels of earnings in London. Earnings in London are markedly higher than other areas of the country due to the disproportionately high cost of living in the capital. The 2016 Annual Survey Hours and Earnings (ASHE) data shows median earnings in London are 24% higher than the national average⁶. Therefore, children in London households where parents have similar occupations, work a similar number of hours and have proportionately similar levels of disposable income, are less likely to be eligible for free school meals under the new criteria compared with children in the rest of the country. This will in turn affect pupil premium allocations for London schools, with less disadvantaged pupils being eligible than previously, and London Councils and ALDCS are concerned about the impact this will have on the attainment of disadvantaged pupils. London Councils and ALDCS have called for a higher earnings threshold to be introduced for FSM eligibility to ensure that disadvantaged London school children are not penalised by the new criteria.

6. Practical implementation of the National Funding Formula

⁶ Source:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/datasets/placeofresidencebylocalauthorityashet/able8>

- London Councils and ALDCS do not support the cap on transfers between the blocks of the Dedicated Schools Grant, which came into effect in April 2018 as part of the introduction of the National Funding Formula. Local authorities and schools forums use this flexibility to move funding to where it is needed most locally. For example, in 2016/17 26 out of 31 London boroughs were overspent on the High Needs Block collectively by approximately £100m due to increased demand and rising costs; almost half of this overspend was balanced through transfers from other blocks of the DSG. London Councils and ALDCS are calling on the government to continue to allow local authorities maximum flexibility to transfer funds between the DSG blocks to ensure greater accountability between schools and enable local authorities to balance their books.
- London Councils and ALDCS believe that the schools forum is the best mechanism through which to distribute all school revenue funding to schools as it allows for local flexibility to address any emerging issues swiftly and effectively. Therefore, we welcome the continued use of the schools forum to distribute school funding through the National Funding Formula.

Blank Page

A Review of School Exclusion: Call for evidence

London Councils welcomes the announcement of Edward Timpson's review into exclusions and the opportunity to submit evidence on this important area. The number of permanent exclusions in London has reduced since 2007 but fixed term exclusions have increased over the past three years, equating to over 25,000 young people a year. In the context of these numbers and London's growing child population the London boroughs have significant concerns about exclusions and the impact that they have on their outcomes.

The likelihood of a child or young person with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) being excluded from school is seven times higher than that of a child without SEND. This is a particular concern for the London boroughs which are facing the dual challenge of rising numbers of SEND pupils at the same time as shortfalls in SEND budgets. Therefore, this submission will focus predominantly on the impact of exclusions on this cohort of children.

Unlawful exclusions / off-rolling (the removal by one means or another, of students from a school's roll)

While analysing formal exclusion trends is important, we would urge the review to also consider the use of unlawful exclusions by schools – or off-rolling. Many London boroughs have reported that the practice of off-rolling pupils with SEND and/or behavioural issues is becoming more prevalent. This has also been highlighted by representatives from parent carer forums in London with whom we have engaged as part of our research. In the 2017 version of *Do The Maths*, London Councils' annual school places planning report, over half of London boroughs (14 out of 23 respondents) reported that they had experienced at least one academy in their local area inappropriately off-rolling pupils with SEND.¹

The practice of off-rolling was also picked up in research that the Department for Education commissioned the ISOS Partnership to undertake in 2015. The findings highlighted in the research report reflect the experience of London boroughs: "During our fieldwork we heard about instances of "back-door" exclusion in which parents of children with SEN would be told by a headteacher that a school "wasn't right" for their child or that another nearby mainstream school would be "much better at meeting the needs of a child like yours".²

The informal nature of this practice, and the fact that parents do not tend to report such interactions, makes it extremely hard to pick up vulnerable children that are being passed around different parts of the education system without being able to access the support they need, or being pushed out of formal education altogether. It also restricts national and local government's ability to understand the scale and true impact of non-inclusive practices. Looking solely at formal exclusions masks the true extent of the challenge in dealing with

¹ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/32443>

² Research on funding for children with special educational needs, July 2015, ISOS Partnership, Natalie Parish and Ben Bryant, p.58

exclusions, therefore we would encourage the exclusions review team to include informal exclusions in the scope of their work. We would also suggest that the exclusions review identifies a mechanism for collecting and analysing data on off-rolling in a robust way to ensure that they can fully understand the scale of off-rolling practice across the country. London Councils would be happy to speak to the team about the work we are doing in this area, including how we plan to collate data from the boroughs in a systematic way.

The link with admissions practices

London Councils recommends that the review of exclusions also considers the trends in admissions practices and the impact these have on the journey of vulnerable children and young people who have been permanently excluded from school or off-rolled.

Many boroughs have experienced schools refusing to admit children with SEND and/or a history of poor behaviour. *Do The Maths 2017* found that 19 out of 24 London boroughs had experienced at least one academy resisting or refusing to admit a child with SEND. 14 boroughs reported that they had come across this situation on more than four occasions. While local authorities can experience resistance from maintained schools as well as academies, the challenge is particularly great in relation to academies because councils do not have the power to direct an academy to change their approach, as they would a maintained school. Furthermore, the fact that academies (as well as a growing number of maintained schools) now act as their own admissions authorities means that councils are not systematically made aware of instances where a school has encouraged the parent to look elsewhere, or refused to admit a certain child, and therefore do not always have the full picture.

Local authorities report instances of having worked successfully with individual schools and governors to change their approach, but in many cases councils have had to support pupils and parents to find appropriate alternative provision.

Barriers to inclusive practice in schools

Schools need to be encouraged and supported to develop inclusive policies and practices. There are currently two key areas which make it more difficult for schools to act in an inclusive manner: funding and accountability measures. These are areas that the ISOS Partnership report, *Research on funding for children with Special Educational Needs*, highlights as impacting on the approach taken by schools.

Funding

School funding pressures are restricting schools' abilities to adequately support vulnerable children. The National Audit Office has identified that all schools will face additional per pupil cost pressures of 1.6 per cent in both 2018/19 and 2019/20¹. The Department for Education announced an additional £1.3bn for 2018/19 and 2019/20. However, 70 per cent of London's schools are set to only receive an 0.5 per cent uplift, the minimum increase, which means that they will face a reduction in real terms per pupil funding when factoring in the expected rise in costs, as forecast by the National Audit Office. London's schools will receive substantially less of this additional funding than the other regions in the country.

This funding pressure is taking its toll on London schools. London Councils' 2017 *Talking Heads* survey found that 70 per cent of London schools had experienced budget cuts over the last two years. In particular, the report highlighted that 74 per cent of schools in London are expecting budgetary cuts to result in negative outcomes for pupils with SEND, and headteachers interviewed as part of the research reported that resource pressures on schools had affected children with SEND in particular. The most common reasons for this were the reduction in staff numbers (for example, teaching assistants, inclusion team staff, class teachers, mental health counsellors, speech and language therapists); increases in overall class sizes; and reductions in the number of small group and one-to-one sessions on offer.

Funding pressures are making it harder for schools to support children with additional needs. This is partly due to appropriately qualified staff or the right infrastructure to offer sufficient support for children with SEND not being in place. It is also due to the fact that budgetary pressures are making it harder for schools to fund the first £6,000 of a child's support needs, which they are currently required to do before the council can step in with additional funding. The ISOS Partnership report highlighted that "some headteachers or SENCOs used the £6,000 threshold as an argument for not admitting a child with SEN as it would necessitate displacing funding from the education of other children in the school."³

Accountability

The second factor affecting schools' willingness to act inclusively is accountability measures. The ISOS Partnership report highlights, "Many heads argued that the current accountability system does not incentivise inclusive behaviours and those who go beyond the norm in creating an inclusive school environment do so on the basis of a strong moral conviction and in spite of a number of countervailing system pressures."⁴

The Ofsted schools inspection framework does not take account of the inclusivity of a school when awarding judgements, and does not appear to investigate instances of non-compliance with the SEND reforms.

The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services and Skills 2016/17 highlights this issue, noting that of the schools that have not been good or outstanding at any point since 2005: "Many had higher-than-average proportions of pupils who have special educational needs and/or disabilities."

If the Ofsted framework were to appropriately recognise inclusive practice –this could encourage more schools to prioritise inclusion and regard it as integral to improving the quality of education on offer to all children.

Impact of non-inclusive practice in schools

The approach taken by some mainstream schools to exclusions, off-rolling and admissions of some of the most vulnerable children is driving more children towards specialist and alternative provision places. For some children and young people specialist and alternative provision is the right option to support their needs and help them to achieve positive

³ ISOS Partnership, p. 60

⁴ ISOS Partnership, p. 58

outcomes. However, others may be driven towards these types of provision as a result of experiencing non-inclusive practices in mainstream settings, which may be detrimental in terms of their overall long term outcomes.

Furthermore, this trend is placing significant pressure on specialist and alternative provision places in many London boroughs, which is resulting in a further strain on high needs block funding. In 2016/17, 26 out of 31 London boroughs spent more than the amount allocated through the high needs block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), creating an aggregate 'funding gap' across these 26 boroughs of £100 million. Boroughs have reported that a significant factor impacting on high needs block overspends is the overreliance on specialist places, particularly those in independent special schools or out-of-borough settings. These types of provision tend to be significantly more expensive than local maintained provision. London has a higher proportion of children with SEND educated in independent provision than the rest of England, which accounts for 9.2 per cent of all SEND places in London in compared to 6.6 per cent nationally (2017).⁵

Considering the growing demand on specialist and alternative places, more capital funding is required for local authorities to be able to expand provision locally. The DfE recently approved plans for 20 special free schools across the country, including five in London, but demand still persists across the capital. 14 out of 16 London boroughs said that they would be likely to put in an application for a special free school if the DfE were to run another round of applications.⁶ Boroughs are also waiting on the announcement of the next wave of free schools, which in many cases will be used to provide new specialist or alternative provision to meet demand. This extra provision within the borough would help reduce the reliance on expensive out of borough placements.

⁵ <http://lginform.local.gov.uk/reports/view/send-research/local-area-send-report>

⁶ This data is taken from a survey undertaken by London Councils in August 2017