



---

# NOTICE OF MEETING

---

**EDUCATION, CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY PANEL**

**MONDAY, 2 FEBRUARY 2015 AT 7.00 PM**

**CONFERENCE ROOM L - CIVIC OFFICES**

Telephone enquiries to Lisa Gallacher 02392 834056

Email: [lisa.gallacher@portsmouthcc.gov.uk](mailto:lisa.gallacher@portsmouthcc.gov.uk)

---

## **Membership**

Councillor Will Purvis (Chair)  
Councillor Ben Dowling  
Councillor Ken Ferrett

Councillor Paul Godier  
Councillor Lynne Stagg  
Councillor Alistair Thompson

## **Standing Deputies**

Councillor Margaret Adair  
Councillor Colin Galloway

Councillor Terry Hall  
Councillor Matthew Winnington

---

(NB This Agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting.)

Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: [www.portsmouth.gov.uk](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk)

## **AGENDA**

- 1 Apologies for absence**
- 2 Declaration of Members' Interests**
- 3 Minutes of Previous Meeting - 24 November 2014 (Pages 1 - 8)**

**RECOMMENDED that the minutes of the previous meeting of 24 November 2014 be confirmed and signed by the chair as a correct record.**

**4 Review into Pupil Premium in Portsmouth Schools (Pages 9 - 44)**

The panel's final report is attached.

**RECOMMENDED that the panel sign off this report.**

**5 New topic for review - Youth Offending Team Improvement Plan**

The panel will draft the scoping document and discuss potential witnesses, and the proposed timetable for future meetings to receive evidence on their new review. Officers will be in attendance to assist the panel.

Members of the public are now permitted to use both audio visual recording devices and social media during this meeting, on the understanding that it neither disrupts the meeting or records those stating explicitly that they do not wish to be recorded. Guidance on the use of devices at meetings open to the public is available on the Council's website and posters on the wall of the meeting's venue.

# Agenda Item 3

## EDUCATION, CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY PANEL

RECORD OF DECISIONS of the meeting of the Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel held on Monday, 24 November 2014 at 7.00 pm in Ground Floor Meeting Room 5, Civic Offices.

### Present

Councillor Will Purvis (in the Chair)  
Ben Dowling  
Ken Ferrett  
Lynn Stagg

### Education Representative

Helen Reeder, Portsmouth National Union of Teachers

#### 34. Apologies for Absence (AI 1)

No apologies for absence had been received.

#### 35. Declarations of Interest (AI 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 36. Minutes of the Meeting of 20 October 2014 (AI 3)

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the Education, Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel held on 20 October 2014 be confirmed as a correct record.**

#### 37. Scrutiny of Children's Services (AI 4)

(TAKE IN REPORT)

Julian Wooster, Director of Children's and Adult's Services presented his report. He reminded the panel that the report had been requested at a previous ECYP Scrutiny Panel meeting following the recent Ofsted report. Ofsted had searched the public reports on the Council's website and raised concern that there were insufficient public reports on the scrutiny of children's services. Mr Wooster advised that the Cabinet Member for Children and Education receives weekly briefings with him and as part of these he is briefed on any cases of concern. Elected members are also well represented on the Corporate Parenting Board and the Children's Trust Board. He summarised the section of the action plan attached to the report which had been submitted to Ofsted.

Members commented that they need to know what questions to ask in order to be able to challenge and scrutinise effectively and also need to be clear on what information they are entitled to have in order to carry out this role. Mr

Wooster confirmed it was appropriate for members to challenge him on performance of the service.

Cllr Purvis said he was pleased with the action plan however was conscious that there was a risk with circulating the reports/minutes of the suggested meetings would not always be read. He asked whether in addition to this 15 minutes of each ECYP meeting could be dedicated to one of the issues with a relevant officer present to answer questions from members. The panel could then decide whether more detailed scrutiny of the issue is required. The panel agreed this would be useful and Mr Wooster agreed to make arrangements for this.

With regard to training, Cllr Purvis said he was pleased that there had been some recent sessions for members around looked after children and safeguarding, however he was keen for the panel to receive further training in order for the members to gain an in depth understanding of the area. He suggested that following each municipal year a development plan for members is created so they can raise any areas where they would like more training. Mr Wooster advised that the Chief Executive was currently in discussions with the LGA regarding the potential for them to provide free training for members on children's services. The panel agreed they would welcome this training and would also be keen to receive more internal training. The panel agreed they would welcome an update from the Chief Executive on progress with the LGA training. Mr Wooster said he would follow this up and inform the panel.

#### **RESOLVED**

**(1) That the proposed way forward outlined by the Director of Children's and Adult's Services for the scrutiny of children's services be approved. In addition an item be included on every ECYP agenda for any issues in Children's and Adult's services to be reported and discussed with a relevant officer.**

**(2) That Mr Wooster will ask the Chief Executive about progress with the LGA training for members and would review with the City Solicitor further training sessions for the panel.**

#### **38. Review into Pupil Premium (AI 5)**

The chair welcomed all guests to the meeting and introductions were made around the table before evidence was given.

(a) Loreley Lawrence, Governor Highbury Primary and Nursery

Ms Lawrence advised that that her school has closed the gap in reading and writing by 2.4%. In their action research project on maths 100% of their PP children made expected progress and of those, 30% made more than expected progress. The school has two ladies at school who help the PP children and their parents. Interventions include providing a mini bus to help children get to and from school, advising parents with money

matters, debt advice, food bank information, and involving the parents by asking them to help the PP children with their reading. She advised that there was a HMI report on their school website and that she found RAISE on line helpful. The governors will be discussing PP at the teaching and learning meeting on 1st December. Ms Lawrence said she felt more time should be spent on PP training, and that governors must be prepared to dedicate more time to monitor PP spend.

(b) Emma Kelsall, Governor Services Officer

Mrs Kelsall advised that governor services were very involved in assisting governors with PP. The team offers a service where individual queries are answered such as how to effectively challenge their head teacher on PP use, or on how much information should be reported on their website on an individual basis. The team offers full governing body training where the school can choose the topics covered and often PP is included as part of these sessions. The team assists governors on how they can effectively challenge school leaders. In June this year a general finance training session was held for governors which had a specific section on PP. The recent PP conference on 17 November was also open to governors to attend and positive feedback had been received from those who had attended this. There had been a conference for governors to include a specific training session for governors on PP scheduled for October. This however has been postponed until late spring as was felt that October was a busy time of year for governors due being just after the beginning of the new term.

The governor services team keep abreast with the information released by the DfE and national governors association such as toolkits and will pass this information on to governors. The team also works closely with the education officers. Mrs Kelsall said that eventually she would like to see the team offer specific PP training rather than having this included in another session. She also thought that offering sessions for both the head teacher and chair of governors to attend would be useful and was looking to offer this in the future.

Mrs Kelsall said that the gap was narrowing well with primary schools however there was still work to be done with secondary schools. Many secondary schools have become academies and some do not buy in to the governor services SLA. As a result of this the governor services team now has limited contact with the governing bodies of these schools.

(c) Patrick Hill, Vice Chair of Governors, Chair of Finance, Redwood Park School

Mr Hill gave a brief history of the situation at Redwood Park and explained that inherited difficulties had meant that PP had been further down the agenda for detailed focus for a period of time. PP it is being managed very well and documents provided the evidence for this. Redwood Park received £75,600 PP in 2013-14 and the majority of money is spent on improving literacy. James Copeland the Interventions Leader at the school

was the lead for PP and he is very enthusiastic and makes sure that the PP grant is spent and accurately tracked where the money is going. The school has found that those pupils receiving dedicated support from the PP funded activities were outperforming other pupils who were not in receipt of the funding.

(d) Claire Tomlinson, Vice Chair of Governors at Corpus Christi School

Ms Tomlinson explained that in Corpus Christi there are 59 pupils eligible for PP and the amount received for 2014-15 was £73,800. The school has found that boosting teaching in small groups and targeted interventions by experienced teachers have been the most effective use of their PP. The quality of teaching is vital to improve educational attainment. The school has part time teachers covering a class so that the senior teacher can be released to focus on smaller groups of pupils who need extra support. They also have a writing specialist to work with targeted pupils to deliver 1:1 support and work with a small group of pupils to accelerate progress and narrow the gap in attainment. The governing body monitors the progress of PP pupils through both the finance committee and the curriculum committee. The head teacher presents the data to governors in various forms and the governors review this and drill down into cases where pupils are not making the expected amount of progress. With KS1 the gap was narrowing but with KS2 more work needed to be done. It was also interesting to note that EAL pupils also made more progress than other pupils.

Questions and discussion

- Councillor Purvis commented that Redwood Park School had adopted a targeted approach with 80% of their pupils benefitting from the PP funding. Mr Hill replied that the vast majority of funding had been spent on extra time and quality teaching, which was a slight contrast to the schools who attended the previous meeting. Both Highbury Primary and Corpus Christi schools have a relatively low amount of PP pupils so it is sensible for them to have a less targeted approach.
- Councillor Stagg said that at the 17<sup>th</sup> November PP conference she attended, it was highlighted that schools who have very few registered free school meal (FSM) pupils PP is focussed on those pupils and they do well, schools with a large number of PP pupils also do well at narrowing the gap, but it is the schools in the middle who are struggling most to narrow the gap. Advice was given at the conference that having outstanding teaching was the most important method for improving PP rather than employing additional teaching assistants.
- Councillor Purvis asked the governors if their school monitored their performance on narrowing the gap against other schools both locally and nationally. Ms Tomlinson said that Corpus Christi do look nationally following advice from Ofsted to do this. Mr Hill said that Redwood Park School monitor their school against two other

special schools one locally in Emsworth and one nationally in Bath. Mrs Kelsall said that governor services encourage governors to use the data dashboard to compare nationally and also against other schools in the city.

- In response to a question about value for money for interventions, Ms Tomlinson said that last year the school had hired several part time teachers so a lot more interventions were in place. The education officers assisted the governors in monitoring this to see the impact of these. Mr Hill said that in his school, one to one tuition is the intervention achieving the most value for money. This was particularly important as Redwood Park is a special school as this keeps the pupils on topic and allows for more focussed learning.
- Councillor Stagg had provided some notes from the PP conference which had been circulated to the panel. She said the HMI session had highlighted some excellent ideas and that Ofsted inspectors want to know the impact that PP is having and schools should have a dedicated person in charge of monitoring its spend and impact. Ms Tomlinson advised that she also worked in a secondary school in Hampshire and in this school the books of PP students are marked first to ensure that they are given the necessary attention. Seating plans of the classroom are produced so that the teacher knows who the PP pupils are so that they receive more attention. Ms Reeder advised that this took place in her school and advised that the pupils would not know who the PP pupils are. Teachers are asked what they are doing for each pupil and are asked to prove their accountability.
- With regard to how PP practice is shared in the city, Mrs Kelsall advised that the HMI at the recent conference had suggested establishing a PP coordinators network for the city. Governor services were also considering ways of sharing information that would not take up too much time for governors, bearing in mind they are volunteers. She felt that social media is not currently being utilised enough in this area and this was something that governor services are looking to improve. One of the clerks had set up a Facebook group for all clerks in the city to share ideas and best practice without having to take time to meet in person. This had been very well received and it was proposed to eventually roll this out for chairs of governors as well. Councillor Purvis felt this was an excellent idea and suggested that the private sector could provide some advice on how best to do this.
- Councillor Purvis said he attended the afternoon session of the conference and said he observed several discussions between school representatives on PP which was a great networking opportunity to share best practice. Mrs Kelsall said that the training sessions are always tailored so that there are networking sections in them as it is recognised that this is a useful way to share best

practice and ideas.

- In response to a question about the amount of time involved for governors on PP, Ms Tomlinson and Ms Lawrence said that governors must be prepared to dedicate time to monitoring PP spend and that they were both happy with that.
- In response to a question about how far up the agenda PP was in schools and whether for example was this a regular governing board item, Ms Lawrence said it was an item on their teaching and learning meeting on 1 December however in the future separate meetings just on PP may be required. Mr Hill said that his school they had brought in a regime of agenda planning and PP is likely to be scrutinised every term. Their two sub committees been given a level of autonomy and they pass and agree motions which are sent to the full governing body to be ratified. Ms Tomlinson said that it was a standing item on their finance and curriculum committees.
- In answer to a question about whether PP was part of the schools improvement plan, the governors present were uncertain. Mrs Kelsall suggested that she could contact chairs of governors to find out whether there is a standing item on the FGB agenda for PP and also whether there is a specific governor for PP. The Panel felt this would be useful information and asked Mrs Kelsall to proceed with this. Mrs Reeder added that there was a danger that if PP is not spent correctly the government may decide not to continue to provide PP funding in the future.
- Councillor Purvis said about the opportunity to look at the comparative impact in other schools. Currently the LA is not measuring this and those present felt this would be useful.
- Councillor Purvis said that interventions can sometimes be less obvious when individual cases are drilled down into. He shared with the panel the washing machine analogy which was told at the PP conference. He explained that a school had a number of pupils absent on a particular day of the week. When this was looked into it was found this coincided with having PE this day and pupils did not want to attend as they had no PE kit and if they attended they would be forced to wear the schools PE kits which were often dirty. The school responded by purchasing a washing machine to make sure the spare kits are always clean which made attendance levels increase on this day of the week. Another intervention mentioned was buying pupils alarm clocks to ensure that children wake up in good time for school and this has found to have made a big difference. Ms Reeder said that it was difficult to record the progress of non-direct interventions such as this although they can have a significant impact.
- Councillor Dowling said that PP funding is a huge amount of money however it was not until the last year that this was taken at a



serious level. It is a flagship government policy and therefore important that all governors understand PP and it is at the top of their agenda.

- In response to a question about what the governors would like to see the council do to help governors with PP, Ms Lawrence said the PP conference was useful and further training and networking opportunities would be welcomed. Mrs Kelsall said that this could be done for those schools that buy in to the governor services SLA. She felt that running sessions for both the chair of governor and head teacher and any other lead members of staff to attend would also add value and allow for a more joined up approach. Ms Tomlinson said that the governors at her school always rely on the Head teacher to make sure they are interpreting data correctly so it is difficult to challenge the head teacher sometimes. More outside support such as the recent conference would be welcomed.
- It was noted that it was unrealistic to say that governors should know and understand everything possible so long as governors know where to find information they don't know. The panel felt that PP was such a big topic however and that governors should endeavour to get to grips with this area of their school.
- There was some concern that with schools moving to academies that the LA has lost contact with a number of school governing bodies. Councillor Purvis asked whether there was merit on having some training sessions to sell to academies that don't buy into the SLA. Mrs Kelsall said that lots of academies do still buy in to the SLA. Following the departure of the Senior Governor Support Officer earlier this year the whole governor services team is being reviewed and they were considering whether to commission the training or keep this in-house. More could be done to help support academies including pay as you use training sessions for them although it was noted that it was likely that the academy sponsors had their own training sessions they offered.

The panel thanked the governors for attending.

### **39. Dates of Future Meetings and Way Forward for Review (AI 6)**

The Panel felt they had received good evidence over the last few meetings and were keen to move forward and start drafting their report. It was agreed to hold an informal meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December to start discussing recommendations and to see whether further evidence gathering was required. It was agreed that the panel's final report would be circulated to all governors and head teachers.

The meeting concluded at 8.45 pm.

---

Councillor Will Purvis  
Chair

# Agenda Item 4



# Portsmouth CITY COUNCIL

EDUCATION, CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE  
SCRUTINY PANEL

**A REVIEW INTO PUPIL PREMIUM IN PORTSMOUTH SCHOOLS**

**Date published: 2 February 2015**

**Under the terms of the Council's Constitution, reports prepared by a Scrutiny Panel should be considered formally by the Cabinet or the relevant Cabinet Member within a period of eight weeks, as required by Rule 11(a) of the Policy & Review Procedure Rules.**

## PREFACE

The aim of this review was to investigate how schools are using and reporting pupil premium monies and whether the Council could identify and disseminate good practice. It was also intended to use the process to ensure that all schools are sharing information about pupil premium appropriately.

During the review which was carried out between September 2014 and February 2015, the Panel received evidence from a number of sources, which it used to draw up a series of recommendations to submit to the Cabinet.

I would like to convey, on behalf of the Panel my sincere thanks to all the officers who contributed to the review. I would also like to thank Helen Reeder from Portsmouth National Union of Teachers for her valuable input into the review.

I would also like to thank the governors and head teachers who took time to attend panel meetings to provide evidence. Also thanks to those chairs of governors who responded to the questionnaire sent by Governor Services (a full list of schools who responded is set out in paragraph 8.8).

.....  
Councillor Will Purvis  
Chair, Education, Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel.

Date: 2 February 2015

## **CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Executive Summary.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Conclusions.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Recommendations.</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Purpose.</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Background.</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>To consider the impact following the introduction of pupil premium.</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>To gain an insight into how pupil premium is currently being used in Portsmouth City Council schools.</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>To review the effectiveness of the reporting process by schools.</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>To review the local authority's role in supporting schools with pupil premium</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>To establish the amount of pupil premium grant each school in Portsmouth receives.</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>To establish the level of awareness among school governors on the use of the Pupil Premium Grant in their schools</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>To identify and share best practice.</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Equalities Impact Assessment.</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Legal Comments.</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Finance Comments.</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Budget and Policy Implications of the Recommendations.</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendix 1 –List of meetings held by the Panel and details of the documents received.</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix 2 - A glossary of terms used.</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix 3 - PPG allocations by school for 2014/15.</b>	<b>33</b>

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. To consider the impact following the introduction of Pupil Premium Grant.**

The Panel received evidence from the Interim Head of Education and the Interim Education Commissioning Manager about the impact pupil premium grant (PPG) has had in the city. The Panel noted that overall standards in Portsmouth have risen since PPG has been introduced and PPG eligible children are catching up with the non PPG children. However, as highlighted in the Ofsted Annual Report 2014, more needs to be done in the city. The panel learned that although the introduction of Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) presents a risk to schools with regard to the amount of money they receive; most schools are taking steps to ensure that all families who are eligible for FSM are registering for this.

### **2. To gain an insight into how pupil premium is currently being used in Portsmouth City Council Schools.**

The Panel heard from headteachers and governors in the city about how their schools are using the PPG funding to improve outcomes for pupils and noted some excellent initiatives that are in place for improving education outcomes for pupils. Identifying the right projects in which to invest PPG is vital to ensuring the best impact from the grant. It was also noted that different interventions worked for different schools and there is no 'one size fits all' with regard to pupil premium programmes. Two members of the Panel also attended the local PP conference held in November where the national pupil premium champion, Sir John Dunford attended to share best practice.

### **3. To review the effectiveness of the reporting process by schools.**

Under Regulation 10 (9) of the School Information (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012, schools are required to publish specified information on their school website in relation to PPG - spend and effectiveness/impact. The majority of schools in the city were doing this however there are some schools where some of this information is lacking and could be improved upon. Advice from Sir John Dunford on this matter recommended that schools publish this information under four headings: strategy, cost, evaluation and impact.

### **4. To review the Local Authority's role in supporting schools with Pupil Premium.**

The local authority (LA) has a statutory role to ensure that outcomes are improved for children and has a role in oversight, advice and sharing of best practice in relation to PPG. The Panel learned of some of the work of the education officers and the governor services team that takes place to help support schools with PPG. The LA also has initiated a PPG programme for secondary schools which involved a number of streams included organising and hosting a workshop for all

headteachers where the national pupil premium champion Sir John Dunford attended and shared advice. The Panel also received evidence from the Tackling Poverty Lead Officer about the Tackling Poverty Strategy which aims to alleviate poverty in the city. The strategy going forward will explore how PPG can be used strategically to improve social mobility. There is also a link between good health and educational attainment and the Panel received written evidence on initiatives that the Council has in place such as the 5-19 Healthy Child Programme which sets out the good practice framework for prevention and early intervention services for children. The PPG could help ensure the LA is able to deliver the healthy child programme in schools targeting those most deprived in a more strategic way.

**5. To establish the amount of Pupil Premium Grant each school in Portsmouth receives.**

PPG for maintained schools is allocated via the Council using data provided by the Department for Education (DfE). Schools are free to spend the money how they wish but are accountable for this and Ofsted review this as part of their inspections. In Portsmouth the largest amount of funding is for free school meals pupils with £6.2 million for primary school and £2.9 million for secondary school pupils. The Panel received a breakdown of how much each school received in 2014/15, which is included in appendix 3.

**6. To establish the level of awareness among school governors on the use of the Pupil Premium Grant in their schools.**

It is vital that school governors understand and articulate how PPG is spent and more importantly its impact. The Panel heard from three governors about PPG in their school to ascertain their level of awareness. Following this, a short questionnaire was also sent to all chairs of governors to ascertain further information about the level of involvement of governing bodies. It was found that while many governing bodies review PPG at their Finance Committee, the impact of PPG is not being reviewed as much as it could. The majority of governing bodies said that PPG was well understood by all governors in their school however the responses also suggested that further training specifically on PPG would be welcomed to ensure that governors understand fully how to measure the impact. Although the majority of governing bodies have a dedicated governor responsible for PPG, there were still some schools who replied who do not have this in place.

**7. To identify and share good practice.**

During their review the Panel heard of some excellent practice delivering impact in Portsmouth schools. Initiatives were being considered on how to share best practice in the city including for governors to utilise social media to share ideas and best practice. Schools in the city that are making significant improvements through using their PPG should also consider and be encouraged to enter the

pupil premium awards for a chance to win some further funding and achieve national recognition for their work.

### **Conclusions**

Based on the evidence and views it has received during the review process the Panel has come to the following conclusions:

1. Pupil premium practice varies in the city. There is some good practice locally but this is not consistent throughout the city. The Panel noted in Ofsted's 2014 Annual Report it states that the LA is making important improvements although the outcomes for young people are still not strong enough. It was also noted that different interventions worked for different schools and there is no 'one size fits all' with regard to pupil premium programmes. (Para 2.6 refers)
2. Excellent work is taking place by the LA in supporting schools through its work around the Pupil Premium and narrowing the gap for FSM children, through its wider work co-ordinated within the Council's Tackling Poverty Strategy and Healthy Child Programme. (Paras 6.11-6.21 refer).
3. Currently the comparative impact of PPG spend amongst schools locally is not being monitored by the LA. The various cluster groups in the city are considering how best to close the gap. (Paras 3.5 and 3.8 refer).
4. The recent pupil premium conference was very well received by headteachers and governors in the city. Further networking opportunities such as this to share best practice would be welcomed. (Paras 6.9 and 8.14 refer).
5. The seconded headteacher driving the pupil premium programme for secondary schools is working well, however more needs to be done to share best practice with primary schools. (Paras 6.3 and 9.4 refer).
6. Although a number of schools have moved to academy status, the LA continues to offer the opportunity to buy into the governor services SLA for training. Many academy schools have taken up this offer however there are some academy schools that the LA now has limited contact with. (Para 6.4 and 6.5 refer).
7. The support to governors on pupil premium from the governor services team is good although some governors felt that they required further training. Training sessions where both the chair of governor and the headteacher from each school attend would be welcomed as would further networking opportunities. (Para 6.10 and 8.14 refer).
8. School governing bodies should be directly involved in pupil premium funding and the challenge and evaluation of PPG funded programmes. Many governing bodies are looking PPG at their



Finance Committee however concern was raised that some governing bodies are not monitoring the impact. Governors were also uncertain whether PPG was included as part of their School Improvement Plan (Paras 8.2, 8.7 and 8.9 refer).

9. Awareness of pupil premium amongst governors varies in the city and best practice needs to be shared between governors. (Paras 8.4-8.15 refer)
10. Some schools do not have a governor who takes responsibility for overseeing PPG impact and spend. (Paras 8.10 & 8.11 refer).
11. In secondary schools PPG is tailored more towards individual PPG pupils however in primary schools it is used more to improve education for all pupils. A pupil premium awards scheme is in place which rewards schools for making significant improvements in closing the gap. (Paras 4.9, 9.6-9.8 refer).

### **Recommendations**

1. That the LA continues to share the good practice of pupil premium taking place in the city and this should be shared in the context of the healthy child programme and tackling poverty strategies. (conclusions 1&2)
2. That schools are encouraged to share best practice and be outward looking and encourage to engage with their clusters. (conclusion 1).
3. That the LA should continually review the impact of the pupil premium work locally and consider an audit of PPG activity in the city to identify what interventions are known to work in the different parts of the city. (conclusion 3)
4. That the LA and schools consider an ongoing joint program of work specifically focussed on PPG impact within clusters.(conclusion 3)
5. That the LA include pupil premium as a key theme for the annual governors' conference in Spring 2015. The LA should also seek to organise an annual pupil premium conference for the city which Sir John Dunford should be invited to contribute. (conclusion 4)
6. That a primary headteacher be seconded to drive the pupil premium programme across primary schools alongside a pupil premium co-ordinators network for the city to share best practice. (conclusion 5)
7. It is Important that there are strong links with academy schools and the LA should continue to work with academies to provide support with pupil premium. The LA should strongly encourage academy schools to join the LA programs of work (conclusion 6).
8. That the LA continues to provide a facilitative role to governors and that pupil premium programmes should be led by governors and

headteachers. The governor services team should investigate holding dedicated sessions for chairs of governors and headteachers to attend together. (conclusion 7)

9. That the LA investigates whether social media could be used further for governors to network and share best practice on the usage of PPG. (conclusions 7&9)
10. That all governing bodies monitor the impact of pupil premium through their standards/curriculum sub-committee as well as their finance committee, due to the importance of pupil premium. In addition all governing bodies should consider designating a dedicated PPG governor. (conclusions 8 and 10)
11. That the LA identify and appoint a pupil premium governor champion for the city to visit all governing bodies within the year to share best practice on pupil premium. The governor services team should also systematically share good practice with governing bodies. (conclusion 8&9)
12. That Governor Services follow up on those schools who did not respond to the questionnaire and to provide them with support to ensure that their governing bodies are fully engaged with pupil premium. (conclusion 8&9)
13. That the LA produces a pupil premium manual of good practice to share with schools. (conclusions 3&9)
14. That headteachers ensure that Pupil premium is embedded in the School Improvement Plan for their school. (conclusion 10)
15. That schools be encouraged, where possible, to aspire to achieve excellent pupil premium practice so that they can enter the pupil premium awards, for the opportunity to win some additional money for their school. Schools should also be encouraged to use PPG to maximise achievement for all pupils in their school who are not making the expected level of progress. (conclusion 11).
16. That the Head of Education circulate a copy of this report with a covering letter to all schools to advise of the panel's findings and to highlight the importance of the PPG.

The budgetary and policy implications of these recommendations are set out in section 13 on pages 28-30.

**1. Purpose.**

The purpose of this report is to present the Cabinet with the recommendations of the Education, Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel following its review of pupil premium in Portsmouth Schools.

## 2. Background.

- 2.1 PPG was introduced by the government in April 2011. It is an additional grant allocation to support schools in raising the educational attainment of disadvantaged pupils and to close the gap with their peers. It is allocated to schools on the basis of the number of pupils who have registered for free school meals (FSM) at any point in the last six years, children who have been looked after continuously in the last six months and children of service personnel.
- 2.2 The Pupil Premium Grant for 2014-15 is paid pursuant to section 14 of the Education Act 2002 and is allocated with certain terms and conditions as set out by the Secretary of State under the powers of Section 16 of that Act. The conditions of grant for 2014-15 are set out in guidance from the Department for Education.
- 2.3 Although schools are free to spend the PPG in whichever way they choose, the increased level PPG, the statutory requirement to publish PPG policies and expenditure on school websites and the inclusion of the PPG within the new Ofsted regime means that there is an increasing focus on how schools are using the PPG to achieve the greatest impact on pupils' educational attainment.

### Local Context

- 2.4 In their July 2014 report, Ofsted identified (based on 2012/13 academic year data) that in Portsmouth, only 22.6% of pupils eligible for FSM achieved five good GCSE passes including English and Mathematics at the end of Key Stage 4. This was the second worst position in the country. The national average level of pupils eligible for free school meals attaining five or more GCSEs 2013 was 37.9%. The report noted that 23 of the top 25 local authority areas attaining the benchmark for eligible pupils are London boroughs, where there are high proportions of pupils coming from poorer backgrounds, indicating that income poverty is not a predictor of poor attainment.
- 2.5 The recent Ofsted report published on 10 December 2014 states that:

*'From Key Stage 2 onwards, poor pupils in the South East continue to do less well than poor pupils in most other parts of England. In 2012/13, attainment at 16 for pupils eligible for free school meals remained below the national level in 15 out of the 19 local authorities in the South East. The attainment gap at the end of Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 between pupils eligible for free schools meals and their more affluent peers is wider in the South East than any other region in the country. There is cause for optimism though: since 2011/12, attainment of poorer students in the South East has improved at a faster rate than the improvements seen nationally at both Key Stages 2 and 4. Pupil premium funding and the efforts of teachers and leaders are making a difference to the progress poorer pupils make in many schools. However, the improvements seen so far only mark the very start of what is necessary and vary considerably between local authorities.'*

- 2.6 In terms of Early Years provision, the Ofsted report identified that Portsmouth is one of the highest performing LA's with 46% of children eligible for FSM achieving a good level of development by the end of their Reception year, which is above the national average. Unvalidated data shows that students in Portsmouth have made impressive gains in their examination results compared with last year's performance. The report goes on to state that Portsmouth is making important improvements although the outcomes are still not strong enough:

*'The HMI have repeatedly visited a number of school clusters over a period of time to feed back on the strengths and weaknesses in the school improvement work being delivered. While the picture remains a mixed one, schools in the most effective clusters are beginning to support and challenge each other over the impact of their work and to share good practice. Above all, HMI are using inspection to drive improvement by asking headteachers and system leaders to be clear about what they want to do, how they will achieve it and how they will check the impact. Schools are left in no doubt that HMI will return to check the progress being made and this is proving to be a powerful motivator.'*

- 2.7 The review of school governance was undertaken by the Education, Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel, which comprised:

Councillors Will Purvis (Chair)  
Ben Dowling  
Ken Ferrett  
Paul Godier  
Lynne Stagg  
Alistair Thompson

Standing Deputies were: Councillors Margaret Adair, Colin Galloway, Terry Hall and Matthew Winnington.

- 2.8 At its meeting on 22 September 2014, the Education, Children and Young People Panel (henceforth referred to in this report as the Panel) agreed the following objectives for a scrutiny review of school governance arrangements:

- To consider the impact of following the introduction of PPG.
- To gain an insight into how PPG is currently being used in Portsmouth City Council schools.
- To review the effectiveness of the reporting process by schools.
- To review the Local Authority's role in supporting schools with pupil premium.
- To establish the amount of PPG each school in Portsmouth receives.
- To establish the level of awareness among school governors on the use of PPG in their schools.
- To identify and share good practice.

- 2.9 The Panel met formally to discuss the review of pupil premium on four occasions between 22 September 2014 and 2 February 2015.
- 2.10 A list of meetings held by the Panel and details of the written evidence received can be found in *appendix one*. A glossary of terms used in this report can be found in *appendix two*. The minutes of the Panel's meetings and the documentation reviewed by the Panel are published on the Council's website [www.portsmouthcc.gov.uk](http://www.portsmouthcc.gov.uk).

### **3. To consider the impact following the introduction of Pupil Premium Grant**

- 3.1 The Panel received evidence from the Interim Head of Education and the Interim Education Information Commissioning Manager with regard to the impact following the introduction of PPG. Evidence was also obtained from headteachers and governors.
- 3.2 The Interim Education Commissioning Manager explained that overall standards have risen with 51% of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSE's at A\*-C including English and Mathematics compared to 48% last year. The provisional 2014 data shows that the gap for free school meal children, (which is the largest cohort for PPG funding) at Key Stage 4 is improving and the gap has reduced from 30% to circa 23% this year. The target is to further reduce the gap to 15% by 2015 and the data shows that the LA is on track to meet this target.
- 3.3 At Key Stage 2 the gap is also narrowing. For the combined measure of reading, writing and mathematics, the gap was 26% in 2012, 24% in 2013 and the provisional figures show this is now 21% for 2014.
- 3.4 The progress of PP eligible children between KS1 and KS2 is improving rapidly and they are catching up to the non PP children. More children are making three levels of progress (above expected levels of progress) than ever before. In 2014, 27.78% of PP eligible children made 3 levels of progress in writing, up by almost a half from the previous year's 18.7%, compared to 29.64% and 22.84% of non-PP eligible children in 2014 and 2013 respectively.
- 3.5 With regard to the comparative impact of PPG between all local schools, The Interim Head of Education advised that the LA was currently not measuring this and this was something that could be developed, perhaps through cluster working.
- 3.6 The Panel were advised by the Interim Education Commissioning Manager that from September 2014 the government introduced UIFSM for all pupils in Years R, 1 and 2. The introduction of UIFSM presents a risk to schools in terms of a reduction in the level of pupil premium a school might receive as parents/guardians of children in Year R, 1 and 2 will no longer have any incentive to register for FSM. To combat this risk the Council issued to all primary and infant schools (and Mayfield School and Mary Rose Academy) a letter and form to be distributed to schools to help assess the likely uptake of FSM, check on whether a special diet was required, but most

importantly allow the Council to check for FSM eligibility and therefore claim for pupil premium funding. Schools are returning these forms to the Council in batches which the Free Schools Meals Checking Service is administering.

- 3.7 The Panel received evidence from headteachers of Flying Bull Academy, St George's Beneficial Church of England School, and Miltoncross School. Also from governors of Corpus Christi, Redwood Park and Highbury Primary Schools.

Flying Bull Academy

- 3.8 With regard to outcomes at Flying Bull Academy following the introduction of PP Mr Hewett-Dale advised of the following impacts in 2013/14:
- Above or at national standards in reading, writing, GPS, maths and combined at key stage 2.
  - Year 2 made above age related expected progress.
  - Writing gap between pupil premium and non-pupil premium reduced in all year groups.
  - Fewer speech and language delays entering reception year group this year due to early interventions in nursery.
  - Improved attendance - Ofsted had raised concerns over attendance and this had improved over the last year and the persistent absentees had stopped.
  - Reduced incidents of poor behaviour disrupting learning.
  - Early intervention with children with poor behaviour.
- 3.9 Mr Hewett-Dale said his school was part of the Heart of Portsmouth cluster and each school within the cluster is looking at ways of closing the gap. With regard to the effect of introducing UIFSM to all primary school pupils on the amount of PPG a school receives, Mr Hewett-Dale and Ms Gibb explained that their schools had 'parent partners' to assist parents in completing the FSM registration forms and explaining that it is important to do this to ensure the school receives the funding it is entitled to. The schools target families that they know are eligible to encourage them to complete the form.

3.10 Governor of Highbury Primary School

Ms Lawrence advised that that her school has closed the gap in reading and writing by 2.4%. In their action research project on maths 100% of their PP children made expected progress and of those, 30% made more than expected progress.

**4 To gain an insight into how Pupil Premium Grant is currently being used in Portsmouth City Council schools.**

- 4.1 The Ofsted Report published in February 2013: *'The Pupil Premium – How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement'*, draws together some of the effective practice that inspectors saw from their visits to 68 schools during autumn 2012. Ofsted identified a number of consistent characteristics in schools where pupil premium

funding was successfully used to improve achievement. Characteristics of success tended to be:

- An analytical approach to improving achievement
- Identification of the levers for improvement
- Taking a long term view
- Involving staff in making decisions about pupils' needs
- Tailoring interventions
- Focusing on attendance
- A fully involved governing body
- Effective use of tracking and monitoring.

4.2 Identifying the right projects in which to invest PPG money is critical to getting the highest measurable impact from the grant. The types of projects funded by the PPG in schools vary enormously, but it is important to remember the designated purpose of the grant is to narrow the attainment gap and that projects should be prioritised for funding for that purpose.

4.3 Sir John Dunford, the government's national PP champion, has written a 10 point plan on spending the PP effectively (*Ten-point plan for spending the pupil premium successfully, October 2014*). In this he states that '*high quality teaching must be at the core of all PP work*'. Headteachers can use sources such as the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF)-Sutton Trust Teaching and Learning Toolkit to inform their decisions and the EEF is accumulating further evidence of 'what works'. Schools will need to determine their use of PP funding within the context of their existing forms of provision for tackling educational disadvantage, and the often complex funding streams through which that provision is supported.

4.4 The Panel invited chairs of governors and headteachers to some of their meetings to receive evidence about how schools are spending their PP grant.

Sandra Gibb, Headteacher, St George's Beneficial Church of England School

4.5 Mrs Gibb advised that her school was allocated £162,500 in PP grant for 2014/15. The number of pupils eligible for PP fluctuates but for 2014/15 there are 51.1% of pupils. She advised that the majority of the funding was used to reduce class sizes and employing extra support staff to help in classes to help narrow the gap and accelerate progress in reading, writing and maths. Money was also spent on enrichment activities such as the sunrise breakfast club, sport and arts clubs and lunchtime activities. The school also subsidises educational visits for PP pupils to allow them take part in these. In addition there were a number of initiatives introduced to improve the wellbeing of children. This included the employment of a speech and language therapist to deliver programmes to the youngest children, emotional first aid training and a subsidy for sun setters to ensure the school offers after school child care with food so parents can access employment or education. Ms Gibb gave further information on some of the enrichment activities the school offers. The Silent Movie Project and Film Noir Project produced high quality films. Following the project the school

noted a significant improvement in the writing of children in years 5 and 6.

- 4.6 St George's Beneficial Church of England School had an Ofsted inspection in November 2014 and received an overall rating of 'Good.' In their report Ofsted stated that:

*'The business manager keeps governors well informed of the state of the school's finances, including the pupil premium and how it is spent. The finance committee check it thoroughly. They know how well pupils in the school are doing because they understand the information about pupils' performance and have detailed reports from the headteacher'*

Deamonn Hewett-Dale, Headteacher the Flying Bull Academy

- 4.7 Mr Hewett-Dale advised that his school was allocated £297,300 in PPG for 2014/15 and half termly pupil progress meetings are held to assess the outcomes and the strategic direction. Mr Hewett-Dale advised that he reports termly to the governing body and will present a final report to the December full governing board meeting. There was 51.6% of the school population who qualified for PP and when the census was reviewed this rose to 54.1%. In 2013/14 the school use the PPG in the following ways:

- Extra teacher working across year 5 and year 6.
- Extra teacher in year 2 with smaller groups in the morning and working with booster groups and reading recovery in the afternoon.
- Speech and language therapist for three days a week.
- Extra teaching assistant support in years 5 and 6.
- Full time attendance support worker.
- Continued Every Child a Reader (ECAR) accreditation and training.
- Fischer Family Trust intervention training and support.
- Better Reading Programme intervention training and support.
- Extra 0.6 teacher to allow PP conferencing.
- Catch up numeracy training and support.
- Lunchtime and after school booster groups with year 6 teachers.
- Extra member of learning and pastoral team working with children who have barriers to learning.

- 4.8 Mr Hewett-Dale advised that the school used the LA's toolkit which had been very helpful. The school inform parents on what they are spending the PPG on and some parents do respond to this. The school are innovative and responsive to new ways of helping children. One future initiative is to introduce a school radio station which will help children develop their listening and speaking skills.

- 4.9 Mr Hewett-Dale and Ms Gibb advised that in his school there was blanket targeting so the PPG was used to improve outcomes for all pupils who are underachieving and not just those who are PPG pupils. It was confirmed that in secondary schools PPG is tailored more towards individual PPG pupils, whereas in primary schools it is used to improve education for all pupils.



Fiona Calderbank, Headteacher Miltoncross School

4.10 Ms Calderbank advised that her school was allocated £327,800 in 2013/14. The gap was at 23% currently with 17% gap between PPG pupils and non PPG pupils in attainment. She circulated a diagram showing the four PPG intervention strands: literacy, attendance, behaviour and progress which were key to the vision and values of the school. The impact of these strands was monitored so that if they do not work, changes can be made and new initiatives put in place. Bespoke plans are in place for different pupils based on their needs. Attendance is one of the key areas where the money is being spent as this is often an issue for PPG pupils. An attendance officer currently employed part time and after Christmas this will increase to five days a week. With regard to progress, pedagogy in lessons ensures that teachers know who the PPG children are, teachers will mark their books first when they are most alert and give these pupils more attention and this has made a difference for the entire cohort.

**5 To review the effectiveness of the reporting process by schools.**

5.1 Schools have the autonomy to decide how best to use the additional resources and are held to account through Ofsted inspections on the impact of this spending and through the performance tables. The Panel received evidence from headteachers, chairs of governors and members of the governor services team in order to consider the reporting process by schools.

5.2 Under the Regulation 10 (9) of the School Information (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012, specified information to be published on a school's website it states that the following information in relation to PPG should be published on the schools website.

*'The amount of the school's allocation from the Pupil Premium grant in respect of the current academic year; details of how it is intended that the allocation will be spent; details of how the previous academic year's allocation was spent, and the effect of this expenditure on the educational attainment of those pupils at the school in respect of whom grant funding was allocated'.*

5.3 The funding is allocated for each financial year but the information published online should refer to the academic year.

5.4 Delegates at the recent PPG conference were advised by Sir John Dunford that schools should create a good audit trail to show what the money is being spent on and its outcomes. It was suggested that an effective way of publishing this information is to use four headings: Strategy, Cost, Evaluation and Impact. It was also suggested that anonymous case studies are used to show how the interventions have helped to narrow the gap.

5.5 Sir John Dunford advised in his ten point plan that the school needs to put in a prominent place on their website an account of PPG spending. This

will also fulfil the governing body's legal obligation to report to parents on how the PPG is being spent and the impact that is being made.

- 5.6 The Panel commented that after looking at some of the Portsmouth schools websites that the amount of information included varied from a basic paragraph containing no financial information to in depth reports with explanations of outcomes and financial breakdowns. On some websites it took a while to find this information and some school websites were not meeting the necessary reporting standards.

## **6 To review the Local Authority's role in supporting schools with pupil premium.**

- 6.1 The Interim Head of Education advised that the LA in its statutory role must take steps to ensure that outcomes in the city are improved for children. The LA also has a role in oversight, advice, and sharing of best practice. Ofsted have a national interest in the effect PPG is having and review how a LA is influencing the spend of PPG. The local authority must allocate the PPG to each school that it maintains for the pupils in the eligible categories (except LAC). The Education Funding Agency will pay monies to academy schools. It is down to schools to choose how to spend the PPG and schools will be held accountable for this, however the LA has a role to play in supporting schools with this process.
- 6.2 The Interim Education Information Commissioning Manager advised that The LA has a team of Education Officers (EO's) who visit their allocated schools regularly. The EO's review data gaps in schools and raise concern if they need to. They are able to advise schools on areas to consider spending their PP funding but cannot direct them. During their visits the EO's will challenge school leaders on effective use of the PP grant and advise on best practice from other schools both locally and nationally. A toolkit is available on the DfE website which highlights research from the Sutton Trust and others into the effectiveness of different interventions and the relevant value for money aspect.
- 6.3 The LA has initiated a PP programme for secondary schools within the city where the GCSE gap was second to bottom in the national league table of 2013. This has involved a number of streams:
- Brokering additional resource from an external secondary education officer.
  - Facilitating and chairing a network of headteachers to work on PP.
  - Seconding a deputy head at a city secondary school funded by the LA and schools to work across all secondary phase provision in sharing good practice.
  - Hosting a workshop for all secondary headteachers with sub-regional lead HMI running a seminar on the priority of PP in school inspections (summer term 2013/14).
  - Hosting a workshop for secondary and primary head teachers with the national PP champion Sir John Dunford) on 17 November 2014.
  - Having a lead headteacher, Fiona Calderbank, to work alongside the LA on this agenda as part of the seconded heads programme. This

initiative was working very well and the gap was narrowing in secondary schools. Further work was needed with Primary schools however.

- Re-focusing analyses from the Education Information Services Team on narrowing the PP gap.
- Attending regional/national conferences for example the South East regional Ofsted conference in March 2014 at which Sir Michael Wilshaw HMCI and other national speakers showed the gap for south east LA's and showcased those areas where gaps are being narrowed.
- Ensuring that there is a focus at the cluster level on narrowing the gap.
- The LA are writing a report which will be available shortly demonstrating impact.

#### Support for Governors with Pupil Premium

- 6.4 Mrs Kelsall, Governor Support Officer advised that Governor Services were very involved in assisting and supporting governors with using PPG to make an impact. The training courses offered are available to all maintained schools and those academy schools who have bought in to the Governor Services SLA. Many academy schools did still buy in to the SLA, however there were a handful who the LA had lost contact with following their move to academy, which was a slight concern. More could perhaps be done to help academies, for example pay as you use training sessions, however the governor services team was currently being reviewed and consideration was being made whether to commission the training or for this to remain in-house.
- 6.5 Mrs Kelsall said that the gap was narrowing well with primary schools however there was still work to be done with secondary schools. Many schools in the city had converted to academy and there were some academy schools that the Council now had limited contact with. Academy schools are included in the school cluster groups in the city and are represented on the Council's Schools Forum so engagement can still be made through these means. It was likely that by the end of the financial year half of the secondary schools in the city would be academies so it was important to ensure engagement with them is maintained. Mr Webb said that a more cohesive strategy in respect supporting schools to use PPG more effectively would be helpful.
- 6.6 The Governor Services team offers a service where individual queries are answered such as how to effectively challenge their headteacher on PPG use, or on how much information should be reported on their website on an individual basis. The team offers full governing body training where the school can choose the topics covered and often PPG is included as part of these sessions. The team also assist governors on how they can effectively challenge school leaders.
- 6.7 The Governor Services team keep abreast with the information released by the DfE and national governors association such as toolkits and will pass

this information on to governors. The team also works closely with the education officers. Mrs Kelsall said that eventually she would like to see the team offer specific PP training rather than having this included in another session. She also thought that offering sessions for both the headteacher and chair of governors to attend would be useful and was looking to offer this in the future.

- 6.8 Mr Webb, Finance Manager advised that Finance Officers had identified a need to for training to support schools with evaluating the effect of the use of their pupil premium funding, particularly with the increasing level of funding that schools are now receiving. In June this year a general finance training session was held for governors which had a specific section on PPG. This was focused around 'school funding and assessing the impact' and included a session on the use of PPG and the governors' role in ensuring it is being used effectively. This had been well attended by 12-15 governors.
- 6.9 Financial Services have developed a training & development programme for schools is was available for both maintained schools and academy schools. Within this programme is an all-day session related to school funding and Pupil Premium which took place in October, with a further event organised for June 2015. The recent PP conference on 17 November was also open to governors to attend and positive feedback had been received from those who had attended this with over 95% of delegates endorsing the session.
- 6.10 The governors who contributed to this review all considered that the support received from governor's services is important. It was felt by some that further training on PPG provided by the LA would be useful, as would more networking opportunities and outside support such as the recent conference on PPG with experts. It was felt that allowing both the head teacher and chair of governors to attend the same session would allow for a more joined up approach.

Written Evidence received from the Tackling Poverty Lead Officer on the Tackling Poverty Strategy and links with Pupil Premium

- 6.11 The LA is also able to support schools with its work around the PPG and narrowing the gap for FSM children, through its wider work co-ordinated within the Council's Tackling Poverty Strategy. This Strategy aims to alleviate poverty within the city, and has a clear focus on child poverty which by default will include children in the city on FSMs. In order to alleviate child poverty in the longer term the Strategy states its commitment to raising educational attainment for those children who live in deprived circumstances.
- 6.12 A recent report by the Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission called 'Cracking the code: how schools can improve social mobility' <sup>1</sup> highlights how being poor too often leads to a lifetime of poverty; and that 'nearly six

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Cracking the code: how schools can improve social mobility' Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission, London (Oct 2014).

out of ten disadvantaged<sup>2</sup> children in England do not achieve a basic set of qualifications<sup>3</sup> compared to only one in three children from more advantaged backgrounds'. The report also confirms that

*'There is nothing pre-ordained to make the UK a low social mobility society where children's starting point in life determines where they end up. International evidence has long suggested that the link between social background and outcomes is stronger in the UK than in many other countries. Now there is growing evidence from the English schools system that deprivation need not be destiny. There is an emerging wealth of data, stories and individual experiences demonstrating that some schools are bucking the trend, enabling their disadvantaged students to far exceed what would have been predicted for them based on experience nationally.'*

6.13 The report says that schools should do more to learn from what they call 'code breakers', and it sets out 5 key steps to improve children's life chances as follows, which it will be important to reflect in any tackling poverty strategy and wider schools strategy going forward:

- Using the PPG strategically to improve social mobility
- Building a high expectations, inclusive culture
- Incessant focus on the quality of teaching
- Tailored strategies to engage parents
- Preparing students for all aspects of life, not just exams

In particular the Council's new Tackling Poverty Strategy going forward will explore: a) using the pupil premium strategically to improve social mobility and b) building a high expectations, inclusive culture.

6.14 Support can be therefore offered by the local authority, via the tackling poverty strategy work, as follows:

**Specific work around raising expectations and aspirations, which in turn can raise educational standards (as cited by the Social Mobility Report earlier).**

6.15 PCC and the University of Portsmouth are currently running and evaluating a project with over 30 schools across Portsmouth, Hampshire and Southampton where we are testing out well evaluated research from the US around moving children from a 'fixed mindset' to a 'growth mindset' (which can lead to raised educational attainment). This pilot, called the Changing Mindsets Project, is funded by the Education Endowment Foundation, a funding stream which is focused on raising educational attainment and narrowing the gap for some of the poorest children in the country.

6.16 The model has potential to be either used with children across a whole school, or to be used with children with specific needs e.g. FSM children, children who have low self-esteem, low belief in their abilities etc. There may be more value to schools clustering together to purchase teacher

---

<sup>2</sup> Free School Meal children

<sup>3</sup> Five a\*-Cs including English and Maths at GCSE

training and materials from the University of Portsmouth, via the PPG, in order to roll this out more cost effectively across schools.

6.17 Work is also being conducted with schools in Portsmouth as part of the Personal, Social, Health and Education (PSHE) agenda, where there is a role for a more consistent/strategic use of pupil premium around raising expectations for children in Portsmouth. In addition to purchasing the Changing Mindsets interventions above, there is scope to build on the work of the Business Leaders Group and the annual Opportunities Fair to further develop and extend provision of school visits by the Roving Business Volunteers Team, which involve engaging young people in activities with successful business people around guessing their occupation and how they got to that position, and making children aware of all the opportunities that are available to them in Portsmouth (rather than being channelled into poorly paid professions which can sometimes occur within poor communities). This effectively builds a culture of high expectation and likelihood of increased educational attainment.

**6.18 Support to schools around the latest child poverty research and interventions as to what works:**

The Council's Tackling Poverty Co-ordinator can bring specialist knowledge and expertise, to advise and influence from both a research/evidence and strategic perspective as to how schools might think about spending their Pupil Premium in general to narrow the gap. As part of the city's Tackling Poverty approach we have strong evidence we can share with schools re what works for children living in poverty from government departments, such as the national Child Poverty Unit, with knowledge and expertise around well evaluated interventions.

Portsmouth City Council's Public Health Strategy and links with Pupil Premium - Written Evidence

6.19 The link between good health and improved educational attainment has been well made likewise between poor health and poor educational attainment. The 5–19 Healthy Child Programme (HCP) sets out the good practice framework for prevention and early intervention services for children and young people aged 5–19 and recommends how health, education and other partners working together across a range of settings can significantly enhance a child's or young person's life chances.

6.20 The Healthy Child Programme has been national policy for a number of years:

[http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/11041/1/dh\\_108866.pdf](http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/11041/1/dh_108866.pdf)

This link provides an updated summary:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/giving-all-children-a-healthy-start-in-life>

6.21 Public Health is currently developing the programme in Portsmouth through Health Visitor and School Nurse commissioning and working closely with schools to get a whole school ownership of the agenda. The Council are working on incorporating both the PHSE and SRE programmes and are

looking to co-produce this with schools. The school premium could help ensure we are able to deliver this in schools targeting those most deprived and work in the areas of highest need in a more strategic way. Children services across the city are working towards a multiagency approach focusing on a locality based model with the healthy child programme at the heart of the offer. Schools will play an essential role in ensuring the children of Portsmouth not only have access to but have a say in a robust healthy child offer locally.

**7 To establish the amount of pupil premium grant each school in Portsmouth receives.**

7.1 The Panel received evidence from Richard Webb, Finance Manager with regard to the amount of PP Grant schools in the city receive.

7.2 Mr Webb advised that PPG for maintained schools is allocated via the Council using data provided by the Department for Education. PPG for academies is allocated via the Education Funding Agency, except that relating to Looked after Children. Schools and Academies are accountable for how they spend this funding. For Looked after Children (LAC) the virtual school Head, Helen Thomson, determines through personal education plans (PEP) the value of funding that should be allocated to schools.

7.3 The PP grant is allocated to the following groups of pupils:

- (a) Pupils in Year Groups R to 6 recorded as Ever 6 Free School Meals
- (b) Pupils in Year Groups 7 to 11 recorded as Ever 6 Free School Meals
- (c) Looked After Children (LAC)
- (d) Children adopted from care under the Adoption and Children Act 2002 and children who have left care under a Special Guardianship Residence Order.
- (e) Pupils in Year Groups R to 11 recorded as Ever 4 Service Child or in receipt of a child pension from the Ministry of Defence (Service Children).

7.4 The amount allocated per pupil to Portsmouth for children in the above categories is shown in the table below: for 2014/15

Pupils attracting PPG	£ per pupil
Free School Meals Pupils – Primary	1,300
Free Schools Meals Pupils – Secondary	£935
Looked After Children (LAC)	£1,900
Post - LAC	£1,900
Service Children	£300

7.5 The total value of the PP allocated to Portsmouth is shown in the table below:

Pupils attracting PPG	£m
Free School Meals Pupils – Primary	6.2
Free Schools Meals Pupils – Secondary	2.9
Looked After Children & Post LAC	0.4
Service Children	0.2
	9.7

A breakdown of PPG allocations by school for 2014/15 is included in appendix 3.

- 7.6 The Panel had some concerns raised that the introduction of UIFSM would have an effect on the amount of PPG a school receives. Ms Gibb and Mr Hewett-Dale advised that in their schools they have 'parent partners' and dedicated session to help parents fill in the form to register for FSM. If children coming into the school have older siblings in the school who are PPG eligible the school will target these parents to register their other children for FSM and then go through the remainder of the new cohort to ensure that all those eligible register.

**8 To establish the level of awareness among school governors on the use of the pupil premium grant in their schools.**

- 8.1 Mrs Kelsall, Governor Support Officer said that school governors must be able to understand and articulate how PPG is spent and more importantly, its impact. The school governing body is accountable for overseeing strategic school improvement and school finances therefore they must know how the money coming into a school from PPG is spent and how it is contributing narrowing the gap.
- 8.2 In the September 2012 Ofsted report, recommendations included that school leaders, including governing bodies, should ensure that PPG funding is not simply absorbed into mainstream budgets but instead is carefully targeted at the designated children. They should be able to identify clearly how the money is being spent. Ofsted also advise that governing bodies should evaluate their pupil premium spending, avoid spending it on activities that have little impact on achievement for their disadvantaged pupils and spend it in ways known to be most effective.
- 8.3 The Panel heard from some governors to establish the level of awareness amongst school governors on the use of PPG in their schools.

Claire Tomlinson, Governor Corpus Christi School

- 8.4 Ms Tomlinson explained that in Corpus Christi there are 59 pupils eligible for PP and the amount received for 2014-15 was £73,800. The school has found that boosting teaching in small groups and targeted interventions by experienced teachers have been the most effective use of their PPG. The school has part time teachers covering a class so that the senior teacher can be released to focus on smaller groups of pupils who need extra support. They also have a writing specialist to work with targeted pupils to



deliver 1:1 support and work with a small group of pupils to accelerate progress and narrow the gap in attainment. The governing body monitors the progress of PP pupils through both the finance committee and the curriculum committee and this is a standing agenda item on both. The headteacher presents the data to governors in various forms and the governors review this and drill down into cases where pupils are not making the expected amount of progress. With KS1 the gap was narrowing but with KS2 more work needed to be done. It was also interesting to note that EAL pupils also made more progress than other pupils.

Patrick Hill, Vice Chair of Governors, Redwood Park School

- 8.5 Mr Hill explained that Redwood Park School received £75,600 in PP in 2013-14 and other funding was added to this to ensure that the school could support all of their most disadvantaged pupils. 80% of pupils benefitted from this funding last year. The main focus for the money was on literacy, extra time and quality teaching. The Interventions Leader at the school was the lead for PPG and ensures that the PPG is spent and accurately tracked where the money is being spent. The school has found that those pupils receiving dedicated support from the PPG funded activities were outperforming other pupils who were not in receipt of the funding. Mr Hill said that his school had brought in a regime of agenda planning and PP is likely to be scrutinised every term. Mr Hill said that Redwood Park School monitor their school against two other special schools one locally in Emsworth and one nationally in Bath.

Loreley Lawrence, Governor at Highbury Primary School

- 8.6 Ms Lawrence advised that that her school has closed the gap in reading and writing by 2.4%. In their action research project on maths 100% of their PP children made expected progress and of those, 30% made more than expected progress. The school has two ladies at school who help the PPG children and their parents. Interventions include providing a mini bus to help children get to and from school, advising parents with money matters, debt advice, food bank information, and involving the parents by asking them to help the PPG children with their reading. She advised that there was a HMI report on their school website and that she found RAISE on line helpful. The governing body discuss PP at their teaching and learning meetings. Ms Lawrence said she felt more time should be spent on PPG training and that governors must be prepared to dedicate more time to monitor PPG spend.
- 8.7 At the recent conference the HMI said that PPG strategies should be 'nested' within the School Improvement Plan and not stand alone and every member of staff should have a target for PP. All three governors were uncertain whether PPG was part of their schools improvement plan.
- 8.8 In order to assist the Panel, the Governor Support Officer asked all chairs of governors some further questions. There are 55 chairs of governors and responses were received from 18 chairs of governors (two schools have two chairs) the following schools responded:

Arundel Court Primary	Penhale Infant
Brambles and Goldsmith	Southsea Infant
Corpus Christi	Southsea Junior
Court Lane Junior	Springfield
Cumberland Infant	St Jude's
Fernhurst Junior	St Swithun's
Mary Rose Academy	The Harbour School
Mayfield	Westover Primary
Milton Park Primary	Wimborne Infant
Moorings Way Infant	Wimborne Junior

Is Pupil Premium a standing agenda item at your FGB or on your Finance Committee?

- 8.9 The main message arising from the governing bodies in response to this question is that the discussions about PPG are included at FGB or committee level however there is less focus on monitoring the impact of PPG. Of the schools who responded there is only one school that has PPG as a standing item on its Finance committee. Nine other schools discuss PPG as a standing item or regularly at their Finance Committee. Fifteen schools discuss PPG at their FGB with four having it as a standing item, another seven discuss 'regularly'. Eleven schools indicated that PPG is discussed at curriculum/standards or other committee. Six of these schools have PPG as a standing item on this committee.

Specific examples of good practice included:

- Arundel Court Primary School has reports on PPG and how it is being used written into the governing body two year plan.
- Moorings Way has PPG as a standing agenda item on all committees and FGB meetings.
- Wimborne Junior School reports that the inspection of PPG is embedded in the ongoing data analysis discussed at their full governing board meetings. Spend is discussed at Finance Committee and the impact is discussed at their Teaching and Learning Committee.
- St Swithun's looks at PPG at Curriculum Standards in order to monitor impact in line with pupil data.
- Brambles Nursery and Goldsmith Infant School have an annual plan with key points in the year to plan the use of PPG and review use at FGB, Leadership and Management Committee and Pupil Development Committee.

Do you have a specific governor who takes responsibility for overseeing Pupil Premium?

- 8.10 Twelve GB's indicated that they do have a named governor who oversees PPG. Six governing bodies do not. Of those governing bodies who did not some indicated reasons for this, for example Fernhurst Junior stated that they have a PPG policy in place of which all the school community is aware and Solent Junior indicated that the full governing body has a good understanding of PPG.

8.11 The role is sometimes combined with another, for example at Court Lane School the PPG governor is also the inclusion governor and at St Swithun's and St Jude's it is a role covered by the SEN governor. The governing bodies of Southsea Infant School, Arundel Court Primary and Wimborne Junior School describe their PPG governor as a 'PPG champion'.

Is Pupil Premium an area that is well understood by all governors?

8.12 Fifteen governing bodies replied yes, two replied no and one gave no indication. Of those who replied no, there was honesty and acknowledgement of the need for improvement. Answers included:

*'PP is not as well understood as it ought to be, it needs constant reinforcement to make its importance clear to all in the GB.'*

*'Not certain that all governors understand the subject but certainly a good number appear to judging from their contribution to discussion etc.'*

8.13 Some of those governors who answered yes elaborated on this and answers included:

*'I believe that most governors understand the PPG finance side - this part is straightforward. It is the measuring the impact that is hazy.'*

*'It is a very important issue involving a great deal of money for a school in a deprived area. We need to ensure that money is being used to good effect. All the governors are aware of its significance.'*

*'Our GB has a clear understanding of PPG - we as a school have a 3 wave approach; wave 1 - quality first teaching, wave 2 - interventions, wave 3 specific target for individual need. The governing body understand the use of PPG needing to demonstrate narrowing the gap in attainment and progress and PPG is specific in our school development plan'*

Do you think more specific training on Pupil Premium would be useful? (It is currently covered in wider finance training)

8.14 Ten governing bodies said yes, seven said no and one did not respond. Some governing bodies felt they are already fully informed and do not require any further training. Some chairs said that the recent conference attended by Sir John Dunford was excellent and felt that those who did not attend might require more training based on his presentation. Responses from those who governors who elaborated were:

*'Specific training on PPG could be a useful addition to available courses. The sharing of good practice might be a useful part of this.'*

*'More specific training on how to measure the impact would be useful as this is what Ofsted are looking for'*

*'It might be useful because narrowing the gap is very important for all schools in Portsmouth.'*

8.15 The Panel felt that it is important that school governors are able to take a strategic overview of the PPG programme and to take an active role in the identification of the most effective PPG projects to raise attainment for the most challenged or deprived pupils.

## **9 To identify and share best practice.**

9.1 During their review, the Panel were made aware of a number of instances of best practice occurring in schools in the city, which have been mentioned earlier in the report. The Panel noted from their conversations with headteachers and governors that different interventions worked for different schools and there is no 'one size fits all' with regard to PPG programmes.

9.2 Interventions can sometimes be less obvious when individual cases are drilled down into. Councillor Purvis shared with the Panel the 'washing machine analogy' which was shared at the PPG conference. He explained that a school elsewhere in the county had a number of pupils absent on a particular day of the week, when this was looked at more closely it was found that this coincided with PE on the same day and pupils did not want to attend school as they did not have a clean PE kit. If they did attend they would be required to wear one of the school kits which were not washed regularly. The school responded by purchasing a washing machine to make sure the spare kits are always clean and this made attendance levels improve. Other interventions is buying children alarm clocks to ensure they wake up in good time to get to schools and this has been found to make a big difference. Interventions such as this can have a significant impact although it was difficult to record the progress of non-direct interventions such as this.

9.3 Councillor Stagg who attended the recent PPG conference advised of several strategies of using PP that are known to effectively narrow the gap.

- Reducing class sizes
- 1 : 1 tuition/small group work
- Improving the quality of teaching
- Extra attendance support to reduce absenteeism
- Imaginative teaching
- Concentrating on transition from one Key Stage to the next
- Pupil Premium planning MUST be part of the school's Development Plan, not isolated
- Drill down into school's data to find individual pupils' needs and address them

9.4 The headteachers who provided evidence to the Panel all advised that they share best practice on PPG spending with other schools and felt that this was vital for improvement. The head of Miltoncross school said she had seconded her Assistant headteacher to work with other secondary schools to monitor the impact of PPG and visits schools for half a day a

week to see how they are using their PPG. This is a good way of finding new ideas and interventions that have worked for them that could be introduced in their school. At the recent PPG conference those who attended witnessed many interesting discussions between delegates which was a great opportunity for networking and sharing best practice. Mrs Kelsall said that governor services encourage governors to use the data dashboard to compare nationally and also against other schools in the city.

9.5 With regard to how PPG practice is shared in the city, Mrs Kelsall advised that the HMI at the recent conference had suggested establishing a PPG co-coordinators network for the city to share best practice. Governor Services were also considering ways of sharing information that would not take up too much time for governors bearing in mind that they volunteer for the role. Social media is not being utilised enough and ways to improve this were being considered. One of the city's clerks had set up a Facebook group for all clerks in the city to share ideas and best practice without having to take time to meet in person. This had been well received and it was hoped to roll this out for chairs of governors as well.

9.6 The Interim Head of Education advised the Panel of the pupil premium awards run by the Department for Education in conjunction with the Times Educational Supplement. This offers significant prizes to the most improved schools in England. Schools can put themselves forward for the chance to win some additional funding. In 2015 and 2016, there will be a top prize of £250,000 for secondary schools and £100,000 for primary and special schools. Large regional prizes of up to £100,000 will also be awarded to schools across the country, alongside hundreds of smaller qualifier awards so schools will have a better chance of being recognised with a prize.

9.7 The aim is to reward sustained improvement over time in raising attainment of disadvantaged pupils. To win the larger prizes, schools will need to provide evidence of implementing effective strategies to improve achievement. The DfE want to make sure schools encourage high aspirations for all their pupils, so schools will also be judged on how they successfully support high attainers to fulfil their potential.

9.8 Case studies of the schools who have won an award are posted onto the pupil premium awards website to share with other schools.

## **10 Equalities Impact Assessment.**

An equality impact assessment is not required as the recommendations do not have a negative impact on any of the protected characteristics as described in the Equality Act 2010.

## **11 Legal Comments**

11.1 Pupil Premium Grants are paid by the Secretary of State in accordance with sections 14 -16 of the Education Act 2002.

- 11.2 The School Information (England) Regulations 2008, as amended by the School Information (England) (Amendments) Regulations 2012, place a statutory requirement on the governing body of a school to publish on its website specific information about the amount of the Grant, how this has been and will be used and the effects of the expenditure on the educational attainment for those pupils.
- 11.3 There are no specific legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

## **12 Finance Comments.**

The Budgetary and Policy implications of the recommendations presented by the Panel are set out within Section 13 of the report.

It has been proposed that all 16 recommendations presented by the Panel will be delivered within the existing available financial resources. It should be noted that the majority of the recommendations are to be implemented by the Local Authority and be funded from within the Council's Education budget. With further savings anticipated to be required from all Council budgets in future years, it may be necessary for resources to be redirected from other activities to implement these proposals.

### 13 BUDGETARY AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS.

The following table highlights the budgetary and policy implications of the recommendations being presented by the Panel:

Recommendation	Action by	Policy Framework	Resource Implications
1. That the LA continues to share the good practice of pupil premium taking place in the city and this should be shared in the context of the healthy child programme and tackling poverty strategies.	The Head of Education, education officers	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources.
2. That schools are encouraged to share best practice and be outward looking and encourage to engage with their clusters.	The Head of Education, link officers, headteachers	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
3. That the LA should continually review the impact of the pupil premium work locally and consider an audit of PPG activity in the city to identify what interventions are known to work in the different parts of the city.	The Head of Education, Portsmouth Teaching Schools Alliance.	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
4. That the LA and schools consider an ongoing joint program of work specifically focussed on PPG impact within clusters.	Link officers, chairs of clusters.	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
5. That the LA include pupil premium as a key theme for the annual governors' conference in Spring 2015. The LA should also seek to organise an annual pupil premium conference for the city which Sir John Dunford should be invited to contribute.	The Head of Education, Governor Services Team.	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources

Page 37

Recommendation	Action by	Policy Framework	Resource Implications
6. That a primary headteacher be seconded to drive the pupil premium programme across primary schools alongside a pupil premium co-ordinators network for the city to share best practice.	The Head of Education	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
7. It is important that there are strong links with academy schools and the LA should continue to work with academies to provide support with pupil premium. The LA should strongly encourage academy schools to join the LA programs of work.	The Head of Education, Link officers, Education officers	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
8. That the LA continue to provide a facilitative role to governors and that pupil premium programmes should be led by governors and headteachers. The governor services team should investigate holding dedicated sessions for chairs of governors and headteachers to attend together.	The Governor Services Team	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
9. That the LA investigates whether social media could be used further for governors to network and share best practice on the usage of PPG.	The Governor Services Team	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
10. That all governing bodies monitor the impact of pupil premium through their standards/curriculum sub-committees as well as their finance committee, due to the importance of pupil premium. In addition all governing bodies should consider designating a dedicated PP governor.	The Governor Services Team, Education officers, Governors Forum	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
11. That the LA identify and appoint a pupil premium governor champion for the city to visit all governing bodies within the year to share best practice on pupil premium. The governor services team should also systematically share best	Governor Services Team, Head of Education, Education officers, Governors Forum	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources



Recommendation	Action by	Policy Framework	Resource Implications
practice with governing bodies.			
12. That Governor Services follow up on those schools who did not respond to the questionnaire and to provide them with support to ensure that their governing bodies are fully engaged with pupil premium.	The Head of Education, Governor Services Team	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
13. That the LA produces a manual of good practice to share with schools.	The Head of Education, Education officers	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
14. That headteachers ensure that pupil premium is embedded in the School Improvement Plan for their school.	Headteachers and monitored by Education officers	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
15. That schools be encouraged to aspire to achieve excellent pupil premium practice so that they can enter the pupil premium awards for the opportunity to win some additional money for their school. Schools should also be encouraged, where possible, to use PPG to maximise achievement for all pupils in their school who are not making the expected level of progress.	The Head of Education, The Seconded Head	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources
16. That the Head of Education circulate a copy of this report with a covering letter to all schools to advise of the Panel's findings and to highlight the importance of PPG.	The Head of Education	On-going work, within Budget and Policy Framework.	With existing resources

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Witnesses</b>	<b>Documents Received.</b>
<b>22 September 2014</b>	Richard Webb, Finance Manager  Kelly Nash, Corporate Performance Manager	Scoping document.  Briefing paper: pupil premium: an overview
<b>20 October 2014</b>	Julien Kramer, Interim Head of Education Marc Harder, (interim) Education Information Commissioning Manager Deamonn Hewett-Dale, headteacher Flying Bull Academy Sandra Gibb, headteacher St George's Beneficial School Fiona Calderbank, headteacher Miltoncross School.	Briefing paper pupil premium - the role of the local authority  Briefing note Pupil Premium in Flying Bull Academy  Briefing note Pupil Premium in St George's Beneficial School  Briefing note - Pupil Premium in Milton Cross Academy
<b>24 November 2014</b>	Emma Kelsall, Governor Support Officer Claire Tomlinson, Governor Corpus Christi School Patrick Hill, Governor Redwood Park School Loreley Lawrence, Governor Highbury Primary School	Briefing paper - Support provided to governors on pupil premium  Presentation - school funding assessing the impact  Briefing paper: Pupil Premium in Corpus Christi School  Redwood Park School Pupil Premium activities for 2013/14  Notes from pupil premium conference from Cllr Stagg. Hand-outs from pupil premium conference.  Written evidence - links with the Tackling Poverty Strategy, Public Health and PP.
<b>2 February 2015</b>	Sign off meeting	

**GLOSSARY**

EO	Education Officers
FSM	Free School Meals
LAC	Looked After Children
LA	Local Authority
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills
PPG	Pupil Premium Grant
SEN	Special Education Needs
SLA	Service Level Agreement

This page is intentionally left blank

School Name	School Type	Total Pupil Premium allocation
Priory School (Specialist Sports College)	Maintained Secondary	£470,585
Arundel Court Schools	Maintained Primary	£407,200
King Richard School	Maintained Secondary	£358,530
Portsmouth Academy for Girls	Mainstream Academy	£353,380
Mayfield School	Maintained Secondary	£350,330
Charles Dickens Primary School	Maintained Primary	£340,600
St Edmund's Catholic School	Maintained Secondary	£301,465
Flying Bull Primary School	Maintained Primary	£297,300
Miltoncross School	Maintained Secondary	£286,220
The Victory Primary School	Mainstream Academy	£283,600
Charter Academy	Mainstream Academy	£263,795
Beacon View Primary Academy	Mainstream Academy	£258,300
Newbridge Junior School	Maintained Primary	£249,600
ARK Ayrton Primary Academy	Mainstream Academy	£236,900
Cottage Grove Primary School	Maintained Primary	£235,300
Portsmouth Primary School	Maintained Primary	£213,900
Admiral Lord Nelson School	Maintained Secondary	£188,325
Fernhurst Junior School	Maintained Primary	£178,500
The City of Portsmouth Boys' School	Maintained Secondary	£173,615
St George's Beneficial Church of England (Voluntary)	Maintained Primary	£162,500
St Paul's Catholic Primary School	Maintained Primary	£161,400
Isambard Brunel Junior School	Maintained Primary	£152,600
Langstone Junior School	Maintained Primary	£145,500
Milton Park Federated Primary School	Maintained Primary	£145,200
Northern Parade Junior School	Maintained Primary	£143,500
Manor Infant School	Maintained Primary	£136,500
Lyndhurst Junior School	Mainstream Academy	£136,300
Stamshaw Junior School	Maintained Primary	£135,500
Wimborne Junior School	Maintained Primary	£131,600
Craneswater Junior School	Maintained Primary	£130,500
St Jude's CofE Primary School	Maintained Primary	£130,000
Meredith Infant School	Maintained Primary	£125,700
Copnor Junior School	Maintained Primary	£124,100
Stamshaw Infant School	Maintained Primary	£117,900
Penhale Infant School, Nursery & Hearing Impaired	Maintained Primary	£115,000
Meon Junior School	Maintained Primary	£113,300
Highbury Primary School	Maintained Primary	£109,700
Cliffdale Primary School	Special Academy	£103,900
Springfield School	Maintained Secondary	£101,750
Northern Parade Infant School	Maintained Primary	£97,400
St John's Cathedral Catholic Primary School	Maintained Primary	£89,000
Medina Primary School	Maintained Primary	£88,600
Copnor Infant School	Maintained Primary	£86,800
Court Lane Junior School	Maintained Primary	£84,300
Milton Park Infant School	Maintained Primary	£80,500
Langstone Infant School	Maintained Primary	£78,700
Redwood Park School	Maintained Special	£77,965
Devonshire Infant School	Maintained Primary	£74,200
Corpus Christi Catholic Primary School	Maintained Primary	£73,800

College Park Infant School	Maintained Primary	£68,200
The Harbour School	Maintained Special	£67,115
Gatcombe Park Primary School	Maintained Primary	£65,600
Goldsmith Infant School	Maintained Primary	£61,000
Westover Primary School	Maintained Primary	£57,000
Mary Rose School	Special Academy	£55,140
Solent Junior School	Maintained Primary	£54,400
St Swithun's Catholic Primary School	Maintained Primary	£49,700
Cumberland Infant School	Maintained Primary	£48,600
Southsea Infant School	Maintained Primary	£44,400
Wimborne Infant School	Maintained Primary	£44,400
Court Lane Infant School	Maintained Primary	£41,000
Moorings Way Infant School	Maintained Primary	£37,200
Meon Infant School	Maintained Primary	£33,900
Solent Infant School	Maintained Primary	£31,500
Willows Centre for Children	Maintained Special	£0