



**OFFICE FOR STANDARDS
IN EDUCATION**

**INSPECTION OF
SOUTHWARK
LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY**

November 1998

**OFFICE OF HER MAJESTY'S CHIEF INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS
in conjunction with the
AUDIT COMMISSION**

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Commentary and Recommendations	2
1. The Context of the LEA	6
2. The Performance of LEA Schools	9
3. LEA Strategy	11
Roles and priorities	11
Budget planning and expenditure	14
School places and admissions	16
Liaison with other services and agencies	17
Statutory duties	17
4. The Management of LEA Services	18
The inspection, advice and school development unit (IASD)	19
Other services which improve access and achievement	22
Management services	22
5. LEA support for improving standards	24
Improvement in the schools visited	24
Support to schools on the use of performance data for target-setting	24
Support to improve literacy	25
Support to improve numeracy	27
Support to schools requiring special measures and schools with serious weaknesses	29
Support to improving attendance	30
Support to raise the attainment of pupils from minority ethnic groups	31
6. LEA support for improving the quality of education	33
Support for improving teaching	33
7. LEA support for improving the management and efficiency of schools	35
Support for headteachers and senior managers	35
Support for governing bodies	36
Appendix 1: The Context of the LEA	38
Appendix 2: The Performance of Schools	41
Appendix 3: The School Survey	44
Appendix 4: The Audit Commission Cost Survey	47

INTRODUCTION

1. This inspection was carried out by OFSTED in conjunction with the Audit Commission under Section 38 of the Education Act 1997. The inspection used the ***Framework for the Inspection of Local Education Authorities***,¹ which focuses on the effectiveness of LEA work to support school improvement.
2. The inspection was in two stages. An initial review established a picture of the LEA's context, the performance of its schools, its strategy and the management of services. The initial review was based on data, some of which was provided by the LEA, school inspection and audit reports, LEA documentation and interviews with key staff. Discussions were also held with Education and Leisure Services Committee members, staff in the Education and other Council departments and representatives of the LEA's partners. In addition, a questionnaire seeking views on aspects of the LEA's work was sent to 97 schools and the response rate was 79 per cent.
3. The second stage of the inspection involved studies of the effectiveness of aspects of the LEA's work through visits to one nursery and 14 primary schools, six secondary schools and two special schools. The visits tested the views of governors, headteachers and other staff on aspects of the LEA's strategy. The visits also considered whether the support provided by the LEA contributes to the discharge of the LEA's statutory duties, is effective in contributing to improvements in the school and provides value for money.
4. This report draws on material from the initial review, from the School Survey, from an Audit Commission cost survey and from the school visits, together with evidence drawn from recent HMI visits to Southwark schools.

November 1998

¹ *LEA Support for School Improvement: A Framework for the Inspection of Local Education Authorities*. London, OFSTED, 1997.

COMMENTARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5. In 1994, Southwark Council set up an Education Commission to review the progress it had made as a Local Education Authority since inauguration in 1990. At that time, the LEA had more weaknesses than strengths. That is no longer the case. The LEA has made significant progress, not least in its relationships with schools. That progress is welcome, and has been hard-won, but it is not yet sufficient.

6. The LEA serves a highly diverse range of communities. Some of the wealthiest people in London, as well as some of the poorest, live in Southwark. The balance, however, is very definitely towards the latter. Overall, Southwark is one of the most deprived of London boroughs. It would be wrong to underestimate the difficulty of raising educational standards in a context of poor health, poor housing, high unemployment and high mobility. Both the Council and central government recognise that difficulty. The local authority has placed raising educational achievement at the heart of its corporate policies and has demonstrated its commitment by spending above its Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) for the past four years. It is providing, through its regeneration strategy, a programme of change which is visibly improving not only the physical environment of the borough, but also the aspirations of many of its residents. Educational spending in Southwark is high, and it is right that it should be.

7. In such a context, public money needs not only to be allocated relatively generously, but to be spent wisely and well. This is by no means always the case. Educational standards are too low and, though at GCSE they are rising much faster than the national rate, this is not consistently the case in the earlier key stages. Moreover, not enough attention has been given to some under-performing groups, such as pupils from black Caribbean backgrounds. The LEA has some way to go before it enjoys the confidence of all its parents in its secondary provision; only 65 per cent of pupils who currently attend a Southwark primary school transfer to a local secondary school. The staying-on rate is low at 59 per cent.

8. The services provided by the LEA are costly. The proportion of the budget delegated to schools is low: this could be justified if resources were accurately targeted to needs, and the services consistently effective. Neither is true. Overall, in relation to educational standards, the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of services and the response to the different needs of schools, the picture is one of considerable variability. There is evidence that the LEA has not taken sufficiently swift and decisive action to address that variability. Its failure, for example, to implement the findings of two critical reviews of personnel services is extraordinary. In all services, good work is being done, but not consistently so. Nor is there sufficient indication that the LEA is meeting the sharpest needs. Significantly, its ability to prevent under-performing schools from going into further decline is weak.

9. Headteachers are rightly critical of the low level of budget delegation. The LEA's aspiration to "partnership" with schools cannot be taken wholly seriously when one partner insists on keeping so tight a grip on the purse-strings, particularly when the

value for money achieved is, too often, not apparent. The accountability needs to be two-way. Both the LEA and schools need to appraise their respective responsibilities in the light of government proposals for fair funding.

10. In other ways, however, there is a sense of partnership developing. Most schools understand and support the LEA's priorities. Most express warm regard for the senior management of the LEA - a regard not undermined by their often scathing criticisms of particular services, or deliverers of service. That general feeling of goodwill towards the LEA is a precious asset, but it should not be allowed to obscure the fact that some headteachers, particularly of secondary schools, have little faith in the ability of particular services to deliver the support they need.

11. The LEA ensures that its statutory duties in relation to schools and pupils are effectively discharged. There are other key tasks that the LEA does well:

- support for teaching in primary schools, particularly in literacy and numeracy, is sound;
- the induction programme for newly-qualified teachers is very good;
- support for governors is effective;
- links with GM schools and with other local authority departments are good;
- the attainment of bilingual pupils is effectively monitored.

12. Nevertheless, the judgement must be that in the context of Southwark, this is not good enough. Parents, children and schools in Southwark need an LEA which performs not adequately, but consistently well. The LEA has the capacity to undertake the role for LEAs set out in the Standards and Framework Act. If it is to do so successfully, it must give urgent attention to the following recommendations:

A To improve standards in Key Stage 2 particularly in literacy and numeracy, the LEA should:

- i) review, with schools, the deployment of inspectors and advisory teachers to ensure that the best practice for the implementation of national initiatives is firmly embedded in all classrooms;
- ii) continue to develop better training for headteachers and co-ordinators in monitoring and improving classroom practice. This should take account of the need to review teachers' planning, assessment and tracking of individual pupils' progress.

B To improve standards in secondary schools, the LEA should:

- i) establish, with secondary schools and other key consultative groups, how the

LEA should organise and deploy its services best to support secondary schools in raising standards in Key Stages 3 and 4;

ii) devise and implement a coherent approach to improve standards in mathematics;

iii) ensure that staff in the Inspection, Advice and School Development (IASD) Unit are sufficiently expert to support the activities outlined above.

C To improve the attainment of pupils from minority ethnic groups, the LEA should:

i) continue to monitor the attainment and progress of pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds and other under-performing groups and intervene more effectively when progress is unsatisfactory;

ii) disseminate the effective practice that exists in some LEA schools and the findings from the various research projects on the attainment of black Caribbean pupils in which schools and the LEA are currently involved.

D To improve the support for schools with serious weaknesses and those requiring special measures, the LEA should:

i) work closely with schools on the implications of the Code of Practice on LEA-School Relations and urgently revise the policy on school support and intervention to ensure that schools causing concern are identified and supported more effectively;

ii) develop more systematic mechanisms for identifying under-performing schools and strategies to improve their performance at a faster rate.

E To support improvement in attendance the LEA should:

i) review its strategies for supporting schools in tackling poor attendance;

ii) review the priorities of the Education Welfare and Attendance Service (EWAS) to ensure that they are consistent with the LEA's priorities and communicate these more clearly to schools.

F To provide schools with efficient services that meet their needs and improve the accountability of service providers to schools, the LEA should:

i) retain funding for school improvement at the centre only where it is necessary to deliver the Authority's Education Development Plan;

ii) subject all high cost services to an in-depth scrutiny with a view to identifying options for reducing service expenditure;

- iii) better customise services to the specific needs of schools rather than give schools an entitlement to a standard set of core services;
- iv) as a matter of urgency complete the current review of personnel support and payroll services and address the serious concerns raised by schools about the structure and orientation of these services;
- v) require the heads of all LEA services to produce relevant performance measures which include costs of central services and the basis for service charges;
- vi) improve the guidance to headteachers and governors on development planning, including the integration of budget information and appropriate mechanisms for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of services purchased from the LEA and other external providers.

SECTION 1: THE CONTEXT OF THE LEA

The Borough

13. Socially and economically, Southwark is a borough of great contrasts. Overall there is a significantly higher proportion of households on the lowest income levels than for Greater London as a whole. There are a large number of post-war local authority housing estates, with significant unemployment and disadvantage. These areas have seen rapid economic decline and increasing levels of social deprivation. Unemployment in Southwark reached 22 per cent in 1993 and although it has decreased steadily ever since, it is still five percentage points above the average for Greater London as a whole. In contrast there is considerable wealth in the area surrounding Dulwich Village to the south.

14. Southwark has a rising population which currently stands at 231,821 but is projected to rise by some 3.5 per cent by the year 2001. Over a quarter of the population (28.2%) are from minority ethnic groups.

Pupils and schools

15. The main figures are given in Appendix 1. Key features include:

- Southwark has 103 schools; there is also one 11-18 City Technology College, and 10 independent schools. Four of the thirteen secondary schools are grant-maintained.
- Southwark maintains three primary and four secondary special schools. About four per cent of all pupils have a statement of special educational need, and over half of them are catered for in mainstream provision. Currently 493 pupils are on the register of Southwark's special schools and a further 151 pupils are registered at the Pupil Referral Units.
- In 1997 52.3 per cent of primary pupils of statutory school age were eligible for free school meals, and 53.9 per cent of secondary school pupils. These figures are well above national averages in both phases.
- The LEA has identified considerable pupil mobility, through its Educational Priorities Survey of 1997-98: 7.7 per cent of primary pupils and 9.5 per cent of secondary pupils joined their school within the previous twelve months, at a time other than the usual point of transfer.

16. The LEA estimates that 87 per cent of all four year olds in Southwark are registered under the Early Years Development Plan; 70 per cent of all three year olds are also catered for, if fee-paying provision is included.

17. Although the number of pupils from Southwark schools who participate in **post-**

16 education is low, Careers Service data for all Southwark schools indicate that staying on rates have increased from 50 per cent in 1992 to 59 per cent in 1997. Increasing participation post-16 is a consideration of the secondary review currently out to consultation.

18. The Education and Leisure Services Department supports a number of voluntary education-related activities. Thirty-one organisations are funded via grant aid to voluntary sector projects for **supplementary education and homework clubs**. There are 19 council-run **After School Centres** based in primary schools providing for over 2000 children and eight homework clubs in public libraries.

The Council, the Education & Leisure Services Committee and the Department

19. The Education Department was established in 1990 following the abolition of the Inner London Education Authority and is one of six Council departments. Each department is headed by a Director, who has a management team which comprises heads of service with strategic responsibilities. In 1994 the Council adopted a management framework 'Towards Service Excellence' (TSE), which incorporates a range of strategies to link the Council's strategic planning to service delivery, and to identify corporate approaches to quality assurance. Operational services are organised as business units, each with a business manager, reporting to their Head of Service, but having devolved responsibilities for service delivery, budget and staffing. Business units may commission external contractors to provide services where it is more cost effective and efficient.

20. Decision making with regard to education is vested in the Education and Leisure Services Committee and its three sub-committees:

- Under 8's sub-committee (jointly with Social Services and Health);
- Schools Inspection sub-committee;
- Urgency sub-committee.

The Education and Leisure Services Committee has voting members which include diocesan representatives.

21. The Under 8's Sub-committee has delegated budget and strategy powers for matters within its terms of reference. The Inspection Sub-Committee considers the Section 10 inspection reports of Southwark schools. Headteachers and governors are invited to attend and report to councillors on the progress of their post-inspection action plans.

22. The present departmental structure was adopted in 1997. The Education and Leisure Services Department is made up of the Learning Services and Community Services divisions, each managed by a Head of Service, and 13 Business Units. Learning Services contains the core functions of the LEA, while the Community Services division focuses on community, leisure and lifelong learning. Two business units delivering departmental or corporate services report centrally to the Director, and both major divisions include client and commissioning units. Education and Leisure

Services is the lead department in the Council's unified Early Years Service which includes all directly managed education, care and play services together with voluntary and private sector provision. It encompasses early years centres, nursery schools, day-care centres and special school units as well as childminders and pre-school places.

23. Business units provide both traded and core services to schools. Core services are those services for which funds are retained centrally and not delegated or devolved to schools. Traded services are available to schools either on annual subscription or a pay-as-you go arrangement. The core and traded services delivered by business units are set out clearly in an annual Services for Schools brochure. Each business unit has a business plan which sets out its arrangements and priorities for delivering to the SLA. Monitoring of services is reported to take place termly within the Learning Services Division and quarterly elsewhere as part of the TSE approach.

Education Funding

24. Southwark is a well funded authority which spends above its Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) for education. It has amongst the lowest levels of delegation of funds to schools.

25. Since 1994 the Council has demonstrated its commitment to education by guaranteeing to fund education above the SSA. It has maintained the Aggregated Schools Budget (ASB) to include the annual level of inflation and provide for rising rolls. To ensure clarity and accuracy in applying this budget policy, outside consultants were engaged to endorse the methodology for calculating relevant education service expenditure. This policy has led to education expenditure substantially exceeding SSA² for the past three years:

Year	Expenditure £m	% above SSA
1995/96	109.934	1.72
1996/97	109,297	5.4
1997/98	114,158	5.6

26. Expenditure per primary pupil under the ASB rose from 1996-97 to 1997-98 while expenditure in the secondary phase increased slightly over the same period. In both phases the LEA's expenditure is well above national averages. Funding per pupil in the 0-4 age group is well above the national average.

² It should be noted that Southwark uses a methodology for the calculation of education spending which includes capital financing charges in excess of the capital financing SSA. This method differs from that used by the Audit Commission in all other LEA inspections. The figures above have been calculated according to the Audit Commission methodology. The only difference with LEA figures occurs in year 1997/98 where the Council calculates education spending as £114.563m.

SECTION 2: THE PERFORMANCE OF LEA SCHOOLS³

27. Attainment on entry to infant and primary schools inspected in Southwark is generally below national expectations in most schools, although there is some variation between schools.

- Results from the LEA's baseline assessment in 1997 indicate that 77 per cent of five year olds were achieving most elements of the desirable outcomes in English, particularly in speaking and listening, including 10 per cent already working towards Level 1 of the National Curriculum and 1 per cent towards Level 2. Eighty per cent of the cohort were assessed as achieving most of the desirable outcomes in mathematics, particularly in competence in number, including 14 per cent working already towards Level 1.

28. Attainment remains below national averages at all the stages of compulsory education.

- In 1997 the proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 in the Key Stage 2 English tests was 50.3 per cent, whereas nationally the proportion was 63.2 per cent.
- In 1997 the proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 in the Key Stage 2 mathematics test was 50 per cent, whereas nationally the proportion was 62 per cent.
- In 1997 the proportion of pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE was 27.9 per cent, whereas nationally it was 43.3 per cent.
- In 1997 the proportion of pupils gaining 5+ A*-G grades at GCSE was 81.7 per cent, whereas nationally it was 88.5 per cent.
- The LEA's assessment of the attainment of pupils on entry to Key Stage 3 indicates that the average reading age of pupils entering Southwark secondary schools in 1997 was almost two and a half years below their chronological age. Over a third of pupils attending Southwark maintained secondary schools are resident outside the borough.

29. The overall rate of improvement in attainment is generally below the national rate at Key Stage 2.

- In 1997, Southwark was ranked 127/132 LEAs for the performance of its schools in the Key Stage 2 English tests and 59/132 for improvement from the previous year. Similarly, Southwark ranked 128/132 in the mathematics tests and 99/132 for improvement.
- Southwark's rate of improvement in the Key Stage 2 English tests between 1995 and 1997 was 13 per cent. The rate nationally was 15 per cent. Southwark's rate of improvement in the Key Stage 2 mathematics tests between 1995 and 1997 was only 10 per cent, which was below the national rate of 17 per cent.

³Details of the educational performance of Southwark schools are given in Appendix 2. The data used in this section are illustrative, not comprehensive.

30. **The overall rate of improvement in GCSE attainment is well above the national rate; albeit starting from a very low base.**

- The proportion of pupils gaining 5+ A*-C at GCSE in Southwark rose by 9.4 per cent between 1994 and 1997; it rose nationally by 2.6 per cent.
- The proportion of pupils gaining 5+ A*-G at GCSE in Southwark rose by 11.2 per cent between 1994 and 1997; it rose nationally by 1.5 per cent.
- Although attainment is below the national average, the LEA was ranked 4th of 132 LEAs in terms of improvement in the proportion of pupils gaining five or more grades A*-C in GCSE. Average point scores have risen from 21.19 in 1994 to 29.82 in 1997.

31. Attendance rates in primary schools have risen since 1995 from 91.4 per cent to 92.8 per cent which is only slightly below the national average of 93.9 per cent. Levels of unauthorised absence have fallen since 1995 to 1.5 per cent in 1997 which is still above the national figure of 0.5 per cent. Attendance rates in secondary schools have improved since 1995. Levels of unauthorised absence fell in 1996 but rose to 3.1 per cent in 1997; this figure is well above the national average.

32. Permanent exclusions in 1997 at 0.6 per 1000 pupils were above the national rate of 0.4 per 1000 pupils. In common with the national profile, the rate of permanent exclusion of boys in Southwark was significantly higher than that of girls. The rate of permanent exclusions has fallen from 8.1 in 1996 to 7.0 per 1000 pupils in 1997, but is still high.

33. **OFSTED evidence confirms that attainment is generally below national norms for the core subjects of the curriculum.** Southwark schools were judged unfavourably against national figures for standards of achievement, quality of education, ethos and efficiency. However the average grade for the quality of teaching matched the national average in both primary and secondary schools.

34. To date, twelve schools in Southwark have been judged to require special measures: eight primary schools and four secondary schools; of these two primary and one secondary school have since come out of special measures. One secondary, seven primary and four special schools have been identified by OFSTED as having serious weaknesses.

SECTION 3: LEA STRATEGY

ROLE AND PRIORITIES

- *The elected members and officers of the LEA have a clear vision and expression of intent through the Regeneration Statement. The Action Plan of the LEA - Raising Achievement - Working in Partnership (1995-2000) - sets a broadly coherent agenda for school improvement which takes account of the Council's vision and overall strategies and focuses on raising achievement.*
- *Most schools readily identify with the LEA's priorities for education and regard the raising of achievement as central to their purpose. Nevertheless, over half the primary and all the secondary headteachers and governors visited expressed difficulties in reconciling their general support for LEA priorities with their resentment at the high level of funding retained centrally.*
- *Four years on from the original definition of 'partnership' in RA-WIP, schools and the LEA need to clarify what constitutes 'partnership' in the light of government proposals for a Code of LEA-School Relations. They need to agree the terms of accountability that arise from a shared understanding of the different roles and priorities schools and the LEA hold.*
- *The views of schools should be taken more into account in determining operational priorities and evaluating whether the LEA has met its priorities.*

35. Since 1990 the way the LEA is perceived by schools and other interested parties has evolved significantly, but more particularly since 1994, following the decision by the then Education Committee to set up the Southwark Education Commission. Not only did the Commission provide a timely opportunity to review the progress of the LEA since inauguration, but it provided a constructive forum for schools and other interested parties to raise concerns about what was perceived by schools at that time as a rather heavy-handed and somewhat distant approach taken by officers. The process of public meetings, written submissions and discussions with representatives from both the public and private sector in Southwark was cathartic.

Council priorities

36. In 1994 a review of the whole Council was undertaken by consultants to assess its organisation and the way it performed. The strategic vision for the Council outlined in its Regeneration Statement of 1996, 'Shaping the Future', was one outcome; the more business-oriented TSE approach, similar to that now encompassed by the Government's 'Best Value' programme, was another. As part of the TSE process all services or business units are working towards Investors in People status and where appropriate units are encouraged to seek ISO⁴ and other Charter Mark standards. The Council uses internal Service Level Agreements (SLAs) to specify service requirements which also define lines of accountability and performance indicators.

37. The Council's Regeneration Statement covered housing, education, employment

⁴International Organisation for Standardization known as ISO in the UK

and the environment. Each department was expected to produce an action plan which set out how it intended to achieve the objectives in the Regeneration Statement. 'Raising Achievement - Working In Partnership' (RA-WIP) was both the response of the Education and Leisure Services Department and the outcome of the first major review of the Department since its establishment in 1990.

Education planning

38. The Council adopted RA-WIP as its five-year strategic action plan for education (1995-2000). The plan identified seven key objectives which focused on improving educational achievement. These objectives have been reviewed and updated each year since the inception of the plan.

39. The seven key RA-WIP objectives are:

- to improve the quality of teaching and learning;
- to support parental, employer and community involvement in the education and care of children and young people;
- to promote effective governing bodies;
- to promote effective school management and professional development;
- to develop provision in the Early Years phase;
- to involve young people in their education and development;
- to set targets, monitor and evaluate.

In 1996 a further objective, for lifelong learning, was added.

40. The action plan sets out a coherent agenda for school improvement and is based on detailed analyses of performance and inspection data. Each objective has priorities which have been translated into action by officers from the different services, though business plans are where detailed operational planning takes place. The planning process is now well established and forms a strong base on which to build the Education Development Plan (EDP).

Education Development Plan

41. Consultation on the EDP has taken place and appropriate priorities have been identified and shared with headteachers and governors. At the time of the review, the following priorities were under discussion:

- raising pupils' standards of literacy in the primary phase;
- raising pupils' standards of numeracy in the primary phase;
- raising pupils' and teachers' competence in the use of ICT;
- improving pupil attendance and behaviour;
- raising pupil achievement at Key Stage 3;
- promoting self-managing schools;
- supporting and intervening in schools subject to special measures/serious weaknesses.

Education Action Zone

42. The LEA has submitted a successful bid to set up an Education Action Zone in north Southwark. The zone contains 18 schools from all phases, an Early Years Centre and Southwark College of FE. The bid focuses on raising achievement from the early years through to Key Stage 4 and is scheduled to begin in January 1999. A project director has been appointed.

Evaluating effectiveness

43. The LEA has a number of mechanisms for evaluating whether it has met its priorities. The Education and Leisure Services Department seeks to meet the expectations of the corporate TSE approach. The department's senior management team, together with business unit managers, undertakes an annual review of progress on the RA-WIP Action Plan's tasks and targets in order to inform the SLAs and individual service business plans. In addition, the Council has a strategic financial scrutiny process: internal reviews are conducted by departments with external moderation by cross-service groups.

44. The annual LMS review and consultation provides one of the main means by which officers and members assess the needs of schools. The Inspection Sub-Committee also receives reviews of OFSTED reports, schools' action plans and the progress of schools in special measures. Moreover, the LEA has established a Standing Forum on Monitoring and Evaluation which meets twice yearly and reports to the Education and Leisure Services Committee. The group comprises elected members, governors, headteachers, parents, employers and other stakeholders. It has met three times to review the key issues from the Action Plan and the progress of the LEA in raising standards of education. The Chief Inspector's Annual Report is a clear and detailed analysis of the progress of schools within the LEA. The report is circulated to schools and presented to the Education and Leisure Services Committee.

45. Despite the range of mechanisms outlined above, most of these are internal and although the views of schools are sought, they are not sufficiently taken into account when evaluating whether the LEA has met its priorities.

Communication and consultation

46. Consultation is extensive. Parents and governor groups feel the LEA goes out of its way to demonstrate the importance of their contribution. Groups such as the diocesan boards value the close liaison. Headteachers believe, as do other consultative groups, that the responsiveness of the authority has improved dramatically in recent years and that relationships between themselves and the Centre are generally very good, and in some cases excellent. This view is also shared by headteachers of grant-maintained schools in Southwark. They view the authority's focus on raising achievement as consistent with their own approaches and therefore easy to endorse.

The schools' response to the LEA strategy

47. Relationships between the LEA and its schools are generally good. Officers and teachers are well known to each other and personal contact with the Director is much valued. Schools agree with the principles underpinning the RA-WIP objectives and priorities which are often reflected in schools' planning. The LEA has prioritised raising standards particularly in primary schools and this is reflected in the professional expertise of the IAS. Special schools also feel well supported by the authority.

48. Secondary schools are less positive and question whether the balance has swung too much in favour of primary support at the expense of the skills and expertise required to tackle the levels of difficulty many secondary schools face.

49. Too little reassurance has been provided to primary and special schools to ensure that they feel confident about the LEA's 'inclusion' policy for special educational needs. Primary schools, in particular, are genuinely concerned that they may be unable to meet the needs of individual children with a diverse range of special educational needs.

50. Over half the headteachers of primary and all the secondary schools visited have difficulties in reconciling their support for the LEA's priorities with their view that they are increasingly constrained by the high level of funding retained by the LEA to meet its priorities. For these schools the LEA's definition of partnership is not one of equals but one in which the LEA takes the lead and the school is expected to follow. Needless to say this is leading to an increasing frustration on the part of about half of the headteachers and governors visited, most of whom welcome the recent Government proposals on fair funding and the prospect of increased delegation of funds to schools.

BUDGET PLANNING AND EXPENDITURE

The LEA has sound and well managed systems for ensuring that schools have clear accurate and timely financial information. Consultation processes on the LMS scheme are effective.

The LEA's services are high cost and few are cheaper per pupil than the average for London LEAs. Yet the schools' perception of the quality of services varies from very good to unsatisfactory. Further work needs to be done to develop performance measures which allow the cost effectiveness of service delivery to be properly evaluated both by schools and by the Education and Leisure Services Department.

51. Southwark spends above its SSA on education, which reflects the Council's decision in 1994 to place education as one of the key corporate priorities. The average funding per pupil for 1997/98 according to the LEA's own analysis of the Section 122 (S122) returns is £1995 for primary pupils and £2608 for secondary schools. This puts Southwark among the highest spending ten per cent of LEAs nationally. Southwark LEA ranks ninth of the inner London boroughs for both primary and secondary funding per pupil; the average funding per pupil for inner London LEAs for 1997/98 was £2069 and £2779 per pupil for primary and secondary pupils respectively.

52. The Education and Leisure Services Department has a high degree of discretion in relation to the allocations to specific spending areas. The annual budget preparation process is clearly structured and provides for the systematic scrutiny of education services to ensure that strategic priorities are funded and new demands resulting from national initiatives and statutory duties are met. The process ensures that efficiency savings and service reductions are identified to fund growth elsewhere.

53. Over recent years, budgetary control has been strong. However, there have been quite substantial shifts in resources between service areas. Expenditure on both Inspection, Advice and School Development and services for pupils with special educational needs has increased since 1994/95. Expenditure in relation to pupils with special education needs accounts for 8 per cent of the education budget overall.

54. In 1996/97, the Head of Learning Services initiated a review of special needs provision including special schools. The review was wide ranging and was undertaken in partnership with school staff. The full report has now been approved and many of the recommendations are already being implemented; they represent a comprehensive and balanced response to the difficult problem of SEN expenditure. However, there is as yet no projection of the likely financial implication of the proposals.

55. The level of delegation of expenditure to schools (as measured by the proportion of the Potential Schools Budget given to the Aggregated Schools Budget) fell from 89.6% in 1997/98 to 88.7% in 1998/99. This is largely a result of the increase in resources for pupils with a statement of special educational needs and the creation of an Intervention Fund to support schools that are subject to special measures or have serious weaknesses.

56. The LMS scheme has been the subject of continuous development and improvement in clarity and sensitivity to school needs. It has also been modified to reflect changes in LEA policy. The LEA has a sound basis to begin a review of the Scheme to meet the new legislative requirements for April 1999. The review of the LMS scheme for special schools (LMSS) will be subsumed within this process.

57. Schools receive clear, accurate and timely information on their budgets. The arrangements for the provision of budget and other financial information to schools are clearly set out within the 'Services for Schools' booklet which is revised annually.

58. The school survey suggests a very variable level of satisfaction with the services provided. The school visiting suggested that the schools are right to think poorly of some services and question their value for money. Overall, the cost of central support is almost twice that of the average for all LEAs and very high even for London.

SCHOOL PLACES AND ADMISSIONS

□ *The LEA has effective plans to ensure the sufficiency of school places. These are developed and reviewed in consultation with schools, diocesan authorities and other interests. Information on admissions is generally satisfactory. The provision for pupils who have no school place is comprehensive and generally well monitored. The remit of the Planning and Resourcing Unit meets the need for detailed planning based on reliable data and is subject to satisfactory quality control mechanisms. The*

position regarding post-16 education is unsatisfactory: staying on rates are low.

59. The LEA takes steps to ensure the sufficiency of school places. District Audit has recently reviewed Southwark LEA's policies, practices and processes for the planning of school places and the authority is considering their recommendations to set targets for the removal of the high percentage of surplus places in both the primary (14.3%) and secondary phase (17.7%).

60. The most recent priority of the Planning and Resourcing Unit has been to analyse all school rolls and projections in the context of Audit Commission guidelines and develop a structured plan for consultations and reviews of issues around education provision for 11-19 year olds. The authority is taking steps to reduce surplus places and, at the same time, plan for a projected increase in secondary places by 2005. Proposals on the future of secondary and 16-19 education are currently out for consultation.

61. Staying-on rates post-16 are low; the LEA loses large numbers of students to provision in neighbouring boroughs. There is a small amount of sixth-form provision in the voluntary-aided CE secondary schools; otherwise it is centred on Southwark College.

62. Procedures for dealing with admissions and appeals are good. Information for parents and carers of pupils of all ages is comprehensive. Appropriate procedures are in place for dealing with pupils who have been permanently excluded from schools.

63. The LEA has two Pupil Referral Units ⁵: the Education Support Centre (ESC) and the Learning Support Service (LSS). These, together with the Home Tuition Service, are managed by the Head of Teaching Services and are part of the Pupils' Support and Special Educational Needs (PSSSEN) Business Unit. The ESC caters at any one time for the full-time education of up to 60 Year 10 and 11 pupils with a range of learning, behavioural and emotional needs; the LSS provides part-time, off-site education for the majority of pupils 5-16 who are not attending school as well as home tuition.

LIAISON WITH OTHER SERVICES AND AGENCIES

□ *There is effective co-operation between the Education and Leisure Services Department and other local authority departments. The positive impact of the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) in schools and service plans which draw together the work of different departments in providing services to children are notable examples.*

□ *The LEA forms productive partnerships with an impressive range of agencies. The LEA enjoys a close working relationship with diocesan representatives. Links with business are established through the LEA-funded Education Business Alliance and Focus Central London TEC, with which there is a partnership agreement. It is a tribute to the Director of Education and Leisure Services that relations between the authority and its grant-maintained schools have remained positive throughout.*

STATUTORY DUTIES

⁵ Both PRUs were scheduled to have their Section 10 inspection during the period of this review.

64. *The LEA takes effective steps to ensure that it meets its statutory duties in relation to schools and pupils.*

SECTION 4: THE MANAGEMENT OF LEA SERVICES

□ *As a result of the reorganisation and reorientation of LEA services eighteen months ago, all services undertake some form of assessment of need and identify areas of improvement. There has been some movement towards a more schools-orientated approach, but there is still some way to go. Developing better mechanisms for assessing the specific needs of schools and adapting the delivery of services to better meet these needs is required if the LEA is to respond to Government proposals for fair funding. There is too little information provided to schools on the cost of services.*

□ *Primary and special schools rate Inspection and Advisory Services highly, as do some secondary schools. Support services for governors and Information and Communication Technology are held in high regard by all schools. Schools have a very poor opinion of payroll and personnel services. Improving the accountability of services to schools and schools to the LEA is therefore a pressing task for the Education and Leisure Services Department.*

65. Appendix 3 provides an analysis of the results of the School Survey which sought the views of schools on aspects of the LEA's work.

66. The overall rating for all elements of the **Inspection and Advice Services** was in the range good to adequate with the majority of services being towards the good rather than adequate. Compared with schools in other LEAs so far surveyed, the schools have a significantly better opinion of key elements of the LEA's own review process, curriculum support, training for literacy and numeracy and support pre-OFSTED inspection. In all elements of the service, primary schools were more satisfied with the IASD than secondary schools. A more detailed profile of the work of this service follows later in this section.

67. All of the **services to promote access and achievement** were rated between adequate and poor. There was no significant difference between the rating of schools in Southwark and those for schools in other LEAs so far surveyed. There was no significant difference between the responses of secondary and primary schools. Apart from a detailed look at LEA support to improve attendance in Section 5 of this report, support for pupils with special educational needs was not a theme of this review.

68. There was considerable variation in the rating given by schools to **management support services**. Finance, Legal, Governor support and training, IT support and Home to School Transport are all rated good to adequate. IT support for the LEA's schools received a higher rating than that for any other LEA. However, Payroll, Personnel and School meals services are rated worse by schools in Southwark than schools in all other LEAs so far surveyed. These results are consistent with the responses to the LEA's own surveys. Secondary schools gave almost all of the services a lower rating than primary schools. These services are briefly evaluated later in this section.

THE INSPECTION, ADVICE AND SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT UNIT (IASD)

□ *The IASD Business Unit covers a wide range of services and functions which provide support to schools. These are generally well managed and management has improved over the past few years. Service planning is clear and is well related to the overall planning of the local authority. Services have clearly defined service standards. The support provided by the IASD is often effective and it is generally valued by schools. However, there is considerable variation in quality and support is not always as well targeted at the needs of schools as it might be. Services are expensive by national and London standards and schools have little idea how much they cost or whether they provide value for money.*

69. IASD was formed in 1997 following the amalgamation of the Inspection and Advisory Service and the services of the former School Development and Support Unit. IASD aims to deliver services in partnership with schools, parents, pupils and the community. The Unit is managed by the Chief Inspector and is made up of a collection of core services which are grouped under three headings: inspection and advice, school development, and trading units. Their prime task is raising standards of educational achievement.

70. Inspection and advice covers a broad range of functions which include:

- supporting and implementing LEA policies, in particular RA-WIP and the emerging strategy for school improvement;
- monitoring and evaluation, which includes undertaking LEA and OFSTED inspections, pre- and post-inspection support for schools including action planning, the maintenance and publication of school performance data, and monitoring 'education otherwise';
- advice to schools on management, through support to headteachers and senior and middle managers. Advice and training are also provided for governors;
- recruitment and staff development through advice to governing bodies on headteacher and deputy headteacher appointments; induction of new headteachers; headteacher appraisal; professional development of teachers; and monitoring and supporting newly qualified teachers;
- a limited amount of consultancy for other bodies outside the LEA.

71. School development includes:

- additional support to schools in special measures and those with serious weaknesses;
- the production of data and other information used by the Education and Leisure Services department for planning, resourcing and performance analysis. This includes the production and sharing of comparative data on individual schools;

- support to governors to ensure that they meet statutory duties;
- encouragement through the Parent and Pupil Partnership to parents to become more involved in the education of their children.

72. The IASD has clear objectives, targets, dates for implementation and performance indicators which relate specifically to its role in the RA-WIP plan. However, the allocation of resources to objectives is not always specified with sufficient clarity, which makes value-for-money analysis problematic.

73. The senior management team has begun to develop a more coherent approach to the management of the service. Senior managers now meet regularly to co-ordinate and evaluate the work of the unit. The IASD has service standards related to meeting customer demands. Each service in IASD has defined a minimum entitlement of provision for schools, for example in the number of inspector days allocated to each school. In general, the allocation is realistic given resource levels but the quality of the provision varies considerably, for example in the extent to which General Inspectors define and meet schools' needs. There are various consultative forums which are valued by schools. Service standards are monitored on a six-monthly basis. The LEA has commissioned independent surveys about the quality and usefulness of its services; it has already taken action on the results.

74. In 1997, the IASD was subject to a budget scrutiny. This led to improved planning and more money to finance the LEA's policy on supporting 'lower-performing' schools. However, this scrutiny addressed in only a limited way the issues now raised by recent government proposals. In particular, the scrutiny did not ask, with sufficient rigour, if services were well targeted and offered value for money.

75. The quality and effectiveness of support provided by the different IASD services vary, though there are many positive features. For example, the development of literacy and numeracy strategies has led to some improvements in pupils' attainment and there has been some helpful support for schools with serious weaknesses and in special measures. General Inspectors have provided valuable help before and after OFSTED inspections. Subject inspectors have also provided valuable help, for example in curriculum planning, and in developing schemes of work and exemplar materials. Formal evaluations of in-service training for teachers indicate that courses run by IASD are well regarded, particularly those related to management and newly qualified teachers. A comprehensive range of data is now provided to schools to help them set targets. Evidence also indicates that Section 11 funds have been well used and that support staff are deployed effectively.

76. SRB-funded school effectiveness projects have been particularly significant in giving primary headteachers the flexibility and confidence to determine their own priorities and target funds accordingly. The allocation of a general adviser to co-ordinate and support schools involved in SRB projects is also effective and much appreciated by schools.

77. However, evidence from our visits to schools also suggests that there is still

considerable variation in the responsiveness and effectiveness of the services provided by IASD. In particular, the monitoring and advice provided by IASD has not prevented schools from going into special measures, and in some schools achievement remains unacceptably low. Thus IASD's provision is not as effective as it should be in identifying schools' needs and targeting in-service training to meet them. For example, classroom monitoring by co-ordinators, particularly in primary schools needs to be improved. Schools need more help in evaluating the impact of IASD services on standards in schools, including ways to analyse the value-for-money that they provide. The concern from secondary schools that IASD is better equipped to give advice to primary schools needs to be urgently addressed. Greater consistency in the amount and quality of advice provided by general inspectors (and consequently by subject inspectors and advisory teachers) will be crucial to the success of meeting these deficiencies.

78. In summary, IASD needs to review its strategy for school intervention and to identify more precisely the effectiveness of its services. There is evidence to suggest that this is already beginning and that mechanisms are in place to ensure more systematic consultation with schools to provide a more objective evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of IASD's services. The service already operates in this way when providing services to local grant-maintained schools who regularly purchase IASD training.

Other curriculum support services

79. The provision of services that supplement school resources in Southwark adds considerable value by broadening the horizons of pupils who are educated in Southwark schools and beyond. There are **two trading units**, the South London Technology Centre and the Centre for Language in Primary Education. Both centres operate successfully as self-funded services and have produced their own business plans. Elsewhere in the report the contribution of the CLPE and Science & Technology Centres in supporting teachers in the core and foundation subjects of the National Curriculum is recognised. They play a key role in providing in-service training for teachers and the production of curriculum materials.

80. Of particular note is the ***Education Library Service***, which was rated highly by all of the schools visited in our sample. Key features of the work of the service are support for the NLP within schools and the promotion of literacy and similar initiatives within the LEA. The Education Library Service houses the NLP collection for the 38 participating schools in partnership with the English Adviser and Library Co-ordinators and is developing resources to support schools in managing the literacy hour. The service also provides a number of exhibitions and displays to accompany LEA initiatives and conferences. In addition the library service is part of the Internet Pilot Project in 14 primary schools. Ninety-nine per cent of schools are reported to purchase the service along with the majority of grant-maintained schools.

OTHER SERVICES WHICH IMPROVE ACCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT

81. The Pupils' Support and Special Educational Needs (PSSSEN) Business Unit includes a number of services which support pupils with special educational needs. The

services provided by the PSEN Unit include:

- Education Welfare and Attendance
- Education Psychology
- Learning Support
- Behaviour Support
- Education Otherwise
- Travellers' Support
- Low Incidence Team (support to pupils with visual or hearing impairment)
- Admissions
- Exclusions
- SEN Management

82. All of the services listed above were subject to a recent wide-ranging review of SEN provision in the LEA; these proposals are currently being considered by the Education Committee. Schools were generally positive about the contribution of SEN services although serious concerns were raised in a mainstream primary about the poor arrangements for speech and language therapy provided by the Health Authority.

MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Governor Support Service

83. Governor Support is a highly regarded, efficient service. All the schools visited by HMI valued both the clerking service and, to a lesser extent, the training for governors provided with the assistance of IASD. The GS service was subject to review in 1995 and involved research into the needs of governors. The resulting action plan has formed the basis for the services now provided. In 1997/8, the service was purchased by all 46 county primary schools, twelve of the twenty voluntary-aided primary schools; six of the seven county secondary schools; and all nine of the maintained special schools.

84. The performance of the service is monitored monthly by the LEA. The OFSTED/Audit Commission School Survey shows a higher satisfaction for this service amongst Southwark schools than the average. Service costs amount to £4.01 per pupil against £3.48 for all London boroughs.

Personnel and School Staffing

85. Personnel-related services are the responsibility of three separate services covering routine administrative support, personnel management (largely grievance and disciplinary issues in schools), and payroll. These three services are supposed to complement each other by providing a coherent and comprehensive set of services; the reality differs somewhat.

86. Schools are very critical of the arrangements and have rated them as adequate to poor in the School Survey. Schools complain that the quality of service depends totally on individuals rather than on service standards. There is also evidence that many teachers still do not have employment contracts. The LEA has been aware of these concerns for some time. Two internal reviews have identified confusion over who provides what; a lack of responsiveness to schools' needs; a lack of liaison between the three services; a failure to tackle long-standing problems; and a general insensitivity to customers by staff. Visits to schools identified recent improvements to services (in particular, payroll services) but schools still complain about incorrect advice from personnel officers.

87. The cost per pupil of £12.02 is substantially higher than the median cost for all LEAs of £7.82 although it is a little lower than the £13.29 for all London LEAs. Given the unacceptable deficiencies, the services provide unsatisfactory value for money. The findings of the recent reviews should be urgently implemented.

Schools' Finance and Budgeting

88. The Schools' Finance Section is part of the Education Services Unit and provides support to schools on financial management including internal audit. Schools are happy with the services provided, which include a two-yearly financial health check.

Planning and Resourcing

89. This service does not provide direct support and advice to schools. Thus, it did not form part of the inspection. However, schools report that the consultations managed by the section are effective, particularly those relating to the LMS formula and the development of SRB projects.

Property Services

90. Property Services is part of the Education Resources Business Unit and acts as landlord for the LEA. Schools are generally pleased with the service. Accommodation was found to be in generally satisfactory condition during the school visits. There were also cases where improved accommodation had clearly made a considerable difference, not only to pupils, but to the wider community.

91. However, schools are critical of the Building Maintenance Service which is a direct services organisation of the local authority. Many schools do not use this service, preferring instead to use alternative providers.

SECTION 5: LEA SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING STANDARDS

IMPROVEMENT IN THE SCHOOLS VISITED

Overall judgement

92. *The inspection team made judgements about the improvements made since the Section 10 inspection in one nursery and 13 primary schools, five secondary and two special schools. The LEA's contribution to schools' improvement, while varied, is good overall in primary schools but only just satisfactory in secondary schools. In 12 primary schools (including the nursery) it was satisfactory or better, and in nine it was good or very good. In two primary schools the LEA had provided some support but it was unsatisfactory and unlikely to secure improvement. One of these two schools was a school with serious weaknesses. In the secondary schools, the picture was less good. In three schools the LEA had provided satisfactory support which has led to some improvements, but in two schools, the LEA's support is unsatisfactory. In the two special schools, the LEA's support has been good.*

SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS ON THE USE OF PERFORMANCE DATA FOR TARGET-SETTING

□ *The LEA provides schools with a comprehensive range of performance data. Advice to schools on the use of this data to raise standards is generally sound and there is evidence that a number of schools have used the information to focus more clearly on individual pupils' attainment and have revised their planning and assessment procedures accordingly. In these schools headteachers can demonstrate that the data provided by the LEA has contributed to improved standards in literacy and numeracy in particular. A minority of both primary and secondary schools require more detailed support in the use, interpretation and application of performance data as a strategic tool in raising standards; General Inspectors need to be more proactive in intervening in these schools.*

93. The Research and Statistics Unit of Southwark LEA provides detailed analyses of performance data for use by schools and within the Education and Leisure Services Department to inform the work of officers and members. A key feature of the data produced by Southwark is its transparency. An annual summary of the overall performance of Southwark schools is produced entitled '**Education Statistics**'. Schools are provided with a wide range of data for use in target-setting, including reports on baseline assessment on entry to Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 3, and end-of-Key Stage test results. Much of this and additional data on finances, staffing and attendance is included in the individual **School Profiles** which headteachers and governors receive annually. The unit also provides additional analyses customised to suit individual schools but this service is not available to all schools, only to those involved in SRB projects or in special measures.

94. The use of performance data to raise standards was a focus of all the school

visits. In all but six schools, the school profiles had been a helpful starting point. Over 50 per cent of the primary and secondary schools had developed more sophisticated approaches, sometimes with an initial spur from involvement in curriculum or school effectiveness projects, and had produced their own analyses of individual pupils' performance, often broken down by gender and ethnicity. They had also changed their planning and assessment procedures as a result of analysing performance data more effectively. In seven primary schools, one secondary and both special schools, the headteachers could demonstrate a clear link between these more focused approaches and an improvement in the quality of education and levels of attainment.

95. Primary schools, particularly those involved in the NLP and Southwark Numeracy Initiative, had made good progress in using data to set targets. For example, one primary school had re-focused its resources to provide smaller classes in Key Stage 1 as a consequence of analysing individual pupils' performance data. One special school had made considerable progress in using assessments to plan future work and to set suitable targets in their SDP; the General Inspector had been closely involved throughout. Schools also cited the annual National Curriculum Assessment conference for Year 2 and Year 6 teachers as helpful in the use of data to set literacy and numeracy targets for individual pupils. The workshops are organised according to teachers' experience; a differentiated approach that schools found very helpful.

96. In two schools, one primary and one secondary, headteachers and governors were unable to use the data strategically and required much more detailed guidance. They found the School Profiles too complex and difficult to understand. In stark contrast, six primary and one secondary school found the exact opposite and judged the School Profiles too general and non-specific to be helpful in setting targets to raise attainment. In these schools, the profile was seen as useful only in so far as it provided benchmark information for governors and parents.

97. The LEA is in the process of reviewing its support to schools on target setting as part of a wider review of information systems and the need for more sophisticated data.

SUPPORT TO IMPROVE LITERACY

□ *Attainment in literacy in Southwark is weak. Test results are below national averages. All of the schools visited have become better at making their pupils more literate and eight out of ten schools have made substantial changes for the better. The LEA's support for that improvement is at least sound in all but one of the schools and good in five of them. Improving literacy in primary schools is a priority of the EDP.*

98. Southwark has been part of the National Literacy Project (NLP) since it began in 1996 and has now begun to extend NLP approaches to all of its primary and secondary schools as part of the National Literacy Strategy (NLS). Most of the beneficial changes in its schools have been in response to these developments. In primary schools and in those secondary schools involved in the pilot NLS work in Key Stage 3, these changes have centred on the introduction of the literacy hour. With more systematic teaching of literacy, particularly in primary schools, teachers have now adopted a more direct

approach to teaching phonics than they did at the time of OFSTED's report on *The Teaching of Reading* which was published in 1996 to report on the inspection of primary schools in three London boroughs, one of which was Southwark.

99. Since that inspection and based on the evidence of the visits to 15 schools during this review, primary schools have made substantial progress in improving their curricula for literacy as well as their teaching. However, amongst those schools which have just begun NLS work, some have yet to adapt the approaches of the NLS to the particular needs of their pupils. This was evident, for example, in a school where many pupils in Key Stage 2 had been newly admitted and had widely varying individual needs.

100. Attainment on entry to Southwark secondary schools is low. In response to the high proportion of pupils from other boroughs, Year 7 pupils entering Southwark county and voluntary-aided schools sit NFER tests in reading to establish a baseline against which to measure future progress. The LEA analysis notes that the average reading age of pupils entering Southwark county and VA secondary schools in 1995 and 1996 was 9 years against an average chronological age of 11 years 6 months. The tests are standardised with scores between 70 and 140 with the median score of 100: in reading, 84% of pupils scored less than the median; 25% scored less than 70. Nationally 50% of pupils would achieve the median and only 1% of pupils would be expected to have scores below 70.

101. The secondary schools visited have also improved their teaching of literacy but, having just begun the NLS, they are at an earlier stage of development than the primary schools. Two have just introduced the literacy hour as part of the Key Stage 3 pilot work. All of those visited have begun to develop approaches to the teaching of literacy which seek to involve all subjects, not English alone. In one secondary school this cross-curricular approach was developing well but in two others, progress was much slower and much less consistent in the different subjects: the work was not co-ordinated well. As in the primary schools, there is weakness in adapting NLS approaches to the particular needs of the pupils, for example to deal with particular weaknesses in sustained independent writing.

102. Although the contribution of the LEA to positive change has been at least sound in both primary and secondary schools, it is, at present, a little weaker in secondaries because the developments there are more recent than in primaries. In both phases, the LEA's chief contribution to improvement in the schools has been through the consultancy and in-service training provided by the Inspection and Advisory Service and the Schools' Library Service. The LEA's schools have also been supported well by the Centre for Language in Primary Education (CLPE) which operates on a full cost recovery basis. A considerable strength of the LEA's approach has been to build its work towards the NLS on pre-existing initiatives, such as the School Effectiveness Projects funded by SRB.

103. In nearly all of the schools visited, the LEA's work was effective and, though costing a lot, provided reasonable value. To improve the value it provides, the LEA will need to equip its schools better to adapt nationally recommended approaches to the

particular needs of their pupils. Furthermore the LEA needs to encourage headteachers and co-ordinators to take more effective responsibility for monitoring the classroom performance of teachers delivering the NLS.

SUPPORT TO IMPROVE NUMERACY

□ *Standards of numeracy in Southwark schools are below the national average at the end of all the Key Stages. Although the LEA has responded well to the challenge this presents in primary schools and has identified the raising of pupils' standards in numeracy as a priority in its EDP; levels of attainment in mathematics remain low. The contribution of the LEA to improving numeracy in secondary schools is unsatisfactory.*

104. Standards of numeracy in Southwark schools fall short of the national average at the end of both Key Stage 2 and 4. At Key Stage 1 scores for level 2 and above are only slightly below and broadly in line with the national average; level 3 attainment is higher than the scores of both the LEA's statistical neighbours and the national picture. However, the Key Stage 2 results are significantly reversed for the scores at level 4 and level 5 and above. Pupils entering Southwark county and voluntary-aided schools sit NFER tests. The LEA analysis notes that the tests are standardised with scores between 70 and 140 with the median score of 100. In mathematics 88% of pupils scored less than the median score of 100; 17% scored less than 70. Nationally the expectation is that 50% would achieve the median and only 1% score less than 70. At the end of Key Stage 3 the results are still well below the national averages and are indicative of major problems in achievement in mathematics in Southwark.

105. The LEA has responded well to the challenge these scores present. The sensible development of the Southwark Numeracy Initiative, which is modelled on the National Numeracy Project (NNP), is being trialled in nine schools. The materials used have been effectively adapted from the NNP model to meet local needs and are based on their own Southwark Maths Scheme of Work. The project is subject to external evaluation.

106. The take-up of training in numeracy by primary teachers is impressive at both centrally-provided and school-based courses. However, the LEA suffers from a severe shortage of subject qualified staff and reports that one-third of schools have a maths co-ordinator who has been in post under three years. This year 20 per cent of co-ordinators in schools are new and 16 per cent of schools have no mathematics co-ordinator in post.

107. Numeracy development is co-ordinated by a senior inspector and two advisory teachers. The LEA maintains a permanent and well-used numeracy base at the South London Science and Technology Centre. This centre is the focal point for much of the in-service training, which involves many more schools and teachers than those nominated in the numeracy project pilot phase. It also runs a range of special projects and schemes designed to raise standards in numeracy across the LEA

108. Every primary school visited during the inspection had been involved in extensive

training, either specially for the LEA's initiative or of their own volition on the basis of identified need in their school. In addition to in-service training, the LEA also provides other activities and services such as the Maths Challenge event for pupils, resources in the Centre, a maths experience day for brighter pupils and training for support assistants. In two-thirds of the schools visited, the LEA's contribution to developments and improvement in the teaching of numeracy was judged to have been good or better; it was less than satisfactory in only one school.

109. The situation in secondary schools is much less favourable. Mathematical attainment in the schools visited demonstrated fluctuating patterns of attainment and no clear evidence of sustained improvement across schools. Where the leadership of the headteacher is determined, and the head of mathematics department is strong, positive measures to secure improvement are under way in some departments.

110. However, assessing the LEA's contribution to improvement in secondary schools is problematic. In one school, where mathematics was listed as a key issue in the Section 10 report, the development of a clear subject action plan with targets, timescale and identified responsibilities was giving greater clarity to the work of the department. The staff were attempting to widen their range of teaching styles. Whilst the LEA had been punctilious in meeting its statutory duties and addressing the key issue in the action plan, the school had not sought to engage the IASD in further development. In another school, with a sound subject report for mathematics, the department had previously received visits from the maths inspector and advisory teacher. Although the department acknowledged that these may have made an effective contribution to raising attainment in the Key Stage 3 SATs by encouraging well-targeted teaching and a focus on numerical skills, the school is still reluctant to engage in LEA initiatives or to accept advice. In a third department, where standards are rising from a very low base, a new head of department and other staffing changes have brought about the improvement, rather than the LEA's involvement.

SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS REQUIRING SPECIAL MEASURES AND SCHOOLS WITH SERIOUS WEAKNESSES

□ *Support for schools requiring special measures and those with serious weaknesses is of variable effectiveness and needs to be more consistent. Despite the fact that the LEA has been successful in supporting three schools which have come out of special measures, the number of primary and secondary schools in special measures gives cause for concern.*

111. Twelve maintained schools in Southwark have been judged to require special measures since 1993: eight primary and four secondary schools. Of those, seven were placed in special measures this year; the two secondary schools after their second Section 10 inspection. One secondary school has been in special measures for three years; the future of the school is now the subject of a wide-ranging review of secondary education.

112. In addition, one secondary, seven primary and four special schools have been identified by OFSTED as having serious weaknesses. Four of the 12 schools were identified in 1997/98. However, eight of the schools have been visited by the OFSTED School Improvement Team and in all but two cases no further monitoring was judged to be required. Monitoring visits by the School Improvement Team indicate that support from the LEA, particularly the role of the General Inspector, has been a critical factor which has led to improvement. One secondary and two primary schools have come out of special measures and are now providing an acceptable standard of education.

113. Earlier this year, the LEA produced a policy for school support and intervention to promote school improvement. The policy sets out the LEA's current thinking on intervention by clarifying 'the way the LEA works with schools and other agencies, including Diocesan authorities, to implement the LEA's education strategy' in the light of new legislative requirements and recent DfEE guidance on the role of LEAs. It is within this policy framework that the LEA defines its support to assist 'lower performing schools' based on LEA criteria or OFSTED reports which indicate performance is less than satisfactory.

114. However, there is little that is new or innovative in the document, which merely serves to formalise what already takes place. Since these approaches have had limited success, a more radical approach which redefines the role of both the LEA and schools is required. The evidence from school visits suggests that the LEA needs to identify in conjunction with schools what aspects of present practice are effective and should be retained, what is not working and the roles and expectations of all parties involved in the task of improving schools in difficulty. The policy needs to discriminate between secondary and primary schools, since experience shows that the challenges are usually of a different order. The LEA may have to acknowledge that IASD as a whole does not enjoy the confidence of its secondary headteachers and to reconsider its approach for intervening in secondary schools.

115. Currently schools requiring special measures or having serious weaknesses are put into a School Support Programme. All schools in special measures automatically have an LEA School Support Plan which to a certain extent complements the statutory requirement of the LEA to produce both a commentary on the school's action plan and a statement of intent. The Diocesan authority is also involved in the planning, monitoring and review of school support where the school is voluntary-aided. Elected members too are involved: headteachers and chairs of governors of schools in special measures are requested to attend Committee meetings in order to give an account of the progress being made in implementing the action plan.

116. Undoubtedly, in common with many other LEAs, the IASD has found the experience of supporting schools in special measures challenging and has drawn on the experience of supporting three schools to come out of special measures. Nevertheless, questions remain about the LEA's capacity to identify schools causing concern. The LEA should adopt a more robust approach, particularly with governing bodies, to ensure that effective action takes place once problems have been identified. An appropriate strategy needs to be devised to help schools improve, before they decline further and become schools with serious weaknesses or requiring special measures. Recent Government proposals demand an even faster rate of improvement and more effective intervention in schools causing concern, which the LEA's improvement policy will need to address.

SUPPORT TO IMPROVE ATTENDANCE

□ *The LEA employs effective strategies to ensure that statutory duties are met. Support to schools to improve levels of attendance is variable. The service maintains a strategic approach which schools do not fully understand or necessarily endorse.*

117. In 1997 rates of attendance in Southwark were 92.8% in primary and 88.5% in secondary schools. Authorised absence was broadly in line with national averages but rates of unauthorised absence were above in both primary schools and secondary schools, at 1.5 and 3.1 per cent respectively. The LEA's analysis of attendance rates and trends since 1990 indicate that rates in primary schools have remained stable. Boys' attendance is only marginally worse than girls' although attendance at single-sex schools has been the highest of all types of school. Older pupils attend less well than younger pupils. This picture was confirmed in the primary schools visited, where attendance rates were either static or rising.

118. Attendance was a focus of the visit in 12 schools. The Education Welfare and Attendance Service (EWAS) takes a strategic view of its responsibilities, only directly intervening in schools once schools have gone through all the procedures outlined in their attendance policies. The documentation clearly states that 'where schools can demonstrate that they have exhausted their school-based strategies to re-establish attendance, a referral can be made to the EWAS who will then embark on a process of assessment and task-centred casework.' The service contends that, in addition, schools can always gain advice from the specialist officer on duty each day. Schools receive a twice-yearly visit to ensure that registers are completed accurately.

119. While this approach has been communicated to schools via the LEA's published service standards for core services, in practice schools are frustrated by the fact that they do not have ready access to a specialist officer assigned to their school to support attendance strategies identified by schools themselves to tackle the underlying reasons for poor attendance. Not all schools have an attendance policy despite having attendance targets set by the LEA.

120. The service maintains quite reasonably that it does not have the staffing to respond in ways schools would prefer, and cites pressure on staffing due to the EWAS commitment to provide an equitable service for the high number of Southwark children who are educated out-borough. Nevertheless, the EWAS is a core service and may need to review its services to schools given the dissatisfaction expressed by schools. Improving pupil attendance is a priority in the LEA's EDP and should provide a timely opportunity to redefine how best the LEA should support schools to raise attendance rates.

SUPPORT TO RAISE THE ATTAINMENT OF PUPILS FROM MINORITY ETHNIC GROUPS

□ *The attainment of pupils of black African heritage, who are the second largest minority ethnic group, is generally satisfactory, often outperforming all other groups including English, Scottish and Welsh heritage groups. However, the LEA's own analysis indicates that the attainment of pupils of black Caribbean origin, who are the largest minority ethnic group, remains a concern in each Key Stage.*

121. The LEA provides data on the performance of pupils from minority ethnic groups and includes analyses by Key Stage of attainment, attendance, and exclusions. The attainment of pupils of black African heritage, who are the second largest minority ethnic group, is generally satisfactory, and they often outperform all other groups including English, Scottish and Welsh heritage groups.

122. The LEA has targeted support to raise the attainment of minority ethnic pupils through SRB and Section 11 projects, and has developed over five years a well-run Black Mentor Scheme. These initiatives notwithstanding, the LEA's own analysis indicates that the attainment of pupils of black Caribbean origin remains a concern in each Key Stage. As a result the LEA has drawn up an appropriate action plan for raising the achievement of boys, with a particular focus on the performance of black Caribbean boys, and is involved in a major action research project involving 30 schools linked to London University. The impact of this project needs to be closely monitored and any successful outcomes widely disseminated.

123. Six schools were visited where the attainment of minority ethnic pupils was a focus; all six schools received Section 11 support. Since their OFSTED inspections, standards have risen in three schools, have fluctuated in one school and have remained

static in one school. In the sixth school, where standards were unsatisfactory, they are now sound. The LEA's contribution to these changes has varied from very good to unsatisfactory.

124. The LEA's Section 11 service has carefully analysed the needs of schools in accordance with the Home Office requirements and has targeted resources accordingly. Section 11 staffing is allocated to schools based on criteria which ensure equity of provision. As part of the monitoring which takes place to meet the Home Office targets for Section 11 work, the LEA can point to performance indicators which demonstrate that there have been reductions in the number of pupils from ethnic minorities who have been excluded, and that levels of attendance are improving. There are clear indications that bilingual pupils are making good progress.

125. Pupils participating in Southwark's Black Mentor Scheme in one secondary school found the contact with black professionals helpful. The scheme has helped pupils to have high expectations, and in some cases they formed close relationships with their mentors. In another primary school the analysis of performance data had improved and the progress of individual pupils from minority ethnic backgrounds was recorded and targets set. This coincided with the introduction of the NLP, and involvement in the Family Literacy Project. This school has developed better links with the community and redeployed its S11 teachers more effectively; learning support assistants had been appointed who were representative of the different cultures within the school. One school felt that more attention should be given to the needs of minority ethnic pupils in NQT training.

126. The LEA's contribution to the improvements within the schools varied from very good to unsatisfactory. Where it was very good or good, in two schools, good training for teachers and resources provided by the LEA have been well matched to the needs of the pupils, and the Section 11 staff deployed to the school provided good in-class support. In these two schools support provided good value for money. In two schools where the LEA's support was only satisfactory, it gave useful but not always sufficient help to schools.

SECTION 6: LEA SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING TEACHING

- *In general, OFSTED inspection reports indicate that the quality of teaching in Southwark schools is satisfactory or better in between 80% and 90% of lessons, often with some variability between key stages or between year groups in a school.*
- *A wide range of in-service training is provided each year. Much of the targeted development work is centred in the school and delivered, in the main, by carefully managed advisory teachers. Support for newly qualified teachers is very good.*
- *Preparation for teacher appraisal has been well organised by the LEA and many senior managers and teachers have been trained. However, the high turnover of headteachers and the difficulty of retaining new teachers in the authority has made constant repetition of appraiser and appraisee training necessary.*
- *Overall, the LEA support systems for the improvement of teaching are more effective and give better value for money in primary schools than in secondary schools. There is still more work to be done in developing the skills of headteachers and co-ordinators in monitoring and improving classroom performance.*

127. OFSTED inspection reports indicate that the quality of teaching in Southwark schools is satisfactory or better in between 80% and 90% of lessons, often with some variability between key stages or between year groups in a school. Where weaknesses were identified they were usually related to poor class management, teachers' low expectation, and failure to identify clear learning objectives in planning or to make best use of assessment information, which resulted in a poor match of the learning tasks set to the needs of the pupils.

128. The LEA's support to improve the quality of teaching is generally good in primary but only adequate in secondary schools. Specialist inspectors, usually in conjunction with advisory teachers and teachers, have produced a number of good quality curriculum guidance documents in the form of schemes of work, planning strategies, good practice portfolios, study packs and project reports. In-service training opportunities are provided for teachers and support staff each year, which are enthusiastically received. The LEA programme of induction for newly qualified primary teachers is highly valued by the NQTs and their headteachers. Support for NQTs in special schools could be improved.

129. Work on spiritual, moral, social and cultural development and the personal, social and health education of pupils is progressing well within a three-year action plan. Strong and mutually supportive partnerships with other agencies in these fields have been established. The focus of the joint work is on health and sex education, and on drug misuse. Major funded projects, such as 'Drug sense', the Treehouse Theatre in Education drugs awareness project and the multi-agency approach to health education

in the LEA make major contributions in these important areas. Southwark also supports the Globe Theatre and the Dulwich Art Gallery. These all provide valuable support for teachers.

130. Preparation for teacher appraisal has been well organised by the LEA and many senior managers and teachers have been trained. However, the high turnover of headteachers and the difficulty of retaining new teachers in the authority has made constant repetition of appraiser and appraisee training necessary.

131. Teaching has improved in nine of the thirteen primary schools visited. This is often due to good headteacher leadership supported by the LEA through the general inspector role and to the practical support of advisory teachers working in classrooms. These primary schools make full use of school-based and off-site in-service training. In the best, a policy ensures that what is learned from such experiences is shared fully amongst the staff. However, if weaker teachers are to be more effectively supported, more precise guidance on setting learning objectives for lessons, more systematic monitoring of teaching and more detailed records of feedback are required

132. Since inspection and advisory support is not costed to a school's budget, schools are rarely aware of the full cost of the services provided and are unable to say whether they provide value for money. Schools are using outside agencies and consultants when they are known for their high quality work and extensive knowledge of the field, often on the recommendation of IASD.

133. Visits were made to four secondary schools. In two the quality of teaching had improved since their OFSTED inspection. In the other two the quality of teaching showed no discernible improvement. In general, LEA support has been patchy. For example, in one school, which had poor teaching in a third of lessons in Key Stage 3 at the time of the Section 10 inspection, planning for improvement has been poorly co-ordinated. Consequently, there is a marked lack of consistency in the strategies used by management to implement the priorities identified in the development plan and considerable fluctuations in teaching quality between departments remain. Yet, in a school where the quality of teaching was identified as a consistent strength in the OFSTED report, extensive use is made of LEA sponsored in-service training events, the very good NQT support and the general inspector, subject inspector and advisory teacher visits to promote further improvement. Here the headteacher has a positive view of the LEA support and believes it provides good value for money.

134. More carefully targeted help, better co-ordination of support and detailed monitoring of progress are needed if the LEA's contribution is to be consistently effective in secondary schools.

SECTION 7: LEA SUPPORT FOR IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT AND EFFICIENCY OF SCHOOLS

- Recruitment and retention of senior staff is a particular problem which the LEA continues to address by providing a useful range of support services. The IASD has put in place a number of well-considered initiatives to support headteachers and deputies. Information to headteachers is generally good and most appreciate the personal support given by their General Inspectors.*
- Guidance and, where necessary, support to schools in constructing development plans and post OFSTED action plans, are unsatisfactory. The quality of such plans is variable and the involvement of General Inspectors in the development planning process varies. Where sound plans have been produced it has usually been with limited support from the LEA.*
- Schools are not helped to be strategic in terms of costing their plans and this fails to promote a discriminating approach on the part of headteachers. This is in contrast to the grant-maintained schools visited where headteachers have become very expert in purchasing LEA support which matches their own specification.*
- The LEA offers a well-developed programme of support for governors. The governing bodies in all the schools visited made a satisfactory contribution to the management of the school.*

SUPPORT FOR HEADTEACHERS AND SENIOR MANAGERS

135. The recruitment and retention of headteachers is a major concern of the LEA. Promoting effective school management and professional development is rightly a key objective of the LEA's Raising Achievement strategy. The LEA has established an appropriate range of initiatives to address these concerns. These include: an induction scheme for newly appointed headteachers, mentoring programmes for new headteachers, sabbaticals and extended courses for experienced headteachers. An Induction Handbook usefully and clearly lays out a well-balanced and wide ranging induction programme. Deputy headteachers are offered the same opportunities as headteachers. All places on the National Professional Qualification for Headteachers (NPQH) available to Southwark have been taken up.

136. The range and quality of administrative support for managers within schools is generally good. The guidance and support provided on financial planning and control, and where necessary, on school administration is satisfactory. Guidance is up to date and clear; the LEA is responsive and helpful in tackling queries. The LEA has a systematic approach to the maintenance of school premises, which ensures that they are maintained to a suitable standard, and provides guidance and support to schools on the effective management of premises. The provision of services for schools on personnel management, including recruitment, pay policy and procedures for handling grievance, discipline and dismissal by the LEA, is variable and generally unsatisfactory.

137. Support for school development planning is variable. Evidence from the School Visits and the School Survey shows that although the majority of schools rate the pre-OFSTED support highly, schools are less satisfied with the quality and range of post-OFSTED support. The extent and quality of help with planning after an inspection varied considerably, from excellent in one case to good or very good in seven cases to unsatisfactory in three and poor in the remaining three; monitoring of progress was inappropriately light or non-existent, given the shortcomings identified in the Section 10 reports of those schools. By contrast, in three cases, the quality of the advice on the action plan, the resources made available, the involvement of a range of services and the pertinent attention given to weaknesses was a model of effective partnership between the school's GI and the headteacher. In one of these instances, the LEA's allocation of an external consultant to act as both mentor and mediator was critical in helping a school to implement its action plan successfully.

138. The LEA's own review of the quality of development planning in its schools identified the following weaknesses: targets are too broad; timescales are imprecise and planning often fails to take account of budgets. The LEA's policy of retaining much of the funding for school improvement at the centre is a potential constraint on schools' ability to plan and drive school improvement. Schools are not helped to be strategic in terms of costing their plans and this fails to promote a discriminating approach on the part of headteachers. This is in contrast to the grant-maintained schools visited where headteachers have become very expert in purchasing support which matches their own specification. The visits to schools confirm that the quality of development planning is inconsistent and the LEA's support to address weaknesses in development planning is unsatisfactory.

SUPPORT FOR GOVERNING BODIES

139. Training and support for governors is provided by IASD and governor clerking by Educational Resources. A detailed induction package including training has been produced for new governors. Training is delivered either by officers from the LEA or by consultants with a good track record. A recruitment drive to attract new governors was put in place two years ago; it successfully targeted ethnic minority groups, and reduced overall vacancies to 10 per cent. Link governors have been established to act as representatives in the Governors' Forum and to co-ordinate training for governors in their schools. Regular communications between the LEA and governing bodies ensure that governors are kept well informed.

140. Support to governing bodies was a focus of visits to sixteen schools; twelve primary, three secondary and one of the special schools. Overall, LEA support to governing bodies provided good value for money in seven schools, and satisfactory value for money in six schools. It is unsatisfactory in three schools, two of which are secondary schools. In two of the secondary schools, although some support had been provided by the LEA it had not met the school's needs and was unlikely to lead to improvement. In the third school, the LEA clerk was well regarded, help had been given on the production of the post OFSTED action plan, training was valued, and the general inspector had provided guidance on the monitoring role of the governing body and on target setting.

141. In the primary schools visited the picture was more varied. In four schools the LEA's support had led to substantial improvements, and in two of these schools it had been critical in the progress being made. In six schools the LEA had provided support which had led to some improvement, but in the remaining two schools support had been unsatisfactory or poor. Seven governing bodies felt that they had benefited from the work of the General Inspector, who had made occasional visits to governing body meetings or provided support before or after the OFSTED inspection. In one school the General Inspector made an annual report on the school which was valued by the governors.

APPENDIX 1: THE CONTEXT OF THE LEA

Characteristics of the pupil population

Indicator	Date	Source	LEA	National
1. Number of pupils in LEA area of compulsory school age	January 1988	LEA	33847	-
2. Percentage of pupils entitled to free school meals	1997	DfEE	53.1	20.5
3. Percentage of pupils living in households with parents/carers (i) with Higher Educational qualifications	1991	ONS Census of Population	16.6	13.5
(ii) in Social Class 1 and 2			17.3	31.0
4. Ethnic Minorities in population aged 5-15. Percentage of ethnic group:	1991	ONS Census of Population		
Asian			1.8	0.5
Bangladeshi			2.8	0.8
Black African			9.1	0.6
Black Caribbean			10.8	1.1
Black Other			5.2	0.8
Chinese			2.1	0.4
Indian			1.5	2.7
Other			3.3	1.1
Pakistani			0.6	2.1
White			62.9	89.9
5. Percentage of pupils:				
(i) with a statement of SEN				
primary	1997	DfEE Form 7	2.7	2.6
secondary	1997		4.5	3.9
(ii) attending special school				
primary	1997		0.9	1.1
secondary	1997		2.3	1.6
6. Participation in education:				
(i) % pupils under 5 on the roll of a maintained school	1997	Audit Commission	Figures unavailable	
(ii) % pupils aged 16 remaining in full time education.	1997	Southwark Careers Service	59%	69.7

Organisation of schools

1. Number of:	Number
Nursery schools	5
Infant schools	3
Junior schools	3
Junior and Infant schools	68
Middle schools	
Secondary schools 11-16	11
11-18	2
Special schools	9
Pupil Referral Units	2

Pupil/teacher ratio

	Year	LEA	National
Primary	1997	21.8	23.4
Secondary	1997	15.4	16.7

Source: DfEE

Class size

Rate per 1000 classes

Size of class	Year	LEA	National
31 or more Key Stage 1	1997	96.9	289.6
Key Stage 2	1997	91.1	379.0
36 or more Key Stage 1	1997	0.0	22.9
Key Stage 2	1997	0.0	35.0

Surplus places

% surplus places	Year	LEA	National
Primary	1997	+14.3	+10.0
Secondary	1997	+17.7	+16.7

Finance

Indicator	Source	Year	LEA	National
% expenditure in relation to standard spending assessment		1996-97 1997-98	+5.4 +5.6	
Funding per pupil: £ per pupil Primary 0-4 5-6 7-10	CIPFA/LEA	1996-97	2142 1561 1500	1278.8 1180.2 1149.4
£ per pupil Secondary 11-13 14-15 16+	CIPFA/LEA	1996-97	1975 1975 2545	1567.4 1931.4 2440.0
Aggregated schools budget: £ per pupil Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996-97	1786.2 2631.3 12629.2	1486.0 2052.7 7945.2
General schools budget: £ per pupil Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996-97	2513.7 3423.9 20607.7	2021.2 2694.2 12395.0
Potential schools budget: £ per pupil Primary Secondary Special	CIPFA	1996-97	2042.5 2834.5 14014.4	1664.6 2232.6 8819.1
Capital expenditure: £ per pupil	CIPFA	1996-97	126.7	128.9

APPENDIX 2: THE PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOLS

The analysis draws on data provided by the LEA, the DfEE and OFSTED. Figures for maintained schools are compared with national averages.

PRIMARY PHASE

Attainment at age 7: Key Stage 1 tests/tasks

	Year	% of pupils achieving Level 2 or above					
		Teacher Assessment			Tasks/tests		
		LEA	National	Difference	LEA	National	Difference
English	1996	75.9	79.3	-3.4	-	-	-
	1997	76.9	80.4	-3.5	-	-	-
English (reading)	1996	75.7	78.6	-2.9	74.3	78.0	-3.7
	1997	77.2	80.1	-2.9	76.4	80.1	-3.6
English (writing)	1996	71.2	76.6	-5.4	73.3	79.7	-6.4
	1997	73.5	77.5	-4.0	75.0	80.4	-5.4
Mathematics	1996	80.6	82.2	-1.6	80.1	82.1	-2.0
	1997	83.7	84.2	-0.5	83.6	83.7	-0.1
Science	1996	83.1	84.1	-1.0	-	-	-
	1997	85.3	85.5	-0.2	-	-	-

Source: DfEE

Attainment at age 11: Key Stage 2 tests/tasks

	Year	% pupils achieving Level 4 or above					
		Teacher assessment			Task/tests		
		LEA	National	Difference	LEA	National	Difference
English	1996	51.3	60.1	-8.8	44.0	57.1	-13.1
	1997	53.7	63.4	-9.7	50.3	63.2	-12.9
Mathematics	1996	54.3	59.9	-5.6	43.2	53.9	-10.7
	1997	55.4	64.1	-8.7	50.0	62.0	-12.0
Science	1996	60.4	65.1	-4.7	51.0	62.0	-11.0
	1997	60.7	69.5	-8.8	58.3	68.8	-10.5

Source: DfEE

SECONDARY PHASE

Attainment at age 14: Key Stage 3 tests/tasks

	Year	% pupils achieving Level 5 or above					
		Teacher assessment			Task/tests		
		LEA	National	Difference	LEA	National	Difference
English	1996	37.6	60.3	-22.7	42.0	56.6	-14.6
	1997	39.7	60.2	-20.5	35.9	56.6	-20.7
Mathematics	1996	41.1	61.5	-20.4	30.5	56.7	-26.2
	1997	43.4	64.0	-20.6	34.4	60.7	-26.3
Science	1996	35.9	59.7	-23.8	27.4	56.4	-29.0
	1997	39.3	62.2	-22.9	33.6	60.8	-27.2

Source: DfEE

Attainment at age 16: GCSE results

Level achieved	Year	LEA	National	Difference
1 A*-G	1995	89.3	93.5	-4.2
	1996	91.5	93.9	-2.4
	1997	93.6	94.0	-0.4
5 A*-C	1995	22.9	41.2	-18.3
	1996	25.3	42.6	-17.3
	1997	27.9	43.3	-15.4
5 A*-G	1995	76.5	87.5	-11.0
	1996	80.1	88.1	-8.0
	1997	81.7	88.5	-6.8

Pupils aged 15 at the beginning of the school year and on the roll in January of that year

Source: DfEE

Vocational Qualifications of 16 year olds

Level Achieved	Year	LEA	National	Difference
Pass Entries	1994	84.7	87.9	-3.2
Pass Entries	1995	100.0	85.3	14.7
Pass Entries	1996	100.0	79.2	20.8
Pass Entries	1997	100.0	80.1	19.9

Source: DfEE

Attainment at age 18: A level results - average point score per pupil

Number entered	Year	LEA	National	Difference
2 or more	1995	3.7	15.9	-12.2
	1996	10.4	16.8	-6.4
	1997	12.0	17.1	-5.1
Less than 2	1995	1.0	2.7	-1.7
	1996	2.9	2.7	0.2
	1997	4.4	2.7	1.7

Source: DfEE

Vocational qualifications of 16-18 year olds

Level achieved	Year	LEA	National	Difference
Pass entries	1995	100.0	80.2	19.8
Pass entries (Advanced)	1996	90.0	79.3	10.7
	1997	73.0	75.4	-2.4
Pass entries (Intermediate)	1996	67.4	69.1	-1.7
	1997	61.0	68.9	-7.9

The percentage of students who were in the final year of a course leading to approved vocational qualifications who achieved them on the basis of the work done in that year. Source: DfEE

Attendance

	Year	LEA	National	Difference
Attendance in primary schools	1996	91.9	93.4	-1.5
	1997	92.8	93.9	-1.1
Attendance in secondary schools	1996	88.0	90.5	-2.5
	1997	88.5	90.9	-2.4

Source: DfEE

APPENDIX 4: THE AUDIT COMMISSION COST SURVEY

142. The Audit Commission cost survey compared the cost per pupil of LEA services with those of other LEAs so far inspected. Southwark is a high cost provider of services in each category. The results are shown below:

Expenditure group	Net cost per pupil £		
	Southwark	Median for all LEAs Surveyed	Average for London Boroughs
LEA support for school improvement	17.19	10.45	15.29
Curriculum Support	109.91	46.86	92.34
Central Support Services	124.48	59.50	82.14
Premises	174.15	98.08	137.86
Services to promote access and achievement (Education Welfare, Special Education Needs etc)	143.63	78.67	84.08
Special Education	235.96	115.30	215.18

© **Crown copyright 1998**

**Office for Standards in Education
33 Kingsway
London WC2B 6SE**

Tel. 0171 421 6800

This report may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-commercial educational purposes, provided that all extracts quoted are reproduced verbatim without adaptation and on condition that the source and date thereof are stated.

A further copy of this report can be obtained from the Local Education Authority concerned:

Department of Education and Leisure Services
Southwark Council
1 Bradenham Close
London SE17 2QA