

FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - MONDAY 19 JANUARY 2015

Agenda No Item

5. Educational Attainment



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE



This page is intentionally left blank

To: Scrutiny Committee

Date: 19 January 2015

Report of: Executive Director for Community Services

Title of Report: Educational Attainment

Summary

Purpose of report: For the Scrutiny Committee to review progress of the City Council's investment in educational attainment at primary level.

Key decision No

Executive lead member: Councillor Pat Kennedy

Report author: Tim Sadler

Policy Framework: Corporate Plan

1. Included in this briefing paper is a report by KRM which provides their evaluation of the KRM programme in Oxford Schools.
2. The report also provides a critique of the previous report that the Scrutiny committee received as an interim report on the programme.
3. The views and comments in the report are those of KRM and are not the City Council.
4. Indeed, the City Council's Educational Advisors contests some of those comments.
5. However, the main body of the report sets out the latest and complete data on the impact of the programme and it is suggested that this be the focus of the Scrutiny Committee in examining the effectiveness of the programme.

Name and contact details of author:-

Tim Sadler, Executive Director for Community Services
Tel: 01865 252101; email: tsadler@oxford.gov.uk

KRM

Psychological & Educational
Research Consultants



An Evaluation of KRM Programmes in Oxford City

2012-2014

Overview

A more detailed and thorough report describing the impact of KRM Programmes in schools in Oxford City and their implications is also available.

1. KRM: Psychological and Educational Research Consultants (KRM) were awarded a contract to work in low attaining schools in Oxford City in September 2012. The aim of the contract was to raise attainments in reading, writing and maths to above national standards over a four year period.

2. All KRM Programmes are underpinned by psychological theory and research and have been researched extensively since 1996. They focus on teaching a small number of the most useful skills that children are then shown how to generalise and apply. This involves teaching reading through what are known as 'real books' rather than the more traditional, phonically regular reading schemes. Writing is taught through seven generalisable skills that can be applied to any form of writing. In maths pupils are taught a four-step strategy for balancing any equations and shown how to generalise and apply their knowledge through 'real life' mathematical problems.

3. The programmes also have a number of unique features in the classroom. They are implemented through differentiated, whole class teaching which has been designed to meet the needs of all pupils, irrespective of their existing attainments or rates of progress. Lower achieving pupils are taught with their peers and so are not taught on a 1:1 basis or

through small groups by teaching assistants. Thus, KRM Programmes are non-labelling and non discriminatory and teachers are encouraged to avoid using labels such as 'low ability' or 'special educational needs' as this frequently serves to lower their expectations and undermine their own effectiveness in the classroom.

4. The impact of the KRM Programmes has been evaluated through the Key Stage 1 SATs, a normative assessment of reading given to pupils in Key Stages 1 and 2 and criterion-referenced assessments in maths that explore pupils' capacity to generalise and apply their mathematical knowledge. These assessments represent a far more comprehensive evaluation of the impact of KRM Programmes than was presented in the review of the Educational Attainment Programme prepared by Anna Wright (educational advisor to Oxford City) in September 2014.

5. The review of the Educational Attainment Programme prepared by Anna Wright contains a deeply flawed analysis of the Key Stage 1 SATs results for 2014. It failed to take into account the extent to which different schools implemented KRM Programmes, in particular KRM Reading. In so doing it presents a partial, distorted, inaccurate and therefore misleading

view of the impact of KRM Reading, KRM Maths and KRM Writing. The information that was subsequently presented to the Scrutiny Committee in October 2014 failed to describe the full extent to which KRM Programmes can raise standards and prevent difficulties.

6. When reporting the KS1 SATs results for Reading, Anna Wright included two schools in the 'Leadership for Learning and KRM Group' that **did not implement KRM Reading** at any time (Larkrise and St. Francis). Additionally Anna Wright included John Henry Newman in the 'Leadership for Learning and KRM Group' although the school withdrew from KRM Reading in January 2014 and so did not teach the programme in the two terms leading up to the KS1 SATs. Furthermore Anna Wright included Pegasus who chose not to implement a number of critical features of the KRM Framework for teaching reading and also chose not to attend a number of workshops when important content was covered so could not legitimately be included in the 'Leadership for Learning and KRM Group.'

7. When reporting the KS1 SATs results for Maths, Anna Wright included East Oxford, John Henry Newman, Orchard Meadow, Pegasus and Windale who **did not implement KRM Maths**. There is no justification for reporting their SATs in the Maths SATs for the 'Leadership for Learning and KRM Group.'

8. In Paragraph 22 of the report presented to the Scrutiny Committee in October 2014, by Anna Wright, it is stated that 'the three schools in the Blackbird Academy have not made progress this year in writing despite implementing KRM Reading.' These schools **did not implement KRM Writing** and so there is no logical reason to expect children's attainments in writing to improve as the skills required to improve reading and writing are fundamentally different. It is regrettable that Anna Wright then failed to report in Paragraph 22 that the one school that did implement KRM Writing, East Oxford, improved its score in the Writing KS1 SATs by an impressive 20% from 2013 to 2014 which covers the period when they taught the KRM Writing programme.

9. In Paragraph 23 of the report presented to the Scrutiny Committee in October 2014 by Anna Wright, it is stated that the 'main difficulties in helping schools to raise attainment continue to be the huge challenges these schools have in recruiting staff. There needs to be sufficient senior leadership capacity in schools to drive improvement.' Paragraphs 11 to 41 in this document indicate that this is not the case and significant improvements can be made through KRM Programmes despite the difficulties in recruiting staff and 'the lack of senior leadership capacity in schools to drive improvement.'

10. Four schools implemented KRM Reading in 2013-2014. Concerns have been expressed as to why they decided to withdraw KRM Reading in July 2014, an issue that is addressed in Paragraphs 60-64. However, it should be noted that the three schools from the Blackbird Academy who implemented KRM Reading between September 2013-July 2014 refused to take part in the Leadership for Learning Programme during this period.

Impact of KRM Reading at Key Stage 1

11. The schools in the Educational Attainment Programme were divided into three groups. The KRM Reading Group (n = 115) comprised three schools:

- East Oxford
- Orchard Meadow
- Windale.

Comparison Group 1 (n = 110) comprised three schools who implemented neither KRM Reading or KRM Maths. They did however, participate in the Leadership for Learning Programme and so the progress of pupils in these schools indicates the extent to which the Leadership Programme increased pupils' attainments:

- Church Cowley
- Wood Farm
- St. John Fisher.

Comparison Group 2 (n = 83) comprised two schools who implemented KRM Maths only:

- Larkrise taught KRM Maths between November 2012-July 2014
- St. Francis taught KRM Maths between January 2013-July 2014.

12. Pupils in Year 2 were assessed in January and July 2014 on a standardised reading test that is not available to teachers, unlike SATs, so there is no danger of teachers 'teaching to the test' which is known to be a common occurrence at the end of Key Stage 1.

13. The KRM Group made almost 12 months progress in six months compared to Comparison Group 1 who made just over six months progress and Comparison Group 2 who made just over eight months progress.

14. All three KRM schools achieved comparable outcomes and secured greater progress than pupils in any one of the five schools in the Comparison Groups

15. The higher achievers (top 25% in each group in the assessments in January 2014) in the KRM Group made over 16 months progress in only six months. This was double the progress of the higher achievers in Comparison Group 1 who made just under eight months progress and six months greater than those in Comparison Group 2 who made just under ten months progress.

16. The higher achievers in all three KRM schools made greater progress than pupils in the five schools in the two Comparison Groups. The progress made ranged from 14.5 months to 21 months. The progress of higher achieving pupils in the five schools in the Comparison Groups ranged from 4.42 months to 11.92 months.

17. The lower achievers (lowest 25% of pupils in each group in the January 2014 assessments) in the KRM Group made on average over nine months progress in reading in six months, which is three months more progress than might have been expected. In contrast the lower achieving pupils in Comparison Groups 1 and 2 made less than the expected progress in six months.

18. Perhaps the most remarkable outcome was that the KRM Group lower achievers made more progress than the higher achievers in Comparison Group 1 and only 0.53 months less than the higher achievers in Comparison Group 2.

19. The lower achievers in all three KRM schools made more than the expected progress over a period of six months. In contrast the lower achievers in four of the schools in the Comparison Groups failed to make the minimum expected progress. Furthermore the lower achievers in all three

KRM schools made greater progress than pupils in the five schools in the Comparison Groups.

20. The progress made by pupils in the KRM Group over six months ranged from 7.6 months to 9.8 months whereas the progress of lower achieving pupils in the five schools in the Comparison Groups ranged from 5.25 months to 6.43 months. Thus, the lowest performing lower achievers in the KRM Group made 1.2 months more progress than the highest performing lower achievers in the Comparison Groups.

21. We also examined the proportion of pupils in the KRM and Comparison Groups with reading ages (RAs) above and below their chronological ages (CAs). With the reading test that we have used, at any given moment in time it can be expected that 50% of pupils will have a RA above their CA ($RA > CA$) and 50% will have a RA below their CA ($RA < CA$).

22. There were 35 pupils with RAs below their CAs in the KRM Group in January 2014. Over the next six months 29 of these pupils (82.56%) made the expected six months progress or more in their reading with their mean progress being 9.72 months. In contrast there were 32 pupils with RAs below their CAs in Comparison Group 1 in January 2014. Over the next six months only 13 of these pupils

(40.61%) made the expected six months progress or more in their reading with their mean progress being 5.29 months.

23. The number of pupils in the KRM Group with RAs below their CAs decreased between January and July 2014 as hoped from 35 to 6 whereas the decrease in Comparison Group 1 was only from 32 to 19.

24. A frequently expressed concern amongst Oxford City teachers during the time that they implemented KRM Reading was that they felt that it was helpful for lower achieving pupils but had less impact on higher achieving pupils. The percentage of pupils in the KRM Reading Group with RAs twelve months or more ahead of the CAs increased by 14% while at the same time the percentage of children with RAs below their CAs fell by 7%. This outcome challenges teachers' perceptions, as well as the conventional wisdom, that if you raise the attainments of lower achieving pupils you will 'hold back' higher achieving pupils.

25. In contrast the reverse situation was observed in Comparison Group 1 where the percentage of pupils with RAs twelve months or more ahead of the CAs decreased and the percentage of children with RAs below their CAs increased. This is the exact opposite of what is desired. In Comparison Group 2 the percentage of pupils with RAs twelve months

or more ahead of the CAs increased by 7% but there was no change in the percentage of pupils with RAs below their CAs.

KS1 SATs Results 2014

26. The analysis examines the change in Key Stage 1 SATs results between June 2012 (before KRM programmes were introduced to schools) and June 2014 in the KRM and two Comparison Groups. The percentage reaching Level 2 in reading improved by 14% in the KRM Reading Group, by 10% in Comparison Group 2 but dropped by 1% in Comparison Group 1. It should be remembered that the schools in Comparison Group 1 all took part in the Leadership for Learning Programme and so indicates the extent to which this programme increased pupils' attainments.

27. In 2014 Orchard Meadow (one of the schools in the KRM Reading Group) was the highest performing school within the Blackbird Academy with 78% achieving Level 2+ compared to Pegasus (71%) and Windale (73%). This is the first time in four years that this has happened. This figure was also higher than the percentage reaching Level 2+ in 2011 and 2012 before KRM Reading was introduced to Orchard Meadow.

28. Windale (one of the schools in the KRM Reading Group) also achieved their best outcome in the last four years despite having,

to our knowledge, four changes of headteacher (or acting headteacher) in the last two academic years. In 2014 73% reached Level 2+ which was a clear improvement on 2011 (55%) and 2012 (56%).

29. Pegasus, John Henry Newman and St. John Fisher either did not implement KRM Reading in 2013-2014 or chose not to implement a number of critical components of the KRM Reading model. It was therefore predicted that these decisions would have significant consequences for children's progress and be likely to lead to a fall in KS1 SATs results or lack of progress in the normative assessment of reading. The KRM Group increased the percentage of pupils reaching Level 2+ in reading by 14% between 2012 and 2014 whereas fewer pupils reached Level 2+ in Pegasus and St. John Fisher over the same period.

30. East Oxford was the only school to implement KRM Writing in Years 2-5 between November 2013 and July 2014. The percentage reaching Level 2+ in writing between 2013 and 2014 rose by 20% between 2013 to 2014 from 65% to 85%.

31. The KRM Maths Group started from a higher baseline in maths in 2012 than the three other groups with whom their performance was compared (Comparison

Group 1, KRM Reading Group & Blackbird Academy). Between 2012-2014 the KRM Maths Group progressed from 86%-96% whereas the schools in Comparison Group 1 dropped from 84%-83%, the schools teaching KRM Reading improved from 80%-88% and the schools in the Blackbird Academy progressed from 84%-91%.

32. The schools in the Blackbird Academy, are in part, funded by the Hamilton Trust who require the three schools in the academy to implement the Hamilton Maths Scheme and so provide a legitimate group with whom to compare the impact of KRM Maths.

33. The analysis of the KS1 SATs data shows that 35% of pupils achieved Level 3+ in the KRM Maths Group compared to only 16% in the Blackbird Academy suggesting that KRM Maths enabled a higher percentage of pupils to generalise and apply their mathematical skills than Hamilton Maths.

John Henry Newman and Pegasus

34. John Henry Newman withdrew KRM Reading in December 2013. It is therefore possible to compare the progress of children at John Henry Newman between January and July 2013 when they implemented KRM Reading and January and July 2014 after it had been withdrawn. The Year 2 pupils at JHN made 10.6 months progress in 2013 when

taught through KRM Reading but only 7.3 months progress after it was withdrawn

35. John Henry Newnam was inspected by Ofsted in June 2014, six months after withdrawing KRM Reading and KRM Writing. Ofsted commented as follows on the quality of education offered at the school:

- ‘pupils, especially those with special educational needs, need to have more opportunities to read’;
- ‘in some year groups, progress in writing is slower than in reading and mathematics. In these year groups, pupils are not catching up quickly enough’;
- ‘pupils’ abilities to read and spell using the sounds that letters make (phonics) are below the levels expected for their ages’;
- ‘judgements about the effectiveness of teaching are over-generous because they do not take account of how well pupils are progressing’.

36. Clearly the programmes that the staff at John Henry Newman were teaching after withdrawing KRM Reading do not appear to have ‘delivered’ or ‘yielded’ the desired results. Given that within the KRM Programme lower achieving pupils read a minimum of three times a day with their teachers, it is difficult to believe that Ofsted would have concluded that ‘pupils with special educational needs, need to

have more opportunities to read’ had the school continued to implement KRM Reading.

37. Pegasus chose not to implement a number of critical features of the KRM Framework for teaching reading and also chose not to attend a number of workshops when important content was covered. It was therefore not surprising that the percentage reaching Level 2+ in Pegasus dropped 17% from 2013 when 88% achieved Level 2+ to 71% in 2014 and dropped 11% from 2012 when 82% reached Level 2+.

Impact of KRM Reading in Key Stage 2

38. Data was collected on pupils in Key Stage 2 between November 2012 and July 2014. As schools implemented KRM Reading for anything between 11 and 16 months pupils’ progress is expressed in terms of their gains per month. The comparisons in Year 3 are between the KRM Group, John Henry Newman and Pegasus. The pupils in the three KRM schools made almost 1.2 months progress for every month that they were taught through KRM Reading. The pupils at Pegasus made similar progress when they were also being taught through the partial model of KRM Reading mentioned earlier. The pupils at John Henry Newman on the other hand only made just over 0.6 months progress per month while in Year 3.

39. The lower achieving pupils (lowest 25% of pupils in each group in the January 2014 assessments) in the KRM group made on average 0.86 months progress per month whereas the lower achieving pupils in Pegasus made 0.68 months progress per month. The pupils at John Henry Newman made 0.49 months progress per month.

40. The percentage of pupils with RAs above their CAs in the KRM Group increased by almost six per cent between Summer 2013 and Summer 2014. In contrast the percentage of pupils with RAs above their CAs at John Henry Newman and Pegasus dropped by five per cent and four per cent respectively.

41. The Year 5 teachers at East Oxford implemented the strategies for teaching lower achieving pupils (i.e. pupils with a RA below their CA in January 2014) following their introduction during the Autumn Term 2013. Pupils' progress was assessed over a six month period between January and July 2014. The progress of the lower achievers at East Oxford was compared with the lower achieving pupils at John Henry Newman and Pegasus and in the Comparison Group 1 and Comparison Group 2 schools. Over 90% of the lower achieving pupils at East Oxford made six months or more progress in six months. Lower achieving pupils at Pegasus also made good progress with 86% making six months or more

progress. In contrast just over 50% of the pupils at John Henry Newman and the two comparison groups made more than the expected progress of six months.

Feedback from Schools on KRM Programmes

42. Teachers were given questionnaires at the end of the Summer Term 2014 so that they could provide anonymous written feedback on the KRM Programmes.

43. Teachers were extremely positive about KRM Reading noting that pupils made good progress. Overall 86.15% of the feedback received was positive about all aspects of KRM Reading. They were 100% positive about the support visits and feedback given and 84.61% were positive about the handouts. Over 75% of teachers were positive about the workshops and almost 70% were positive about the content.

44. Teachers were positive about the content of KRM Writing (83.34%), the workshops (69.23%) and handouts (83.34%) but were less positive about the support visits and the feedback they were given.

45. The feedback revealed a clear difference between the two schools implementing KRM Maths. Teachers at St. Francis were 100% positive about the content of KRM Maths, the

support visits and feedback with 80% of staff being positive about the workshops and handouts. This can be contrasted with Larkrise where 66.67% of teachers were positive about the content of KRM Maths but generally negative about the workshops, support visits and handouts.

46. Overall when combining the results from both schools, teachers were positive about the content of KRM Maths (78.57%), the support visits (64.29%) and the feedback on programme fidelity (71.42%). There were numerous positive comments with some negative feedback centring on the number of handouts. Quite often the feedback was contradictory with some teachers finding the handouts confusing whereas others found them clear and helpful.

47. Some teachers didn't like the fact that KRM Maths was different from what they had experienced before and struggled with the pace with which material was presented. For example, several teachers felt that the workload was considerable with one teacher commenting that just as they got their heads round what had been presented previously there was more information to take on board.

Criticism of KRM Programmes

48. The major criticisms of KRM programmes focus on the following areas:

- KRM's lack of flexibility;
- cost;
- teacher mobility.

KRM's Lack of Flexibility

49. The content of the KRM Programmes has been researched and refined over many years and is only amended in response to detailed and systematic research. KRM Programmes cannot be implemented alongside other methods for teaching reading, writing and maths without their fidelity being compromised and their impact potentially lessened.

50. 'Programme fidelity' (also known as treatment fidelity) refers to the fact that any programme, in any subject, which research has shown to be effective, should be implemented in the classroom as designed. Any variations that teachers introduce, for whatever reason, could have a negative impact on children's learning.

51. The Rose Review reported on the teaching of reading in March 2006 and stressed the importance of 'programme fidelity' in Paragraph 55 when it stated:

'Once started, what has been called 'fidelity to the programme' is also important for ensuring children's progress. Experience

has shown that even high quality programmes founder if they are not applied consistently and regularly. It can be unwise to 'pick and mix' too many elements from different programmes because this often breaks up important sequences of work and disrupts planned progressions.'

52. The original invitation to tender for this project indicated that Oxford City wanted to commission a language, literacy and numeracy programme based on the best research evidence in instructional psychology on how to accelerate attainment in language, literacy and numeracy. The contract that KRM signed with Oxford stated that schools were expected to follow the KRM Programmes and headteachers also signed a licence agreement at the beginning of each academic year stating that they would ensure 'programme fidelity.'

53. We have therefore, encouraged teachers and headteachers to adhere to all the components of KRM Reading, KRM Writing and KRM Maths and have advised against making any changes based on impressions of 'what works' or past practice that is familiar but not necessarily effective. Although we have encouraged 'programme fidelity' we have been extremely flexible in many other ways when responding to requests from schools.

54. Paradoxically the perceived 'lack of flexibility' is one of the considerable strengths of KRM Programmes, particularly when teacher mobility is high. KRM Programmes provide schools with a curriculum from day one of Year R to the final day of Year 6 that offer a clear progression and consistent teaching methodology. This in turn makes it easier for schools to cope and manage frequent staff changes which is evident in the results reported above. Despite the frequent changes of staff, both at the end of the year and during the academic year, the schools implementing KRM Programmes made considerably greater progress than the two Comparison Groups.

Costs

55. Helen Catt, a political reporter at BBC Oxford, stated on BBC Radio's David Prever Drivetime show on 8th. October 2014 that, 'critics of the scheme that I have spoken to today have said, "well it's very costly for just eight schools. You know half a million quid on eight schools is a lot of money. There are better ways of improving school performance.'" This criticism reveals a failure to appreciate the real cost to each school for implementing each programme, the way KRM Programmes enable schools to reduce their expenditure or the full financial outlay in meeting the needs of pupils perceived to have a difficulties in learning.

56. Overall the cost per school of implementing KRM Programmes was approximately equivalent to employing 1.5 Higher Level Teaching Assistants (HLTA) for a year. The question is whether 1.5 HLTAs could achieve comparable results to KRM? The answer to the question can be seen in the performance of children in the two Comparison Groups who employed TAs and HLTAs to teach lower achieving pupils.

57. A key feature of KRM Programmes is that they are inclusive, involve differentiated whole class teaching, are only taught by class teachers and so are ultimately cheaper and more cost effective than the traditional alternatives. There are no withdrawal groups, one to one or small group teaching for lower achieving pupils which are typically expensive and, research suggests, not always particularly effective

58. A school could potentially save a minimum of £210,000 a year through teaching pupils on a differentiated, whole class basis rather than employing TAs to work with lower achieving pupils. Thus, over the two years of the project the schools that we have worked with in the Educational Attainment Programme could potentially have saved £3.3m had they maintained programme fidelity and implemented KRM Reading or Maths for two years, as originally intended.

59. The cost of reading failure and pupils experiencing difficulties in school is considerable. The World Literacy Foundation (2012) produced a report on the economic and social cost of illiteracy and estimated that the annual cost to the UK was £127 billion a year.

Teacher Mobility

60. Helen Catt (a political reporter for BBC news) reported on BBC Oxford Radio and BBC 1 Oxford News on 8th. October 2014 that Oxford City Council blamed high teacher turnover for schools withdrawing KRM Reading. However, there is no evidence to support this view and no school offered this reason in feedback provided to Anna Wright or to KRM. The new headteacher at East Oxford had no previous knowledge of KRM Reading and chose not to speak to KRM about the programme or its considerable positive impact at East Oxford. Nevertheless he withdrew KRM Reading and KRM Writing stating that when he met with all staff, all class teachers except one wanted to stop doing the programme because they found it too inflexible and felt it didn't cover the whole literacy curriculum.

61. Pegasus and Windale when withdrawing KRM Reading said that they had appreciated many aspects of the programme and thought it had many strengths. However there were some omissions and alterations that they

wished to make and appreciated that to do so would not maintain programme fidelity.

62. Finally, the headteacher at Orchard Meadow indicated that they would not continue to implement KRM Reading as she wished to use guided reading across the school. This is an approach to hearing children read that was used widely in the past, has now been heavily criticised and is incompatible with KRM Reading.

63. Overall it is quite clear that all four schools withdrew KRM Reading because they wanted to amend the programme and introduce guided reading. No school withdrew KRM Reading and attributed this to teacher mobility.

64. Anna Wright's (educational advisor to Oxford City) report to the Scrutiny Committee in October 2014 noted that KRM Programmes presented challenges to teachers stating that they require a 'major culture change in the schools' and 'committed and courageous leadership.' Although this is undoubtedly desirable the results presented in this document indicate that these are not prerequisite conditions for achieving outstanding progress. The nature of KRM Programmes is such that excellent results can be secured even when the quality of leadership is not ideal and so they are extremely well suited to meeting the demands

of raising standards in low attaining groups of schools.

Barriers to Implementing KRM

Programmes

Educational Vision and Philosophy

65. Schools did not appear to have a coherent philosophy of education that informed (i) the curriculum, (ii) the nature of pupils' learning experiences; (iii) the role of theory and research in informing classroom practice and (iv) potential barriers to pupils learning when attempting to raise academic standards.

Leadership

66. There are four elements to the way leadership has featured in the Oxford Educational Attainment Programme (OEAP). The first is the way the programme was created and introduced to schools by Oxford City and the second is the Leadership for Learning Programme. The third is the leadership of the programme by Anna Wright (educational advisor to Oxford City) once the KRM Programme were being implemented. The fourth is leadership of KRM in schools by headteachers. Key areas where the KRM Programmes were not reinforced in schools were:

- the lack of commitment from schools;
- the Leadership for Learning Programme frequently undermined the KRM interventions. For example it claimed that it

helped to: (i) embed the new KRM initiative in school through providing the opportunity to talk through common issues and gain support in how to address them. Apparently having colleagues on the course addressing these issues provided a 'common language' to continue the conversations in school; (ii) develop support structures for children with Special Educational Needs and (iii) lead to a more sophisticated use of data to drive improvements in teaching. These claims were without foundation as far as KRM Programmes are concerned since: (i) the schools have now withdrawn KRM Reading (ii) any support structures for children perceived to have special educational needs would have run counter to the principles and ethos of KRM Reading and KRM Maths (iii) schools withdrew KRM Reading before seeing the data analysing the full impact of KRM Programmes on pupils' progress. The Leadership for Learning Programme reflects an educational model of leadership that can be contrasted with a psychological model which is based on theory, research, developing a coherent school philosophy to teaching and learning and requires all those in positions of leadership to behave in ways that are consistent with their beliefs

- the leadership offered by Anna Wright (educational advisor to Oxford City) during

the project failed at a number of crucial times to support the work of KRM. Overall there was a degree of micro management by Oxford City that was both unhelpful and damaging and was outlined in an e-mail sent to Anna Wright in March 2013. KRM notified Anna Wright of its concerns about the progress of the project at various points between March 2013 and July 2014. For example, a meeting was held with representatives from Oxford City in February 2014 when Helen Wall and Jonathan Solity presented details of KRM's continuing concerns. These concerns were then described in considerable detail in a report forwarded at the end of February 2014. Anna Wright indicated that the report would be helpful during her visits to schools during the second half of the Spring Term 2014. It had been suggested that it would be useful if Anna Wright met with headteachers and school leaders to explore these concerns further with a view to helping schools implement the KRM Programmes with greater commitment and fidelity. It was then disappointing that we did not receive any feedback from Anna Wright on the outcome of her visits until June 2014, when it became clear that these concerns had not been addressed by Anna Wright during her meetings which may well have contributed to schools withdrawing KRM Reading.

- with very few exceptions headteachers chose not to attend KRM Reading and KRM Maths workshops suggesting that headteachers do not perceive their own curriculum knowledge to be a priority in the way they led the implementation of KRM Programmes. Perhaps such an approach can work where a school has an overall philosophy towards teaching and learning but it is clearly unlikely to be successful where this is not the case. It would appear that the lack of such knowledge and understanding placed headteachers at a considerable disadvantage when addressing teachers' concerns and objections to the KRM programmes.

Changes in Headteachers

67. It appears that there were 21 changes of headteacher in the schools implementing KRM Reading, KRM Maths or KRM Writing between November 2012 and July 2014. Where a school has a clear overall philosophy and approach to teaching and learning, changes in leadership need not be a cause for concern or change in direction. That the schools in Oxford City had traditionally had a high turnover of staff was well known before the project began yet little was done to address this issue, from an instructional perspective. At the very least new headteachers could have been invited to meet representatives of the council before taking up their appointments and school

governors should also have been fully involved and informed of the need for continuity in making new appointments. Nevertheless the KRM Programmes enabled schools to achieve outstanding results despite the changes in leadership.

Initiative Overload

68. The schools in Oxford City are under considerable pressure to improve pupils' attainments. In doing so they have undertaken a variety of initiatives and may well have attempted to implement more programmes than can realistically be introduced in any one academic year.

Teacher Subject Knowledge

69. A major factor in securing the successful long-term implementation of KRM Programmes is headteachers' and teachers' subject knowledge. The successful classroom implementation of KRM Programmes is facilitated through teachers appreciating the theory and research that underpins the programmes, as well as mastering its principles and teaching methodology. Numerous teachers reported that they did not wish to hear about the theory and research that has informed the content of the KRM curricula and their desire to adapt and amend curricula to suit their needs indicates that they have found it difficult to accept that there is a

body of psychological knowledge that underpins KRM Programmes.

Seeing Phonics and Reading as Two Separate Processes

70. From the perspective of KRM, effectively seeing phonics and reading as separate processes is a major concern. Unfortunately the schools implementing KRM Reading saw the two as separate, distinct processes which will have been a barrier to the successful use of real books in teaching reading. Documents on how to teach phonics, reading and spelling on the Blackbird Academy website, posted after the three schools withdrew KRM Reading ('Learning to Read and Spell at the Blackbird Academy Trust: A Teacher's Guide') and the East Oxford website, indicate that all four schools now separate the teaching of phonic skills from reading. Thus, the way phonics, reading and spelling are now being taught indicates that teachers failed to understand the fundamental theory, research, instructional principles or practice associated with KRM Reading.

Communication Within Schools

71. It has become clear from working in schools since November 2012 that there have been numerous instances where communication in schools between senior managers and teachers was poor which will in

turn have directly influenced the implementation of KRM Programmes.

Moving Oxford City Forward

72. This document has presented data that shows quite clearly that KRM programmes have had a dramatic impact on pupils' attainments. It has also highlighted what has been learned about raising standards in traditionally low attaining schools. These can be summarised as follows:

- develop a coherent and consistent school philosophy towards teaching and learning;
- implement instructional programmes based on theory, research and evidence of impact;
- ensure curriculum coherence and consistency;
- ensure programme fidelity;
- prioritise developing the subject knowledge of teachers and headteachers;
- create a leadership programme that is consistent with, and reinforces, instructional programmes;
- research the impact of instructional interventions through normative and criterion-referenced measures and the use of control and comparison groups;
- develop an induction programme for new headteachers;
- develop an induction programme for governors;

- prepare headteachers for Ofsted inspections;
- prioritise new initiatives;
- ensure transparent and clear decision making and communication within schools;
- develop strategies across schools for managing Government and local authority pressures.