
THE MAYOR'S EDUCATION INQUIRY

CALL FOR EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

MAYOR OF LONDON

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Responses to the call for evidence	2
Online call for evidence questions	4
Call for evidence summary	6
Q1 School places	6
Q2. Free schools	7
Q3. Maximising school resources	7
Q4 Maximising resources on a strategic level	8
Q5 Effective school places planning	9
Q6. Improving literacy	9
Q7. Managing the transition from primary to secondary	10
Q8. Factors which prevent children from fulfilling their potential	11
Q9. Values and ethos of successful London schools	12
Q10. Improving behaviour and attendance	13
Q11 School exclusions and alternative provision	14
Q12 Take-up of STEM subjects and modern foreign languages	15
Q13. Careers advice	16
Q14 Access to higher education for disadvantaged groups	18
Q15 What every London school child should know about their city	18
Q16. Building partnerships	19
Q17 Other issues or suggestions	20

Introduction

Responses to the call for evidence

52 individuals and organisations responded online to the call for evidence document or made other written submissions.

These responses informed the inquiry panel's analysis, findings and development of their recommendations in their final report.

The organisational breakdown of respondents was as follows:

Respondent	Number	Percentage
Charities and foundations	19	37%
Other	6	12%
Schools and school staff	5	10%
Representative bodies	5	10%
London boroughs	4	8%
Other public sector organisations	4	8%
Commercial organisations	4	8%
Research organisations	3	6%
Parents and parents' organisations	2	4%

We are grateful to the following individuals and organisations who provided written responses to the call for evidence.

A New Direction
 Achievement for All 3As
 Alliance for Inclusive Education
 Ambitious About Autism
 ARK Schools
 Arkwright Scholarships Trust
 Association of Colleges London Region
 Association of School and College Leaders
 London Borough of Barnet
 Best Practice Network

Black Parents Network
Sir Tim Brighouse
Campaign for Real Education
Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics
City Year
Demos, Centre for London
Edge Foundation / Baker Dearing Trust
Education Links
Emanuel School
London Borough of Enfield
Federation of London Youth Clubs
Field Studies Council
GLA Diversity and Social Policy Team
Institute of Education, University of London
Dame Sue John
Keystone Consulting
London Borough of Lambeth
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Metropolitan Police
Migration Watch
National Literacy Trust
Next Gen Skills
Office of the Children's Commissioner
Peaceful Schools Movement
Prospects Services
Race on the Agenda
Royal Geographical Society
Royal Opera House
School-Home Support
Smallpeice Trust
Teach First
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
Who Cares? Trust
Prof. David Woods CBE
Young Foundation
Youth Justice Board for England and Wales

Parent Governor, Waltham Forest
School Inclusion Manager, Hillingdon
Teacher, Hounslow
Teacher, London
Individual Respondent, Cambridge
Individual Respondent, Coventry

Online call for evidence questions

- Q1. What creative ways can schools, boroughs and strategic agencies use to address the growing demand for school places?
- Q2. What more can be done at a strategic level in London to support free schools?
- Q3. How can schools maximise their resources including the Pupil Premium to support the most disadvantaged pupils?
- Q4. What can be done on a wider strategic level to maximise available resources for London schools, as well as make the case for more appropriate funding?
- Q5. What can be done at a strategic level to ensure that schools places planning is effective and intelligence can be shared?
- Q6. Which approaches are most effective in improving literacy in London schools?
- Q7. What examples are there of good practice in managing the transition from primary to secondary which ensure good attainment and progression?
- Q8. What are the key factors which prevent some groups of children from fulfilling their potential and how can we better address and share these lessons across London?
- Q9. What are the values, aspects of teaching, learning, discipline and ethos that make some London schools so successful? How can this be shared more strategically in London?
- Q10. What are the factors connected to poor behaviour and attendance in some London schools and what can be done to improve it?
- Q11. What are the changing patterns of school exclusions and techniques for managing disruptive pupils, and how can the quality of alternative provision be driven up to the standard of the best?
- Q12. How can we improve the take-up of STEM subjects and modern foreign languages in London?
- Q13. What kind of careers advice do young Londoners need and how can this be linked more strategically to employers and FE/HE?
- Q14. What good models of practice exist to help young people from the most disadvantaged groups access higher education?
- Q15. What should every London school child know about their city and how can we help schools to achieve this?

Q16. How do schools currently access opportunities to build partnerships across London and what more could be done to help them?

Q17. Are there any other issues or suggestions you would like to draw to our attention, which have not been mentioned in this report?

The most popular questions by volume of responses were as follows:

Question 8 *Key Factors Which Prevent Some Groups of Children from Fulfilling their Potential* received the highest volume, with 37 responses.

This was followed by Question 10 *Factors Connecting to Poor Behaviour and Attendance*, with 26 responses; Question 3 *How can schools maximise their resources including the Pupil Premium?*, Question 4 *What can be done on a wider strategic level to maximise available resources for London schools, as well as make the case for more appropriate funding?*, Question 9 *What are the values, aspects of teaching, learning, discipline and ethos that make some London schools so successful?*, and Question 13 *What Kind of Careers Advice do Young Londoners Need?*, all with 23 responses each.

Call for evidence summary

Q1. What creative ways can schools, boroughs and strategic agencies use to address the growing demand for school places?

There were 20 responses to this question.

Seven respondents stated that free schools can or should provide extra school places in London to help address the shortage, but three respondents felt that there were not yet enough free schools to make a substantial difference, and that additional schools would take too long to come "on-line".

Five respondents were of the view that existing schools should be expanded to meet the excess demand for places. Other proposals included operating a shift system in schools (four respondents), converting secondary schools to all-through schools to maximise the use of places (three respondents), and developing more partnerships between schools to share the use of facilities and space (three respondents).

Three respondents suggested that class sizes should be expanded to increase capacity, or that each teacher should lead two classes, assisted by additional support staff. One respondent noted that teacher effectiveness is more important to educational attainment than class size in justification of this view.

University Technical Colleges (UTCs) and studio schools were mentioned by one respondent as future sources of good quality school places, which should be expanded. It was also proposed that under-utilised government properties should be made available for use as schools on a systematic basis (one respondent).

One respondent felt that more efficient use of resources and school places could be achieved by switching to inclusive education of all pupils in mainstream schools instead of having separate special schools; alternatively, another respondent suggested that successful special schools should be used as expertise hubs to provide training for staff in mainstream schools on achieving good outcomes for children with special educational needs and disabilities.

Further education sector resources could be redirected to the primary sector to ease shortages there according to one respondent, with potential for FE staff to be deployed training additional primary teachers and support staff. One respondent suggested that greater use could be made of vocational education provision outside of schools in the secondary phase to free up accommodation for more primary places.

Flexible modular classrooms and multi-site provision linked to central hub schools were proposed as a solution to creating extra spaces quickly without having to create a new school from scratch (one respondent). Extra units could be dismantled or moved to other locations in response to changes in demand over time.

Q2. What more can be done at a strategic level in London to support free schools?

There were 20 responses to this question.

A range of views was expressed by respondents relating to free schools and how London children's interests can be maximised through this type of provision. Seven respondents supported a coordination or regulation role, possibly including encouragement of free school proposals in areas with school place shortages. Suggestions for who should fulfil this role included the Department for Education (nationally), the Greater London Authority (for London), an independent body, or a working party representing interested bodies.

Several respondents felt that the question of which children free schools provide places for was a central issue. Five respondents stated that free schools in London should be fully inclusive and accessible to pupils with special educational needs and disabilities, and pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.

One respondent supported more help for free school proposers representing Black and Minority Ethnic communities or disadvantaged groups generally, stating that these groups were underrepresented and received insufficient support (including financial) to come forward in future.

Others felt that free schools should be sited in areas with high "basic need", where there are shortages of school places (five respondents). Four respondents stated that free schools should not be opened in areas where there are surplus places in schools that perform well (for example, with good or outstanding Ofsted grades).

Four respondents proposed increased efforts to create links between free schools and other schools nearby. Suggestions included school partnerships open to academies, free schools and independent schools as well as LA maintained schools, or voluntary charter schemes open to all school types.

Q3. How can schools maximise their resources including the Pupil Premium to support the most disadvantaged pupils?

There were 23 responses to this question.

Respondents frequently described their conceptions of the best approach to making decisions about spending the pupil premium. Eight respondents emphasised the importance of a targeted approach to spending based on thorough assessment and identification of needs. Choosing interventions based on evidence and systematically tracking progress and evaluating impact were also supported by eight respondents. One respondent stated that schools were best placed to make decisions on how to spend the pupil premium. Another respondent felt that learning from schools and teachers with the most experience of disadvantage and underperformance would improve decision making.

Seven respondents felt that additional tuition, individual tutoring or revision support were effective uses of pupil premium funding. Spending on programmes to increase parental engagement or resources to help parents support their children's learning was suggested by seven respondents; for example, the employment of specialist family liaison practitioners was suggested. Ensuring that all eligible parents apply for free school meals (and therefore secure pupil premium funding) was raised as an important objective by two respondents.

Collaboration to maximise resources was a strong theme in the responses received, with six respondents suggesting that there should be more pooling of funding to buy shared specialist staff or services. Similarly, providing access to wider experiences comparable with the opportunities available to more affluent pupils should be pursued through greater collaboration with community organisations and others outside the school, according to six respondents.

Spending to enhance teaching quality was felt to be an effective use of the pupil premium by five respondents; this might include recruitment initiatives or more continuing professional development for teachers or support staff. Two respondents stated the importance of strong whole-school teaching as well as targeted interventions.

A holistic view of children's needs and possible interventions was supported by five respondents. Personal development programmes and behaviour support interventions were mentioned by four respondents each. Breakfast and homework clubs or other extended hours services, computer hardware and technology, and books and libraries were each cited as potential uses for the pupil premium by three respondents.

Q4. What can be done on a wider strategic level to maximise available resources for London schools, as well as make the case for more appropriate funding?

There were 23 responses to this question.

Six respondents were in favour of increasing the number of partnerships amongst schools and between schools and cultural or community organisations. Similarly, three respondents suggested that schools should make more use of parents and the voluntary sector.

Efforts to lobby central government to maintain or increase funding levels were supported by six respondents. Particular types of funding that respondents felt should be protected or increased included capital funding for building new schools, Ethnic Minority Achievement Grants and funding for further education for pupils with special educational needs or disabilities.

Three respondents stated that resources should be targeted at the schools or areas with the greatest need. Raising more money from the private sector was suggested by three respondents, and making joint bids for European funding by two respondents. Two respondents felt that private sector sponsorship should be collected centrally and allocated to schools with the greatest need because some schools would find fund-raising easier than others to the detriment of the most disadvantaged.

Greater cross-borough working was supported by four respondents as a means to increase efficiency. Two respondents proposed shared employment of senior leaders and/or specialist staff by pairs or groups of boroughs. The establishment of a regional network for virtual head teachers of looked after children was suggested by one respondent.

Three respondents suggested efforts to increase the sharing of best practice in maximising school resources, and one respondent advocated new research into how successful schools spend their funds, and what differences might exist between schools with higher or lower levels of funding.

Q5. What can be done at a strategic level to ensure that schools places planning is effective and intelligence can be shared?

There were 20 responses to this question.

The most frequently stated proposal on place planning was to bring about joint working across London with all boroughs participating in a coordinated system for place planning and admissions (nine respondents).

Five respondents supported increased use of data to improve the accuracy of forecasts for the demand for school places. Specific suggestions included modelling to take account of new housing developments and detailed analysis of special educational needs patterns in London. Birth records and housing data were suggested as sources of information to feed into the analysis.

Two respondents expressed concerns that school intakes in London do not always reflect local diversity, and stated that the admissions code should be revised to prevent selection of unrepresentative pupil intakes.

One respondent called for more involvement of parents in the planning of new school places and admissions arrangements. Another suggested that a full survey of existing and proposed school sites was needed to assess their capacity and feed into the planning process.

Q6. Which approaches are most effective in improving literacy in London schools?

There were 22 responses to this question.

Specific pedagogic programmes or approaches were frequently advocated by respondents for improving literacy. Eight respondents believed that pupils should be taught using phonics or synthetic phonics techniques. Three respondents were in favour of reading recovery programmes and two respondents supported increased use of pre-literacy activities in the early years, including rhyme-based activities for babies and parents.

Strategies to focus support on particular stages of learning or groups of pupils were also commonly suggested. The importance of early intervention to combat literacy problems and of high quality early years provision was stated by six respondents. Others believed that one-to-one literacy tuition should be provided for some or all pupils (six respondents), or that children's literacy would be improved by

greater use of literacy schemes for parents who struggle to read and write (four respondents), or parents for whom English is not their first language (three respondents).

Specific components of literacy were highlighted by several respondents, with six citing the importance of explicit speaking and listening tasks in lessons. Four respondents stated that lessons should include more extended writing opportunities, and two respondents felt that writing tasks should have real-world purposes and audiences. Three respondents noted the importance of reading for pleasure and immersion in literature. More time on formal spelling and grammar teaching was supported by two respondents.

On a strategic level, six respondents stated that parents and/or the home learning environment needed to be considered as part of programmes to raise literacy. The importance of whole-school literacy plans or the teaching of literacy by all teachers, including secondary teachers of subjects other than English, was raised by five respondents. Three respondents stated that there should be more coverage of literacy in initial teacher training and continuing professional development; two respondents proposed lead or expert literacy teachers in each school.

Five respondents supported the use of wider arts and cultural activities to promote pupils' engagement with literature, while workshops or visits bringing children into contact with writers were specifically mentioned by five respondents. School and local libraries and librarians (four respondents), out-of-lesson reading clubs (two respondents) and internet blogging or other publication opportunities (two respondents) were also suggested as tools for improvement.

Q7. What examples are there of good practice in managing the transition from primary to secondary which ensure good attainment and progression?

There were 21 responses to this question.

The strongest theme in the responses on managing the transition from primary to secondary school was the importance of targeted extra support for vulnerable pupils groups (twelve respondents). Formal transfer of sensitive information about pupils' needs in advance of the transition was advocated by five respondents, and six respondents stated that collaborative formal transition plans should be developed for pupils with special educational needs.

Eleven respondents were in favour of schools sharing teachers across the two phases, for example with specialist subject teachers from secondary schools teaching some classes in primary schools. School clusters, federations or other relationships were cited as effective in improving transition by ten respondents. Transition days or visits (five respondents), bridging projects started in primary school and finished in secondary school (three respondents), summer schools (three respondents) and formal secondary induction programmes (three respondents) were also suggested. Two respondents stated full and timely achievement and learning profiles should be transmitted from primary to secondary schools as part of their information sharing.

The importance of parental inclusion and involvement in the transition process was stated by seven respondents. Four respondents felt that transition planning and activities should start well in advance

of leaving primary school, and three respondents stated that information for parents should be communicated early enough for queries to be resolved before deadlines and decisions approach.

Six respondents commented on the need to provide pupils with preparation and support for the transition to separate subject teaching and independent study skills. Opportunities for social bonding and friendship building in year 7 were felt to be important by five respondents. Four respondents were in favour of teaching non-cognitive 'soft' skills in primary school or through out-of-school activities, and four respondents believed there should be a focus on setting expectations for pupil behaviour at the start of secondary school.

Q8. What are the key factors which prevent some groups of children from fulfilling their potential and how can we better address and share these lessons across London?

There were 37 responses to this question.

Respondents described numerous and complex sources of educational disadvantage experienced by some of London's children. The most frequently cited was poverty and related concerns such as socio economic disadvantage, unemployment or social exclusion (thirteen respondents). Poor school attendance and/or disengagement and reluctant participation were reported as a source of disadvantage by eight respondents.

Exposure to criminal or gang activity (five respondents), inadequate or insecure housing (five respondents), and excess pupil mobility due to moving home or school (five respondents) were mentioned as additional sources of disadvantage experienced by some London pupils. Alcohol or substance misuse by pupils or their families was cited by four respondents.

Fourteen respondents stated the importance or effectiveness of developing better parental engagement by schools in reducing the disadvantages experienced by some pupils. Ten respondents cited a need to improve or compensate for disadvantaged home environments to secure better outcomes for some children. Examples included facilitating access to books or computing equipment, as well as building the confidence of disadvantaged parents or carers in navigating education, employment and life generally.

Low parental literacy (nine respondents) and issues of family conflict and breakdown or domestic violence (eight respondents) were other disadvantages stemming from the home mentioned by respondents. Unidentified special educational needs (seven respondents) and poor quality or inflexible teaching (four respondents) were cited as school-based disadvantages.

After better parental engagement, the most commonly supported strategies for reducing disadvantage were interventions to address social and emotional problems or reinforce personal development (thirteen respondents), raising aspirations and expectations for all pupils and reinforcing these among pupils, parents and teachers (twelve respondents), and delivering a broad curriculum which reflects the lives of all pupils (twelve respondents).

Six respondents felt that the curriculum and school experience should be designed to support good self-esteem for the full range of pupils. Principles of inclusion and equality were advocated to achieve this. Four respondents stated that the ethos and values of the school attended influence the level of advantage or disadvantage experienced by each pupil. Sharing of best practice (seven respondents) and focusing teacher training and development on reducing disadvantage (five respondents) were also advocated.

Q9. What are the values, aspects of teaching, learning, discipline and ethos that make some London schools so successful? How can this be shared more strategically in London?

There were 23 responses to this question.

Responses to this question generally focused on the characteristics and activities of successful schools or those which were felt to be desirable for schools or the system as a whole, rather than proposals for strategic action.

The most frequently advocated value that respondents wanted schools to promote was ambitious expectations of all pupils (nine respondents). Linked to this, five respondents cited the importance of accountability and tracking of progress in standards over time. Celebrating successes was also felt to be a key ingredient by four respondents.

Another theme that emerged from the responses was the necessity for London schools to uphold an inclusive ethos (seven respondents), with a focus on narrowing gaps between different groups of pupils (six respondents). This focus on relationships was also evident in the four responses which advocated greater efforts to engage parents. Additionally, three respondents felt that providing positive role models for children and young people was an ingredient of successful schools; another three were in favour of schools using restorative approaches to pupil behaviour.

Six respondents cited innovation and creativity as key ingredients of successful schools. Enrichment of the school curriculum and other opportunities for learning (six respondents), and fostering adaptation to different learning styles (three respondents) were also supported.

Another group of responses focused on how pupils experience and respond to successful schools. A focus on the personal development of each pupil was important for six respondents, while the fostering of respectful behaviour was a priority for five respondents, and four respondents believed there should be an emphasis on personal responsibility. Smaller numbers of responses mentioned the importance of a safe environment (three respondents) and pupil voice in school life (two respondents).

Eight respondents believed that high quality school leadership is necessary for achieving success and one mentioned effective school governance. At a strategic level, collaborative working (six respondents) and partnership-building (five respondents) were viewed as pathways to success. Five responses mentioned the importance of disseminating good practice across London schools and having a shared vision of what success is. One respondent felt that school success could not be

achieved without improvements to strategic planning and housing provision in order to ameliorate out-of-school disadvantages.

Q10. What are the factors connected to poor behaviour and attendance in some London schools and what can be done to improve it?

There were 26 responses to this question.

The most frequently cited cause of poor behaviour and attendance was bullying and associated social isolation (six respondents). Five respondents reported that pupils experiencing social and emotional problems are more likely to develop behaviour issues; learning problems were also cited by five respondents. Peer pressure and low expectations or aspirations were each felt to be sources of behaviour problems by four respondents.

Larger volumes of responses were received on what can be done about poor behaviour and attendance in some London schools. Targeting underlying needs and causes received the most support, with eleven respondents in favour of schools deploying holistic need assessments that encompass the external problems faced by some pupils. Addressing special educational needs was also felt to be a key component of tackling behaviour difficulties. Six respondents stated that unidentified special education needs or inadequate resourcing of provision are a source of behaviour problems; the same number believed that teachers should receive more training on the links between special educational needs and behaviour and how to respond when faced with these.

Another six respondents were in favour of a multi-agency approach to behaviour support in schools. Access to counselling or extra pastoral support was supported by six respondents, while five noted the importance of early identification and intervention when behaviour or attendance issues arise.

After holistic needs assessment, the next most popular approach for improving behaviour was investing time in good communications with parents and wider communities (supported by eight respondents). Similarly, five respondents felt that schools should prioritise the involvement of parents in school life generally; examples included encouraging parents from diverse backgrounds to volunteer at the school. Four respondents stated that parenting classes or other support should be provided to help parents to manage their children's behaviour.

Respondents recommended various school-based strategies for managing pupils' behaviour and attendance. The balance of submissions was slightly in favour of strategies to increase pupil engagement, but with a substantial volume focusing on behaviour-specific strategies. For example, while seven respondents cited the importance of an engaging school curriculum in preventing behaviour problems, six respondents felt that teachers should receive more training in behaviour management techniques.

Other responses focusing on engagement in learning included support for extra training in effective teaching and learning techniques (six respondents), flexible and responsive approaches to different pupil learning styles (five respondents), pupil voice and consultation (three respondents), and

speaking visits from positive role models to promote the value of education to pupils (three respondents).

Further responses on behaviour-specific strategies emphasised the importance of consistency and clarity in the application of school behaviour policies (five respondents), staged reward and sanction schemes (four respondents), and linking the school's expectations of behaviour to reparatory actions that pupils should take if they have fallen short of the required standard (two respondents).

Other responses included support for greater use of creative projects to help pupils explore their identities, cultures and learning styles, linked to broader personal development aims (three respondents).

Q11. What are the changing patterns of school exclusions and techniques for managing disruptive pupils, and how can the quality of alternative provision be driven up to the standard of the best?

There were 16 responses to this question.

The most frequently cited exclusions patterns related to disproportionate rates of exclusion of children with special educational needs or disabilities (SEND) (three respondents) and Black Caribbean children, especially boys (two respondents), and to unofficial ('illegal') exclusions (three respondents). Three respondents stated that disproportionate exclusions of specific groups of pupils are linked to distinct learning needs among those groups that are not being addressed by schools. One respondent stated that children from disproportionately excluded ethnic groups are more likely to be excluded from schools where that ethnic group forms a minority of the pupil body.

In relation to exclusions of pupils with SEND, two respondents felt that there should be more teacher training on inclusion and teaching children with special educational needs. One respondent noted that unidentified learning needs are a cause of disruptive pupil behaviour, and another recommended that statements should be automatically reviewed whenever the exclusion of a child with stated special educational needs is proposed. Three respondents called for research into the practice of unofficial exclusions.

Commenting on the management of disruptive pupils, four respondents felt that exclusions should only be considered as a last resort. However, managed moves to another school that are decided in collaboration with parents were supported by three respondents as a means of providing pupils with a fresh start. Two respondents were in favour of small internal units or nurture groups for managing challenging behaviour within mainstream schools.

Specific behaviour support approaches cited by respondents included provision of counselling for pupils with behaviour problems (three respondents), whole family interventions (two respondents), and parenting classes (one respondent).

Respondents described the features of high quality alternative provision as ensuring access to the full range of subjects and options (two respondents), maintaining a strong relationship with the referring school (two respondents), focusing on building positive relationships between staff and pupils (two respondents), and including personal development programmes as well as appropriate education (two respondents). One respondent felt that alternative education providers should be subject to equivalent monitoring of standards, curriculum and health and safety procedures to those which apply to mainstream schools. Two respondents stated that vocational programmes incorporating maths and English lessons can be effective in re-engaging disruptive pupils.

Q12. How can we improve the take-up of STEM subjects and modern foreign languages in London?

There were 21 responses to this question.

The most common responses to this question related to pedagogy, or how the subjects are taught in schools. Eight respondents were in favour of an increase in the prevalence of practical and/or creative teaching of STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and mathematics). In order to help deliver this aspiration, seven respondents wanted to see more subject enrichment programmes shared across maintained schools, further education providers and independent schools in London. On a similar theme, increasing the use of partnerships between primary schools and secondary school subject departments was suggested by two respondents.

Linking learning to the world of work was supported by several respondents, with six citing the importance of nurturing careers aspirations linked to STEM or MFL subjects, and four calling for the content of maths and science lessons to be linked to real-world applications and jobs. However, five respondents stated that there were barriers to the ease of organising educational school trips and workplace visits, and that more should be done to facilitate this. For example, one respondent felt that teachers needed more time and support from their school leadership teams in order to be able to deliver these kinds of activities. Three respondents felt that there is a need to increase awareness of and funding for Saturday schools and summer schools focused on STEM subjects or modern foreign languages.

The supply of specialist subject teachers was the second largest theme in the responses to this question, with six respondents reporting a need to increase the number of high-quality specialist STEM subject teachers. Four respondents believed that the number of specialist teachers at Key Stage 3 in particular should be increased in order to boost the uptake of both STEM subjects and languages at GCSE level. One respondent felt that it will be challenging for schools to find enough teachers with computer programming skills in response to changes to the National Curriculum requirements for Information and Communications Technology (ICT) intended to support the growth of a rigorous computer science curriculum.

The curriculum and qualifications offered in London's schools were cited as a lever for increasing participation in languages and STEM subjects more generally. Three respondents called for systematic teaching of languages throughout the primary school phase. Similarly, the reintroduction of a

requirement for all pupils to take at least one modern foreign language at Key Stage 4 was proposed by two respondents. Two respondents stated that the range of languages offered by schools should meet the needs of a global city like London; (Brazilian) Portuguese, Russian, Indian and Chinese languages were cited as examples of useful options for schools to deliver.

During secondary education, two respondents felt that more schools should teach triple science (separate qualifications in biology, chemistry and physics), and/or further maths qualifications. Alternatively, two respondents were in favour of more schools offering BTEC or vocational qualifications in STEM subjects, buying in places at FE colleges to deliver these programmes where it is not practical to offer them on-site. The debate over appropriate qualification routes was linked to concerns about equal access to sciences and languages for pupils with special educational needs (two respondents). One respondent called for assessment of pupils' 'digital literacy' at Key Stage 3 to boost schools' focus on preparation for Key Stage 4 ICT options.

A small number of respondents suggested action at a strategic level to increase the profile of STEM subjects and languages in London schools. For example, two respondents called for an increase in the opportunities to share best practice across the capital. University Technical Colleges were mentioned by two respondents as potential centres of excellence, but acknowledging that the numbers of UTCs would need to increase from the two open so far in order to make a London-wide difference. Two respondents felt there should be coordination and collaboration between the various organisations offering STEM enrichment packages.

Q13. What kind of careers advice do young Londoners need and how can this be linked more strategically to employers and FE/HE?

There were 23 responses to this question.

Respondents felt that careers advice for young Londoners needs to be broad and diverse in its presentation of different employment sectors and options open to those with different skill levels (eight respondents). Linked to this, six respondents stated that careers advice should be impartial; concerns over impartiality related to conflicts of interest for schools with sixth forms when advising on FE options, parity between academic and vocational options, and the need to avoid any stereotyping of deprived pupils, those with special educational needs or disabilities, and ethnic minority groups.

Another theme in the responses was the importance of ensuring that young people do not make decisions which close off their options through lack of information. Six respondents cited a need to increase understanding of the pathways from courses to careers, and the practical steps required at each stage of the journey; one respondent stated that teachers' understanding of career paths for non-graduates in particular needs to be improved. Similarly, six respondents stated that careers advice should provide clear and timely information on the specific entry requirements for education and employment options.

Building links with employers received support, with eleven respondents stating that there should be more employer outreach and engagement schemes, or that all pupils should be able to access such

schemes. Examples provided by respondents included ambassador schemes with employers visiting schools, taster days at employers' premises, city career walks, and mentoring of pupils by employer representatives. Seven respondents commented that schools should build relationships with employers, but one expressed concerns about the greater challenge in engaging with small and medium sized employers.

The importance of access to work experience (seven respondents), apprenticeship opportunities (seven respondents), work-based learning (six respondents) and formal internship schemes (three respondents) was a common theme in the responses. One respondent suggested the establishment of modular work experience schemes to share the costs across different employers and enable young people to build up breadth of experience across a sector.

Eight respondents felt that careers advice should be fully accessible to all groups of young people, including pupils with disabilities, ethnic minority pupils, and youth offenders. Continuing this focus on the least advantaged and least engaged groups, two respondents stated that there should be an ongoing focus on developing strong career aspirations; greater access to business and professional role models from a range of backgrounds was proposed by two respondents.

Specific instruction in skills for employment was supported by respondents to this question. For example, five respondents stated that school pupils should be taught soft skills in communication, networking, team working and problem solving. Four respondents advocated the teaching of basic work expectations such as punctuality and self-management, and three respondents suggested that pupils should be taught application skills, for example through practice interviews with real employers. Two respondents felt that there should be accreditation of employability skills, enabling monitoring and accountability of school provision, possibly through a formal qualification.

Aspects of the delivery of careers advice were important to respondents; for example, five respondents stated that pupils should receive careers advice from a younger age than is currently the case. Four respondents felt that advice and services should be available through a variety of media, in a range of locations and at flexible times of the day or week. Respondents wanted to see a range of formats including face-to-face advice, online resources and group sessions; three respondents were in favour of more immersion events such as enterprise games or competitions, career-themed drama workshops, or 'have-a-go' skills events.

Concerns about access to careers services were expressed with four respondents emphasising the importance of local services of a consistent quality; three respondents stated that existing provision is too fragmented or piecemeal. Two respondents stated a need to widen awareness of and access to university courses, and felt that universities should facilitate this by providing more course tasters, summer schools and campus visits.

Small numbers of respondents commented on strategic considerations in delivering high quality careers advice. For example, three respondents stated that there should be training and development for staff delivering careers advice, and two respondents felt that it should be delivered by experts, or at least by staff with access to experts on different employment sectors. Another strategic concern

was the availability of systematic labour market demand information; four respondents stated that this should be collected and made available to inform up-to-date careers advice.

Q14. What good models of practice exist to help young people from the most disadvantaged groups access higher education?

There were 20 responses to this question.

Respondents cited a total of twenty-seven existing schemes which help young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to access higher education. These included schemes run by universities, charities and local authorities, and were variously focused on disadvantaged groups including care leavers, pupils with special educational needs or disabilities, ethnic minority pupils or those from deprived families. Some schemes were tailored to a specific subject or academic field.

Commenting on the components of schemes to support wider access to higher education, respondents were in favour of taster events highlighting the lifestyle and wider benefits of higher education (five respondents), more outreach events targeted specifically at disadvantaged pupils (four respondents), more trips to visit university campuses (four respondents), and mentoring schemes staffed by university students and/or employers (two respondents).

Two respondents felt that there should be a one-stop resource sign-posting all university courses, higher education institutions and careers, also including information on all bursary and financial support schemes. Two respondents also advocated greater use of foundation degrees as a route into higher education which could widen the group of young people with access to university.

Q15. What should every London school child know about their city and how can we help schools to achieve this?

There were 22 responses to this question.

Respondents provided a rich set of suggestions for what every London school child should know about their city. The most popular proposal for London-specific knowledge related to the city's heritage, history, evolution or historical landmarks (seven respondents). Learning about London's global links including patterns and causes of migration was supported by four respondents. London's geography and physical environments were suggested by two respondents. The city's political and economic significance (three respondents), local and national democratic institutions (three respondents), and business hubs (two respondents) were also cited.

Six respondents felt that diversity and the development stories of the many communities within London should feature as part of what children are taught about their city. Linked to this, five respondents stated that children should know about how the individual neighbourhoods in London fit together to form the city. Four respondents suggested that pupils should be taught about the importance of tolerance and social inclusion and how to challenge discrimination. Three respondents

proposed that pupils should learn about sustainability and regeneration the capital, including pollution and its impact on health.

Awareness of the rich set of opportunities in London was a strong theme in the responses, with eight respondents supporting learning about the city's cultural sector and creative industries. Other organisations which pupils should know about opportunities to engage with, cited by individual respondents, included London's sporting organisations, academic institutions, growth sectors in the economy, and community and youth groups.

Wider outcomes from learning that respondents wanted for all pupils in the capital included the ability to navigate confidently across London, not just their local area, using all forms of transport in the city (two respondents), and feeling a sense of belonging and ownership towards the city (one respondent). Two respondents stated that pupils should have access to (and competence in using) information and communications technologies for learning and creative activities. Three respondents stated that pupils' families and the wider community should be engaged in the process of learning about London. Two respondents felt that what pupils have learned about their city should be accredited.

Commenting on barriers to the kinds of learning described above, two respondents stated that timetabling and curriculum pressures present an obstacle to school trips or extended activities during Key Stages 3 and 4. Three respondents cited funding and resourcing as a limitation on what schools can deliver. Two respondents cited risk aversion as a disincentive to organising educational visits off the school premises.

Q16. How do schools currently access opportunities to build partnerships across London and what more could be done to help them?

There were 19 responses to this question.

Respondents were generally in favour of schools developing partnerships with other organisations to improve their outcomes. Three respondents specifically stated that successful partnerships can increase standards and opportunities for pupils, and one respondent said that failing schools or those in deprived areas stand to benefit from external engagement through sustained partnerships. Another benefit of partnership working cited by one respondent was that it enables information sharing between different organisations in the education and allied sectors.

The range of existing partnership options reported by respondents included partnerships with businesses and employers (six respondents), higher education institutions (four respondents), arts and cultural organisations (three respondents) and sports organisations (three respondents). Music-focused and careers-focused partnerships were cited by three respondents each. Four respondents mentioned partnerships which prioritise outcomes for disadvantaged pupils, and two mentioned partnership working with supplementary schools in particular. Other types of partnerships included those with churches or other religious organisations (two respondents), and those focused on healthy lifestyles, outdoor learning or parental engagement (one respondent each).

Requirements for successful partnership working were described by respondents, including brokerage and support (six respondents), funding and resourcing (three respondents), and strong commitment from partner organisations (two respondents). Two respondents cited a need for quality assurance of potential partner organisations or partnership schemes, and two respondents were in favour of awards and/or accreditation schemes. Raising awareness of partnership opportunities and building support in school leaders were felt to be important support activities (one respondent each).

Examples of models for partnership working were suggested by respondents. For example, two respondents mentioned local authority brokerage between schools and potential partner organisations. Partnerships between different local authorities to deliver services such as subject and curriculum development schemes for teachers were proposed by two respondents, and resource hubs covering more than one local authority area were proposed by one respondent. Whilst brokerage was a strong theme in the responses, two respondents felt that some services delivered by partner organisations should be available on an independent open-access basis, whereby individual pupils or families can opt in without a referral from the school. Other respondents were in favour of web-based coordination of partnership offers (two respondents).

Q17. Are there any other issues or suggestions you would like to draw to our attention, which have not been mentioned in this report?

Selected responses to question 17 are presented below.

The Inquiry should consider how to develop opportunities for schools, local authorities and central government to achieve stronger families and better outcomes for children through a parental engagement programme. *[A Local Authority]*

There is an urgent need for an Education Ombudsman in London to rebuild the confidence of parents, not only from BME backgrounds – but all parents. *[A Charity]*

Parts of London have high levels of mobility including families with children, although there is some evidence this has slowed due to the economic downturn and high house prices. We are particularly concerned to ensure pupils have as little disruption to their learning as possible and that pupils do not go missing. *[A Local Authority]*

First we need to recognise the real and enormous barriers to educational success that some children face as a result of frequent moves, household overcrowding, lack of books, computers or someone to read with them, as well as social and emotional difficulties arising from experiences as refugees, from neglect, parental drug or alcohol abuse, etc. etc. We need to identify good practices in schools for children with these issues but also it is critical that support and resources are available outside school as well. Second, we need to be able to think more radically, not just about general good practice (what is effective for most people), but about what would work in school for those with the most difficulties. *[A Research Organisation]*

Every Teacher a Scholar – a proposal to the Greater London Authority. To link teachers and the academy and to inspire teachers in terms of their subject-knowledge and pedagogy. A one week summer school. *[A teacher]*

Our response throughout has been to present the case for an investment in non-cognitive skills as well as cognitive skills which are currently addressed through mainstream education. *[A Representative Body]*

Many schools do excellent work in keeping young people known to the youth justice system focused on their learning – for other young people the experience is of barriers to achievement and progression being put in place. *[A Public Sector Organisation]*

Underpinning my response is a belief in family citizenship education and capacity building, delivered through an expanded curriculum and with the active engagement of parents. *[An individual respondent]*

We would suggest that a complete solution for London has two foci that would help achieve the result of a world-leading city: a. enabling disadvantaged and poorly-performing students to compete at world level; and b. identifying London's very best students, in disciplines where London can lead the world, and providing them with the support and opportunities to become world beating in their ability. *[A Charity]*

It is important to stress that over the last 10 years London secondary and tertiary education has significantly improved, and at a rate that it is hard to match elsewhere. Most capital cities lag behind the rest of their country – not London. Educationalists from across the UK and abroad often come to London to learn. *[A Representative Body]*

[The] importance of close working relationships between London LAs, especially at operational levels. *[A Local Authority]*

As the spotlight is on children and young people with SEN, the London Education Inquiry must focus on how schools can be fully inclusive of disabled children (including those with SEN). If disabled children and young people feel valued by schools and their peer group and feel part of their local communities, then they are more likely to lead purposeful lives. *[A Charity]*

Evidence continues to highlight the disproportionate adverse treatment that pupils from BAME backgrounds receive in the education system from pre-school assessment through to secondary education. While poverty and socio-economic disadvantage are key determinants of educational outcomes, they need to be considered separately from, yet alongside issues of racism in education. *[A Charity]*

[We] would like to reinforce the potential for the Mayor to use the Olympic Games legacy, in particular the development of education activities in the Olympic Park post-Games, to create a world-leading outdoor learning facility. *[A Charity]*

A subject-based education should begin at primary school, just as children become independent readers. Well taught children can reach a reading age of eight years by the end of their first year of full-time schooling. From this moment, they are ready to be taught the best that is known and thought. *[A Charity]*

Despite record levels of government investment in education and training over recent years, London still faces a skills shortage that is damaging its competitiveness. If sustained economic growth in the capital is to be achieved, those entering the labour market must be 'work-ready' and employability skills need to be instilled in school children at a young age. *[A Representative Body]*

Improving the literacy levels of parents has been shown to have a positive impact on children's cognitive performance. Developing parents' spoken English also increases their confidence and ability to develop contact with the school. *[A Public Sector Organisation]*

Every child in London should learn the concepts and principles of Information Technology and Computer Science from primary school age onwards, and later to specialise in Computer Science if they wish. *[Other Organisation Type]*