



## Evaluation and review of the introduction of DCSF funded One to One Tuition programme in schools for South Gloucestershire Local Authority.

This evaluation was carried out by Steve Lloyd – Director - The Networked Learning Partnership Ltd, between 3rd January 2010 and 12<sup>th</sup> February 2010

### What is the One-to-One tuition programme?

From 2009 one-to-one tuition is being rolled out nationally to pupils in Key Stages 2, 3 and (in National Challenge schools) in Key Stage 4. An initial tranche of individual tuition was trialled in the spring and summer terms of 2009 for the 36,000 pupils falling behind in the latter part of Key Stage 2. In South Gloucestershire this involved 46 Primary schools.

One-to-one tuition is now available to 3.5 per cent of the Key Stage 2, 3 and (in National Challenge schools) Key Stage 4 cohorts in English, and to 3.5 per cent of each cohort in mathematics. This is in operation in 106 South Gloucestershire schools.

From 2010/11 tuition will be available to 300,000 pupils a year in both English and mathematics. It will be an entitlement to every pupil who entered Key Stage 2 behind the expected level and who is not on track to make two levels of progress.

There are set criteria for the allocation of tuition — (i) pupils who entered the key stage behind the expected level, (ii) pupils who in the second half of the key stage are falling off trajectory to make two levels of progress, and (iii) looked-after children who would particularly benefit from this kind of support. This may include SEN pupils who meet the criteria for one-to-one tuition and who the schools feel would particularly benefit from this support. However it is important that one-to-one tuition is seen as a supplementary intervention and is not used to backfill or replicate existing support.

### What is the purpose of one-to-one tuition?

One-to-one tuition is appropriate for pupils who have been taught a skill in the classroom, and subsequent efforts have failed to secure it. Consequently, much of the tuition time should be spent discussing high-value strategies which can be applied again and again in other contexts. Highly tailored tuition sessions should be delivered by a qualified tutor at a pace that is both appropriate to the child and provides a balance between challenge and support to help pupils feel secure in their learning. Within the session misunderstandings should be quickly identified and addressed at the point of misconception.

(Source <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/teachingandlearning/onetoone/tuition/> )

### What are the focus areas of the review?

- The focus of one-to-one, e.g. subject, year groups and vulnerable groups;
- Recruitment and Deployment of tutors; Quality assurance procedures;
- Impact of one-to-one tuition, including measurable outcomes, such as attendance, and qualitative data such as pupil attitudes; Identification of good practice models that can be shared across the Local Authority
- Impact back in the classroom; Challenges and benefits of one-to-one; identification; information passed to tutors; progress measures.

## How was the review undertaken?

10 focus schools were identified by the Local Authority as being representative of; rural, suburban, and urban settings; a broad range of socio-economic backgrounds; and, covering each of the three localities of Yate, Kingswood, and Severnvalle. In addition to the focus schools, other feedback, and background data on the programme was provided by Bob Basley, and Richard Hanks, through copies of 'School Notes of Visits' where One to One tuition was the focus. The schools represented 140 pupils at Key Stage 3, and 74 at Key Stage 2, entitled to the programme in the period 2009-10

Over the six week period 03/01/10 to 12/02/10 visits were made by the evaluator to 9 of the 10 schools, the other felt that the review was so early in their programme that there was little impact evidence to provide, although subsequently, this school had been visited by Bob Basley, and visit notes were provided.

In each school visited interviews were undertaken with the Headteacher, or Senior member of staff, leading the programme. In most schools, further discussions with tutors (n=10) and pupils (n=40, KS3=12, KS2=28) took place. It was not possible to gain any primary data from parents but tutors, senior staff and pupils, provided much anecdotal evidence of parental attitudes and views. An online survey was also used with tutors to gain additional information.

## Review Findings

### Leadership of the programme in the school, and Quality assurance

In every case the programme was led and coordinated by the Headteacher, or a member of the Senior leadership team. This was identified by the tutors, and pupils, as essential, as it raised the profile, status, and importance of the initiative, and helped to ensure that the programme ran smoothly. All of those in leadership positions spoke of the great potential this provision had to challenge and support pupils to make significant progress, especially in raising confidence in learners. Each leader also demonstrated a variety of methods of tracking and maintaining the quality of the tutor – tutee experience.

**Exemplar practice:** In one school the Headteacher met regularly with the pupils as a group to discuss what they liked about the programme and how the pupils would like it changed. In another an Assistant head had monitoring and development conversations with each tutor following observations of sessions in progress, and, in one case chose not to renew the tutor contract. A primary school Head facilitated regular meetings between the tutors and class teachers to exchange information.

## How are pupils selected in practice?

The key criteria of being 'stuck' at a National Curriculum level within, and towards the end of a Key Stage, were universally used by the schools as initial selection criteria. Monitoring and tracking systems indicating current pupil progress relating to expectations were used in every case observed. In most schools, this produced a larger cohort than that covered by the funding. Additional criteria were then developed in schools such as; 'likely to make the most of it', 'lacking confidence in group situations', 'good parental support, but low socio-economic background', 'positive attitude, but quiet' and 'low self –esteem'. Criteria such as 'poor behaviour', 'challenging attitude' were not used. Only one school had used criteria relating to targeted groups, such as BME pupils, 'Looked after children', SEN, EAL.

In the schools sampled, there seemed to be no significant difference between the numbers receiving extra Numeracy/Maths, or English/Literacy, and overall there appeared to be no gender bias in selection.

**N.B.** LA data for the Autumn period 2009 indicated a significant gender bias towards English/Literacy (n=229) for boys (67%) and a slightly smaller bias towards Numeracy (n=184) for girls (55%). Overall of all pupils engaged in the programme (n=413), 57% were boys, and 47% were girls.

Almost all pupils in Primary schools were in Y5/Y6, with one in Y4. In the Secondary schools most pupils targeted were in Year 9, with a few in Year 8, although current thinking through experience was leading the some schools to consider changing the focus to Year 7. The tutor focus exclusively worked towards improving progress across levels 3, 4, and 5.

**N.B.** LA data for the Autumn period 2009 indicated that in KS2 (n=217), 84% were in Y5/6, and, in KS3 (n=190), 37% were in Y9, and 40% were in Y8. In KS4, all pupils (n= 15) were in Y11.

**Exemplar practice:** In one case the funding was used to fast track the literacy development of a new EAL student joining the school mid-year, complementing other provision for the pupil in the school. Another school used the provision to support other measures in place focused on 'under-achievement among boys'. A secondary school identified a long list of pupils through their tracking system and then asked the English and Maths departments to separately determine those who should benefit most from the initiative. Another secondary school focussed provision on those pupils arriving in Year 7 at level 3, but close to level 4

## Learning Programme design and implementation

In all but one case Individual Tuition Plans were designed, in advance of the tuition period. These were based on pupil needs and often based on prior assessments, although these plans were adapted and amended based on pupil progress, and changing needs identified through ongoing classroom activity. In the example where a pre-planning was not in place it involved a single tutor working with a few pupils, where session planning took place on a weekly basis depending on classroom needs, through in depth discussions between teacher, pupil, and tutor between sessions. Most pupils, when asked, described some type of needs analysis activity at the beginning of the planned sessions, with interim assessments over the tuition period. They could also describe specific areas where they knew they needed help, and some alternative strategies that they had learned through the programme. Assessing Pupil's Progress (APP) is not fully implemented in all schools so direct linkage was not always possible, records were kept of activities undertaken, and achievement logged, in some schools a separate pupil progress booklet was shared with the teacher, pupil and parents. Contacts with class teachers varied from occasional informal contact, to regular planned meetings. In the single case where an Individual Tuition Plan was not designed in advance for the whole period of the tuition, the teacher and tutor met prior to every session in order to jointly plan the session based around needs identified in Maths lessons during the week.

**Exemplar practice:** A school held detailed records of each session outline, including outcomes of activities, and any amendments to the original plan had been appended by the tutor. Pupils had been offered an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of each session and the programme as a whole. Each pupil had their own personalised list of strategies to help them when 'stuck' in class.

## Contact and engagement with parents and carers

In every school but one, parents were contacted in advance of the programme explaining the expectations and selection methods and to elicit their support and also give parents the opportunity to withdraw their child from the programme. Only one incidence of parental withdrawal was reported, and that because of fears of stigmatisation, regardless of the schools efforts to persuade them otherwise. In all other cases schools

reported that parents were delighted at the extra opportunity available to their child. In circumstances where schools were engaging with very small numbers of pupils, less than 3, the programme was deliberately kept low key to avoid stigmatisation and concerns about meeting demand from other parents.

In most cases parents were kept informed of progress, at least midway through, and at the end of the period of tuition. A mix of informal and formal contact was quite usual but tended to be focused at the beginning and end of the tuition programme.

**Exemplar practice:** One tutor regularly telephoned each parent to update them on progress and expectations from week to week, others maintained contact through weekly progress report cards, which included descriptions of ideas to support the learners and certificates of progress were awarded at the end of the tuition period and sent to the home.

## Recruitment of tutors

In every school visited the school leads spoke of the importance of matching the right tutor to the needs of the pupil. One secondary school interviewed 5 potential tutors but did not find a suitable appointee; eventually they appointed somebody through a recommendation from a colleague in another school. Schools indicated that they were therefore reluctant to select from a pool of 'unknown' tutors. At the outset of the programme, with Key Stage 2 pupils only, all tutors used were existing staff, part time teachers, cover teachers, recently retired teachers, or others well known to them through neighbouring schools. The main reasons given for selecting from this group were 'knew the school and systems well'; 'knew the children'; 'good relationships with school and class teacher'; 'flexibility'; and, 'reliable and able to be trusted to deliver'. As the programme developed to involve more pupils, and consequently, greater demands on tutor time schools still maintained this approach as the most favourable way forward.

**Exemplar practice:** A Secondary school was keen to involve its Maths and English teachers in the delivery of the programme and planned the staffing complement of the two departments for 2009-10 to enable existing expertise to be used. A Primary school approached an existing Special Needs support teacher in the school, with a Maths Specialism, to redeploy to the One to One tutor role. Another Primary school recruited a Newly Qualified Teacher on a part-time contract to deliver the programme so that she was considered as a member of staff and could contribute to the school beyond the One to One programme. A secondary school recruited a Primary trained teacher to focus on work with Year 7 pupils

## Deployment of tutors

In all but 2 cases, tutors were deployed within the existing school day. Where this was not the case, both schools were Primary schools, and the arrangements were organised to make best use of existing teacher expertise. Concerns were expressed by the tutors working after school, regarding the effectiveness of a full hour of extra tuition immediately after school, although the pupils when asked seemed content with the arrangement. In the other school the sessions took place before school for 40 minutes, and covered 12-13 sessions to ensure that the full time entitlement was used. In some cases, this was delivered as more than one session in a week.

Where pupils were taught within the school day all schools ensured that English/Literacy and Maths/Numeracy lessons were not missed, and that the time slot was varied. Pupils were expected to catch up on work missed in these lessons, although no pupils interviewed expressed any problems with doing that. Pupils also all stated that they were content with the arrangements offered to them. i.e. those receiving tuition outside school hours preferred it that way to prevent them missing other lessons, whilst those receiving tuition within the school day preferred it that way so that they could either go home, or not miss out of school hours activities such a sport, or drama.

**Exemplar practice:** A Primary school tutor employed for the whole day offered additional drop-in sessions in assembly time to pupils who were not part of the tuition programme, another was employed as a cover teacher in the mornings, supporting PPA time, whilst offering One to One tuition in the afternoons.

## Impact of the programme on the professional development of tutors and other staff

All tutors interviewed expressed their delight at helping pupils progress more than they might expect normally, especially as many already had, or were currently working with, the same pupils in the classroom, or through group learning activities such as 'Booster' classes, and other intervention offerings. They recognised that they had developed new skills and that planning sessions focused on individual needs required significant planning. Those who had used the DCSF guidance materials found them useful and a good source of ideas. Only 4 of the tutors interviewed were using the recommended DCSF structure for the sessions, some tutors were not aware of this methodology, although all structured sessions around school recommended approaches for consistency i.e. 5 part lessons, etc. All had received some induction training from the 'Lead' teacher in the school, and 3 had also attended Local Authority meetings, which were considered to be useful for sharing ideas, and updating. 2 tutors had no awareness of the DCSF support materials and guidance. One school organised regular tutor meetings to share good practice and to jointly design new sessions, and negotiate future deployment.

**Exemplar practice:** A recently retired Primary school tutor described the impact of the tutoring on her as 'rejuvenating', another very experienced supply teacher described it as 'the best INSET I have ever taken part in ..... I have learned so many new techniques'. One Secondary teacher stated 'it was much more intense and challenging than I had expected, but I looked forward to every session with.....'

## Impact of the programme on the attainment of pupils

The measurement of progress in attainment was taken very seriously by schools as they were all keen to assess whether the considerable investment in time, effort, funds, and organisation was demonstrating good value. All demonstrated that measurable progress had been made, often beyond that expected on prior rates of progress. There were many examples of pupils progressing at least one whole attainment level over the period of the tuition, with almost all making progress by at least 2 sub levels. There seem to be some early indications that greater progress may be being noticed in Maths.

**Exemplar practice:** One school links the One to One tuition planning to the class teacher's APP (Assessing Pupils Progress) system so that the class teacher, and the pupils, can see regular progress against shorter term, curriculum related targets, within sub levels.

## Impact of the programme on pupil attitudes and behaviour

All but 2 pupils described the tuition programme as very helpful and recognised the support offered to them by the tutor. They enjoyed the quality relationship with an adult who cared about their progress, and had the patience and strategies to help them help themselves. Many described increasing confidence in other subjects as well as those focused on through One to One tuition. Some participants wished that most of their learning could be organised in this way. Class teachers reported evidence of greater application in lessons, and a willingness to try alternative strategies before asking for help.

**Exemplar practice:** In the pupils' own words: 'I used to put my hand up and the teacher ignored me because I didn't try, now when I put up my hand in class the teacher knows that I really need help'; 'The classroom is so noisy I can't concentrate, and miss things, One to One means I can really get to understand how to do Maths'; 'normally I am just a quiet one of 36, now I can be 1 of 1'; 'I've really gained in confidence in writing. I plan and slow my writing down and make less mistakes'; 'My tutor really cares, and helps me understand, she gives me lots of different ways of doing Maths'; 'When I get stuck I try other ways to do it and don't worry so much if I get it wrong, at least I've tried. I just used to sit there'; 'at the end of each lesson my teacher tells the tutor what's bothering me in Maths and my tutor helps me sort it out'; 'my teacher asks me to show her what I have been doing in One to One'

## Overall summary

In the schools visited, teachers, tutors and pupils described the initiative with enthusiasm, especially for its potential to enhance the quality of the overall learning experience. Schools are only just beginning to consider whether there are common patterns in the causes of learning blocks identified through the One to One tuition programme which may affect future curriculum design and delivery.

Leadership of the initiative was effective with great efforts taking place to match the learning needs of the student with the expertise and understanding of the tutor, and was clearly demonstrated in the practices of recruitment and deployment of the tutors. Induction and training of tutors is developing although greater use could be made of the DCSF guidance materials, especially in the areas of session planning, some tutors were unaware of the existence of these materials.

Initial contact with parents is well developed with an assumption that parental choice is to 'opt-out', this early contact is normally by letter and provides information to parents/carers about the overall aims of the programme. Further work may be needed to engage parents/carers, more effectively, in supporting the programme.

The selection of pupils broadly follows guidelines set out by the LA, although further work could be done to target pupils in vulnerable groups, such as 'looked after children'. Similarly, earlier identification of needs, and subsequent interventions, in a Key stage should be considered.

Planning of sessions was quite variable, although pupils with their tutors negotiated focus areas and strategies, as part of the programme. There remain opportunities for greater interactions between tutor/class teacher/pupil/parent as part of the developing APP process.

Record keeping is well developed.

Impact measurements on attainment, were very well developed, although formalising approaches to collection and analysis of qualitative impact measures needs significant work.

## Thanks

I would like to thank the teachers, tutors, and pupils of the schools involved for the honest and insightful contributions to this evaluation report.

Steve Lloyd – Director – The Networked Learning Partnership Ltd

12.02.2010

Schools visited as part of this evaluation report

Hanham High School  
Brimsham Green  
Patchway High School  
Beacon Rise Primary  
Charborough Road Primary  
Frenchay Primary  
Oldbury on Severn Primary  
St. Stephens Junior  
Charfield Primary  
Christchurch Primary