

# Whatever it Takes Project – 2015/16 Full Evaluation

---

## Introduction

---

The Whatever it Takes (WiT) initiative completed its seven academic year of activities in the summer of 2016. This annual report seeks to evaluate the effectiveness of that investment towards achieving the ultimate aim of doing “whatever it takes to get every child in Leicester reading”.

Whilst there are no specific performance measures of WiT that can definitively tell us the success or otherwise of the project, there are a number of proxy measures and indicators that this report will use to gauge overall reading outcomes in the city.

All such measures and indicators will be influenced by other factors, of course, but taken together will be used to consider the impact of WiT.

This report will consider the reading attainment of children in Leicester’s schools and their attitude to reading, using the WiT pupil survey.

The majority of the WiT investment is distributed through school-based projects and the effectiveness of these in the academic year 2015/16 are also considered. So too are the central WiT events of the last academic year. Some projects and data referred to in this report come from beyond the academic year into the remainder of the calendar year, but given the lag in finalised academic data, it has historically been seen as more timely to report them together with 2015/16 academic information.

This report encompasses all aspects of the Whatever it Takes work, including those funded from both the Dedicated Schools Grant and the General Fund, so some of the work sits outside of school settings.

## Summary

---

The key findings from this report are:

- Key Stage 1 reading assessments changed during this academic year
  - Historical comparisons are no longer possible
  - The gap to national at expected standards is 7.1 percentage points
  - There is a smaller gap in those reaching higher standards
  
- Key Stage 2 reading assessments changed during this academic year
  - Historical comparisons are no longer possible
  - The gap to national at expected standards is 6.6 percentage points
  - This gap is not reflected in teacher assessments
  
- Outcomes for the younger cohorts continue to improve
  - The gap to national at EYFS is under 10 percentage points for first time
  - Y1 Phonics screening gains continue to be larger than national, with the gap narrowing
  
- Attitudes to reading amongst Leicester's children and young people is relatively stable
  - Confidence in self-reported ability has declined again, but choosing to read at home seems to be stable
  - For the first time since the secondary survey began, one question – confidence in reading aloud – received a similar response pre and post transition
  
- 85 schools received a total of almost £1m to run projects during the 2015/16 academic year.
  - Less pupil-led data were available, linked to the assessment changes, but data for 3% of the primary population were provided and showed progress being made at the same levels as previous years
  - Secondary schools provided pupil-level data showing good progress being made on WiT-funded projects, approximately 8% of the entire Y7/Y8 cohort in Leicester were reported upon
  
- WiT central events contribute to main aims of project
  - Previously successful central work continued

## Reading attainment and attitude

---

### Baseline and Context

WiT activities commenced in February 2010 and, up until this report, the statutory assessments from 2009 have been used for baseline comparison in order to note progress of children in reading in Leicester.

Whilst statutory assessments have always been used as a proxy measure of impact by WiT, clearly there are many things that contribute to these outcomes, both within school and outside.

Also given the nature of WiT-funded work, some projects would take many years to make an impact on the stated aim of ensuring children leave primary school reading at age-related standards, as a child moves through their school life. WiT is not specifically aimed at improving statutory assessment outcomes, although they do form an important part of its success criteria.

The changes in statutory assessments at the end of Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 in 2015/16 have meant that historical comparisons are no longer possible and therefore this report will not be able to judge progress in the same way it has in previous years.

At the end of this section, historical data have been provided, but purely for reference and not for any sort of comparison.

### Reading Attainment at Age 7

KS1	2016	
	Leic	Nat
<b>Reading</b>		
<b>At or above Expected Standards</b>	<b>66.9%</b>	<b>74%</b>
Boys	62.8%	70%
Girls	71.2%	78%
<b>Higher Standards (Greater Depth)</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>24%</b>
Boys	17.5%	20%
Girls	24.9%	27%
<b>Working Towards</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>19%</b>
Boys	23.2%	21%
Girls	19.1%	16%

There is a 7.1 percentage point gap between the attainment in Key Stage 1 in Leicester and that of the national average in terms of those who reach expected standards. This gap is slightly larger amongst boys and slightly smaller amongst girls. The gap is evenly reflected in those who are not reaching higher standards.

## Reading Attainment at Age 11

KS2	2016	
	Leicester	National
<b>Reading</b>		
<b>Expected Standards</b>	<b>59.4%</b>	<b>66%</b>
Boys	55.9%	63%
Girls	63.0%	70%
<b>High Score</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>19%</b>
Boys	9.2%	16%
Girls	13.9%	22%
<b>Avg Scaled Score</b>	<b>101.0</b>	<b>103</b>
Boys	100.3	102
Girls	101.7	103

In Key Stage 2 there is a 6.6 percentage point gap between those in Leicester reaching expected standards and the national average and a 7.5 percentage point gap between those achieving a higher score.

Leicester performs much closer to the national average in GPS and maths, however there is something of an anomaly when comparing the test outcomes to the teacher assessment outcomes.

The gap to national in reading for teacher assessments is only 1.5 percentage points, a difference of over five percentage points compared to the gap in the tests. As a comparison, in mathematics, where data are also published from tests and teacher assessments, Leicester marginally outperformed national in tests and was marginally below national in teacher assessments, certainly there was no significant difference between the comparisons in the two measures.

The new progress score measure shows Leicester at -1.1, where the national expectation would be 0.0.

### Attainment in the Early Primary Years

Previously this report has not considered outcomes at Foundation Stage or in the Year 1 Phonics screening test, as these were not initially considered measures indicative of outcomes funded by WiT projects.

However, in recent years the significant investment in the Knowledge Transfer Centre (KTC), both through the centrally co-ordinated training programme and the investment in resources through school-based projects, it is considered timely to report the city-wide outcomes in this report.

It should be noted that not all schools in the city engage in KTC, although about half of them now do. Further information on the KTC programme can be found in the centrally funded projects section.

## Outcomes at Age 5

EYFS Literacy (Expected and Exceeding)	2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat
<b>Reading</b>	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>70.5%</b>	<b>55.0%</b>	<b>73.9%</b>	<b>60.2%</b>	<b>76.1%</b>	<b>67.3%</b>	<b>77.0%</b>
Boys	41.7%	64.9%	48.4%	68.4%	54.0%	70.6%	61.3%	71.7%
Girls	54.7%	76.4%	62.1%	79.7%	66.2%	81.9%	73.4%	82.7%
<b>Writing</b>	<b>38.0%</b>	<b>61.9%</b>	<b>46.1%</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>53.8%</b>	<b>70.8%</b>	<b>63.8%</b>	<b>72.6%</b>
Boys	30.1%	53.9%	38.1%	59.5%	46.7%	63.6%	57.1%	65.9%
Girls	46.6%	70.2%	54.5%	74.9%	60.7%	78.3%	70.7%	79.7%

The significant improvements, albeit from an extremely low base, continue to be made in both the reading and writing strands of the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile. The seven percentage point improvement in reading was higher than Leicester year's gains and the gap to national is now less than ten percentage points. A similar story is found in the writing outcomes.

## Outcomes at Age 6 and 7

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Leic	Nat								
<b>Y1 Phonics Meeting Standard</b>	<b>56.8%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>66.9%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>68.2%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>71.5%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>76.8%</b>	<b>81%</b>
Boys	53.6%	54%	63.4%	65%	65.0%	70%	67.9%	73%	73.6%	77%
Girls	60.4%	62%	70.6%	73%	72.2%	78%	75.7%	81%	80.0%	84%
<b>Y1 Phonics at end of Y2 Meeting Standard</b>			<b>84.4%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>85.9%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>87.6%</b>	<b>91%</b>
Boys			82.7%	83%	85.8%	86%	84.8%	88%	88.0%	89%
Girls			87.0%	88%	90.7%	91%	88.9%	92%	92.0%	93%

After widening in recent years, an improvement of 5.3 percentage points has seen Leicester narrow the gap to national in terms of children meeting standards in their Year 1 Phonics screening test. Similarly there has been a closing of the gap at Year 2.

## Historical data

The following is Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 outcomes before the change of statutory assessments.

KS1	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat
<b>Reading</b>														
<b>Level 2+</b>	<b>80.8%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>81.4%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>83.8%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>87.0%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>85.9%</b>	<b>90%</b>
Boys	76.6%	80%	78.1%	81%	81.1%	82%	82.2%	84%	84.1%	86%	82.8%	87%	84.0%	88%
Girls	85.5%	88%	84.7%	89%	86.6%	89%	88.4%	90%	90.2%	92%	89.9%	93%	88.1%	93%
<b>Level 2b+</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>67.9%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>70.3%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>74.0%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>76.4%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>76.2%</b>	<b>82%</b>
Boys	61.4%	67%	62.5%	67%	66.4%	68%	70.6%	72%	73.4%	74%	72.4%	77%	72.7%	78%
Girls	72.5%	77%	73.6%	78%	74.5%	79%	77.6%	81%	82.0%	83%	80.9%	85%	80.0%	86%
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>22.0%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>26.6%</b>	<b>32%</b>
Boys	16.0%	22%	16.4%	22%	18.0%	22%	20.2%	23%	21.0%	25%	21.2%	26%	22.0%	27%
Girls	20.7%	30%	23.1%	30%	23.9%	30%	23.9%	31%	26.7%	33%	32.0%	35%	31.7%	37%
<b>APS</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>16.6</b>
Boys	14.3	15.1	14.4	15.1	14.8	15.2	15.1	15.5	15.3	15.7	15.3	15.9	15.3	16.1
Girls	15.5	16.3	15.6	16.3	15.7	16.4	15.9	16.6	16.3	16.8	16.6	17	16.5	17.2

Source: DataNet (Leicester), DfE (National)

KS2	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
Reading	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat	Leic	Nat
<b>Level 4+</b>	<b>81.3%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>78.2%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>80.2%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>83.2%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>85.3%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>87.4%</b>	<b>89%</b>
Boys	77.2%	82%	73.8%	80%	76.5%	80%	80.0%	84%	82.1%	83%	82.8%	87%	85.8%	87%
Girls	85.7%	89%	82.9%	87%	84.3%	88%	86.8%	90%	87.4%	88%	88.0%	91%	89.1%	91%
<b>Level 4b+</b>	<b>71.6%</b>		<b>66.9%</b>		<b>65.9%</b>		<b>72.3%</b>		<b>72.6%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>74.6%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>80%</b>
Boys	66.3%		63.0%		61.2%		68.3%		70.3%	72%	71.1%	76%	76.4%	78%
Girls	77.4%		71.0%		71.0%		76.6%		75.2%	78%	78.3%	81%	79.8%	83%
<b>Level 5+</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>39.1%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>39.6%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>38.0%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>44.0%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>49%</b>
Boys	32.4%	41%	35.8%	45%	29.9%	37%	34.4%	43%	34.8%	41%	40.3%	47%	38.8%	44%
Girls	43.6%	54%	42.6%	56%	37.9%	48%	45.4%	54%	41.4%	48%	48.1%	53%	44.8%	53%
<b>APS</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>28</b>		<b>28.4</b>		<b>28.4</b>	
Boys	27	27.9	26.9	28.1	26.7	27.5	27.4	27	27.6		27.9		28.1	
Girls	28.4	29.3	28.1	29.3	27.9	28.9	28.6	28.4	28.5		28.9		28.8	

Source: DataNet (Leicester), DfE (National)

## Children's attitude to reading

Given the lag of other information and the timing of the annual pupil survey at the beginning of the academic year, historically survey data has always been presented 'a year in advance' ie this survey data is from the 2016/17 survey, not 2015/16.

## Primary phase

Over 11,000 primary age pupils undertook the survey this year, the second largest uptake since the survey began, which equates to 40% of all eligible pupils in Leicester's primary schools.

Assuming the survey continues in its current form, this proportion could rise as the larger cohorts of younger children move through the year groups.

The enjoyment of reading results are very marginally down compared to last year, but in the longer term have been broadly stable for the last six surveys. Self reported reading ability has declined slightly compared to last year and the combined 'good' and 'very good' is at the lowest levels since 2012.

Reading at home with someone daily has fallen slightly to levels matching those of the 2014 survey. Choosing to read books at home daily has stayed consistently just under 41% for the last four years.

## Survey Results

### Do you like reading?

Yes, definitely	Yes, I think so	I'm not sure	No
65%	22%	7%	6%
↔	↔	↔	↔

### How good are you at reading?

Very good	Good	OK	Not very good
47%	34%	16%	3%
↓ -1%	↑ 1%	↑ 1%	↔

**How often do you read with someone at home?**

Almost every day	Every 2 or 3 days	About once a week	Usually more than a week between times
41%	27%	19%	13%
↓ -1%	↓ -1%	↔	↑ 1%

**When you are at home do you choose to read books...**

Almost every day	Every 2 or 3 days	About once a week	About once a month	Hardly ever or never
41%	27%	16%	6%	10%
↔	↓ -1%	↔	↔	↑ 1%

**When you are not at school how often do you go to the local library (not school library)?**

More than once a week	About once a week	About once a month	Hardly ever or never
14%	23%	20%	44%
↓ -1%	↓ -1%	↔	↑ 3%

**Do you like the books you can choose at school?**

Yes, definitely	Yes, I think so	I'm not sure	No
66%	21%	8%	5%
↔	↔	↔	↔

**How do you feel when someone asks you to read out loud?**

Happy	OK	A bit scared	Very scared
42%	33%	18%	7%
↔	↑ 1%	↔	↔

**Do you know how to become a better reader?**

Yes, definitely	Yes, I think so	I'm not sure	No
49%	31%	14%	7%
↓ -1%	↑ 1%	↑ 1%	↔

**Do you like hearing an adult read a story out loud?**

Yes, lots	Yes, it's OK	I'm not really sure	No
61%	25%	7%	8%
↑ 2%	↓ -1%	↔	↔

**Which of the following do you enjoy reading the most? (Please choose your favourite 3)**

Story books	Information books	Magazines	Websites	E-mails	Newspapers	Comics/Picture books	Instructions/Manuals	Poetry	Books in other languages	e-Books
71%	25%	37%	18%	7%	12%	43%	6%	27%	11%	10%
↑ 2%	↔	↓ -3%	↔	↓ -1%	↔	↑ 1%	↔	↑ 2%	↔	↔

**Do you think reading is for people who....? (tick all that you think are appropriate)**

Are geeky/nerds	Want to do well	Are boring	Are happy	Are shy	Are trendy/cool	Don't have many friends
14%	61%	14%	54%	20%	17%	20%
↔	↔	↑ 1%	↑ 1%	↑ 1%	↓ -1%	↑ 1%

NB Answers may not add to 100% due to rounding or multiple responses

## Children's attitude to reading

### Secondary phase

Just under 3,000 secondary school students took the survey, slightly down on last year but still one of the biggest cohorts since the survey began. This equates to 19% of the entire maintained secondary school population (not including sixth form). As secondary WiT activities are only aimed at pupils in Years 7 and 8, these year groups make up the majority of the survey cohort.

The proportion of Year 7s rose this year to 43% of the citywide cohort, whilst 27% of all Year 8s and nearly one in five Year 9s took the survey.

The enjoyment of reading responses are almost identical to last year and have been fairly consistent throughout the survey. Likewise self reported confidence is at a similar level to last year, with the one small change being a move from 'OK' to 'not very good'.

Regular home reading for pleasure has risen for the third year in a row, although there has been a drop in the equivalent for help with school work. Library attendance is down one again, now just shy of half say they 'hardly ever or never' go. More students want to become better readers and more believe they know how to do so.

### Survey Results

#### Do you like reading?

Yes, definitely	Yes, I think so	I'm not sure	No
41%	36%	13%	11%
↔	↔	↔	↔

#### How good are you at reading?

Very good	Good	OK	Not very good
33%	45%	18%	4%
↓ -1%	↔	↔	↑ 1%

#### How often do you read at home for pleasure?

Almost every day	Every 2 or 3 days	About once a week	Hardly ever or never
29%	26%	24%	21%
↑ 1%	↓ -1%	↓ -1%	↔

#### When you are at home how often do you choose to read books to help with school work?

Almost every day	Every 2 or 3 days	About once a week	About once a month	Hardly ever or never
11%	25%	26%	13%	24%
↓ -1%	↔	↔	↓ -1%	↑ 1%

#### When you are not at school how often do you go to the local library (not school library)?

More than once a week	About once a week	About once a month	Hardly ever or never
8%	20%	23%	50%
↓ -1%	↓ -2%	↓ -1%	↑ 6%

**Do you like the books you can choose at school?**

Yes, definitely	Yes, I think so	I'm not sure	No
38%	35%	19%	9%
↑ 3%	↓ -2%	↑ 1%	↓ -1%

**Do you find the books or worksheets at school easy to understand?**

Yes, definitely	Yes, I think so	I'm not sure	No
27%	61%	10%	2%
↑ 1%	↓ -1%	↔	↔

**How do you feel when someone asks you to read out loud?**

Happy	OK	A bit scared	Very scared
33%	41%	20%	7%
↑ 3%	↓ -1%	↓ -1%	↔

**Would you like to become a better reader?**

Yes, definitely	Yes, I think so	I'm not sure	No
59%	25%	10%	6%
↑ 2%	↓ -1%	↓ -1%	↓ -1%

**Do you know how to become a better reader?**

Yes, definitely	Yes, I think so	I'm not sure	No
35%	43%	16%	6%
↑ 2%	↔	↔	↓ -1%

**Do you like hearing an adult read a story out loud?**

Yes, lots	Yes, it's OK	I'm not really sure	No
32%	42%	13%	13%
↑ 1%	↓ -1%	↔	↔

**Which of the following do you enjoy reading the most? (Please choose your favourite 3)**

Story books	Information books	Magazines	Websites	E-mails	Newspapers	Comics/ Picture books	Instructions /Manuals	Poetry	Books in other languages	e-Books
66%	20%	38%	27%	14%	14%	50%	7%	18%	9%	14%
↑ 3%	↑ 1%	↓ -2%	↓ -3%	↓ -1%	↓ -2%	↑ 2%	↔	↑ 1%	↑ 1%	↑ 1%

**Do you think reading is for people who....? (tick all that you think are appropriate)**

Are geeky/nerds	Want to do well	Are boring	Are happy	Are shy	Are trendy/cool	Don't have many friends
24%	79%	20%	46%	26%	16%	23%
↔	↑ 2%	↑ 1%	↑ 6%	↑ 1%	↔	↑ 1%

*NB Answers may not add to 100% due to rounding or multiple answers*

## **Children's attitude to reading**

### **Transition comparisons**

When the secondary survey was started in 2012, it allowed the comparison of pupils' attitudes towards reading pre and post the transition between the phases. These data have been compared for the last six years.

The comparison is between the responses from Year 6 children in last year's survey and those from Year 7 pupils in this year's survey.

The fall in liking reading post-transition has returned to a double figure percentage point drop, although it has not risen to the high points of two or three years ago.

There is a much lower drop in those thinking they are 'very good at reading' than has been the case in recent years, although that was more to do with a low number of Y6s selecting this option compared with previous years.

There has been almost no difference in the responses to given to the reading out loud question, this is the first time any question has almost identically matched pre and post transition. The confidence in knowing how to become a better reader has fallen in a way that matches last year's responses.

A complete survey evaluation is available from [daniel.routledge@sdsa.net](mailto:daniel.routledge@sdsa.net).

## School-based projects

---

### Context

Most of the WiT funding is passed directly into schools through grants for reading based projects. The amount of the total school-based spend varies from year to year, but generally in the region of 80% of all WiT monies are spent by schools on their reading project.

These WiT projects also provide the most direct measure of impact on children of WiT funding. Whilst end of Key Stage results give us a city-wide feel for reading abilities of Y2 and Y6 pupils, these data pick up children in all age groups across both primary and secondary sectors.

The other matter of note when it comes to understanding school-based project pupil level data, is that the majority of intervention work undertaken is with the most vulnerable and reluctant readers in the city. More often than not, these pupils are starting from a low base.

### Funding

Schools are able to bid for a Core Grant, the key reading work that is above what they are already doing within their own general reading policy and an Additional Grant to enhance this work should funds remain after Core Grants have been awarded.

In the primary phase, funding was awarded to 68 schools for 110 projects for a total of £804,003 (average £11,823 per school):

- Core Grant – 68 schools received funding for a total of £724,869 (average £10,660 per project)
- Additional Grant – 42 schools received funding for a total of £79,134 (average £1,884 per project)

In the secondary phase, funding was awarded to 17 schools for 23 projects for a total of £184,428 (average £10,848 per school):

- Core Grant – 17 schools received funding for a total of £163,517 (average £9,619 per project)
- Additional Grant – 6 schools received funding for a total of £20,911 (average £3,485 per project)

### Evaluations

Schools are required to supply an evaluation of each project, outlining the impact and outcomes for children.

Schools will not receive funding for the next academic year until the previous year's evaluation has been submitted.

## Types of project

In order to get some idea as to what sort of projects were being funded, they were rated by type, based on the information supplied. The six types of project were:

- Resources – Books and resources
- Intervention – Work with specific pupils
- Technology – IT and software (likely to be for direct intervention)
- Parental – Work with parents, carers and the community
- Inspirational – Author visits, library trips, theatre trips, reading clubs
- Training – For interventions that have yet to take place or general strategies
- Staffing – usually for running a previously existing intervention project


This methodology of rating types of projects has become increasing less effective in recent years as schools have become more sophisticated in their bidding. More often than not, school projects will encompass most, and in some cases all, of the above.

There is also the obvious cross-over between the types, for example intervention may include some training at the start, technology is likely to be for direct intervention, as are resources and training, parental work is often aimed at pupils on other interventions etc.

With the above caveats, all projects were given one or two project types, based largely on the share of the funded money spent on it.

The category of 'staffing' has been added this year given it's significant rise in the last few funding cycles. In many ways this has replaced the 'intervention' category as where schools have previously purchased some form of intervention package, increasingly now they are using the money to fund the delivery of an intervention that they may already have working within their school.

The level of resources funded continues to be high and, in the main, is due to the continued roll out of the Knowledge Transfer Centre, with schools using their WiT bids to resource this work, and also as schools replenish stocks for previously effective interventions.



### **Project impact data – Primary**

Data were supplied to support the primary projects on 836 children, roughly 3.1% of the primary school population. This is lower than last year and indeed the lowest since the first year of a full evaluation in 2011.

Some of these data were in a format that historically has not been aggregated for this report, for example phonetical knowledge and some in measures that are not comparably with other information supplied. There were also school or year group level aggregate data supplied which has not been included.

The movement from national curriculum levels in this academic year has made it more challenging to compile citywide project data for this report.

Not all the data supplied were for all the children so a complete average of progress is not possible. However, averages can be calculated by the main measures used by schools:

- Book Level – 203 children made an average of 5.5 book levels progress
- Reading Age – 404 children made an average of 13 months progress

The levels of progress are broadly in line with previous years WiT school-based project data.

There are less data on pupils in the middle years of primary than there has been in previous years, although this is more likely to do with the assessment changes than children not being targeted in these groups.

Some projects provided length of intervention information so progress could be measured in terms of time. In the majority of cases anecdotally it was reported that progress was on the whole accelerated and where data were submitted, this would appear to be a reasonable assumption. For those projects where timescales were reported:

- Book level – 95 pupils made an average 0.3 levels progress per week (1 level per 3 weeks)
- Reading Age – 138 pupils made an average 1 month progress per week

### **Project impact data – Secondary**

Data were supplied to support the secondary projects on 623 students, this included 75 pupils who by virtue of not being Year 7 or 8 were technically beyond the scope of the WiT project. It has not been unusual for schools to target some Year 9 pupils who had previously been engaged in WiT project, but who required further support beyond Year 8.

The 516 known Year 7 and 8 pupils equated to approximately 8% of the citywide cohort. As with primary, some further data on pupil progress was presented with projects and not counted here as it was not in a format to fit.

Not all the data supplied were for all the children so a complete average of progress is not possible. However, averages can be calculated by each measure:

- Reading Age – 593 children made an average of 12 months progress
- Spelling Age – 96 children made an average of 12 months progress

The gains in reading and spelling age were broadly speaking in line with previous years.

Some projects provided length of intervention information so progress could be measured in terms of time. In the majority of cases anecdotally it was reported that progress was on the whole accelerated and where data was submitted, this would appear to be a reasonable assumption. For those projects where timescales were reported:

- Reading Age – 504 pupils made an average 1 month progress per week
- Spelling Age – 96 pupils made an average 1 month progress per week

### **School-Based Project Summary**

This year has been a challenge when it comes to aggregating the information from school-based projects given the changes to assessment within the primary sector.

Whilst there appears to be evidence of impact, it is hard to fully measure that on a city-wide basis and this will likely continue to be the case going forward. Schools do, however, continue to report learning from their projects and building on work done in previous years.

Schools appear to be overtly spending more of the funding on staffing than at any point in previous years, with many using funding to continue intervention work they have found to be successful in their previous projects.

There also appears to be a continuation of the significant amount of resources being purchased by schools with their project money, again this is in part due to the roll-out of KTC, but also in replenishing stocks for previous intervention work.

There are also reported gains in areas that are less quantifiable, such as self-confidence – both of pupils and staff – behaviour and also improvements in other curricula areas, notably in writing.

## Central WiT events

---

### Context

Running alongside the school-based projects are a range of centrally organised events under the WiT banner.

The central events attempt to cover the areas of the overall WiT strategy which cannot be achieved through the school-based projects, either because schools are not best placed to do this work, because by their very nature they are collaborative or because the costs of running such events on an individual basis would be prohibitive.

---

### WiT CPD Programme

The ongoing WiT CPD programme seeks to increase the capability of the school workforce in the leadership and teaching of reading within schools in the city.

Over the course of the year over 200 members of staff from more than 50 city schools attended the range of courses, which had been requested by school staff via feedback from the Reading Champions events and school bidding process.

Evaluation forms showed that 96% of attendees thought the courses fully or mostly matched their expectations and the overall assessment was scored at 3.8 out of 4 and the relevance of the course at 3.7 out of 4.

This feedback is in line with previous year's evaluations of the CPD programme.

---

### Reading Champions

The Reading Champion events provide networking opportunities for the school staff who are the leads of WiT work, as well as an opportunity to share best practice across the school community and tackle issues that are significant to all and provide general CPD through keynote speakers.

These events continue to be well attended by schools, with between 60 and 90 staff from across the city in both phases attending each event. Feedback suggests they are well pitched and there is also evidence from the school projects that Reading Champions are using this shared learning within their own environment.

The Reading Champions also shape and develop future centrally organised activities, including the CPD programme.

## **Ready and Reading, Supported Summer Read**

Ready and Reading and Supported Summer Read combine Fresh Start intervention programme with an inspirational event and a '6 books for the summer' approach for children in Year 6 whose reading ability suggests they may be vulnerable during the transition into secondary school.

The scheme was originally designed to target pupils who historically would have been reading at a level 2b – 3c and whilst these levels no longer exist, schools were invited to nominate a similar cohort.

Schools were provided with the all the resources necessary and, where required, training in Fresh Start and/or Academic Coaching. Schools were given a grant for staff time, based on the number of pupils, of up to £2,500, assuming they met all the requirements set out in the agreement.

Supported Summer Read is a one-off event held at the end of academic year, which brings together many of the pupils on the Ready and Reading programme (as well as others nominated by schools) with buddies from their prospective secondary schools. As well as having a reading focus, the event is designed to assist potentially vulnerable pupils in transition into the secondary phase.

The cost of the 15-week intervention was approximately £240 per pupil and the cost of the inspirational event and books for the pupils to read over the summer was about £74 per pupil.

Reading gains for those undertaking Ready and Reading were in line with what you would expect for such intervention work, whilst over the longer term of Ready and Reading and Supported Summer Read, pupils who were involved in the whole programme made average gains of approximately seven months set against a target of avoiding the 'summer dip'.

A complete Ready and Reading/Supported Summer Read evaluation is available from [daniel.routledge@sdsa.net](mailto:daniel.routledge@sdsa.net)

---

## **Author Week**

Author Week is the regular city-wide inspirational event led by authors and illustrators over the course of a week at Leicester Tigers' Welford Road Stadium. Just under 5,000 pupils from across the city were involved, roughly one in seven 4-12 year olds in Leicester's schools.

Feedback questionnaire responses were received from 42 schools post event and they were overwhelmingly positive. Responses for the Authors showed three-quarters of schools felt they were 'excellent' and a further 17% said 'good'.

Nearly two-thirds of schools said the impact of attending Author Week was 'significant' for their children, with a further 18% saying it was 'very significant'. More than half thought the writing session had a 'significant' or 'very significant' impact.

## **Knowledge Transfer Centre**

As with last year, the cost of the further roll out of the KTC programme has been split between the Leicester Education Strategic Partnership and WiT following a successful pilot in year one.

Data around overall outcomes in the younger years of primary school can be found earlier in this report, but schools who have engaged in the KTC programme continue to outperform those locally who have not yet.

As an example, schools who have engaged in the KTC programme had a 6.5 percentage point increase in pupils meeting standard in the Year 1 Phonics screening test between 2015 and 2016, the citywide average was 5.1 percentage points and the national average was 4 percentage points. Gains at the eight schools who were in the first two waves of the programme have averaged at just under 20 percentage points for the last four years, during which time the citywide improvement has been 10 percentage points and the national 12 percentage points.

The schools who have 'universal' status, also show some of the largest improvements in this measure in the last twelve months.

The KTC over the academic year encompassed an extensive CPD programme which was well attended and well received by the schools who had joined in the third wave as well as school to school support from those 'core' schools who had been engaged in previous years.

---

## **Writing Competition**

The annual WiT writing competition was open to children aged 5-16 within city schools to write a 500-word story based on the theme of Roald Dahl.

Entries from 11 different schools were received, with a shortlist drawn up and sent to schools for judging. Ten stories were chosen by the schools as winners and were published in the WiT 'Scrumdiddlyumptious Stories' book to be circulated to all schools in the city.

---

## **Reading Rampage**

On a similar line to 'Our Best Book' (see work with libraries), Reading Rampage saw secondary age pupils pick their favourite book from a pre-selected shortlist, with the winner announced at a celebration event at Stamford Court in the summer term attended by students from most of the secondary schools.

The scheme appears to be popular with secondary schools, with good take up across the city and now has become part of the calendar on par with 'Our Best Book' in the primary sector.

Feedback from 17 teaching staff involved showed they felt approximately 3,000 pupils had been targeted to be part of Reading Rampage and that there was a notable impact on around 1,500 students. The overall success of the project was rated as 'Good' by 70% of respondents and

‘Excellent’ by the remainder. The training and resources received were also all rated either ‘Good’ or ‘Excellent’.


### Everybody’s Reading Festival

The seventh annual Everybody’s Reading Festival took place over nine days in October with the usual aim of promoting reading across the city and, in particular, engaging communities and groups who do not normally access reading.

Once again local community groups, individuals and schools were funded to host events within their own area and these ran alongside stand-alone high profile events, which whilst not funded by ER, still sat within the programme.


Around 100 events took place across over 50 venues engaging directly with 5,500 people, making it the largest festival so far.

Feedback forms in the shape of post-it notes were again used to gauge feedback from attendees, find out where they have come from and if they usually attend reading festivals.



*Distribution of ER2016 events*

Over 450 responses were received from 40 events across the festival programme and almost everyone said they would like to go to an event like the one they had just attended again. Just under two-thirds had not gone to a festival event last year, whilst 58% said they do not generally go to reading events. These numbers are broadly consistent with previous years’ responses.



*ER2016 attendees by post code sector; darker colour denotes more attendees; black line denotes approximate city boundary.*

Respondents were also asked for the first four digits of their post code in order to establish where in the city they had come from and 460 provided this information. In total 88% of the post codes provided came from people who live within the urban area of Leicester, with 82% living within the city boundary.

For the first time since four digit post codes have been collected, the largest response was not from an LE2 district. The highest level of responses (8.3%) came from LE5, an area of Evington between Wakerley Road and East Park Road. The next highest response was from LE2 1 (Clarendon Park into North Highfields), which previously has always had one of the top

responses from festival goers, followed by LE3 0 (Westcotes).

LE3 6 (Dane Hills around Glenfield Road out to the city boundary), LE2 9 (the south edge of the city and Glen Parva), LE2 3 (Knighton and Stoneygate) and LE5 4 (the area around Broad Avenue and the General Hospital) all had similar levels of engagement.

Only one city post code sector (the area north of and including the Highcross Shopping Centre) was not represented. The north of the city, LE4, was the least represented area.

Connection with the festival continues to grow through its social media outlets and once again it was well supported via traditional media.

A complete ER2016 evaluation is available from [daniel.routledge@sdsa.net](mailto:daniel.routledge@sdsa.net)

---

### **Storytelling Week**

Now in its fifth year, Storytelling Week is a well-established strand of WiT, targeting children of pre-school age through the city's network of children's centres.

Events are held across the city for one week, with other lead-up and follow-up work taking place led by children centre staff, in each of the eight neighbourhood areas across one week, with further work done by children centre staff in the lead up.

Feedback from more than 70 adults were very positive, with 92% saying their child had enjoyed the event and all but one saying they had enjoyed the event.

Around three-quarters felt the events had given them a better understanding of how sharing stories, songs and rhymes helps their child's development and 90% felt they were more confident to do so.

The average score for overall satisfaction with the sessions was 9.4 out of 10, with over 60% rating it 10 out of 10.

---

### **Work with Leicester Libraries**

Our Best Book is funded through the school-based projects and is aimed at Year 5/6 pupils and funded through the school-based projects. Over 30 schools and 2,100 children were involved in picking a winner from a short list of books, with library staff hosting motivational events at each school. Feedback from the pupils involved showed that three-quarters 'loved' or 'enjoyed' it, a slight rise from the previous year.

The annual summer reading challenge, on the theme of Big Friendly Read, engaged with 6,800 children, just shy of the 7,000 target to get them to read six books across the summer holidays. Over 4,000 completed the challenge and the libraries reported rises in junior members borrowing books and new children signing up for membership. Over 100 events to support the challenge were held

across the city in both libraries and other venues, including Town Hall, Curve and neighbourhood settings.

Booktime packs were once again gifted to four year olds, with over 4,700 children receiving a pack. 740 children signed up to their local library, significantly more than last year and over 3,000 children and adults attended promotional story events.

The 'Every Child a Library Member' scheme targeted Year 4 pupils in the summer term, signing up 817 pupils to the library from 29 schools and offering the chance of winning a prize for visiting the local library, whilst also offering a list of the best reads for children aged 7 to 9.

Full evaluations of WiT funded library work are available from [paul.gobey@leicester.gov.uk](mailto:paul.gobey@leicester.gov.uk)

## Conclusions

---

### Attitude to Reading

The primary pupil reading survey shows the enjoyment of reading remains very stable, with very little movement in the last five years in either direction. The decline in self-reported ability continued this year, albeit only a small drop. Set against the recent changes in primary curriculum this might be worth continuing to monitor to see what happens as things bed down.

Levels of home regular home reading have almost matched last year's and viewed over the longer term appear relatively stable since the significant gains in the early years of WiT activities. There is a similar story told in the secondary survey and it is worth noting that daily reading at home for pleasure has risen for the third year in a row.

When viewed in the long term, the survey results appear to be holding relatively firm.

### Attainment

It is very hard to make any real assessment on attainment outcomes given the changes at both Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2, which mean historical comparisons are no longer possible.

Evidence from the younger cohorts would appear to show that the KTC programme is having an impact on the initial years within schools, albeit it Leicester still lags behind national in these measures and it is still too soon to see a longer term impact on the end of Key Stage results.

Whilst historical data are no longer comparable, what is true is Leicester did not fare well in the end of Key Stage assessments compared to the national average and still ranks relatively lowly when compared to other authorities.

There does, however, appear to be something anomalous happening when comparing the gap to national in the reading tests to the gap to national in the teaching assessments. Leicester appears to be much closer to the national average in teaching assessment than it is in the tests, a swing that is not visible in other subjects and therefore warrants further investigation and/or monitoring in future years to understand why there is this variation.

### School-based projects

As has been the case in reading attainment, the changes in tests have meant a reduction in the available comparable data from school-based projects.

Where data have been provided in a manner that is able to be aggregated for this report, it is, generally speaking, in line with the sort of gains we have seen in previous years and those gains have been made in similar timescales.

Further non-comparable or aggregate data that has not been able to be included in this report, but which have been provided by schools, suggests that, in the main, they continue to see desired outcomes from the work their WiT school-based project monies was intended to deliver.

It is likely that the challenge of demonstrating city-wide evidence of a return on investment in this area will continue in the short term and further consideration may wish to be given as to the balance between the feasible and the acceptable in this regard.

Whilst data are clearly important, it is still worth reiterating that other less quantifiable gains continue to be reported both in the pupils (self-confidence, behaviour, gains in other areas of the curriculum) and the staff (skills, confidence, expertise).

There continues to be evidence of schools being much smarter in terms of their analysis and understanding of the issues within their school and their use of projects to tackle these than ever was the case even three or four years ago.

### **Central WiT events**

As ever, it is far harder, if not impossible, to draw the line between the work that is done centrally under the WiT banner and those outcomes for the children and young people within Leicester's schools.

What is clear is that these central events are almost universally well-received and feedback suggests that teaching staff believe the events that directly target children have a good impact upon them.

It does appear that there is evolution of the central events, with some modified to take into account previous learning. As ever, the challenge for decision-makers is the balance of cost effectiveness versus impact, particularly as it pertains to the most vulnerable groups.

Clearly the CPD programme whilst amongst the hardest to link to outcomes, would feel to be an important strand, as improving the expertise of the adults who work with children can surely only improve outcomes. As an example, the KTC programme, which is heavy on CPD for those schools involved, does appear to be improving outcomes as it is rolled out. Schools who have engaged outperform both locally and nationally in terms of improvements in Year 1 Phonics. This investment in adult skills does, on the face of it, appear to be driving up outcomes.

The Reading Champions events in recent years have also had a more CPD-themed approach than perhaps they did in the early years of WiT and, as ever, the engagement from schools in these events is arguably the best measure of their perceived importance and relevance to them.

There remains a tension between cost effectiveness and outcomes around Ready and Reading/Supported Summer Read, one which will likely always be hard to resolve, but it is clear that targeting what is a vulnerable group at what is possibly the time of most significant change in their educational career should remain a focus of WiT activities.

Author Week, one of the most high profile of WiT central activities, continues to receive positive feedback in regards to its inspirational impact and, given the wide reach, feels to have a significant value, albeit one that is hard to quantify in any way beyond the anecdotal reports from teaching staff.

The Everybody's Reading Festival again continues to be successful, based on the feedback, in its ambition to target areas of the city and groups who would otherwise not engage in reading. Whilst this is not directly targeted at the children within city schools, engaging adults in reading-themed events does offer the opportunity to potentially increase the profile within hard to reach groups.

Likewise, whilst Storytelling Week's impact on school aged reading is hard to prove, it seems a logical extension of the WiT activities with parents and careers of young children before they reach school age. At a time when baseline data suggests children are not entering the school system at levels they once did, this feels consistent with the WiT ambitions.

Work with the library service also seems like it should feed into the overall WiT goals, although survey data is concerning around the use of libraries for school aged children and this will remain a challenge in the current climate of pressure on the service to be able to offer opportunities within local areas.

### **Overall**

As an insight into the long term effectiveness of WiT compared to previous years, this report has been constrained by the changes to end of Key Stage statutory assessments in the primary phase. These changes have impacted not only the ability to judge city-wide progress over time, but also on the ability to provide aggregatable pupil-level data as evidence for the effectiveness of the investment in school-based projects.

That being said, what data exists from school-based projects is consistent with previous years, so it is reasonable to assume that the outcomes of such projects are at least in line with those historically.

Whilst Leicester appears to have some distance to travel in terms of outcomes at the end of the primary Key Stages, it is not clear as to whether this year's outcomes are continuing the gains which had seen Leicester make some of the largest improvements in the country over the previous five years or not.

Also the anomaly between teacher assessment and end of Key Stage 2 assessment tests requires further investigation to unpick why there is such a divergence compared to national outcomes. As such, it is likely that 2016 outcomes will merely become a baseline against which future performance can be compared when it comes to the assessment of WiT impacts.

There continues to be evidence that centrally coordinated collaborative work is fulfilling the aims desired of them and that enjoyment of reading within the city remains relatively stable despite the changing environment, both of which would appear to be positive when taken in the round.

But how these, and the work delivered by schools directly to vulnerable groups is impacting on overall reading ability, is perhaps less clear than it has been in years gone by as a result of the changes in assessment.