

Response to 'Schools that Work for Everyone' Consultation Document

December 2016

EDUCATION
POLICY
INSTITUTE

A graphic element consisting of a white semi-circle on the left side of a dark blue circle, partially overlapping the text box.

Official Submission

About the Education Policy Institute

The Education Policy Institute is an independent, impartial and evidence-based research institute that aims to promote high quality education outcomes, regardless of social background.

Education can have a transformational effect on the lives of young people. Through our research, we provide insights, commentary and critiques about education policy in England - shedding light on what is working and where further progress needs to be made. Our research and analysis spans a young person's journey from the early years through to higher education and entry to the labour market. Because good mental health is vital to learning, we also have a dedicated mental health team which will consider the challenges, interventions and opportunities for supporting young people's wellbeing.

Our core research areas include:

- Accountability and Inspection
- Benchmarking English Education
- Curriculum and Qualifications
- Disadvantaged, SEND, and Vulnerable Children
- Early Years Development
- School Funding
- School Performance and Leadership
- Teacher Supply and Quality
- Children and Young People's Mental Health
- Education for Offenders

Our experienced and dedicated team works closely with academics, think tanks, and other research foundations and charities to shape the policy agenda.

ISBN: 978-1-909274-40-2

Published December 2016 Education Policy Institute.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. For more information, visit creativecommons.org

Just About Managing

How can we better understand the impact of policy on a wider cohort of pupils whose life chances are profoundly affected by school but who may not qualify for free school meals?

The Consultation Document states that “schools should take greater account of those children of people on modest incomes, who do not qualify for [the Pupil Premium] but who are nevertheless just about managing”.

In responding to this question, we first consider the characteristics of families who might reasonably be defined as ‘just about managing’. We then review the evidence about the relationship between these families and educational outcomes, before finally considering which policy interventions may support this group.

Characteristics of those who are ‘just about managing’

In September 2016, the Resolution Foundation published new analysis which sought to define families who are ‘just about managing’.¹ The Resolution Foundation describes this group as ‘Low to Middle Income’ or LMIs and defines such households as those in the bottom half of the income distribution who are above the bottom ten per cent and who receive less than one-fifth of their income from means-tested benefits. This group covers almost 6 million working age households and over ten million adults.

Half of all children live in low to middle income households.

Low to middle income households have a net income of £12,000 to £34,000 and are half as likely to be graduates compared to those from higher income households (one-fifth of LMIs hold a degree compared to two-fifths of individuals from higher income households). 42 per cent of LMI households have remained in this group for 15 years.

An assessment of effective predictors of low-attainment in school

Turning then to what we know about how children from LMIs or ‘just about managing’ families perform in school, the Department for Education published research in November 2015 which considered which factors are most closely associated with achievement at Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4.² One of the key questions the DfE-commissioned research sought to answer was ‘Can FSM histories be improved on as a proxy for social deprivation?’.

The research looked at the relationship between outcomes and factors that relate to a child’s socio-economic status, parents’ education and prior attainment. The table below sets out the extent to which each of these factors can be a predictor of attainment.³

Table 1: Predictors of attainment at Key Stage 2 and 4

¹ D.Finch, “Hanging On: The stresses and strains of Britain’s ‘just managing’ families”, September 2016.

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/factors-associated-with-achievement-key-stages-2-and-4>

³ The percentages in this table represent the proportion of attainment variation explained by *a standard set of base characteristics* plus the factor in each row.

	Key Stage 2 (per cent)	Key Stage 4 (per cent)
Free School Meals	13.7	20.7
Free School Meals at any point in the past 5-6 years (used for the Pupil Premium allocation)	14.9	23.3
Neighbourhood measure (IDACI)	12.9	20.8
Parental Occupation	18.9	25.6
Parental Education	17.7	25.8
Parental Income	16.1	20.6
Other Household Characteristics	16.5	24.4
Prior Attainment	27.6	51.7

The research found that, while factors relating parental income, education and occupation were stronger predictors of later attainment, there are significant difficulties in collecting this information at a national scale. Parental education and occupation information currently relies on self-declaration and could therefore be subject to bias. Similarly, the study found that parental income is typically mis-estimated by survey respondents and suffers from substantial non response bias. There is a risk that DfE spends money and takes up schools’ time collecting data on these, but these efforts could be futile without strong incentives for parents and schools to give accurate data.

The Small Business, Enterprise and Employment Act (2015) enables the Secretary of State to collect information on pupils, which could include income data directly from HMRC. However, it is unclear whether this information could then be used for the purposes of funding schools or for identifying individual pupils as ‘just about managing’. The Department has yet to confirm whether and to what extent this relatively new power will be used.

The research also found that prior attainment is the strongest predictor of future attainment but, for Key Stage 2, there is currently no reliable baseline from which to assess prior attainment. This research used the vocabulary test administered to 3 year olds who were part of the Millennium Cohort Study a meaning that we do not have similarly reliable data for all pupils. The research does not recommend using Key Stage 1 tests as they are teacher-assessed. It is unclear whether the Department intends to continue with plans to introduce a statutory reception baselines assessment or to continue with the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile over the medium to long term. As a result, an assessment using prior attainment data in primary school can serve as a proxy at school level, but is unlikely to be a reliable assessment at pupil-level.

For secondary school pupils, using Key Stage 2 attainment provides a more stable baseline for prior attainment. While this tells us about low attainers however, it is not in itself, a measure of socio-economic deprivation or ‘just about managing’.

The DfE research concludes that FSM history (currently used to allocate the Pupil Premium) remains the most practical indicator of low attainment and deprivation. The additional cost of collecting new parent-declared data or matching income data with HMRC data would be disproportionate given the relatively low marginal gain in the effectiveness of these measures as a predictor of future attainment. The advantage of a FSM measure is that the data underpinning it are used and checked by HMRC and DWP to administer the tax and benefit systems, so it is robust and reasonably complete nationally.

The introduction of a National Funding Formula would help to target resources in schools with challenging and vulnerable pupils. At present, local authorities can route additional funding to schools through FSM factors, prior attainment, IDACI (a neighbourhood level deprivation indicator), EAL and looked after children. This provides schools with an allocation of funding for deprived and low-attaining pupils, that sits outside of the Pupil Premium ring-fence and enables (but doesn't require) them to use that funding to provide additional support for these groups of children.

The problem is, as the Department has recognised, that the allocation to local authorities (through the Dedicated Schools Grant) is 'out of date, arbitrary and unfair'.⁴ However, the introduction of a National Funding Formula has been delayed by a further year, to 2018, and a response to the initial consultation (which was issued in February 2016) along with further details of the NFF have still not been put forward by government.

If the, laudable, purpose of this suite of reforms is to ensure that pupils have access to a good school, irrespective of their family circumstance, then the experience of system improvement in London provides some evidence of what works. Over the last ten years, Key Stage 4 attainment in London has improved by two-thirds of a grade, on average across 8 GCSE subjects and by almost a third of a National Curriculum Level by the end of primary over the same period. The improvement in disadvantaged secondary schools in London is even higher; the most disadvantaged secondary schools have improved by 0.9 of a GCSE grade across 8 subjects in the last decade.⁵

Research suggests that this is due to a range of interventions, including the London Challenge, literacy and numeracy strategies, the ability to attract high quality teachers and relatively higher levels of per-pupil funding, as well as some less well-understood improvements that took place in primary attainment during the 1990s and fed through to secondary schools during the 2000s. While the research points to a range of interventions which are likely to have led to London's improvement, the stratification of pupils is not cited.⁶

Conclusions

In order to identify disadvantaged children who are at greatest risk of falling behind, the research to date is clear that an EVER FSM measure remains the most effective and practical.

As identified by the Resolution Foundation, 50 per cent of children live in low to middle income households. Therefore, targeting pupils from LMIs or 'just about managing' would in effect mean targeting 50 per cent of the pupil population. It is not clear that 'targeted' policies can operate effectively on this scale, as the numbers of pupils involved will necessarily limit the intensiveness of any intervention that can be offered in the absence of significant new resources.

Moreover, a wider 'target' groups risks overlooking the needs of the hardest to reach. This risk is highlighted in our Annual Report, which found that, at Key Stage 4, the gap is actually widening

⁴ https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/schools-national-funding-formula/supporting_documents/Schools_NFF_consultation.pdf

⁵ N. Perera, M. Treadaway et al, "Education in England: Annual Report 2016", April 2016

⁶ See J. Blandon et al, 'Understanding the improved performance of disadvantaged pupils in London', September 2015

between pupils who are persistently disadvantaged (those who have been eligible for FSM for 80 per cent or longer of their school lives) and non-disadvantaged pupils. This demonstrates that having a wide and fairly heterogeneous 'target' group has, at a national level, resulted in the most deprived pupils falling further behind.

Even if there were stronger arguments to focus on a wider group of pupils from 'just about managing' families, efforts to widen access to grammar schools for these pupils would likely encounter similar barriers to those facing FSM pupils. That is, that the entry requirements for a grammar school place would still be out of reach for many of this group (although not to the same extent as for those on FSM).

The Department also needs to reform the school funding system with urgency if schools are going to be better equipped to support children with a wider range of needs. This needs to be through a new National Funding Formula, but also potentially through an overall increase to the schools budget. As EPI analysis has found, schools are set to face cost pressures of 11 per cent by 2019/20 as a result of wage growth, increased pension contributions and inflationary pressures.⁷

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

What contribution could the biggest and most successful independent schools make to the state system?

There is currently no comprehensive data on which independent schools are collaborating with or supporting state-funded schools. As a result, it is difficult to assess whether and to what extent these types of arrangements are having an impact on overall attainment or social mobility in the state sector or other aspects of school management (such as staffing and facilities).

Pupils at independent schools tend to benefit from greater access to employers and businesses. The DfE might consider what role independent schools could play in matching state school pupils with work experience places (giving them similar access) and providing support to Year 11 pupils in state schools (not just those on scholarships) to help with building networks, CV writing and interview techniques.

Governance in the state sector, and particularly in MATs, give rise to a plethora of different challenges from those generally faced by the independent sector. For example, MATs will need to manage resources across multiple schools and locations, tackle under-performance and low parental engagement, ensure the recruitment and retention of high quality teachers and address the needs of larger numbers of pupils with SEN and / or behavioural disorders. The proposal to ensure senior leaders of independent schools become directors of multi-academy trusts should therefore be considered with some caution and it cannot be assumed that leaders of independent schools are more or less equipped to understand or address those challenges, compared to school leaders in the state sector.

⁷ <http://epi.org.uk/analysis/education-white-paper-budget-2016-financial-implications-schools/>

UNIVERSITIES

How can the academic expertise of universities be brought to bear on our schools system, to improve school-level attainment and in doing so widen access?

In her first speech to support the idea that universities should sponsor schools, the Prime Minister cited the University of Cambridge Primary School, the University of Birmingham's new free school, the new King's College London Mathematics School, and the University of Brighton which is involved in sponsoring more than a dozen different primary and secondary schools."⁸

Whilst demonstrating the feasibility of universities being involved in the running of schools, these examples do not represent evidence that such linkages can generally be expected to lead to an improvement in standards. All of these schools opened recently and it is too early to draw conclusions about their long-term success. The King's College London Mathematical School opened in September 2014, while the University of Brighton Academy Trust, the University of Cambridge Primary School, and the University of Birmingham School were established in 2015.

As with any educational intervention, it takes time to build evidence to prove or disprove its' effectiveness. Not all specific examples will demonstrate success: the University of Chester Academy Trust ranked in the bottom 20 for performance at Key Stage 4 in a league table of 174 multi-academy trusts and local authorities produced by the EPI earlier this year.⁹ More generally, isolated positive examples would not constitute evidence that the model is, on average, effective.

Expanding the involvement of universities in school management may increase their role in providing careers advice. Although this is not the aim of this consultation, it is worth highlighting that there is some evidence¹⁰ that careers guidance and advice in schools (and in universities as well) has been weak in recent years, and advisors have been left with few resources with which to address students' needs properly.

Universities might be able to offer resources to improve careers advice, and better links with higher education to provide more insight to prospective students. However, neutral career counselors are in a good position to offer broader guidance to students, presenting and discussing all opportunities available to them after school. These should include the possibility of pursuing a technical education qualification or an apprenticeship. There is a risk that greater university involvement would jeopardise the provision of unbiased careers advice, particularly in schools with sixth forms offering an A-level route which, seeking a through-flow to higher study, universities may have a financial incentive to promote.

Are there other ways in which universities could be asked to contribute to raising school-level attainment?

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/britain-the-great-meritocracy-prime-ministers-speech>

⁹ <http://epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/school-performance-in-multi-academy-trusts.pdf>

¹⁰ <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03069885.2013.773962>;

<http://www.tandfonline.com/gate3.library.lse.ac.uk/doi/full/10.1080/03069885.2015.1017551?scroll=top&needAccess=true>

The Office for Fair Access has been publishing the outcomes of the outreach activities undertaken by schools under bipartite agreements,¹¹ and while progress may be slow, the process of learning lessons from these wide-ranging educational interventions needs to be sustained (in order to justify the continued investment).

Another way in which universities can contribute to raising attainment in schools is by further transferring the outcomes of research to primary and secondary education institutions. This could include collaboration with the Education Endowment Foundation to embed evidence based practice in good teaching; greater involvement in Initial Teacher Training to distil evidence-based approaches; and by providing pro bono teacher CPD in research literacy and data interpretation, or in subject knowledge for non-specialist teachers / subject refreshers for specialist teachers.

What is the best way to ensure that all universities sponsor schools as a condition of higher fees?

The government has recently increased the number of criteria universities will need to satisfy if they want to raise fees. Not only is it likely that they will have to score above certain threshold in the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), but it is also proposed that they will also have to sponsor schools or improve the way they engage with schools.

There is a high risk that the latter could result in a considerable burden to universities, in a context where doubts about universities' funding abound.

These concerns create a risk that:

1. Some universities will adhere to the requirement to sponsor or set up schools primarily as a means to raise fees and with inadequate consideration of their means of and commitment to delivering school improvement, leading to the involvement of some who are ill-prepared for the task; and
2. The consequent commitment to any management arrangements could wane as financial pressures begin to mount for universities.

Any system of including universities more widely in school management should therefore maintain safeguards against these risks to prevent future problems for schools.

Should we encourage universities to take specific factors into account when deciding how and where to support school attainment?

According to UCAS, there is a 36 points gap between those with low and high A-level grades when it comes to university access (56.9 per cent vs 93.1 per cent).¹² This suggests that universities should work to help improve school-level attainment, as it predicts progression into university very precisely. Similarly, students taking A-levels are more likely to be accepted to a university than those taking other

¹¹ <https://www.offa.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/2016.04-Outcomes-of-access-agreements-monitoring-1.pdf>

¹² <https://www.ucas.com/file/44376/download?token=IEffXt8> ;
https://www.ucas.com/file/44386/download?token=2_BRGxAL

qualifications – a gap that could be presented to students by a well-resourced careers guidance service and an enhanced university-school collaboration.

As acceptance rates vary widely between **ethnic groups**, universities should especially support students from ethnicities with low progression rates. As shown by DfE data¹³, white and mixed race students are substantially less likely to go to university than average (45 per cent and 51 per cent, respectively), while Asian and Black students are the group the most likely to do so (64 per cent and 61 per cent). However, Black students are the least likely to go to a top university, and according to UCAS data, their acceptance rate (proportion of successful applications) is the lowest. As these differences are most probably driven by different levels of attainment¹⁴, taking a multidimensional approach to university access, as suggested by OFFA¹⁵, would be sensible.

Another group that is less likely than average to go to university is that of **students with especial needs and disabilities** (SEND). While 59 per cent non-SEND students go to university after Key Stage 5, this is the case for only 49 per cent of students with special needs and 34 per cent of students with disabilities. They are in turn the least likely to go to a top university.

Social and family disadvantage is a good predictor of attainment and progress to higher education too. 44 per cent of students eligible for free school meals go to university, compared to 49 per cent of non-eligible students. The gap is even wider at top universities (Russell Group), where only 5 per cent of students eligible for FSM go compared to 12 per cent of non-eligible students.

¹³ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/469390/SFR40-2015_Destination_Measures_2013-14_Final_20151019.pdf

¹⁴ <http://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Financing-of-HE-Nick-Barr.pdf>

¹⁵ ¹⁵ <https://www.offa.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/strategic-access-agreement-guidance.pdf>;

GRAMMAR SCHOOLS

How should we best support existing grammars to expand?

EPI analysis published in September 2016 found that, at a national level, grammar schools have no discernible effect on attainment after controlling for pupil characteristics.¹⁶

Pupils attending a grammar school achieve, on average, one-third of a grade higher in each of eight GCSEs compared to similar pupils in non-selective areas (and once we control for pupil characteristics).

The positive effect for FSM pupils in grammar schools is slightly higher – at around half a grade in each of eight GCSEs. However, there are only around 500 FSM pupils per cohort in grammar schools (representing only 2.5 per cent of all grammar school pupils), out of 90,000 FSM pupils nationally in any given year (13.2 per cent of the total secondary cohort).

Furthermore, the positive grammar school attainment effects decline as the proportion of pupils attending grammar school rises, and in the most selective areas there is a small negative effect of not attending grammar schools. For pupils who live in the most selective areas but do not attend a grammar school, negative effects emerge at around the point where selective places are available for about 70 per cent of high attaining pupils.

In the most selective areas the small negative effect of not attending grammar schools is equivalent to an average of 0.6 grades lower per pupil across all GCSE subjects (or just below 0.1 grades per subject). Additionally, in areas with a high level of selection, pupils eligible for free school meals who do not attend grammar schools achieve 1.2 grades lower on average across all GCSE subjects (just below 0.2 grades lower per subject).

Compared to non-selective schools in the top 25 per cent (as measured by value-added progress), there is no benefit to attending a grammar school for high attaining pupils.¹⁷

Further research published by EPI in December 2016 finds that there are only 6 local authorities in which more than 10 per cent of that local authority could open a new grammar school without having a negative impact on pupils who do not attend grammar schools or on a nearby high-performing school and where there are enough pupils and clear parental demand.¹⁸

The 6 potentially qualifying areas are: Solihull, Essex, North Yorkshire, Dorset, Northamptonshire and North Somerset.

In conclusion:

Grammar schools have no overall effect on national attainment.

Poor children are significantly under-represented in grammar schools.

¹⁶ J.Andrews, J. Hutchinson and R.Johnes, “Grammar schools and social mobility”, September 2016

¹⁷ As measured by ‘Best 8’ GCSE grades.

¹⁸ J.Andrews and J. Hutchinson, “Grammar schools and social mobility: further analysis of policy options”, December 2016

Expanding grammar schools could lead to i) a diminished benefit for those who attend; ii) a penalty for those who do not attend (disproportionately felt by FSM pupils); and a drain of resources from high-performing local schools.¹⁹

In attempting to prevent these consequences, avoid children travelling very long distances, and meet clear and strong demand for parents, there are only 6 local authorities with areas in which grammars could be opened or expanded.

Overall, our analysis supports the conclusions reached by the OECD for school systems across the world – there is no evidence that an increase in selection would have any positive impact on social mobility at a national level.

The Department should look instead at the common features of the top 25 per cent of comprehensive schools (as measured by value-added progress). There are five times as many of these schools as there are grammar schools and they are far more socially representative.

Are these the right conditions to ensure that selective schools improve the quality of non-selective places?

As we find in our report, a quota to increase the proportion of disadvantaged pupils would, at best, only improve outcomes for a very small proportion of those pupils.²⁰

For example, if we were to set a quota at the level of high attaining poor pupils in the catchment area, this might raise the proportion of FSM pupils entering grammar schools from 2.4 per cent to 6.8 per cent and would mean an increase in FSM pupils accessing existing grammar schools from 500 pupils per year to 1500 pupils per year.

Such a quota would result in a very slightly reduced negative impact from grammar schools for all FSM pupils in areas with higher numbers of grammar places. The benefits of grammar schools would still be significantly in favour of non-FSM pupils. Because the FSM pupils who would benefit under this scenario make up such a small proportion of the 76,000 FSM pupils nationally, this would not translate to a national closing of the gap between disadvantaged children and the rest, and so could not be considered to improve social mobility in any meaningful way.²¹

If we were to set a quota which mirrored the national FSM rate of 13.3 per cent, or the local FSM rate in areas within reach of grammar schools (14.6 per cent), the overall GCE attainment position for FSM pupils living within reach of grammar schools would remain negative compared with similar pupils in non-selective parts of the country. This is because even under large quotas, the majority of disadvantaged children would still not secure places in grammar schools, and the biggest share of the benefits from attending grammars would still be secured by better-off families. It is also the case

¹⁹ R. Allen 2016, 'Inequalities in access to teachers in selective areas'

<http://educationdatalab.org.uk/2016/06/inequalities-in-access-to-teachers-in-selective-schooling-areas/>

²⁰ J.Andrews and J. Hutchinson, "Grammar schools and social mobility: further analysis of policy options", December 2016

²¹ The FSM cohort is 76,000 by the end of Key Stage 4 (compared to 90,000 by the end of Key Stage 2) due to more parents entering paid employment.

because FSM pupils suffer penalties that are twice as large as the average for not getting into a grammar school.

Under both scenarios, (quotas which reflect either the national or local FSM rates), grammar schools would need to admit FSM pupils who are markedly further down the distribution of attainment at Key Stage 2.

At the King Edward VI grammar schools in Birmingham, which are already operating quotas, pupils eligible for pupil premium are required to achieve a ‘qualifying’ score, lower than the standard pass mark, in order to be eligible for a place in the pupil premium quota.

This is not necessarily problematic but what needs to be considered is whether grammar schools would have a similar effect as they do now on attainment if they were educating a more academically and socially diverse intake. Evidence relating to this (in particular, Key Stage 4 results for an affected cohort), is not yet available, including from the King Edward VI grammar schools in Birmingham; changes allowing schools to prioritise pupils eligible for the pupil premium were only extended to all schools in the 2014 School Admissions Code (academies and free schools had previously been permitted to do this if specified in their funding agreement). It may therefore be that grammar schools are well-equipped to deal with this challenge or that they are ineffective at doing so, or that success on this measure varies between different schools.

Quotas constitute an attempt to ameliorate the impact of the attainment gap on the intake of grammar schools, rather than tackling the root of the problem. By age 11, the gap between the most disadvantaged pupils and the rest is already 9.6 months. A quota may increase the proportion of FSM pupils in grammar schools, but it will not close the attainment gap at age 11; on the other hand, closing the attainment gap at age 11 would render quotas redundant and at the same time serve the interests of FSM pupils with lower attainment. This suggests that, even if quotas are introduced as an interim measure, the ultimate goal should be to reduce and ultimately eliminate the attainment gap through interventions in the early years and at primary school.

The Consultation Document also proposes that pathways be established which allow for multiple entry points to a grammar school, including at ages 14 and 16, as well as at age 11. The main problem relating to this proposal in practice is that the attainment gap continues to widen after pupils leave primary school: by the age of 16, it is 19.2 months.²² If a pupil from a low income background misses out on a grammar school place at the age of 11 then the chances of them gaining entry at a later point are substantially lower.

FAITH SCHOOLS

Are these the right alternative requirements to replace the 50 per cent rule?

The government’s proposal to remove the 50 per cent cap on faith-based admissions for new faith free schools will promote the creation of more school places via the establishment of more faith free schools. This will help to tackle the urgent need for school places which is being driven by demographic

²² This figure is calculated from data contained in the National Pupil Database, 2015. See: N. Perera and M. Treadaway with P. Sellen, J. Hutchinson, R. Johnes and L. Mao, CentreForum (now EPI), April 2016, p.42.

pressures.²³ However, an expansion of faith schools raises a number of questions which need to be considered.

Firstly, recent analysis by the Education Policy Institute has shown that the average faith school is more socially selective than the average non-faith school.²⁴ As part of this work, a 'social selection score' was calculated for each school, comparing the proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM) in the school with the proportion of FSM pupils in the local area. This score is known as an odds-ratio: the odds of a pupil in the school being eligible for free school meals divided by the odds of a pupil living in the local area being so. A score of 1.0 means that these two proportions are aligned; a score below 1.0 means that FSM pupils are under-represented in the school; and a score greater than 1.0 means that FSM pupils are over-represented in the school.

At secondary level, faith schools had a median social selection score of 0.7, meaning that at the average faith secondary school, the odds of a child being eligible for free school meals are around two-thirds of those for all children living in the local area. In addition, although there are a number of secondary faith schools in which FSM pupils are over-represented, around 1 in 10 faith schools were at least as socially selective as the average grammar school (median score 0.2); this compares with around 1 in 30 non-faith, non-grammar schools.

Primary faith schools likewise had a median social selection score of 0.7. This means that an expansion of faith schools comes with a risk of increased social segregation between schools. The green paper proposes several measures designed to promote religious integration between faith schools. However, other forms of social segregation which are associated with faith schools must be considered and tackled if social integration is really to be achieved.

Secondly, the green paper states that faith schools tend to be of high quality and that attainment at these schools is better than that at non-faith schools. This does not account for the levels of social selection which take place at faith schools. The EPI's recent analysis of faith schools found that although attainment and progress are indeed higher on average in faith schools than non-faith schools, once pupil characteristics (including deprivation, ethnicity and prior attainment) are taken into account, much of this premium disappears: indeed, it is virtually eliminated at Key Stage 2 and at Key Stage 4 is reduced to the equivalent of around one-seventh of a grade in each of eight GCSE subjects, which is a relatively small gain. In other words, an expansion of faith school places does not necessarily guarantee provision that is of higher quality than non-faith school places. In order to develop more genuinely good school places, measures need to be considered that offer high quality which does not derive from the characteristics of pupils.

²³ Department for Education, 'National pupil projections – future trends in pupil numbers: July 2016', SFR 25/2016, July 2016, p.3.

²⁴ J. Andrews and R. Johnes, *Faith Schools, Pupil Performance and Social Selection*, Education Policy Institute, December 2016.