

**WARDS AFFECTED:
ALL WARDS**

FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS:

CABINET

21 MAY 2001

Review of Primary Education

Report of the Director of Education

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1. Report

The National and Local Context for Early Years Education

- 1.1 Early Years research in the late eighties and early nineties focused on the needs of four-year-olds and in particular how reception classes in many LEAs did not meet their educational needs. This research was taken into consideration when the former County Authority set up four plus provision in a range of its schools which now includes the 7 four plus schools in the City. The most significant factors associated with high standards were identified as:
- the qualifications of the staff(i.e. an early years teacher and a trained nursery nurse);
 - the adult to child ratio. (A ratio of 2:26 was recommended but the former authority worked with 2:30 which now meets the requirements of the Key Stage 1 class-size pledge.) and;
 - an appropriate early years curriculum.
- 1.2 These factors are incorporated in the City's four plus provision, and mirror the provision in nursery classes for three-year-olds.
- 1.3 Since 1997 there have been many major, Government led, national developments in Early Years education. These have built on research findings and on the Government policy of expanding educational provision for three

and four year olds through a range of providers, creating a diversity of provision to meet the differing needs of families and giving parents a genuine choice. LEA 4+ and nursery classes are now considered as one among a range of early years settings, rather than as necessarily the primary provider.

- 1.4 Government policy is clear that Early Years Development and Childcare Partnerships (EYDCPs) and LEAs must offer parents a genuine choice of provider. For example, for parents of working families, a setting that provides day-care along side nursery education may be the preferred choice. For others the priority may be low cost community based provision. The LEA and the EYDCP are required to work together to ensure that the quality of education available in all settings is of a high standard. Future work needs to develop closer links between schools and other settings.
- 1.5 The most recent development has been the introduction of the Foundation Stage Phase of Education. This identifies a separate phase of education from age three to the end of the reception year. Extensive curriculum guidance has been distributed to all settings which provide education for three and four year olds. This includes the Early Learning Goals which identifies a set of clear expectations of what children should achieve by the time they begin Year 1. These also include the relevant reception objectives from the Literacy and Numeracy Strategies. The Foundation Stage guidance also identifies a set of principles for early years education.
- 1.6 The new guidance has provided reception and nursery teachers with a clear focus in their work, and in most cases have reaffirmed their present practice. This is evidenced by the number of recent school Ofsted reports where the quality of teaching in the Foundation Stage is described good or very good and this phase as strength of the school.
- 1.7 Recent national developments in this field include the Early Years Development and Childcare Partnerships (EYDCP) and the Sure-Start programme. EYDCP'S regulate the provision of nursery education providers and with the LEA they provide support training and guidance for these settings. Ofsted inspects the settings, which include playgroups, day nurseries and Children and Family Centres. Leicester City has 101 settings offering funded nursery education to three and four year-olds. An advisory teacher and development workers support these. Standards are high, with the number of settings receiving a satisfactory or better inspection reaching 100% for the last two years. This range of provision ensures that there is sufficient provision in the City for all three years olds to have 5 sessions of funded nursery education if their parents wish it. This provision is across a range of different providers, enabling families to choose from a diversity of provision to suit their individual needs.
- 1.8 The Sure-Start programme is designed by the Government to deliver services to families with children under four years in the areas of greatest need. In Leicester there are three Sure-Start schemes. The EYDCP has been involved with the strategic development of each of the schemes. Locally, schools and other providers are working with Sure-Start managers to ensure that services

are targeted appropriately, and where new services are needed they are coordinated with existing ones.

Consultation Response from the National Union of Teachers and the Teachers Consultative Committee

- 1.9 Responses from the teacher associations to the consultation about admission to school at 4+ are supportive in principle to addressing the inequalities in the current distribution of nursery places, in particular the current level of surplus places. They acknowledge too the disadvantage experienced by summer born children in the present system. Particular concerns are focused on the possible reduction in the number of places at 3+, if full-time provision was made for pupils at 4+ at the expense of 3+ provision. Both responses argue for growth in expenditure on early years provision in schools together with a redirection of resources released by the removal of surplus nursery places. Both express the view that private and voluntary settings do not make equivalent provision to schools and set out proposals to give parents an entitlement to a place in schools at three and a half plus and four plus, with additional entitlements for pupils in areas of high social deprivation, or with additional needs.
- 1.10 The responses need to be considered in the context of government expectations that the EYDCP will promote a diversity of early years provision in the city to meet a spectrum of childcare needs and in the context of a professional debate about the types of settings which are most likely to promote the cognitive and social development of very young children. Section 1.11 below sets out some of the arguments which support teaching 4 year olds together as a group. Sections 1.12-5 set out arguments against full-time provision for three year olds and some of the advantages of playgroup settings over schools for very young children.

4+ Provision in schools

- 1.11 Concerns have been expressed that the needs of some of the present younger four-year-olds would be better served in nursery classes than in four plus classes. Although this may have been the case five years ago, the introduction of the Foundation Stage curriculum now provides a clear focus on the learning needs of all three four and five year olds. There is an emphasis on:
- The role of parents as partners in children's education;
 - The emphasis on the understanding of child development in children's learning;
 - The importance of well planned play as a key to learning;
 - Guidance from the DfEE on meeting the reception objectives in the Literacy and Numeracy for younger four year olds;
 - An emphasis on speaking and listening as the basis for all development in reading and writing.

Full-time provision for 3 year olds

- 1.12 In some areas of the City, some school nurseries offer full-time nursery provision for three-year-olds and there is concern that this provision will be lost. Currently, full-time provision exists where:
- Schools have experienced a fall in their intake of nursery children because of demographic changes and have increased provision to full-time.
 - Schools in some areas of particular deprivation were allocated full-time places in the late seventies and early eighties when it was felt appropriate to remove children out of their home environment for as long as possible.
- 1.13 In the light of research findings, new developments such as Sure Start are exploring alternative models which focus on developing parenting skills as part of a more holistic community based approach to addressing the issues of social deprivation as they impact on young children. The most recent research into Effective Early Education from the Institute of Education, London; a longitudinal project tracking 3000 children from age 3 to the end of Key Stage 1, has identified that there is no added advantage of full-time nursery education for three year-olds over part-time education.
- 1.14 Concerns have been expressed at the appropriateness of playgroups and day nurseries in delivering quality nursery education for young children. In these settings there is a much better adult child ratio of 1:5 or 1:8. There is evidence that younger three year olds make significantly better progress in these more advantageous ratios especially where children have no previous pre-school experience outside the home. There are also advantages where groups are local and early years staff speak the same home language as the child.
- 1.15 There are concerns too about the appropriateness of admitting children to a school nursery immediately after their third birthday when they may not be sufficiently mature to cope with a ratio of 2 adults to 30 children, or with a full day away from home.

First –time Admissions – Current Arrangements

- 1.16 The current pattern of full-time admission to infant and primary schools at 4+, inherited from the former County Council, provide the context in which this pattern of early years provision has developed. It combines one set of arrangements for schools which do not have nursery classes with a second and complex set of arrangements for schools with nursery classes.
- 1.17 There are 7 infant and primary schools which have 4+ units. Pupils are admitted to these schools full-time, in one year group, in the September after their fourth birthday.

- 1.18 The remaining 63 infant and primary schools have nursery classes which can provide for children from 3+. Each school has its own policy for admitting children to the nursery class. Most children spend some time, normally part-time and in some instances full-time, in a school's nursery class from the age of 3+ before they are formally admitted full-time to the school itself at 4+. These arrangements for formally admitting children to the main school are complicated and confusing.
- Children born between 1 September and 31 January are admitted full-time into a reception class at the beginning of the Autumn term in which they are five.
 - Children born between 1 January and 30 April are admitted into a reception class at the beginning of the Spring term in which they are five.
 - Children born between 1 May and 31 August join the older children in their year group and are admitted into what has become a Year One class, at the beginning of the Autumn term after they are five.
- 1.19 The present policy allows children with birthdays between 1 September and 30 April (i.e. two thirds of the year group) have part-time nursery provision followed by full-time reception provision before moving to Year 1. Summer-born children do not have a similar entitlement. They have variable amounts of part-time nursery provision (with a full-time term where provision permits in a few schools) before transferring directly to Year 1. It is possible for a summer born child, in area with limited school based nursery provision, to have no experience other than a part-time place in a playgroup before the age of 5.
- 1.20 This has a major impact on the educational achievement of the youngest children because they have:
- No entitlement to a full-time reception year;
 - No access to the same curriculum as their peers;
 - Lack of adequate preparation for the literacy and numeracy strategies as recommended by the DfEE and;
 - Lack of continuity caused by the requirement to move classes.
- 1.21 This arrangement creates an inequitable pattern which schools and the Authority have long identified as impacting negatively on standards of teaching and learning, although schools do endeavour to provide an appropriate curriculum for all children.

Advantages and disadvantages of moving to a single admission date

- 1.21 The advantages of moving to a policy which admits all children full-time in the September following their 4th birthday include:

For children /parents

- 1.22 The arrangements would give all pupils in the 4+ age group equality of provision and reduce the current disadvantage for summer born children. The arrangements are also simple for parents to understand. All children in a year group would be together at all stages of their education which would help to minimise changes and would help foster social development.

For schools

- 1.23 It would reduce the organizational difficulties where class size requirements change from year to year depending on the distribution of birthdays.
- 1.24 The arrangements would reduce the need to employ temporary teachers for one or two terms to provide for these changing numbers of pupils. The current labour market makes it difficult to secure continuity and staff with appropriate skills and expertise.
- 1.25 The present admission arrangements distort the LEA Baseline Data because it always refers to a split cohort. This gives an artificially high score for the LEA which in turn indicates less progress to Key Stage 1, thus not reflecting the true value added score for any summer-born children. The data that predicts Key Stage 1 results is also flawed and so cannot be used by teachers for target setting.

For other registered providers

- 1.26 These arrangements could help to foster a diversity of provision at 3+. A single date of full-time admission to school at 4+ would enable private and voluntary providers to identify their target group more easily. It would also make projections of income more reliable for them.

For the Authority

- 1.27 First-time school admissions would be easier to administer in a fair way. The change would enable the Authority to target its resources more effectively to meet patterns of identified need.

Disadvantages associated with introducing such a policy include:

For children/parents

- 1.28 Provision of additional full-time 4+ places could reduce the number of part-time nursery places available in schools unless additional resources were provided. As pupils would generally be admitted to school in September, there could be reduced scope for mid-year admissions to nursery classes, particularly for younger children.

For schools

- 1.29 There may be a wide range of maturity in 4+ classes. There could be a significant redistribution of resources between schools, particularly if surplus nursery places were to be removed as part of this change. For some schools this could result in large reductions in the budget available to them.

Implications for Nursery Provision of moving to a single admission date

- 1.30 Nursery classes in schools currently provide for a mixed cohort of pupils which includes the youngest reception aged children (i.e. those with summer birthdays) and older nursery children (i.e. those with autumn and spring birthdays). Each school determines its own nursery admissions arrangements and, depending on the available places, offers part-time, or a mixture of part-time and full-time provision to children. The distribution of nursery places is set out in Annex C. It shows also the extent to which different schools are able to provide full-time and part-time places and the level of surplus places. In some instances resources allocated for nursery provision are used to support provision in other parts of the school. The diversity of the arrangements made in schools to deliver nursery education mean that the effects of introducing a single date for admission from nursery into school would be varied and uneven in its impact.
- 1.31 As the issues arising from the introduction of a single date of admission are so complex and variable at the level of individual schools and the communities they serve, a significant amount of research will be necessary to develop and model options which are securely grounded. Factors which will need to be considered in developing detailed options for determining the consequent distribution of 3+ provision in schools include:
- The needs of the diverse communities in Leicester
 - Coherency with planning to limit Key Stage 1 class sizes to 30 pupils.
 - A correlation between the size of nursery classes and Published Admission Numbers (PANs) at 4+.
 - The capacity of private and voluntary early education settings to provide for 3 year olds in different areas of the City to complement the provision made in schools.
 - Appropriate nursery provision in areas of high social deprivation.

- The needs of areas served by schools which currently do not have nursery classes
 - Current and projected levels of demand for places at 3+ and 4+. (a small reduction in the number of three and four year olds is anticipated over the next three years.)
 - The need for a minimum nursery size of 30 and subsequent 'steps' of 15 places to ensure appropriate adult to pupil ratios.
 - Detailed funding arrangements for 3 and 4 year olds in schools.
 - Decisions about the appropriate age for admission to school nursery classes (e.g. at 3+ or 3yrs 6 months).
 - The need for transitional financial support for schools which might be affected by the removal of any surplus nursery places.
 - The potential personnel implications of large scale change
 - The availability of suitable accommodation in schools to provide for all pupils full-time at 4+ as well as for continuing nursery provision.
- 1.32 It will also be essential to consider how the impact on resourcing for individual schools which arises from this change may interact with other changes in funding arising from the review of the Authority's Local Management Scheme and the delegation of resources for pupils with special educational needs.
- 1.33 There are schools which have up to 90 surplus nursery places. Each nursery place is funded at £1441.90 irrespective of whether it is taken up. Removal of surplus places could reduce some schools' budget shares by up to £130,000. 23 schools are listed in Annex C as having more than 15 surplus places. Another small group of schools would not have sufficient accommodation to take in all four year olds full-time in September. In these instances it might be necessary to build extra classroom space. For other schools internal remodelling might be necessary to create suitable teaching spaces. A key outcome of any research and modelling of options would be to identify their impact on individual schools and the neighbourhoods they serve.
- 1.34 Were the distribution of nursery places in school to be reviewed in a way which took account of this complex range of issues and which produced a pattern of provision which was aligned to identified need it would provide the Authority with a significant opportunity to target its resources more effectively in this area.
- 1.35 However the process would be complex and could involve significant redistribution of resources. Some schools could face considerable reductions in the financial resources available to them and the consequent personnel issues.

- 1.36 At this stage it is proposed to take forward further research in this area as the basis for a subsequent report.

Area Review Process

- 1.37 The original drivers for the area review process included the need to remove surplus places, to address shortfalls in provision in specific areas of the city, and make more effective management of the building stock. The Authority inherited an uneven, historical pattern of provision with many inequalities of opportunity. The process of area review was originally planned to address this range of issues. The covering report sets out the rationale for deferring this process.
- 1.38 Nonetheless, at present there are approximately 4000 surplus places in primary schools in the city (13.7% of all primary places). A total of 17 primary schools currently have more than 25% surplus places. DfEE guidance is clear that the Authority will at some stage be required to justify maintaining schools which fall into this group, 'especially those performing poorly against both LEA and national averages in published performance tables or as indicated in OFSTED reports'. When decisions about new first-time admission arrangements have been made and in the light of the new capacity calculations, it may be appropriate to consider a more focussed approach to the issue of surplus places in the future.

Process and timescale

- 1.39 The implications for the current pattern of 3+ school-based provision of moving to full-time 4+ provision are too variable and complex at school level to determine without further research. The process of developing options needs to include schools as well as registered pre-school providers and other consultative and decision making bodies such as the School Organisation Committee and Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership.
- 1.40 The statutory requirements in terms of amending the LMS Scheme, publishing statutory notices where necessary, seeking approvals and carrying out the statutory consultation about school admissions mean that it is not realistic to consider implementation before September 2003.
- 1.41 In order to work to that timescale, it would be necessary to create a dedicated project team. The bulk of development work and the associated consultation with schools and other stakeholders would need to take place during 2001. This would then enable the statutory processes to take place during 2002 and provide a reasonable timescale to plan the detailed implementation of any changes. As a first stage it is proposed to establish a Reference Group drawing on headteacher, Teachers' Consultative Committee (TCC), Diocesan and Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership (EYDCP) representation for the development of the project. The reference group would commission and consider reports to enable the drafting of a feasibility study for the introduction of a single admission date at 4+ and options for 3+ provision in schools and report back through the established decision making

structures.

1.42 Draft Timescale

May 2001	Publicise proposed change of direction. Establish Reference Group. Obtain headteacher, TCC, Diocesan and EYDCP nominations for a reference group for the development of the project.
Jun - Aug 2001	Reference group commissions and considers reports to enable the drafting of a feasibility study for the introduction of a single admission date and options for the distribution of 3+ provision in schools.
Sept 2001	Report to Scrutiny Committee /Cabinet
Oct - Nov 2001	Further consultation with development groups, schools, private and voluntary providers. Consultation with parents through the local media.
Dec 2001	Reference Group reports back to elected members with proposals as the basis for statutory consultation
Jan 2002 – March 2002	Statutory consultation period.
April 2002	Consideration by elected members and School Organisation Committee. Consultation about funding implications
May 2002	Publication of statutory notices (if required).
Sep 2002	Schools/LEA begin to address any staffing/organisational issues arising from the changes.
Jan 2003	Parents express first-time admission preferences under the new arrangements.
Sep 2003	First cohort admitted under the new arrangements.

- 1.43 The draft timescale necessarily compresses much of the research and modelling work into the summer and autumn terms of 2001. A decision about a preferred option would need to be made by December 2001 at the latest in order to implement any change by September 2003. If for any reason that is not possible the implementation date would need to be put back to September 2004.

Communications Strategy

- 1.44 It will be essential to establish and maintain regular communication with infant and primary schools and with private, independent and voluntary providers as the development work arising from these proposals takes place. Schools and other providers will be involved through representatives on the proposed steering group. In addition to communication with individual schools about the likely impact on them, it is proposed to issue a regular newsletter setting out progress. It will also be important to use the Link magazine and other local media to ensure that parents and other interested groups in the city are aware of the developments and enabled to participate in subsequent consultation.

2. Research

- 2.1 This report draws on the outcomes of a conference held in September 1998 and a subsequent questionnaire in November 1998 as well as the consultation described below.

3. Consultation

- 3.1 Details of the consultation exercise are attached as appendices to this report.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 The costs of establishing a project team to take forward the research are estimated at £15000. These can be met from the existing budget provision for supporting reviews
- 4.2 Nursery provision is funded through the Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) Grant in the same way as provision for pupils of statutory school age. Leicester spends at a higher level on 3 and 4 year olds than indicated in the relevant SSA sub-block and at a lower level for pupils aged 5 – 11. The level of surplus nursery places is a contributory factor to this effect.
- 4.3 Funding for nursery places in schools is allocated through the schools' formula on the basis of an amount per place, irrespective of whether those places are filled. Other age groups are principally funded on the basis of an amount per pupil. Those schools with surplus nursery places are able to use the resources for the surplus places to support provision in other year groups.

- 4.4 At this stage it is difficult to identify the financial implications of the developments proposed in this report. They would form an essential element of the proposed feasibility study. In principle the introduction of a single date of admission at 4+ and the consequent redistribution of nursery provision could be managed in a way which was cost neutral to the revenue budget in the longer term, by reallocating the resources currently deployed in those areas. This would have the effect of have the effect of increasing the level of provision made for pupils at 4+ at the cost of reducing provision in schools for pupils at 3+.
- 4.5 It would be necessary for elected members to consider at a future date whether they wished any changes to made as part of an overall expansion of school based nursery provision, or whether there were other priorities for resources released by the removal of surplus nursery places. Schools and parents would be understandably concerned if any changes were perceived to be driven by financial rather than educational priorities.
- 4.6 A significant realignment of nursery provision in schools could give rise to a need for some schools to reduce staffing and for others to increase. In the context of locally managed schools, this could lead to costs associated with redundancy or early retirement. It is possible that in a small number of schools it might be necessary to provide additional accommodation to enable the admission of all pupils full-time at 4+ or to undertake internal remodeling to reflect the changed use of teaching spaces

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 These matters are dealt with in paragraph 4.7 of the covering report.

6. Other Implications

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	Paragraph References within this report
School Improvement	YES	1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7
Equal Opportunities	YES	1.4, 1.9, 1.14, 1.20, 1.21, 1.31
Policy	YES	1.14, 1.6 - 9
Sustainable and Environmental	NO	
Crime and Disorder	NO	
Human Rights Act	NO	

7. Background Papers – Local Government Act 1972

The Primary Review Report of the Director of Education to Education Committee April 1998

Improving Primary Education: Report of the First Phase of the Primary Review Report of the Director of Education to Education Committee June 1999

Primary Review - Area Planning Methodology Report of the Director of Education to Education Committee November 1999

School Organisation Plan 2000-5

9. Reasons for Treating the Report as Not for Publication

9.1 The report may be published.

School A	Current Places in Nursery * B	NOR in Nursery Full Time # C	NOR in Nursery Part Time # D	NOR FTE (D/2)+C E	Surplus (B-E) F
Abbey Primary Community School	100	85	9	89.5	10.5
Alderman Richard Hallam Primary School	90	62	52	88	2.0
Avenue Infant School	60	19	38	38	22.0
Barley Croft Primary School	0	0	0	0	0.0
Beaumont Lodge Primary School	40	19	18	28	12.0
Belgrave St. Peter's C of E Primary School	30	0	54	27	3.0
Bendbow Rise Infant School	180	76	27	89.5	90.5
Braunstone Frith Infant School	45	0	63	31.5	13.5
Buswells Lodge Primary School	60	9	17	17.5	42.5
Caldecote Infant School	90	27	52	53	37.0
Catherine Infant School	90	0	54	27	63.0
Charnwood Primary School	45	18	44	40	5.0
Christ The King Catholic Primary School	0	0	0	0	0.0
Coleman Primary School	60	0	120	60	0.0
Dovelands Primary School	45	39	10	44	1.0
Evington Valley Primary School	30	0	57	28.5	1.5
Eyres Monsell Primary School	40	0	77	38.5	1.5
Forest Lodge Primary School	60	28	35	45.5	14.5
Fosse Primary School	60	24	45	46.5	13.5
Glebelands Primary School	50	25	34	42	8.0
Granby Primary School	30	0	58	29	1.0
Green Lane Infant School	60	0	120	60	0.0
Hazel Primary School	60	36	1	36.5	23.5
Heatherbrook Primary School	0	0	0	0	0.0
Herrick Primary School	60	28	42	49	11.0
Highfields Primary School	40	15	21	25.5	14.5
Holy Cross Catholic Primary School	30	17	25	29.5	0.5
Humberstone Infant School	90	24	58	53	37.0
Imperial Avenue Infant School	90	54	49	78.5	11.5
Inglehurst Infant School	90	54	18	63	27.0
Kestrels' Field Primary School	50	14	26	27	23.0
King Richard III Infant and Nursery School	90	27	31	42.5	47.5

School A	Current Places in Nursery * B	NOR in Nursery Full Time # C	NOR in Nursery Part Time # D	NOR FTE (D/2)+C E	Surplus (B-E) F
Knighton Fields Primary School	50	7	25	19.5	30.5
Linden Primary School	30	0	58	29	1.0
Marriott Primary School	90	29	22	40	50.0
Mayflower Primary School	30	0	59	29.5	0.5
Medway Community Primary School	60	23	28	37	23.0
Mellor Primary School	90	39	37	57.5	32.5
Merrydale Infant School	90	53	57	81.5	8.5
Montrose Primary School	30	0	57	28.5	1.5
Mowmacre Hill Primary School	30	0	60	30	0.0
Northfield House Primary School	60	27	35	44.5	15.5
Overdale Infant School	0	0	0	0	0.0
Parks Primary School	60	14	43	35.5	24.5
Queensmead Infant School	120	24	46	47	73.0
Rolleston Infant School	40	12	51	37.5	2.5
Rowlatts Hill Primary School	50	26	44	48	2.0
Rushey Mead Primary School	60	31	21	41.5	18.5
Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School	45	43	0	43	2.0
Sandfield Close Primary School	0	0	0	0	0.0
Scraptoft Valley Primary School	40	15	41	35.5	4.5
Shenton Primary School	60	17	61	47.5	12.5
Slater Primary School	30	11	12	17	13.0
Southfields Infant School	105	23	54	50	55.0
Sparkenhoe Community Primary School	60	33	33	49.5	10.5
Spinney Hill Primary School & Com Centre	60	34	47	57.5	2.5
St. Barnabas C of E Primary School	25	13	18	22	3.0
St. John the Baptist C of E Primary School	0	0	0	0	0.0
St. Joseph's Catholic Primary School	30	21	18	30	0.0
St. Mary's Fields Infant School	90	43	36	61	29.0
St. Patrick's Catholic Primary School	40	19	6	22	18.0
St. Thomas More Catholic Primary School	0	0	0	0	0.0

School A	Current Places in Nursery * B	NOR in Nursery Full Time # C	NOR in Nursery Part Time # D	NOR FTE (D/2)+C E	Surplus (B-E) F
Stokes Wood Primary School	30	20	17	28.5	1.5
Taylor Road Primary School	80	30	44	52	28.0
Thurnby Lodge Primary School	30	15	20	25	5.0
Uplands Infant School	100	42	84	84	16.0
Whitehall Primary School	30	0	59	29.5	0.5
Willowbrook Primary School	40	0	51	25.5	14.5
Wolsey House Primary School	60	21	76	59	1.0
Woodstock Primary School	40	0	63	31.5	8.5
Wyvern Primary School	60	32	29	46.5	13.5
Totals	3810	1417	2667	2750.5	1059.5