



A REPORT BY THE ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY GROUP
ON A FIT AND HEALTHY CHILDHOOD

THE PRIMARY PE AND SPORT PREMIUM

Please note that this is not an official publication of the House of Commons or the House of Lords. It has not been approved by the House or its Committees. All-Party Groups are informal groups of members of both Houses with a common interest in particular issues. The views expressed in this Report are those of the Group but not necessarily the views of each individual Group Officer or each contributor. This Report seeks to influence the views of Parliament and the performance of Government to better address issues relating to the Primary PE and Sport Premium paper.

We thank The University of Winchester, Sheffield Hallam University and Kingston University for the financial support that made this Report possible and wish to make it clear that The University of Winchester, Sheffield Hallam University and Kingston University neither requested nor received approval of its contents.

This Report was prepared by a Working Group of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood and we are grateful for the contributions of:

HELEN CLARK	Chair of the Working Group
PHIL ROYAL	APPG Secretariat
HELEN WEST	APPG Secretariat
Dr VICTORIA RANDALL	University of Winchester
Dr ALISON MURRAY	University of Roehampton
NEIL COLEMAN	OPAL
Dr GERALD GRIGGS	University Campus of Football Business
EMMA WHEWELL	University of Northampton
SHEILA FORSTER	Fitmedia Fitness
ALEX SCOTT BAYFIELD	Fitmedia Fitness
CHRIS WRIGHT	Youth Sport Trust
KATE THORNTON-BOUSEFIELD	Youth Sport Trust
JOSH DENINGTON	Greenhouse Sports
SARAH WILLIAMS	Sheffield Hallam University
NEIL ROLLINS	PADSIIS
MELINA HEALEY	Enhancing Performance
KATHRYN SEXTON	Juka Dance
JULIE PEARSON	St Mary's University
GILES PLATT	London & SE Primary PE
	Health & Wellbeing Development Assoc
MIKE CRICHTON	Association for Physical Education
CHARLOTTE DAVIES	Fit2Learn
GREG DRYER	Kingston University
JO HARRIS	Association for Physical Education
GARY PALMER	London Sport

THE ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY GROUP AND THE WORKING GROUP

The Working Group that produced this Report is a sub-group of the All Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood.

The purpose of the APPG is to promote evidence-based discussion and produce reports on all aspects of childhood health and wellbeing including obesity; to inform policy decisions and public debate relating to childhood; and to enable communications between interested parties and relevant parliamentarians. Group details are recorded on the Parliamentary website at <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/llparty/150929/fit-and-healthy-childhood.htm>

The Working Group is chaired by Helen Clark, a member of the APPG secretariat. Working Group members are volunteers from the APPG membership with an interest in this subject area. Those that have contributed to the work of the Working Group are listed on the previous page.

The Report is divided into themed subject chapters with recommendations that we hope will influence active Government policy.

The Officers of the APPG are:

CHAIR

Steve McCabe MP

CO CHAIR

Baroness (Floella) Benjamin OBE

VICE CHAIRS

Ian Austin MP, Nic Dakin MP, Diana Johnson MP, Lord McColl of Dulwich, Julie Elliott MP, Nigel Dodds MP, Dr. Philippa Whitehead MP.

CONTENTS:

	<u>Page:</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	7
1. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF PE AND SPORTS FUNDING IN ENGLAND	11
2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE PESS PREMIUM	16
3. THE ROLE AND PURPOSE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS	21
4. HOW IS THE PESS PREMIUM BEING SPENT AND WHAT IS ITS IMPACT?	25
5. TACKLING SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND HEALTH INEQUALITIES, CULTURAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY THROUGH THE PESS PREMIUM	35
6. INTERNATIONAL MODELS OF PRACTICE FOR FUNDING IN PRIMARY PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT	39
7. THE WIDER WORKFORCE IN PRIMARY PE AND SPORT	44
8. TRAINING NEEDS OF PRIMARY TEACHERS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION	48
9. THE PESS PREMIUM: BREAKING THE CYCLE	54

THE PRIMARY PE AND SPORT PREMIUM

A REPORT BY THE ALL PARTY PARLIAMENTARY GROUP ON A FIT AND HEALTHY CHILDHOOD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Central to London's successful bid to host the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, was the Government's commitment to improve competitive sport and the sporting habits of young people (Ofsted, 2014). On the 12th March 2013, the then Prime Minister, David Cameron, announced that Primary Schools in England would receive funding worth £150 million per year to create a sustainable infrastructure for long-lasting change and improve the provision of physical education (PE) and sport across all state maintained primary schools. Speaking at the time, he said:

'We can create a culture in our schools that encourages all children to be active and enjoy sport.'

He added:

'The Olympic and Paralympic Games marked an incredible year for this country and I will always be proud that we showed the world what Britain can do. I want to ensure the Games count for the future too and that means capitalising on the inspiration young people took from what they saw during those summer months.': <https://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/21808982>

Six years on, and with a total investment now of over £1.2 billion, the Primary PE and Sport Premium (here onwards referred to as the PESS Premium) has been a defining feature of the London 2012 legacy. Invariably funding streams at this level do not last forever or in the same format, which raises significant questions about what impact the funding has had on young people since 2013.

We believe that a significant investment from Government merits debate and accountability at the highest possible level and that it should acknowledge where the opportunities and shortcomings of such a policy have left us. During the years of austerity, mounting concerns have arisen over the present and long term state of children's health and the need for the debate to be heard is now imperative. To date there has been little critical appraisal of the PESS Premium funding. This report aims to begin a necessary process and in doing so, brings together evidence from across the sector to consider the future of the PESS Premium post 2018.

During the course of the report, we outline and underpin the holistic value and importance of PE for every child. We examine the historic status and funding of PE and Sport and the nature and increasing diversity of the workforce. How has the PESS Premium funding impacted the way in which the subject is regarded and the ability of those tasked with delivering it to discharge their responsibilities? We have uncovered an abiding uncertainty about the nature of the PESS Premium itself; the ways in which it may be spent and its effect on an increasing divide between PE specialists, generalists and externally contracted coaches. Will its legacy be to have established a secure foundation for lifelong physical activity, sport and education – or is it, in effect, another temporarily seductive mirage, leaving PE precisely where it has become accustomed to be; regularly sidelined, delivered largely by those who are not qualified teachers and perpetuating the status quo for the children who already belong to groups that are perceived to be at a disadvantage? The PESS Premium funding is a significant sum and these questions deserve answers. This report is therefore our contribution to an essential debate, containing practical suggestions that we hope will be of use to policy makers.

We invite all who care about the physical and mental health and emotional wellbeing of children to join the discussion.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF PE AND SPORTS FUNDING IN ENGLAND:

No Recommendations outlined.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE PRIMARY PE AND SPORT PREMIUM:

- 2.1 Re-launch the PESS Premium under the name of the *Primary Physical Education and Physical Activity Grant*
- 2.2 Making a specified length of time for school break time a statutory requirement
- 2.3 Schools to be held to account for the way in which they adhere to DfE PESS Premium spending guidance and the effectiveness of their spend
- 2.4 An organisation to be appointed to review the spend (independent of DfE) to ensure that an accountability system is in place both to celebrate excellent practice and report to the DfE instances of the spend *not* being used effectively or ring fenced
- 2.5 Head teachers to be held accountable for the investment; those non-compliant to be interviewed by the DfE to determine whether or not the funding should be given to a third party to manage for the school so that the pupils do not miss out on the intended investment.

3. THE ROLE AND PURPOSE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS:

- 3.1 Physical education is repositioned around the development of the whole person through the physical
- 3.2 Physical education is taught by qualified teachers whose training gives them an understanding of the whole child
- 3.3 Initial Teacher Training (ITE) is remodelled and extended to provide a thorough grounding in PE theory and practice for every primary teacher.

4. HOW IS THE PESS PREMIUM BEING SPENT AND WHAT IS ITS IMPACT?:

- 4.1 The introduction of a statutory evaluation tool for the monitoring of the PESS Premium
- 4.2 Vast sums have been spent on organisations claiming to train teachers in PE/sports with little or no quality assurance. Tighter regulations or guidance should be developed to ensure that training is appropriate and trainers are suitably qualified
- 4.3 A PSA target to be a central accountability measure of PESS Premium funding and to include an expectation of a minimum amount of 120 minutes of PE curriculum time per week
- 4.4 Ofsted to ensure all primary school inspections include an explicit focus on the effectiveness and monitoring of the PESS Premium

- 4.5 A national infrastructure of regional and local networks/hubs to support improvement in the area of physical education, sport and competition and physical activity and health.

5. TACKLING SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND HEALTH INEQUALITIES, CULTURAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY THROUGH THE PESS PREMIUM:

- 5.1 Schools to be given further guidance about the potential of the PESS Premium to tackle social, economic and health inequalities and cultural and ethnic diversity. Good practice examples should be collated for the purpose of sharing and adaptation as requisite
- 5.2 The PE community itself must ensure that it is properly reflective of the diverse learners that it serves. Ten years ago, 11% of teachers came from BAME backgrounds but in PE the figure is under 3% (Turner D, 'Ethnic Diversity in Physical Education Teaching', *Physical Education Matters*, 2, 14-16). The Centre for Physical Education, Sport and Activity at Kingston University is acting to address this and in the Teacher Education programme, just under 80% of the current PE specialist cohort are from BAME backgrounds.

6. INTERNATIONAL MODELS OF PRACTICE FOR FUNDING IN PRIMARY PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT:

- 6.1 A degree of central direction and commitment by all stakeholders in making physical activity part of the daily lifestyle is essential to improve the physical health of any nation's children with curriculum PE the integral component of strategy
- 6.2 The most successful nations in terms of children's fitness and maintaining low BMI (Japan and Slovenia) have made physical activity central to their health and education programmes. We can learn from the key elements of their provision; their programmes are well-informed by university research, teacher training is prioritised and very little of the core PE curriculum is contracted out to third parties.

7. THE WIDER WORKFORCE IN PRIMARY PE AND SPORT:

- 7.1 The challenge for future provision is one of *standard* rather than *identity*. The Government should now devise initiatives that will identify the best curriculum content, teaching approach and training to ensure a high quality lesson experience for each child
- 7.2 Minimum break times should be statutory across England and a minimum quality standard (such as the OPAL standard) for the outdoor environment should be required in all state and academy primary schools and assessed by Ofsted.

8. TRAINING NEEDS OF PRIMARY TEACHERS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION:

- 8.1 A review of policy relating to primary PE that considers teacher education of professional learning from the ITE stage through to subject leadership
- 8.2 Increased time allocated for PE across all ITE routes with a compulsory requirement for all primary training teachers to teach PE as part of a school-based placement
- 8.3 A core curriculum for Primary Physical Education ITE
- 8.4 Qualified teachers to become core deliverers of primary PE supported (but not replaced) by a wider workforce
- 8.5 Explicit guidance to be given to schools and ITE providers on the role of the wider workforce in primary schools and identification of qualification level needed to work within and outside the curriculum in a school context (ie play providers, sports coaches, teachers, leisure and fitness instructors and health professionals)
- 8.6 Schools, ITE providers, county sports partnerships and other relevant bodies to work more cohesively together to plan provision for CPD
- 8.7 With regard to special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) schools to be given guidance via Ofsted to foster a democratic, robust and inclusive PE culture in every school so that all children are given access to developmentally appropriate PE.

9. THE PESS PREMIUM: BREAKING THE CYCLE:

- 9.1 Elevate Physical Education to core status within the curriculum, instigating a curriculum review based on lifelong physical activity and building upon secure foundations from Early Years education. Guidance should state that Early Years age groups qualify for PESS Premium funding
- 9.2 Prohibit the targeting of PE for PPA release time
- 9.3 Commit to a sustainable School Sport and Physical Activity Action Plan setting out a long-term commitment to harnessing the potential of PE within the curriculum; joining up work of relevant Government Departments and providing sufficient funding to give schools certainty over future investment and planning
- 9.4 Head teachers to be properly held to account by DfE to ensure that all funding streams are spent in accordance with published guidelines with the potential for recall if funding is misspent
- 9.5 Head teachers to ensure that PE subject leaders receive subject leader training as a condition of the annual grant
- 9.6 Government to issue a statutory requirement that all schools complete their annual report by using the commissioned template as produced by afPE and YST:
<http://www.afpe.org.uk/physical-education/evidencing-the-impact-guidance-template/>
- 9.7 To bring to an end the practice of outsourcing the sampling of school

performance to market research companies whose report findings are based upon school self-review without any meaningful on-site inspection of reported standards

- 9.8 Proper, effective Ofsted scrutiny of every school's PESS Premium record of spend, impact and sustainability
- 9.9 The creation of a national 'digital platform' whereby positive impact of the PESS Premium arising from good practice can be shared
- 9.10 The establishment of a national data system as operated by the Slovenian SLOfit system would provide a wealth of useful data for schools and health authorities to act upon to address children's fundamental needs.

1. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF PE AND SPORTS FUNDING IN ENGLAND

In 1868, the Royal Sanitary Commission stated that:

'The people perish for lack of knowledge.'

The beneficial effects of the Commission's reforms were acknowledged during the 1914-18 War by both the Ministry of National Service and the Galloway Report on the physical examination of recruits in 1917-18. Interest in national fitness escalated further during World War II (*'Physical Education in Great Britain'*, George Newman, *Nature*, 27th July 1940).

In 1991, the inclusion of PE in the National Curriculum denoted a landmark in the history of the subject; effecting its removal from the curriculum outskirts and re-positioning it on the 'inside track'. The rationale was that:

'The national curriculum is for all children and the purpose of physical education is to promote general fitness rather than to train Olympic champions or to remedy motor difficulties or disabilities', (*'Physical education and the national curriculum'*, Ian A McKinlay, *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 1993; 68: 428-431).

Following the 1991 decision, various initiatives were established for the funding of PE and sports programmes.

The shift from specialist to generalist training

In 2002, *'Qualifying to Teach'* (*'Qualifying to Teach: Professional standards for qualified teacher status and requirements for initial teacher training'*, DfES London: TTA) decreed that trainees were no longer required to hold an additional subject specialism beyond basic primary training. Many universities therefore converted three/four year undergraduate training programmes into one year postgraduate courses. A decrease in specialist subject teaching prompted a commensurate decline in staff numbers, and Foundation subjects within the National Curriculum (such as PE) were typically delivered with minimum provision. University staffing shortfall was supplied by teacher secondment from nearby schools and LEAs began streamlining their own workforces; phasing out advisory teachers (many of whom became self employed, hoping to be 'bought in' as PE consultants, *Griggs G, 2007, Physical Education; Primary Matters, Secondary Importance, Education 3-13, 35, 1, 59-69*). This arrangement was sustained in some areas, but the dynamic was further impacted by consecutive policy announcements concerning PE and School Sport, namely the Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links (PESSCL) and Physical Education and Sport Strategy for Young People (PESSYP) strategies.

The PESSCL and PESSYP strategies and funding

In October 2002, the Physical Education, School Sports and Club Links (PESSCL) strategy invested in excess of £1 ½ billion in Physical Education and School Sport within the UK.

The overall objective was to enhance the take-up of sporting opportunities by 5-16 year olds through eight programmes:

- Specialist Sports Colleges
- School Sport Coordinators
- Gifted and Talented
- Investigating Physical Education and School Sport
- Step into Sport
- Professional Development
- School/Club Links
- Swimming

'Learning Through PE and Sport':

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/learningthru.pdf>

Between April 2003-March 2006 the Government invested £459 million in an attempt to transform PE and School Sport (on top of £686 million dedicated to improving school sport facilities across England). Funding levels were maintained until 2008 to support a joint DfES and DCMS Public Service Agreement (PSA) target that pledged to engage children in at least two (and later five) hours of high quality PE and sport at school each week. The five hour offer was financed by a further injection of £¾ billion through the Physical Education and Sport Strategy for Young People (PESSYP), (*Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) 2008, 'Physical Education and Sport Strategy for Young People', London: DCSF.*

PESSYP aimed to build upon PESSCL by creating a world class system for PE and sport for all children and young people which would stimulate, increase and sustain their participation. The strategy was bolstered by a total financial outlay of at least £755 million between 2008-2011 which included:

- £537m to continue support for the network of Sports Colleges and School Sport Partnerships
- £36m to engage young people who currently did not participate in sport beyond school, by providing more attractive sporting activities
- £9.3m to train and develop PE teachers and other sports professionals
- £16m to extend School Sport Partnerships into the FE sector

- £6.6m to identify and support gifted and talented athletes
- £30m to upgrade facilities in targeted Sports Colleges
- £30.5m to provide more coaches for School Sport Partnerships
- £5m to recruit volunteer coaches, especially in areas of deprivation, affording a wide range of role models
- £8.25m to ensure that children can swim safely by the end of primary school
- £28.5m for competition, to raise the quality and quantity of competitive school sport
- £3m to establish a network of multi-skill clubs for disabled pupils
- £45.5m for Playing for Success centres.

From Subject Expert to Link Teacher - how this funding and strategy impacted the role of the primary PE subject leader

A network of 450 School Sport Partnerships was created across England; specifically 'families' of secondary, primary and special schools, collaborating to increase the quantity and quality of PE and sports opportunities for young people. SSPs were run by a Partnership Development Manager (centrally funded and employed directly by schools, usually a Sports College). The SSP financed a School Sport Coordinator in each secondary school and a Primary Link Teacher in each primary and special school.

Examples of good practice reported at the time included the forging of strong partnerships between schools, local authorities, leisure services, sports organisations and local clubs. The respected and proven accreditation schemes Sportsmark and Activemark were augmented by a new Sports Partnership Mark. However, from 2006-2008, the annual breakdown of criteria necessary to attain award status was reflective of a decline in expectations from the Government in the face of a burgeoning curriculum administrative workload for primary and secondary sectors. The trend was highlighted by 'The Times Educational Supplement':

'Changes to the Sportsmark and Activemark awards have been made to help meet government targets for school sport, which the Prime Minister has said will help Britain's chances at the 2012 Olympics. In a letter to PE coordinators, a government official said the awards' criteria had been 'refocused' to reflect this ambition.

PE teachers said the move was clearly designed to improve the figures and exaggerate the quality of sports in schools.

A school sport partnership development manager told the TES: 'This is clear evidence that the awards have been watered down. Unfortunately, the people who

suffer the most here are the children because they are not getting the amount of sport they deserve. Surely, with 2012 around the corner, we should be trying to raise the bar', ('PE teachers cry foul as goalposts are moved', Michael Shaw, TES, 2008).

The role of the Primary Link Teacher (PLT) was designed to reinforce the link between each Sports College and their associated feeder primary schools. The PLT (often the PE subject leader) could theoretically be released from teaching duties for 12 days per annum and was tasked overall with:

'sharing good practice with school colleagues, developing and ensuring implementation of after-school sport programmes, using sport to support transition from primary school to secondary, developing programmes to engage non-participants and to work with others to support transition to local clubs.' (YST 2008:9).

However, some studies indicate that in reality, PLTs were largely passive recipients of targets, surveillance and accountability disseminated from on high by their School Sports Colleges (SSCs) which bore little relevance to the school specific context (*'For sale - Primary physical education. £20 or nearest offer', Griggs G. 2010 Education 3-13, 38, 1:39-46).*

The primary subject leader was thus a 'link' in both name and practice between the delivery of Physical Education in primary schools and the transition to secondary school and community activities. The subject leader began an unwitting and unwilling transition into functioning as a passive recipient of policy change, rather than a developmental and innovative subject 'mover and shaker.'

The impact of strategy and funding

In October 2010, the DfE announced the Government's intention to axe SSPs as part of an overall cuts programme and instigated the removal of the need for schools to:

- Plan and implement their part of the five hour offer
- Collect information about every pupil for an annual survey
- Deliver a range of new Government sports initiatives every year
- Report termly to the Youth Sport Trust on various performance indicators
- Conform to a national blueprint for how to deliver PE and sport and how to use their staff and resources
- Get permission from the Youth Sport Trust and the Department to use their funding flexibly or to vary how they do things:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/refocusing-sport-in-schools-to-build-a-lasting-legacy-of-the-2012-games>

These plans were partially modified by DfE on 20th December 2010 (serving as a partial reprieve) to the effect that:

- The DfE will pay school sport partnerships for the full school year to the end of the summer term 2011 at a cost of £47 million. This will ensure the partnerships and their service can continue until the end of the academic year
- A further £65 million from the DfE's spending review settlement will be paid to enable every secondary school to release one PE teacher for a day a week in the school year 2011 to 2012 and in 2012 to 2013. This will ensure all the benefits of the current system are fully embedded:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-approach-for-school-sports-decentralising-power-incentivising-competition-trusting-teachers>

However, in August 2011, Government funding of School Sport Partnerships stopped.

Early findings on the overall effectiveness of the SSP programme were largely favourable; in particular, a welcome extension of the range and provision of extracurricular activities and a definite increase in the number of young people being physically active (*various research studies by Loughborough Partnership, Loughborough University, Loughborough Institute of Youth Sport, 2004 -2006*).

In 2008, DfE Secretary of State, Ed Balls observed:

'Ignore the half pint-full critics who carp nothing has changed. School sport was a national embarrassment a decade ago. Sport had all but withered and died in many schools; thousands of playing fields had been sold off, there was negligible investment and an ingrained anti-competitive culture.'

In addition, some later evaluations of PE and School Sport within the SSP system indicated historic improvements across inter-school and intra-school sports participation levels up to 2010 (*PE and Sport Survey 2009/10 London: DfE/TNSBMRB*).

However, praise for the SSP system was to some extent qualified by issues raised about the nature and reliability of the evidence base (*'Evidence. What Evidence? Evidence-based policy making and School Sport Partnership in North West England. International Journal of Sport Policy 2, no. 3:327-45, Smith A and Leech R*) and also a perceived subtle shift from a focus on high quality PE to basic participation statistics (*Griggs G, 2015 'Understanding Primary Physical Education', London, Routledge*).

With the advent of the Coalition Government in 2010, the reduction and then removal of funding meant that the network and partnership working that had been widely seen as SSP's crowning glory, broke down, fragmented and in most regions, was largely dismantled (*Pitt E and Rockwood J, 2011, 'Waving a white flag? Examining developments in school sport ideology and the implications for coaching and educational provision.' Paper presented at the Political Studies Association - Sport Under Pressure Conference, March 18, 2011, University of Birmingham*).

The disintegration in partnership working resulted in an obvious loss of cross-school collaboration, facilitation of inner-school planning of events and development of communication.

'The loss of eight years of development of relationships across the primary, secondary and community sectors will be hard to replace.....the longer term picture of the real impact of the dismantling of the SSP infrastructure.....remains to be seen. However, what is clear is that primary Physical Education appears to have been a key loser in this policy transition and that a new tier of problems for practice may have been unexpectedly generated', ('Dismantling the school sport partnership infrastructure: findings from a survey of physical education and school sport practitioners', Mackintosh C, 2014, 'Education', 3-13,42(4),432-449).

Following the dismantling of SSPs and under felt pressure to deliver upon promises of a post-Olympic legacy (*Griggs G and Ward G, 2013, 'The London 2012 Legacy for Primary Physical Education: Policy by the Way?', Sociological Research Online 18(3):13*) the Coalition Government announced the launch of the Primary PE and Sport Premium in March 2013.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE PESS PREMIUM

The PESS Premium was devised with the aim of assisting primary schools in improving the quality of their PE and sporting offer to pupils. It was funded by the Departments of Health, Education and Culture, Media and Sport and ring-fenced.

£150 million per year was allocated to all maintained and state-funded schools, academies and pupil referral units from 1st September 2013 for the period 2013-2016 (and in principle, up to 2020) amounting to a sum of approximately £9,000 per school, plus £5 per pupil for schools over a certain size. From September 2017, the amount was doubled, courtesy of projected income from a new sugar levy on the Soft Drinks Industry, making a total of over £1.2 billion invested to date.

Initial Government guidance about school spend was purposely flexible. Head teachers were given autonomy in determining how to achieve the goal of improving the quality of PE and sports provision in their school, but early DfE information supported by Ofsted, outlined some potential uses of the funding, including:

- Hiring specialist teachers or qualified sports coaches to work alongside primary teachers when delivering PE
- New or additional Change4Life sport clubs
- Paying for professional development opportunities in PE and sport
- Providing cover to release primary teachers for professional development in PE and sport.

The term 'physical activity' was included in current (more detailed) DfE guidance for schools published on 25th October 2018 and available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pe-and-sport-premium-for-primary-schools>

Schools should not use their funding to:

- Employ coaches or specialist teachers to cover planning preparation and assessment (PPA) arrangements – these should derive from core staffing budgets
- Teach the minimum requirements of the national curriculum – with the exception of top-up swimming lessons after pupils' completion of Core lessons (or, in the case of academies and free schools, to teach their existing PE curriculum)
- Finance capital expenditure.

Ofsted now assesses the ways in which primary schools use the PESS Premium funding as part of their inspection process. Its impact on pupil outcomes is measured (as is the relative effectiveness of the governors in holding school leaders to account for this). Schools bear responsibility for their own online reporting and are required to publish details of how they spend their PESS Premium funding by the end of the summer term. They must include:

- The amount of PESS Premium money received
- A full breakdown of how it has been spent
- The impact the school has seen on pupils' PE, physical activity and sport participation and attainment
- How the improvements will be sustainable in the future
- The percentage of pupils within Year Six who met National Curriculum swimming requirements.

Further advice is available at:

- GOV.UK teacher blog
- Swim England's website
- UK Coaching's primary schools' toolkit
- Short films on the Sport England website
- 'What works in schools and colleges to increase levels of physical activity among children and young people' (Public Health England)
- Local county sports partnerships (CSP)
- The Association for Physical Education (afPE)
- Youth Sport Trust
- Ofsted schools inspection handbook 2018.

The PESS Premium: some key issues

Funding for the PESS Premium (designed for the beneficent purpose of improving primary school physical education and sport provision in England) has seemingly had the unfortunate and unforeseen consequence of virtually 'ceding' the subject in its entirety to non-qualified individuals; specifically, sports coaches/instructors with limited qualifications, a minimal knowledge of the pupil recipients and imperfect understanding of key pedagogical matters such as inclusion, progression and assessment (*Griggs, 'Spending the primary physical education and sport premium: a West Midlands case study', 3-13. International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education, 44(5):547-555; Jones & Green K, 2015. 'Who teaches primary physical education? Change and transformation through the eyes of subject leaders', Sport, Education and Society, 22(6):759-77; Smith A, 2015 'Primary school physical education and sports coaches; evidence from a study of School Sport Partnerships in north-west England', Sport, Education and Society, 20(7):872-888*).

Whilst there is a persuasive argument for schools partnering with high-quality sports providers because they can make a valid contribution to upskilling teachers' technical knowledge (eg the Football Association working with the Premier League supporting the quality development of the Premier League Primary Stars programme) PE is a key curriculum subject and as such, must be designed and delivered by well qualified teachers.

The outsourcing of curriculum PE is widespread. Randall et al (*Randall V, Richardson A, Swaithe W & Adams S, 2016, 'Generation Next: the Preparation of Pre-service Teachers in Primary Physical Education', Winchester, University of Winchester*) found that across 1148 primary schools sampled, most had decided to outsource all teaching and resourcing of PE, including planning and assessment.

Griggs and Randall (*Griggs G & Randall V, 2018, 'Primary physical education and subject leadership along the road from in-house solutions to outsourcing', Education 3-13, DOI:10.1080/03004279.2018.1520277*) cite the unseemly rush of commercial providers for PESS Premium funding and a significant increase in employment of sports coaches to deliver curriculum PE.

In 2015, Smith (*2015 as above*) contended that many primary schools may well have entrapped themselves within an increasingly privatised model of PE provision. The responsibility for determining the ways in which the PESS Premium is spent rests with head teachers, but in 2014, Ofsted found that many lacked the necessary confidence and preparation to make the best use of it.

A shift towards outsourcing physical education should be taken extremely seriously because it can compromise the quality of learning and introduce a randomised 'postcode lottery' approach to the subject, heightening the risk that in many schools, pupils' physical competence dips below projected levels of progression and development; talent is neither recognised nor extended and some children may even become 'turned off' from activity. High quality physical education is the right of every child; yet it appears that despite a substantial increase in funding, few receive it (especially in primary schools; a key window of opportunity in which to develop skills and establish a positive attitude).

A further concern is that the PESS Premium, as presently constituted, fails to encourage the development of programmes that have the capacity to reach all pupils, not just those with obvious sporting talent.

Some key statements in the DfE PESS Premium guidance to schools

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pe-and-sport-premium-for-primary-schools>

The five key indicators:

- The engagement of all pupils in regular physical activity – the Chief Medical Officer guidelines recommend that all children and young people aged 5 – 18 engage in at least 60 minutes of physical activity a day, of which 30 minutes should be in school
- The profile of PE and sport is raised across the school as a tool for whole-school improvement
- Increased confidence, knowledge and skills of all staff in teaching PE and sport
- Broader experience of a range of sports and activities offered to all pupils
- Increased participation in competitive sport

open the way for the introduction of wider and more inclusive programmes that have the potential to engage a majority of children rather than a naturally 'sporty' few.

The Government's guidance (above) includes as the first of five indicators:

'the engagement of all pupils in regular physical activity' but the very name of the PESS Premium omits mention of 'physical activity'; thereby excluding by default, those who are not currently participating in any organised and externally delivered activities - and who are not meeting the Chief Medical Officer's minimum standard of 30 minutes of activity (out of breath, feeling hot) every day:

<https://www.tes.com/news/only-1-6-pupils-do-recommended-hour-daily-exercise>

A widening of the name for the funding stream could liberate head teachers from the (mistaken) mindset that the resources 'can only be spent on PE or sports lessons', thus dispelling common misconceptions that play, dance etc are somehow less important or valued components in children's health and development.

A more inclusive and encompassing name (as recommended below) would make significant advances in realising the potential of the PESS Premium as originally intended:

'Head teachers recognise that the gateway to PE/Sport is and always has been, Children's Play. This is because children learn to kick, throw, safely fall, etc as they play, long before they try any sport for the first time.

With the introduction of high quality play comes significant improvements in health and wellness.....Therefore the richer the play offer, the earlier the development of, and appreciation across the school of, sporting skills and teamwork.

Increased confidence, knowledge and skills of all staff in teaching PE and sport – schools with great playtimes report teaching and supervising staff feeling less stress and greater confidence in their abilities, which they can translate into other areas of teaching, including PE/sports', (Neil Coleman: Outdoor Play and Learning).

Recommendations:

- 2.1 Re-launch of the PESS Premium under the name of the *Primary Physical Education and Physical Activity Grant*
- 2.2 Making a specified length of time for school break time a statutory requirement

- 2.3 Schools to be held to account for the way in which they adhere to DfE PESS Premium spending guidance and the effectiveness of their spend
- 2.4 An organisation to be appointed to review the spend (independent of DfE) to ensure that an accountability system is in place both to celebrate excellent practice and report to the DfE instances of the spend *not* being used effectively or ring fenced
- 2.5 Head teachers to be held accountable for the investment; those non-compliant to be interviewed by the DfE to determine whether or not the funding should be given to a third party to manage for the school so that the pupils do not miss out on the intended investment.

3. THE ROLE AND PURPOSE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Before analysing the role of physical education in the primary school it is necessary to define it. Over the years, the term has been loosely interchangeable with others such as 'physical activity', 'physical literacy' and sport. Dr Gavin Sandercock, for example, recommends measuring children's physical literacy at key developmental stages, because it combines testing certain elements of fitness (running, jumping, throwing) with the assessment of a child's motivation and confidence to lead a physically active life (*'Temporal trends in muscular fitness of English 10 year olds 1998-2014: An allometric approach'*, Gavin RH Sandercock & Daniel D Cohen, *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, July 2018.)

However, in the absence of a widely accepted definition of physical education, it has become customary to concentrate upon what it is not. Therefore:

'The national curriculum is for all children and the purpose of physical education is to promote general fitness rather than to train Olympic champions or to remedy motor difficulties or disabilities', (*'Physical education and the national curriculum'*, Ian McKinlay, *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 1993, 68: 428-431).

Few would disagree.

However, achieving a commonly held working definition of what it does mean to be physically educated is a necessary starting point for policy formulation. James MacAllister below:

'Physically educated persons should be defined as those who have learned to arrange their lives in such a way that the physical activities they freely engage in make a distinctive contribution to their long-term flourishing', MacAllister J, 2013 *'The Physically Educated Person: Physical education in the philosophy of Reid,*

Peters and Aristotle', Educational Philosophy and Theory, 2013 Vol 45, No. 9, 908-920).

aligns with comments from the Youth Sport Trust (2018):

'The timetabled curriculum entitlement of all pupils, planned and taught by a qualified teacher.....has a clear focus on physical and whole person development where learning is in and through movement.'

YST gives examples of what this would involve with pupils developing:

- attitudes, skills and knowledge
- wellbeing (physical, emotional and social)
- healthy, active lifestyle behaviours
- life skills
- physical literacy and
- enjoyment and love of movement.

The nationally agreed definitions poster and the afPE outcomes poster demonstrate the impact of PE when taught well, on pupil's achievement and wider outcomes:

Definitions poster: <http://www.afpe.org.uk/physical-education/wp-content/uploads/Definition-of-PE-School-Sport-PA-3.jpg>

Outcomes Poster: <http://www.afpe.org.uk/physical-education/wp-content/uploads/Outcomes-of-PE-Poster-2018.pdf>

In 2013, The Department for Education asserted that a high quality physical education curriculum:

'Inspires all pupils to succeed and excel in competitive sport and other physically-demanding activities. It should provide opportunities for pupils to become physically confident in a way which supports their health and fitness. Opportunities to compete in sport and other activities build character and help to embed values such as fairness and respect', (DfE, 2013:246).

DfE stated that the national curriculum for physical education should ensure that all pupils:

- develop competence to excel in a broad range of physical activities
- are physically active for sustained period of time
- engage in competitive sports and activities
- lead healthy, active lives (DfE, 2013: 247).

By contrast, some countries such as Slovenia set out very specific curriculum requirements:

<http://en.slofit.org/measurements/test-battery>

Slovenian school children are required to attain significant physiological developmental markers such as:

1. postural control: to be established by 7 or 8 years of age)
2. bi-lateral integration of motor skills: to be established by 7 or 8 years of age
3. maintaining good postural control and coordination whilst the child experiences considerable growth throughout their school years (*'Motor Control, translating research into clinical practice', 5th edition, Shumay-Cook and Woollacott, Wolters Kluwer, 2017*).

A lack of clearly defined objectives in England makes a persuasive case for thorough training programmes for PE teachers in the primary sector extremely difficult to sustain. The effectiveness of the workforce is therefore hampered by the inadequate nature of the training that is available and the insufficient amount of time allocated for it.

Postgraduate entrants receive around 6-8 hours of PE in initial teacher education and undergraduate trainees about 24 hours (*Rainer P, Cropley B, Jarvis S & Griffiths R, 2012, 'From policy to practice. The challenges of providing high quality physical education and school sport faced by head teachers within primary schools', Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 17, 429-446*), *Tsnangaridou N, 2012, 'Educating primary teachers to teach physical education', European Physical Education Review, 18, 275-286*).

In schools where the class teacher does not lead PE lessons, the adult in charge is usually from a sports coaching background. Many coaches hold sporting awards (including sports science degrees) that are higher than the level 2 in each activity taught that should be expected by head teachers, but head teachers may still employ/contract a person with a qualification at 5 levels lower than that expected of a class teacher who now enters the profession at level 7 (Masters standard if completing a PGCE as is customary). Also, practitioners with a sports related degree (usually sports science) are very likely to have studied courses that contain no pedagogical modules.

The primary school workforce is therefore all too often, teaching a subject supported only by a body of 'perceived wisdom' that is typically unclear, confused and deriving from popular mythology rather than fact. Pre and in-service

practitioners frequently cite the reasons below as justification for the inclusion of PE in the curriculum:

- keeps children fit and healthy by providing opportunity to exercise
- helps to address the obesity crisis
- affords a 'break' from classroom demands
- a source of fun
- introduces children to winning and losing (preparation for a competitive world)
- helps to develop social skills
- allows academic strugglers an opportunity to excel.

(Evidence collated from eight years of asking this question to around 800 primary trainees a year on their PE ITE day. Further reinforced by undergraduates at Kingston University who complete an assignment in which they ask different stakeholders, including head teachers, what they consider the purpose of PE to be.)

The key stakeholders including head teachers (and parents who are influenced by their own adverse or positive school experiences) have different perceptions of the purpose of the subject. This is reflected by its name; variously 'PE', 'PE and Sport', 'Physical and Health Education' or even 'Physical Health and Wellbeing'. The independent school tradition divides the subject into 'PE' and 'Games'. None of the terms are inherently educative and all position the teacher as either an adult sports coach or a health and fitness professional. Most teachers do not consider themselves to be either, but the current climate surrounding the subject is dominated by 'Health' and 'Sport' rather than 'Education' with inevitable consequences relating to funding and policy-making.

However, since 1999, there has been an increasing focus on mental, emotional, social, cognitive and moral aspects in addition to physical skilling. Richard Bailey et al (*'The Educational Benefits Claimed for Physical Education and School Sport: An Academic Review', 2006*) conclude that as pupils engage in a range of physically active pursuits during a school day, the overall physical education of the individual should be seen as much more than the activities that they are taught or experience within a school curriculum. The emphasis should be on promoting age-appropriate activity largely through active play rather than focusing on more adult-orientated concepts of exercise and fitness according to Harris and Cale (*Cale L & Harris J, 2006, 'School-based physical activity interventions: effectiveness, trends, issues, implications and recommendations for practice', Sport, Education and Society. 11(4), pp. 401–420, Cale L & Harris J, 2013 'Every child (of every size) matters in physical education! Physical Education's role in childhood obesity', Sport, Education and Society.*)

Therefore the knowledge, skills and understanding that pupils acquire during curriculum time can be applied and transferred to a range of differing contexts including playtime, after school and away from the school environment as 'life skills'.

It is important that future policy initiatives around 'PE and Sport' restore the central role of education; that teachers and policy makers understand what physical education is; its importance in developing the whole person (contribution to confidence building, communication, team work, problem solving, leadership and planning) and what an engaging physical experience looks like and comprises.

In order to be physically educated, children need to learn through various domains. At Kingston University, a MAT model is used, requiring children to Move well, Think whilst they are moving and develop certain Attitudes to themselves, other children and activity. It is hoped that via this model, the role and purposes of all embodied experiences in school whether they fall under the guise of PE, Sport or Physical Activity will be clearer.

It naturally follows that PESS Premium funding should be focused on ensuring that activity levels, mental wellbeing and broad developmental goals are enhanced in every school child – adopting and promoting a 'whole person' approach rather than a narrow concentration upon disseminating specific sport-related skills.

Recommendations:

- 3.1 Physical education is repositioned around the development of the whole person through the physical
- 3.2 Physical education is taught by qualified teachers whose training gives them an understanding of the whole child
- 3.3 Initial Teacher Training (ITE) is remodelled and extended to provide a thorough grounding in PE theory and practice for every primary teacher.

4. HOW IS THE PESS PREMIUM BEING SPENT AND WHAT IS ITS IMPACT?

The use of the PESS Premium and evidence of its impact to date is mixed.

In a DCMS Consultation Paper (*'The New Strategy for Sport,' 1st August 2015*) The Primary PE and Sport Premium section, introduced by the Minister for Children and Families, Edward Timpson, MP stated:

'Research into the impact of the Premium so far has produced very positive findings – with significant improvements reported in the breadth of offers, quality of teaching and pupil participation among other areas.'

This followed the 2014 Ofsted survey which identified successful practices arising from the PESS Premium including:

- employing specialist PE teachers to plan and deliver structured professional development programmes
- joining with other schools to achieve structured staff training and value for money
- fun, competitive approaches to improving lunchtime participation
- developing the leadership skills of Year 2 pupils to become 'Little Leaders'.

However, several weaknesses also emerged, including a lack of clear guidance about how funding should be spent and an absence of improvement targets.

An insufficiency of guidance is, in part, confirmed by the DfE (3rd June, 2016):
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pe-and-sport-premium-for-primary-schools>

'We trust head teachers to spend this money on what they think will most benefit their pupils. When schools are deciding how to spend their PE and Sport Premium we want them to consider how they will demonstrate that it has led to additional and sustainable improvement to the quality of PE and sport in the school. We have published further guidance on the PE and sport premium, including how to use the funding.'

However, following a DfE commissioned report (Callannan M, Fry A, Plunkett M, Chanfreau J & Tanner E, 2015, 'The PE and Sport Premium: An investigation in primary schools', National Centre for Social Research) the words 'sustainable', 'impact' and 'effectiveness' now appear in revised guidance on funding spend; schools must invest it strategically, building capacity for the future and addressing a breadth of provision across the gamut of Physical Education, physical activity and sport. The report highlighted that the Primary PESS Premium had predominantly been spent on:

- Purchasing new equipment (76% in 2013-14 and 86% in 2014-15)
- Up-skilling and training staff (86% in 2013-14 and 81% in 2014-15)
- Increasing extra-curricular school sport provision (74% in 2013-14 and 69% in 2014-15).

In making spending decisions, schools had sought advice from remaining School Sport Partnerships, local authorities and head teacher/school networks and around

35% of schools consulted national guidance from organisations such as the YST, AfPE and Sport England. Only 2% accessed no support; whereas 97% of those who did said that it had been useful.

Regionally, the County Sport Partnerships (CSP) has provided further guidance to schools on how to make more effective PESS Premium spending decisions. CSPs have been commissioned by Sport England (since 2013) to gain an insight into how schools are spending their PESS Premium grant and the County Sport Partnership Network (CSPN) has presented annual reports to Ministers. In autumn 2018, London Sport published an online toolkit to update colleagues on recent changes to the PESS Premium; how the money could be spent and how to monitor funding effectively:

<https://londonsport.org/children-young-people/london-sport-pesp-toolkit-2018-2019-final-2/>

Whilst the post London 2012 Olympic legacy was a central driver in the early years of the PESS Premium; in recent years, the spending focus appears to have shifted to address the health and wellbeing of young people, with an increased emphasis on 'physical activity' and the place of Physical Education as a tool for 'whole school' improvement.

The inspection process

Section 5 of the Ofsted Inspection Handbook:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-education-inspection-handbook>

states that accountability for the PESS Premium will be monitored via school inspection as follows:

- How effectively leaders use the PESS Premium and measure its impact on outcomes for pupils
- How effectively governors should hold school leaders to account for the PESS Premium spending.

The outstanding criteria for school inspection are that:

- Governors systematically challenge senior leaders so that the effective deployment of staff and resources, including the PESS Premium secure excellent outcomes for pupils
- Governors do not avoid challenging leaders about variations in outcomes for pupil groups and between disadvantaged and other pupils nationally.

In practice, time allocated to Ofsted inspections to monitor the effectiveness of the PESS Premium is limited and the 2015 School Inspection Handbook mentions the PESS Premium only five times in 73 pages. Many inspection reports make no reference to PESS Premium funding and schools have little accountability in practice to evidence and validate their online reports.

Increased reliance on outsourced PE teaching

The County Sport Partnership Network's most recent mapping exercise examined ways in which schools spent their PESS Premium during the 2017-18 academic year.

30% (5,437) of all primary school websites in England were viewed during April/May 2018 and it was found that an increasing number of schools (63% in 2017/18, up from 36% in 2014/15) used a proportion of the funding for additional health-enhancing activities aimed at increasing participation amongst the least active pupils. Employing sports coaches to support PE and extra-curricular clubs is the most popular investment choice with 80% of schools nationally spending some of their funding on sports coaches.

Using PESS Premium money to employ external coaches is not prohibited, but the guidelines state:

'You should not use your funding to:

- a) Employ coaches or specialist teachers to cover planning, preparation and assessment arrangements (these are to come out of your own staffing budgets)*
- b) Teach(ing) the minimum requirements of the national curriculum – including those specified for swimming, or to teach your existing PE curriculum':*

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pe-and-sport-premium-for-primary-schools>

Funding should be used to enhance a school's current PE and sport provision, not replace it; however, the CSPN mapping shows that despite grant conditions stating that it must not be used to cover PPA time or the minimum requirements of the curriculum, a quarter of schools nationally show evidence of using funding for this. Many coaches market themselves as 'training providers' (77% of schools invested in CPD for their existing staff in 2017). There are some examples of coaches having a positive impact on improving teaching and learning in PE lessons, but significant evidence is lacking on the return of investment in this area. The case study referenced below illustrates how effective cpd such as the afPE/SLUK level impacts on PE: <http://www.afpe.org.uk/physical-education/level-56-professional->

[vocational-qualifications-primary-school-specialism-and-subject-leadership-in-pe-school-sport/](#)

Whilst financial outlay on external coaches has increased (together with investment in equipment and facilities) the CPSN reported that paying for specialist PE teachers has decreased. It was down to just 34% in 2017 with anecdotal evidence from West Yorkshire suggesting that as few of 48% of 'PE specialists' have Qualified Teacher status - despite the ever increasing number of primary specialist PE teachers being trained at universities and Ofsted reporting that where there are specialists, progress, achievements and outcomes are better (*The PE and Sport Premium for Primary Schools*, Ofsted, 2014).

The displacement of classroom teachers delivering PE can be further seen in a report examining the preparation of pre-service teachers to teach Primary PE in England (Randall, Richardson, Swaites and Adams, 2016, 'Generation Next: The preparation of pre-service teachers in Primary Physical Education':

<https://Winchester.elsevierpure.com/en/publications/preparing-our-next-generation-of-primary-physical-educators-3>

Data in the study indicated that a varied workforce for primary PE existed in schools across England. From a sample of 625, the total percentage of occurrences of who delivered the PE curriculum was reported in the academic year 2015/16 as follows:

- Class teacher 34.2%
- Sports coach of external company 33.3%
- Specialist primary PE teacher 12%
- A class teacher alongside a sports coach 4.5%
- Other 15%.

Since the initial introduction of the PESS Premium, the primary PE workforce is no longer expected to be comprised of qualified teachers. Furthermore (and as a consequence of the funding) many primary schools may have locked themselves into an increasingly privatised model of PE provision (Smith A, 2015, 'Primary school physical education and sports coaches: evidence from a study of School Sport Partnerships in north west England', *Sport, Education and Society* 20(7) p. 872-888) and must now take care to negotiate 'a new generation of specialist childhood PE/sport advisers and services (who) have come into play and thrive upon the commercial exploitation of their anxieties', (Evans J & Davies B, 2010 'Family, class and embodiment: Why school physical education makes so little difference to post school participation patterns in physical activity', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20, p. 773). For schools solely reliant upon outsourcing the PE curriculum, an urgent consideration is how they plan to

sustain a privatised curriculum model if such funding ceases to exist long term and if they cannot, how will they ensure a quality of provision?

Lack of effective evaluation

Sport England's Strategy for 2016-2021 (*Sport England 'Towards an Active Nation'*): <https://www.sportengland.org/news-and-features/news/2016/may/19/sport-england-triples-investment-in-tackling-inactivity/>

emphasizes the need for robust and consistent evaluation for all investments. However, limited accountability for the PESS Premium spend has meant that there has been little objective evaluation or impact measurement of the programmes funded.

Fitmedia Ltd undertook an intensive evaluation of an intervention financed by the PESS Premium at a school in North London in 2013-14; the testing methods used indicated that the money had been well spent and in a subsequent Ofsted testing, the school rating of 'Outstanding' was augmented by the fact that the inspectors specifically praised the assessment of attainment in the PE programme.

Otherwise, two independent empirical studies have been published, investigating the way in which the PESS Premium has been spent and its resulting impact.

1. *Griggs G, 2016, 'Spending the primary physical education and sport premium: A West Midlands case study', Education 3-13, 44(5), 547-555*

A total of 1848 West Midlands primary schools were sampled to assess how they spent their funding. The study concluded that recent trends such as the employing of sports coaches and the development of more after-school clubs and competitions is likely to stay high on the agenda for schools in their PESS Premium use. A matter of concern is their unwillingness to invest in PE Specialists and there is doubt about how sustainable primary PE would become should funding be withdrawn. Almost two thirds of the schools failed to comply with regulations holding them to account to publish their spending plans.

2. *Griggs G, 2018, 'Investigating provision and impact of the Primary Physical Education and Sport Premium: a West Midlands case study', Education 3-13, 46(5), 517-524*

Reflecting the national trend, the seven schools studied spent the bulk of the PESS Premium funding on employing external agencies such as sports coaches. However, the individual freedoms afforded to schools within the ring-fenced PE focus and school sport had allowed some to invest in a single activity such as swimming or diversify into broader holistic issues such as healthy lifestyles. Whilst

all schools considered that the funding had made a tangible impact, none had used a robust evaluation tool.

Nationally, only limited evaluation of spend is required; it is therefore difficult to assess whether the PESS Premium has been successful; against what criteria and whether it is being delivered in the way originally intended by the Government. Further issues remain unresolved, such as how schools quality-assure their current practices and might sustain them into the future; especially when the funding ceases.

Examples of good practice

The examples below illustrate the diversity and capacity of PESS Premium grant funding when used well:

- West Lodge Primary, Pinner, LB Harrow (video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LEQBGTmFH7Q>)
PESS Premium funding has been used to improve playtimes: *'The influence (of the OPAL Play Programme) is incredible, and has had such an effect in such a short time that I would recommend it wholeheartedly. The knock-on effects in terms of pupils' resilience and creativity, but fundamentally their enjoyment of lunchtimes has risen exponentially, so it's been great!'* J Dees, Head teacher
- Berrywood Primary School, Southampton. For the past six years, the school has spent the entire PESS Premium on a sport and physical development leading teacher. The specialist teacher was given autonomy to improve the subject profile, increase participation and ensure that children and teachers recognised its value
- Thorner Church of England Primary School, Leeds. Physical activity and wellbeing have been placed at the core of the school development plan with resourcing that has improved the children and staff approach to physical activity - and concentration and motivation within the classroom
- Craggs Community School, Rotherham. PESS Premium grant was used to train staff and lunch time supervisors to deliver Active Break times. A comprehensive programme of activities for all staff to use on playground duties has been embedded and is altered fortnightly
- Greenhouse Sports is a London-based charity that provides sporting opportunities for underprivileged and disadvantaged children. Greenhouse Sports work occurs in mainstream schools, SEND schools and their own centres. At a centre, Greenhouse have been working with 5 local primary schools since September 2018 and each uses money from their PESS Premium budget to fund weekly table tennis session for multiple years groups. *'The sessions are great when they are clearly linked and progressive from one session to the next. Pupils seem to benefit most when they can tie*

in learning from previous lessons. The behaviour and self-reflection talk and expectations are brilliant', PE teacher, King Solomon Academy

- St John Fisher Catholic Primary schools (London Borough of Ealing). PESS Premium money was used to invest in whole staff training with Create Development with their 'real PE' programme. Research conducted some months after the training was completed saw significant increases in percentages of staff who enjoyed teaching PE (from 60% - 90%), percentage of staff who felt confident in teaching PE (from 60%-100%) and the percentage of staff who felt empowered to teach high quality PE lessons (from 28% - 85%). The percentage of pupils who enjoy PE lessons rose from 77%-90%)
- Sandal Castle Primary School Wakefield had 85% of its Early Years pupils deemed not school ready. PE is placed at the heart of school life and the head teacher employs teaching school assistants trained as swimming teachers to drive up swimming and PE is led by specialists. Coaches are used to increase activity and range of clubs <https://youtu.be/zOkrGOwd6JE>

Some practitioner views

Unfortunately, positive Government feedback and good practice as above are perforce qualified by criticism about the operation of the PESS Premium including comments such as the following taken from a monitoring website set up by 'Active Matters':

- *'Just play the system. Provide as little information as possible online and then produce a made-up report that we knocked up the night before the Ofsted visit. The inspectors didn't even bother asking for any evidence'*
- *'Too many coaches focus upon sports rather than actual PE. They also 'coach' and don't 'teach.' I'd rather have teaching staff run the lessons – however the boss insists upon using coaches so that teachers can catch up on their marking in the staffroom with coffee and a cake'.*

A Freedom of Information Request response (April 2018) from DfE to Active Matters reads:

'You requested for us to provide details of those schools who have failed to comply with set regulations and who have been required to 'pay back the whole or any part of the Premium' and to break it down and send back to you in the form of an excel spreadsheet on a year by year basis starting from 2013-14. You asked for:

- a) Name of schools*
- b) Borough*
- c) Total funding returned*

- d) *Misuse discovered eg the funding of statutory curricular swimming lessons*
- e) *Whether subsequent instalments of the Premium were then withheld.*

I have dealt with your request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Following a search of the Department's paper and electronic records I have established that the information you requested is not available. The Department has not requested that any school pay back the whole or any part of the Premium and misuse of the Premium has not been reported':

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/primary_pe_and_sports_premium_sp

On 5th October, 2018, a national educational journal, Schools Week reported findings about PESS Premium use including:

- *'My last head teacher went for copying and pasting last summer term's report from an older year. Totally gobsmacked by her brazenness. However, HMI didn't spot it'*
- *'The online plan is a complete work of fiction on our website. The money has (instead) been used to prop up TA salaries'*

('Investigation: Schools accused of fudging sport premium funding' by John Dickens):

<https://schoolsweek.co.uk/investigation-schools-accused-of-fudging-sport-premium-funding>

Practitioner Kathryn Sexton (www.jukadance.co.uk) describes a frustrating experience of trying to liaise with PE subject leaders in primary schools, school games organisers and head teachers in Bromley. Amongst other grievances, she lists:

- *'I had expected to find an overall borough structure/strategy/director or even guidelines for the use of the money but there isn't one'*
- *'I had to resort to cold-contacting schools directly via their school offices which rarely proved fruitful or making contact with other teachers in the borough who could vouch for the quality of my work'*
- *'It all seemed very hit and miss and just dependent on who I happened to meet in my freelance work'*
- *'Primary school PE subject leaders have continually told me that their hands are increasing tied in terms of seeking out best practice to buy in support as control of the PESS funding in being kept by head teachers and its use is not scrutinised by Ofsted'*
- *'More than one head teacher has told me that they.....use the money to cover shortfalls in their staffing budgets by buying in 'one stop shop' coaching companies to deliver the entire PE curriculum, and giving their teachers the time for PPA (which should be covered by the normal school budget). My*

understanding of the Premium funding is that this is not only unethical but actually potentially fraudulent.'

In the Consultation Paper for the Strategy of Sport (2015) the Minister, Edward Timpson MP stated:

'As well as ensuring that all schools, not just some, are using the Premium effectively to improve PE and sport, we want to make sure that the impact, on both schools and pupils themselves, is sustainable in the long term.'

He concluded by stating that the strategy was driven by a desire to:

'Ens(ure) that improvements made by head teachers today have an impact upon pupils at school in a year, five years, ten years time. If every teacher feels confident about getting up and teaching a PE lesson, the school won't be reliant upon buying in external coaches whose expertise disappears when their contract runs out.'

To this end, the Government would benefit from engaging purposefully with specialist consultants and practitioners who have daily experience of the use of the PESS Premium and here Kathryn Sexton's comments are pertinent:

'My question is what then happens when the PESS Premium ends? Primary teachers in numerous schools will not have taught PE for years, so will be even less confident to deliver. The coaching companies will not come in unpaid and, with ever tighter budgets, there will certainly not be enough money elsewhere to continue buying them in. The legacy of the PESS Premium was supposed to have been to increase the provision and participation of PE in schools. The long term reality in areas such as Bromley will probably be exactly the opposite.'

Recommendations:

- 4.1 The introduction of a statutory evaluation tool for the monitoring of the PESS Premium
- 4.2 Vast sums have been spent on organisations claiming to train teachers in PE/sports with little or no quality assurance. Tighter regulations or guidance should be developed to ensure that training is appropriate and trainers are suitably qualified
- 4.3 A PSA target to be a central accountability measure of PESS Premium funding and to include an expectation of a minimum amount of 120 minutes of PE curriculum time per week
- 4.4 Ofsted to ensure all primary school inspections include an explicit focus on the effectiveness and monitoring of the PESS Premium

- 4.5 A national infrastructure of regional and local networks/hubs to support improvement in the area of physical education, sport and competition and physical activity and health

5. TACKLING SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND HEALTH INEQUALITIES, CULTURAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY THROUGH THE PESS PREMIUM

The PESS Premium has been mainly targeted at increasing pupil participation in better quality PE and school sport; however some schools are using it to address societal issues including socioeconomic and health inequalities and cultural and ethnic diversity in and around their catchment areas.

There is a correlation between socioeconomic and health inequalities, poor social mobility and children with diverse ethnicity and special educational needs. These children have the poorest life chances and are marginalised from leading healthy, active lifestyles. Disadvantage also appertains to gender where issues concerning girls' ability, body confidence, social engineering and school ethos, result in a larger proportion of them being inactive compared to boys from 8 years upward with the behaviours carried into adulthood.

However, as Ingrid Beutler said in her 2008 paper:

'Through sport and physical education, individuals can experience equality, freedom and a dignifying means for empowerment, particularly for girls and women, for people with a disability, for those living in conflict areas and for people recovering from trauma', (Sport Serving Development and Peace', 2008).

Schools are uniquely placed to offer every child regardless of background, all that they need to be active, healthy and happy. Yet the most glaring disparity can be seen in the PE and sport experience of the 7% of privately educated children compared to the majority who attend state funded primary schools. Many primary school head teachers have switched from the previously required (but now just recommended) two lessons per week, to one lesson of curriculum PE (*The Youth Sport Trust, 'School Sport and PE Survey Report', 2015: <http://www.sportsthinktank.com/research,117920.html>* compared to a likely 3-5 hours in independent schools.

Research (*Stidder G & Hayes S, 2012 'Equity and inclusion in physical education and sport', 2nd ed, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge*) and anecdotal evidence from Kingston University collected by asking hundreds of trainee teachers if their host training schools held one or two PE lessons a week, indicates that a high proportion have only one timetabled lesson plus many instances whereby a

second (timetabled) lesson is regularly replaced by something judged as a higher priority.

Privately educated sportspeople are over-represented in most elite sports (football excepted, although even here, private schools are catching up). According to Sutton Trust research (*'Educational Background of Olympic Medallists'*: <https://www.suttontrust.com/research-paper/education-backgrounds-of-olympic-medallists/>

around a third of GB medallists at the Rio Olympics were privately educated. Ofsted also highlight this gap in provision (2014).

A number of studies show how PE and School Sport could be seen to benefit boys rather than girls (Azzarito L & Solomon M, 2005 *'A reconceptualization of physical education; The intersection of gender/race/social class'*, *Sport, Education and Society*, 10:1, 25-47) and white children over those from BAME communities (Flintoff A & Dowling F, 2017, *'I just treat them all the same, really; teachers, whiteness and (anti) racism in physical education'*, *Sport, Education and Society*). Children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) are less active than those with no recognisable disability or educational need (YST 2015, Sport England, 2018 *'Active Children and Young People Survey'*):

<https://www.sportengland.org/media/13698/active-lives-children-survey-academic-year-17-18.pdf>

The 'Breaktime' survey shows that the amount of time that schoolchildren are permitted outside to play or participate in organised physical activities during a school day has decreased with each passing decade.

'The main reason given by schools for the reduction in break times are to create more time for teaching and learning, specifically to cover the curriculum and to manage poor behaviour of students at lunchtimes. These are the same reasons for reductions in breaks identified in previous surveys.'

Also *'primary schools with a higher proportion of pupils in receipt of free school meals and/or in urban areas tended to have less total time for breaks even when controlling for the length of the school day.'*:

<http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/significance-school-breaktimes>

The link to inequality is that independent schools enjoy longer break times than any other type of school.

As children's right to access public open spaces disappears, school playgrounds (where children of all ages and circumstances will freely play together if they are

given time and opportunity to determine where and with what themselves) are becoming increasingly rare.

Using the PESS Premium to achieve change in the areas discussed aligns well with Sport England's '*Towards an Active Nation*':

<https://www.sportengland.org/media/10629/sport-england-towards-an-active-nation.pdf>

This strategy identifies five outcomes for sport:

- Physical wellbeing
- Mental wellbeing
- Individual development
- Social and community development
- Economic development.

and the case studies below demonstrate how schools have used the PESS Premium to impact wider issues of diversity and inequality.

Social inequalities

Social inequality has the effect of limiting or adversely stigmatising a group's perceived status, social class and circle (*Sciencedaily.com*). Far fewer girls take part in sport than boys (*Active Lives: Children and Young People Survey*, Sport England 2018). This gap is widest when children are in Years 5 and 6. In Leicestershire and Rutland, targeted programmes for girls are funded by the PESS Premium. 'A Girl's Active Lifestyles' (GALS) programme was introduced with Key Stage 2 girls participating in 6 weeks of activity at school followed by a centre venue celebration event. It succeeded in engaging 135 girls in sport from 11 different schools across the county.

Economic inequalities

Economic inequality is the unequal distribution of income and opportunity between different societal groups. Persistent school absence is an indicator and absence rates are higher for pupils known to be eligible for (and claiming) free school meals (*'Pupil absence in schools in England': DfE 2016-17*).

Some schools in areas of deprivation in Essex use the PESS Premium to fund interventions designed to improve attendance rates. At St. Leonard's Church of England Primary Academy, persistent absentees met with the PESS Premium-funded sports coach. Parents and pupils were then set individual non-negotiable attendance targets and a clear commitment was required both within class and at clubs. Over four and a half years, overall attendance has risen consistently between a half and two percent year on year.

Health inequalities

Scunthorpe is listed as one of the 'least thriving' places in England (*The Thriving Places Index*, 2017). Bottlesford Junior Primary School used their PESS Premium grant to provide more sporting activities with the aim of improving pupils' long term health outcomes. The school employed a sports mentor to encourage pupil participation in break time activities including table tennis, yoga, Zumba and dance. Percentage involvement in extra curricular physical activity increased from 22% in 2013 to 63% in 2018 and the number of disadvantaged pupils participating is now slightly higher than that of other pupils. The head teacher has noticed increased pupil, staff and parental enthusiasm for extra curricular activities.

Cultural inequalities and diversity

Cultural status inequalities are perceived, or actual, differences in the treatment, public recognition or status of different groups' cultural norms, practices, symbols and customs (*gsdrc.org*). UNESCO's Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (Article 2) states that:

'In our increasingly diverse societies, it is essential to ensure harmonious interaction among people and groups with plural, varied and dynamic cultural identities as well as their willingness to live together.'

St Theresa's Catholic Primary School pupils in East Leeds derive from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds. Many are in receipt of an additional pupil funding which is allocated to children who are looked after by the local authority; those eligible for free school meals or whose parents/carers serve in the armed forces. Working with other local schools, St Theresa's use their PESS Premium grant to employ a 'bespoke PE teacher' to work across their feeder and high schools to improve sporting outcomes and participation levels. This has had a positive impact on wider aspects of schools life including attainment, progress and personal growth. Progress measures in reading and maths place St Theresa's in the top 10% of national schools.

Ethnic Diversity

Ethnic diversity is the marked difference between people of many ethnic groups as well as slight variations in behaviour of those in the same ethnic group coexisting within the greater culture:

<http://racerelements.net>

Wolverhampton has the seventh lowest percentage of the population identifying as White British outside London and the second highest rate of combined childhood overweight and obesity in England. 43% of Year 6 pupils are overweight or obese compared with the England average of 34%. To address this, a stakeholder group from the local authority, public health, school improvement and School Games Organisers has developed and deployed 18 Physical Activity

Leaders using a combination of the PESS Premium investment and the Apprenticeship levy. The apprentices have a remit in facilitating, monitoring and supporting all areas of physical activity and wellbeing within school in addition to working within the local community to encourage more families within the area to adopt healthy and active lifestyles. A consortium approach has enabled a range of expertise to be utilised to tackle health needs that have been identified across the local authority area.

These examples of good practice, illustrate the capacity of the PESS Premium to address 'the bigger picture' via sport, PE and physical activity. It should be designed and promoted by policy makers in such a way that its potential to benefit children suffering from the greatest inequality can be understood; whether that relates to socioeconomic issues, health, social mobility or the need to combat the cultural, racial and religious obstacles to participation in PE, sport and physical activity that may be found for some girls, children with a disability and those living in BAME communities. In this way, the 'universal language' of rewarding physical activity may be harnessed to break down barriers, change perceptions, challenge prejudice and reduce the gap between those who have and those who do not.

Recommendations:

- 5.1 Schools to be given further guidance about the potential of the PESS Premium to tackle social, economic and health inequalities and cultural and ethnic diversity. Good practice examples should be collated for the purpose of sharing and adaptation as requisite
- 5.2 The PE community itself must ensure that it is properly reflective of the diverse learners that it serves. Ten years ago, 11% of teachers came from BAME backgrounds but in PE the figure is under 3% (*Turner D, 'Ethnic Diversity in Physical Education Teaching', Physical Education Matters, 2, 14-16*). The Centre for Physical Education, Sport and Activity at Kingston University is acting to address this and in the Teacher Education programme, just under 80% of the current PE specialist cohort are from BAME backgrounds.

6. INTERNATIONAL MODELS OF PRACTICE FOR FUNDING IN PRIMARY PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT

The World Health Organisation recommends at least 60 minutes of moderate to vigorous-intensity physical activity daily for children and adolescents aged 5-17 including muscle and bone strengthening activities at least three times per week.

An international comparison of children's fitness is published every other year:

'Global trends, including excessive screen time, are contributing to a generation of inactive children and putting them on a dangerous path' said Professor Mark Tremblay, President of the AHKGA and Senior Scientist at the CHEO Research Institute in Canada. 'We have a collective responsibility to change this because inactive children are at risk of adverse physical, mental, social and cognitive health problems.' (*Global Matrix 3.0 Physical Report Cards For Children and Youth: Results and Analysis from 49 Countries*, *Human Kinetics Journal*, Volume:15 Issue: S2 Pages:S251-S273 doi: 10.1123/jpah.2018-0472).

Slovenia and Japan have the most active children; each country relies on very different approaches, but the consistent feature is that physical activity is underpinned by pervasive cultural norms. Being active is a way of life as opposed to a 'choice'.

Slovenia

Slovenia has the highest grades of all countries for the overall fitness of its children. 86% of boys and 76% of girls aged 6-18 years are meeting World Health Organisation recommendations for daily physical activity (*Results from Slovenia's 2018 Report Card on Physical Activity for Children and Youth, Sember et al, Human Kinetics Journal, Volume 15 Issue S2, November 2018*). Each school follows the national PE curriculum and primary schools must provide additional elective subjects in sport and extra curricular physical activity programmes. At least 50% of primary school classes are taught by a PE teacher with a university degree in the subject. 100% of Slovenian primary schools have at least one fully equipped sports hall and Slovenian primary schools offer 39–77 minutes per day of in-school, professionally guided physical activity.

All primary and secondary schools in Slovenia are organised to collect SLOfit measurements every April, using the same fitness test battery. This is a national surveillance system for physical and motor development of children and young people. It was implemented in 1982 by a sample of schools and after 5 years of testing, introduced to primary and secondary schools nationwide. A web application 'My SLOfit' gives students and parents access to students' SLOfit results. PE teachers and the child's doctor can also see a child's SLOfit results via this application. The system has been developed by the Laboratory for the Diagnostics of Physical and Motor Development, located at the Faculty of Sport, University of Ljubljana in cooperation with the Fitlab Institute. With up to date, comprehensive data on the physical fitness of children and young people, the Slovenian system can detect problems and propose interventions promptly. With SLOfit, they can also observe effects of school-based physical activity interventions.

The national project Healthy Lifestyle was introduced in the school year 2010/2011 and was one of the best examples of the evaluative strength of the SLOfit system. Through SLOfit, the Laboratory detected an accelerated increase in childhood overweight from the mid 1990s onwards that was predicted to exceed 30% of the population in 2020 and it was proposed to intervene with the introduction of an additional 2 hours of PE per week, administered by newly employed PE teachers. The progress of the 30,000 children included, was monitored through SLOfit for the following five years, and each year, emphasis was placed on the poorest component of physical fitness from the preceding school year. Such targeted intervention caused obesity prevalence to decline, a growth of physical fitness in all Slovenian schools and the trends from 2010 to 2015 today, presuppose only a 22% prevalence of overweight in 2020 (at the level of the year 2004).

SLOfit has been financed via government grants and external international funders from outside Slovenia. The teaching in schools has been a component of the normal school budget.

Japan

The Japanese education system embraces an active lifestyle through a range of activities beyond the weekly scheduled two lessons. In primary schools, PE lessons are taught by the class teacher. The curriculum and objectives for the subject nationally are centrally directed by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. This may limit individual teacher creativity, but it does produce a more standardised approach.

In Japan, children's daily physical movement also includes:

- Walking to school with other children in the neighbourhood
- Radio calisthenics (the whole school undertakes daily exercises together)
- Cleaning the school each day
- Taking part in extra curricular activities; it is during this time that external agencies from the community come into some schools and offer activities. This is seen as part of the school's community links.

The aims of Japanese PE are to develop in children the competencies to maintain and improve their mental and physical health for life, and to realise a rich lifelong sporting potential. This involves learning health and physical activity such as fitness, apparatus gymnastics, track and field pursuits, swimming, ball games and expressive activities. In Japan, physical education is seen not only as an individual subject but also as part of the whole school education plan and schools organise many extra curricular activities in which physical education plays a central role.

Japan's Ministry of Education requires schools to carry certain toys that help build core strength. In addition to bamboo stilts and hula hoops, most elementary schools are stocked with an equally large number of unicycles. The children maintain the equipment themselves and the Japanese Lottery Association (a collection of public lotteries) regularly donates money to schools for the purchase of unicycles.

Japanese children prepare and serve their own school lunches and this approach to nutrition is an integral part of the national health strategy.

Physical education in Japan is integral to the whole education system. Japanese BMI statistics are the lowest for any developed country (*'Why is the Obesity Rate so Low in Japan and High in the US? Some Possible Economic Explanations'*, Benjamin Senauer and Masahiko Gemma, 2006, University of Minnesota). Radio Calisthenics is an example of how the whole nation undertakes simple daily exercises from a young age and then learns how to lead. Children continue the exercises during school holidays and one community leader marks each child's card which they then give to their teacher on returning to school. The Japan International Cooperation Agency distributes information and advice on physical education to around 90 other countries to improve their practices in PE.

The Japanese physical education system is not funded separately, but forms part of the whole education and lifestyle.

Canada

Canada is a country of provinces; each with jurisdiction over local education. Below is a brief insight into the Ontario model.

Generally speaking, the elementary schools in Canada (UK primary equivalent) have qualified PE teachers who teach mandatory PE to all grades and run teams and/or coaching on a voluntary (often after school) basis. They are paid teachers (not externally funded coaches) who charge fees for their time and who undertake mandatory volunteering. All PE teachers are expected to volunteer for extra curricular activities. Some schools have very strong PE and sports programmes and others less so; largely dependent upon the skills and dedication of the teachers who organise the teams and inter-mural games/competitions with other schools, many of which occur during the school day rather than outside the core hours.

The aspiration-focused trend in physical education and the training of PE teachers is gradually changing from an emphasis on 'sports' towards physical literacy/skills development – but teaching quality is reportedly variable. Older teachers remain doggedly attached to their favourite teams and sports.

Overall, Canada, in common with most of the developed world, has an overly sedentary lifestyle problem encompassing the generations. As in the UK, the school system still appears to favour 'sports' to the detriment of wider physical activity, artistic movement and physical literacy/traditional PE so that children who are naturally athletic (and whose parents can pay for their extra training) will generally excel in school sports programmes, leaving others in their wake.

At age 15 in high school, pupils may drop PE from their syllabus and many reportedly do so. There are many charities/corporate supported community sports activities for talented children, but little is available for non-sporting students who require a greater level of support in improving their fitness, mental wellbeing and physical literacy. It seems preferable in Canada for funded PE/sport programmes to focus on 'easy wins'; via concentrating upon a few of the most able individuals instead of trying to engage a vast and inactive majority in innovative, attractive activities (such as play, dance, Zumba etc) that can promote wide scale fitness and engagement.

There appears to be little understanding or interest at a senior level of government about how to achieve such a difficult objective using only the large PE and sports charities/organisation that dominate the sector. These organisations continue to lobby the local parliament (with some of the funding they are given by that same parliament) often without justification, or any credible record of achievement.

The Ryerson Study of the initial 2016 OPAL pilot in Toronto:

<https://earthday.ca/earthplay/schoolplay>

showed that student perceptions of wellbeing rose immediately after the delivery of the OPAL programme:

'More children are happier when playing outdoors, and more children self-reported higher overall subjective wellbeing':

<https://earthday.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/OPAL-Report-May-2018-final.pdf>

The initial six-school OPAL pilot was funded by a part of the Lawson Foundation's 2.7m Canadian Dollar investment (<https://Lawson.ca>) but now that the programme has proved to be so popular (42 schools already signed up, with a very long waiting list) funding is now coming in from other sources including the Toronto Catholic District Schools Board.

Further results will be published by Ryerson University over the coming years.

Finland

Finland's Schools on the Move is a national action programme aiming to establish a physically active culture in Finnish comprehensive schools. Schools and municipalities participating in the programme implement their own individual plans to increase physical activity during the school day. Finnish Schools on the Move programme is one of the key projects in the field of knowledge and education in the Government Programme of Finland. The goal of the government is that "the Schools on the Move project will be expanded across the country to ensure one hour of physical activity each day".

Decreasing excessive sitting during school lessons is an opportunity to participate in the programme ideology. The promotion of physical activity among school-aged children consists of both increasing physical activity and decreasing sedentary time. This requires measures to be undertaken both at school and at home.

- During the school day, physical activity can be increased by adding more physical education lessons, promoting active commuting and encouraging physically active breaks.
- During schools' lessons, sedentary behaviour can be decreased by implementing active learning methods involving short active breaks, to support optimal learning and avoid long periods of continued sitting.
- Decreasing excessive sitting during school lessons is an opportunity for all school personnel to participate in the programme ideology.

Recommendations:

- 6.1 A degree of central direction and commitment by all stakeholders in making physical activity part of the daily lifestyle is essential to improve the physical health of any nation's children with curriculum PE the integral component of strategy
- 6.2 The most successful nations in terms of children's fitness and maintaining low BMI (Japan and Slovenia) have made physical activity *central* to their health and education programmes. We can learn from the key elements of their provision; their programmes are well-informed by university research, teacher training is prioritised and very little of the core PE curriculum is contracted out to third parties.

7. THE WIDER WORKFORCE IN PRIMARY PE AND SPORT

There has been a decisive shift in the delivery of physical activity, within and beyond the classroom in England's primary schools. Before 2007, it was unusual

for the class teacher not to take PE lessons in maintained primary schools. The 2005 introduction of mandatory Planning, Preparation and Assessment (PPA) time into primary schools created a demand for additional timetable resourcing. Many schools appointed external physical activity programme providers; thus meeting the PPA requirement economically and removing the obligation of class teachers to deliver PE lessons.

This created a staffing vacuum filled by a new industry and saw the marketisation of PE services with a range of organisations advertising their staff to schools (Griggs G, 'For sale – Primary Physical Education £20 per hour or nearest offer', *Education 3 – 13 38 (1):39-46*). The staff are predominantly male (mainly football) sports coaches and generally in their twenties. 85% of the primary teaching workforce are women (DfE, 2017 'School Workforce in England') and it is plausible that when schools buy in predominantly male staff to teach PE, they are inadvertently presenting their pupils with stereotyped perceptions of gender roles (Azzarito L, & Solomon M, 2005, 'A reconceptualization of physical education: The intersection of gender/race/social class', *Sport, Education and Society, 10:1, 25-47*). Gender equity within physical activity remains an aspiration.

Since 2007, the market for PE providers has diversified. Schools may choose from, large nationwide companies or regional ones. Many localized providers also work with a number of schools. Staff are typically paid relatively low wages (£8-£16 per hour). Commercial firms compete with other providers and sports clubs (especially professional football) have community coaching teams who take PE lessons. The Premier League Stars programme supports the delivery of a range of services to schools; some clubs run community coaching sessions at profit and others at cost. Also, many former school sports partnerships continue to offer staffing solutions. Some head teachers recruit an in house 'specialist' and these may be qualified teachers who have moved from classroom to take PE across all year groups. PE apprentices are relatively new additions; in the main, 16-18 year olds who are meant to work alongside a teacher. They are paid from the apprenticeship levy and cost the school very little.

The quality of the new workforce remains extremely variable. Concerns were initially raised about the extent to which coaches lack appropriate teaching qualifications, prioritise activities and sporting objectives above educational goals and lack class management skills (Griggs G, 2008, 'Outsiders inside: The use of sports coaches in primary schools in the West Midlands', *Physical Education Matters 3 (2):332-36*). The field is largely unregulated. The Chartered Institute for the Management of Sport and Physical Activity (CIMSPA) has recently been working on industry standards. Guidance has been published in a joint statement by the Youth Sport Trust, the Association for PE, Sport Coach UK, Sport England and the County Sport Partnership Network on the employment and deployment of

coaches in schools (UK Coaching (2014), 'The employment and deployment of coaches in schools':

<https://www.ukcoaching.org/resources/downloadables/how-should-coaches-be-used-in-schools>

The statement recommends that head teachers should only recruit staff who possess at a minimum Level 2 sports coaching qualification.

However, some individuals have no qualifications at all. The majority of coaches come from football backgrounds and delivering the wider ambitions of the National Curriculum presents a challenge that is not addressed adequately by Level 2 of the Qualifications Framework. The average age of a peripatetic coach is early twenties; rapid sector turnover suggests limited experience and many struggle with pastoral issues such as behaviour management. Lesson delivery is often autocratic and skills-based as opposed to 'child-centred' and sessions are frequently characterised by a high level of 'adult talk', correspondingly low levels of pupil activity and a technical focus that makes it difficult to ensure that every pupil is afforded an individual challenge. The guidance states that coaches should 'support' PE and not conduct lessons alone; however, this advice is all too often sidestepped. In summary:

'Coaches who have learnt to coach through NGB awards and through their own experience are unlikely to have the background, experience or knowledge, skill and understanding.....Formal coach education courses do not adequately prepare coaches for working with pupilsor delivering extra curricular provision.....indeed for working with young people inside and outside of school in terms of pedagogy and reflective practice,' (Blair R & Capel S, 2013, 'Who should teach physical; education in curriculum and extra-curricular time?', 'Debates in Physical Education,' ed S Capel and M Whitehead, 171-187, London; Routledge).

The adult workforce in the school playground during the lunchtime break is equally conflicted and the quality of learning experience delivered on the playground is unacceptably varied. All too often, the lunchtime playground is seen as a 'poisoned chalice' by many class teachers and Teaching Assistants, and old-style 'dinner staff' (usually parents on minimum wage) are expected to supervise several hundred highly energised and frequently frustrated children - without any proper training from their employer.

Management of the break time period (20-22% of the school day depending on key stage) is not covered in any depth during teacher training. Therefore in some schools where supervisors struggle to engage children and protect them from boredom or bullying, some of the more 'responsible' children may be given high visibility vests and expected to act as 'entertainers' and 'chaperones' of younger pupils.

Programmes such as that provided by OPAL:

www.outdoorplayandlearning.org.uk

however, have the ability to engage children in self-chosen, playful, creative, social and physically active pursuits every day for a small financial outlay. Once supervising staff have completed an initial training period, such programmes are also almost entirely self-sustaining.

Certainly in the foreseeable future some outsourcing of Physical Education is likely to remain. The gulf between the 'ideal' position set out by official bodies and representatives of the PE community and the daily reality experienced 'on the ground' requires new solutions to ensure that whoever is delivering PE is equipped with the knowledge, understanding and skill to ensure that children have the best possible experience. The Centre for Physical Education Sport and Activity (CPESA) at Kingston University has established a new degree programme specifically for the diverse PE workforce- FDA – leading to BA (Hons) in Physical Education, Sport and Activity (PESA). Students must be in paid or unpaid work and attend one evening per week. The work-based learning affords full time student status with part time attendance and is designed to back-fill the glaring gaps in workforce knowledge base, allowing students to apply theory and research in their classes. Now in its second year, CPESA has collated evidence from schools and teachers to demonstrate its impact. The degree course is expected to be delivered at various venues nationwide as CPESA enters into partnership with a range of deliverers.

In addition, all the sources of advice listed have expertise in primary school PE and sports (see their individual websites and Primary School Programmes and Support 1st July, 2013):

- County Sports Partnership Network
- Youth Sport Trust
- Association for Physical Education (afPE)
- Sport England
- School games
- School Sport Partnership
- Independent Community Organisations
- Borough School PESSPA Advisors
- School Games Organisers
- Change4life sports clubs
- Volunteer Coaches and Leaders
- National Governing Bodies.

Recommendations:

- 7.1 The challenge for future provision is one of *standard* rather than *identity*. The Government should now devise initiatives that will identify the best curriculum content, teaching approach and training to ensure a high quality lesson experience for each child
- 7.2 Minimum break times should be statutory across England and a minimum quality standard (such as the OPAL standard) for the outdoor environment should be required in all state and academy primary schools and assessed by Ofsted.

8. TRAINING NEEDS OF PRIMARY TEACHERS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

'We must have PE teachers and coaches, who are well trained and qualified', (Lynn Davies, former Olympic Gold Medallist).

Primary teachers delivering PE are expected to convey a diverse range of physical activities and team sports safely, instilling confidence in every child and nurturing enthusiasm for physical activity irrespective of natural ability. However, the historical quality and nature of PE teacher training is equally relevant today as can be seen from comments (below) accessed from the publicly available TES Forum Board:

'I am a primary PE teacher who completed a four year BEd, specialising in PE.....the issue in my eyes was the delivery of PE. Non specialists had six hours of PE in total – three 2 hour sessions.....In my eyes, six hours is not enough time to prepare students for becoming confident and competent PE teachers', (The Running Man – January 2016)

'On my primary PGCE I have had one session on teaching PE – we observed the delivery of 50 minute lessons. I certainly don't feel confident in teaching PE myself, I have sought out opportunities to observe PE in my placements and it seems none of the general primary teachers are confident teaching it either. One teacher I observed delivered a Year 3 PE lesson on tennis whilst tottering on six inch heels, saying 'but I'm not a sporty person', (Bumblebee435- April 2016).

Traditionally, primary PE has been delivered by non-specialist classroom teachers. Barriers include inadequate training, time, interest support and resources and low levels of teacher confidence (*Philip J Morgan & Vibeke Hansen, 2008, 'Classroom Teachers' Perception of the Impact of Barriers to Teaching Physical Education', Quality of Physical Education Programmes, Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 79:4, 506-516, DOI: 10.1080/02701367.2008.10599517*). Research findings demonstrated that many classroom teachers believed that they possessed neither knowledge nor ability to teach PE and that the low confidence levels of non-

specialist teachers related to a lack of belief in their ability and competence to perform skills and activities (Layson J, Scott L, Centeio E, Shen B & Mccaughtry N, 2016, 'Classroom Teachers' Perceptions About Physical Education', *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 87(52), A32-A24:

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/1817494390/>

Evidence points to inadequacies in continued professional development (CPD) leading to calls for more effective ways of developing teachers' confidence in delivering high quality PE. CPD for non-specialists has tended to be sport-focused physical skills and drills; generally coach-led and doing little to address pedagogical practice and child development theory (Dely L Elliot, Matthew Atencio, Theresa Campbell & Mike Jess, 2013, 'From PE experiences to PE teaching practices? Insights from Scottish primary teachers' experience of PE, teacher education, school entry and professional development', *Sport, Education and Society*, 18:6, 749-766, DOI:1080/13573322.2011.609165).

Feedback from trainee and qualified teachers demonstrates that PE is often seen as a subject that can be removed, reduced or isolated from the curriculum (See- Jess M, McEvelly N, & Carse N, 2017, 'Moving primary physical education forward: start at the beginning', *Education 3-13*, 45:5, 645-657:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03004279.2016.1155072>

It is given a low value within many schools and positioned as an 'add on extra.' Unsurprisingly, non-specialists are inhibited from developing an understanding of the benefits that PE can bring to children's lives. PE is perforce physical yet necessitates forethought, action and reflection. Pupils of teachers who have been trained to teach primary PE to children through inquiry-based methods (which explicitly develop thinking possibilities) progress in emotional understanding and wellbeing alongside physical competencies and confidence.

A national study into initial teacher education (ITE) in primary PE (Randall, Richardson, Swaites and Adams, 2016, 'Generation Next: The preparation of pre service teachers in Primary Physical Education':

<https://winchester.elsevierpure.com/en/publications/generation-next-the-preparation-of-pre-service-teachers-in-primar-3>

identified a widening polarisation between generalist and specialist teachers in primary ITE since the 2012 London Olympic Games. Generalist trainees reported that teaching opportunities were often given to specialist trainees over generalists. Pre-service teachers (specialist and generalist) considered the main barrier preventing them from teaching PE in school to be the outsourcing of the subject to external agencies. This had contributed to nearly 50% of pre-service teachers being unable to teach PE as a component of initial teacher preparation compared with around 25% prior to the introduction of the PESS Premium in 2012.

The use of the PESS Premium to enhance the knowledge and confidence of in-service teachers has developed since its inception. However, it may have inadvertently created more teaching barriers for pre-service teachers and ultimately a worsening picture of teacher confidence and competence for the future. Furthermore, by setting PESS Premium funding at a threshold whereby schools can only afford non-qualified teachers (ie sports coaches) as a means to address teacher competence, the specialist teacher has been priced out of the market (Griggs G, 2010, 'For Sale Primary Physical Education £20 or Nearest Offer', *Education* 3-13, 38(1) p 39-46).

Finally, the presence of specialist trainees and outside providers in school may well be adding to the perception of PE as a 'specialist' body of knowledge both in terms of the child experiencing it and the profession delivering it. The presence of sports coaches may lead to a strengthening of the opinion that the subject can be easily confused with the concept of 'sport' (Coulter M & Ni Chroninin D, 2013, 'What is PE?' *Sport, Education and Society* 18 (6) p.825-841) and a further narrowing of PE as a children's learning discipline.

Despite the many challenges presented to training providers in preparing students on a Physical Education 'specialism' pathway, the following are excellent examples of practice whereby providers have maintained a clear focus on teacher quality despite a fluctuating policy landscape.

Primary PE PGCE Specialist Training Route, Worcester University:

- A specialist Primary Physical Education PGCE training programme now in its third year; cohort of approximately 16-20 trainees annually
- Works in tandem with schools to raise the profile of PE across school
- In order to meet the requirement of 50% PE teaching the specialist trainees work across key stages and year groups
- Working with recent graduate alumni so that they can mentor future PE specialist cohorts.

Sheffield Institute of Education (SIOE) at Sheffield Hallam University:

- Received an 'Outstanding' grade from Ofsted for primary teacher training
- PGCE Primary PE Specialist programme developed over the past five years with over 180 graduates
- PE specialist programme has the highest employability rate across all the Sheffield Hallam Early Years and Primary Education programmes
- Programme trainees receive 100 hours of PE specialist training and may access a one week international placement
- During placements, trainees must spend 4 weeks in a specialist PE teaching role, teaching across the key stages as well as their classroom experience.

BEd Primary Education, University of Winchester:

- BEd/MEd Primary Education (with Physical Education specialism)
- Received 'Outstanding' grade from Ofsted in 2017
- 87 hours of subject input focusing on movement development, subject pedagogy and subject leadership
- Students identify themselves as primary educators first and foremost but with a strong commitment to teach and lead quality PE in the primary school.

St. Mary's University, Twickenham:

- B A (Hons) in Primary Education with QTS (Primary Physical Education Elective)
- Over three years, all students receive 5 core PE lectures totalling 10 hours per year.
- In Years 2 and 3, PE is an elective module ; thereby allocating a further 20 hours per year
- Students receive input around subject leadership, SEND, national governing body of sport course, use of technology as an assessment tool, practical teaching in schools over 4 weeks each year and directed tasks to ensure that teaching a series of PE lessons occurs during school placements.

St Mary's University Primary PGCE (M) (with a specialisation in PE):

- All students, whether generalist or specialist, receive 11 lectures totalling 22 hours of core PE. Those on the specialism module have a further 72 hours
- Students are confidently equipped to teach PE across 3 school placements building up to a series of lessons across year groups and key stages

All students engaged in elective or specialist modules are promoted as primary practitioners who have had extra training in PE. They are not called 'PE specialists' because the importance of their role as a classroom teacher is maintained as the priority.

Through the use of a Training Plan and the Abyassa system for monitoring progress, St Mary's are beginning to track PE teaching experience across school placements for all UG and PG trainee teachers so all trainees teach PE before leaving their course. This has also helped to highlight schools that do not support the teaching of PE whilst on placement (eg the use of coaches or PPA)

Received 'Outstanding' grade from Ofsted in January 2019.

Ofsted Inspection of Primary Physical Education Initial Teacher Training:

As a statutory subject of the primary curriculum, PE is an essential component of primary initial teacher education (ITE) and the recommendation of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). ITE providers recommend trainees for the award of QTS based on accurate and reliable assessment over time in meeting the Teaching Standards. The school-based element of the ITE programme is an important source of a student's developing professional knowledge and integral to the assessment of their competence in the subject:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-from-september-2015>

The following overview presents a summary of all references made to 'Primary Physical Education' in the ITE Ofsted inspection reports published between January 2016-January 2017. In total, 37 inspections for ITE were undertaken across school and university based programme routes; these included 19 from School Centred ITE, 11 from university-led providers and 7 from Teach First.

Good practice was illustrated by:

Trainees demonstrating:

- Good subject knowledge and curriculum knowledge
- Confidence to teach
- Good teaching skills
- Engagement in and leading extra-curricular and the wider school curriculum
- An awareness of Primary PE and Sport Funding
- Good use of questioning in lessons
- Use of technology in lessons
- Knowledge of assessment.

The programme facilitates:

- Opportunities for trainees to teach and observe high quality physical education
- Extensive training and subject input
- Specific knowledge of PE within SEN and EAL contexts
- Direct input on behaviour and safe practice
- Links between Physical Education with health and wellbeing
- A range of activities
- 'Hands-on' experience
- A well-resourced programme for PE, with links to national governing bodies of sport and the subject association
- A balance of theory and practice in taught input
- Auditing of subject knowledge and PE specific targets (linked to the DfE Teaching Standards).

The provider:

- Tracks progress and experience of their trainees in PE
- Has expert tutors who share practice with school partners
- Prioritises PE at ITE level
- Offers guidance for mentors provided and followed up
- Ensures opportunities are given to students to plan and teach PE despite schools not offering this on placements
- Receives high satisfaction from trainees
- Identifies schools with specialism and best practice.

Limitations:

- *Sports coaches deployed in schools prohibited trainee teachers from teaching and planning (*this was the main issue experienced throughout the reports)
- No opportunity to plan, teach and assess – leading to a lack of confidence and dissatisfaction in the subject
- Poor mentoring and feedback
- Trainees were keen to learn more about PE, but there was insufficient input/opportunities to meet demand
- PE was not related to all of the Teaching Standards
- Judgements of lessons were inaccurate
- Trainees did not track and monitor progress of children in PE (particularly for children from disadvantaged contexts)
- Insufficient time allocated to the subject at ITE.

Recommendations:

- 8.1 A review of policy relating to primary PE that considers teacher education of professional learning from the ITE stage through to subject leadership
- 8.2 Increased time allocated for PE across all ITE routes with a compulsory requirement for all primary training teachers to teach PE as part of a school-based placement
- 8.3 A core curriculum for Primary Physical Education ITE
- 8.4 Qualified teachers to become core deliverers of primary PE supported (but not replaced) by a wider workforce
- 8.5 Explicit guidance to be given to schools and ITE providers on the role of the wider workforce in primary schools and identification of qualification level needed to work within and outside the curriculum in a school context (ie play providers, sports coaches, teachers, leisure and fitness instructors and health professionals)
- 8.6 Schools, ITE providers, county sports partnerships and other relevant bodies to work more cohesively together to plan provision for CPD
- 8.7 With regard to special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) schools to

be given guidance via Ofsted to foster a democratic, robust and inclusive PE culture in every school so that all children are given access to developmentally appropriate PE.

9. THE PESS PREMIUM: BREAKING THE CYCLE

In the short term, the large sums of money available to external companies are an obvious attraction to those who could seek to profit from the primary school recipients of the PESS Premium. The House of Commons Education Committee (2013:49, HC. 2013. *'School sport following London 2012: No more political football'*, edited by the House of Commons Education Select Committee. London. The Stationery Office) noted that primary school head teachers were met with:

'A rush of commercial providers once the funding was announced. This was seen as a danger, with unknowing head teachers taking on commercial providers who were of questionable quality and limited to coaching rather than teaching PE.'

Concerns have been raised that the encouragement for schools to use their PESS Premium creatively may exacerbate already widening social inequalities (Ball S, 2013, *'The Education Debate 2nd edition ed. Bristol: Policy Press*) where schools find themselves locked increasingly into privatised models of PE provision. Overall, the key issue concerning the PESS Premium is what will its legacy be? The funding will end eventually and despite warnings about sustainability, some schools will have little to show for it if they have spent it all on sports coaches (whose presence is contingent upon the funding).

Apart from residual items of equipment, what is likely to be the legacy (unless pre-emptive action is taken) is the familiar cycle of funding, followed by its cessation, leading to a wasteland consisting of teachers' lack of knowledge and confidence because little or no appropriate training has occurred. In addition, there will be few subject advisers, clear structure or strategy – and once again, no money to supply these needs.

It is above all imperative that future funding decisions should be supported by a transparent process of consultation with qualified subject experts (Physical Education experts should advise on PE, sport experts on sport, play on play etc) so that they will not be vulnerable to the charge of 'knee jerk reactions' to ephemeral populist themes.

The suggestions below are intended to break the logjam - or forestall the inevitable:

9.1 Elevate Physical Education to core status within the curriculum, instigating a

- curriculum review based on lifelong physical activity and building upon secure foundations from Early Years education. Guidance should state that Early Years age groups qualify for PESS Premium funding
- 9.2 Prohibit the targeting of PE for PPA release time
 - 9.3 Commit to a sustainable School Sport and Physical Activity Action Plan setting out a long-term commitment to harnessing the potential of PE within the curriculum; joining up work of relevant Government Departments and providing sufficient funding to give schools certainty over future investment and planning
 - 9.4 Head teachers to be properly held to account by DfE to ensure that all funding streams are spent in accordance with published guidelines with the potential for recall if funding is misspent
 - 9.5 Head teachers to ensure that PE subject leaders receive subject leader training as a condition of the annual grant
 - 9.6 Government to issue a statutory requirement that all schools complete their annual report by using the commissioned template as produced by afPE and YST:
<http://www.afpe.org.uk/physical-education/evidencing-the-impact-guidance-template/>
 - 9.7 To bring to an end the practice of outsourcing the sampling of school performance to market research companies whose report findings are based upon school self-review without any meaningful on-site inspection of reported standards
 - 9.8 Proper, effective Ofsted scrutiny of every school's PESS Premium record of spend, impact and sustainability
 - 9.9 The creation of a national 'digital platform' whereby positive impact of the PESS Premium arising from good practice can be shared
 - 9.10 The establishment of a national data system as operated by the Slovenian SLOfit system would provide a wealth of useful data for schools and health authorities to act upon to address children's fundamental needs.

In conclusion, a core knowledge base of advice, guidance and experience must be returned to schools as of urgency if the repetitive cycle of failure is to be reversed.

If the health and wellbeing of the nation's children is as important as we are led to believe by the nation's Government, then it is a duty incumbent upon that Government to ensure that the legacy of the PESS Premium is the acceptance that being active and educated in a physical sense, is as important and ultimately life-enhancing as being able to read or do maths.

This is an opportunity to break the cycle.