

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Report

Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Date:	20 March 2017
Title:	Attainment of children and young people in Hampshire Schools
Report From:	Director of Children's Services

Contact name: David Hardcastle

Tel: 01252 814755

Email: david.hardcastle@hants.gov.uk

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1. This report has been produced using the data sets released by the DfE during December 2016. The data set for Key Stage 4 is still provisional and therefore changes could still occur when the final data set is produced. At the time of writing, there are elements even of this provisional set that are still to be published, so the picture and analysis, whilst having a sufficiency, is not the complete picture. In particular, we still await the information regarding the performance of disadvantaged children in Hampshire. The data for Key Stage 2 are drawn from the recently published national datasets, as are those for Key Stage 1 and Early Years Foundation Stage. The comparisons with statistical neighbours at Key Stages 1 and 2 are based on provisional data.

2. Contextual Information

- 2.1. Pupils perform well against the national averages in the new, more challenging standards at all key stages, with performance generally being above, or well above these measures. Performance is strong, too, when compared to the group of our statistical neighbours. Schools have been well-prepared for the introduction of the new standards and in most cases performance against them is relatively greater than it was previously when compared to the national averages. The impact of the work of the local authority can be evidenced in this improvement.

3. Consultation and Equalities

- 3.1. There is no consultation proposed in relation to the contents of this report. Similarly, there are no equalities issues raised in Appendix B of this report.

4. Early Years Foundation Stage Profile

- 4.1. Performance by children in the foundation stage is well above that nationally and has been so for the past three years. Standards, as measured by the proportion of children judged to have reached a good level of development (GLD) have risen over this time albeit at a slightly slower rate than nationally.

Good Level of Development (GLD)	2016	2015	2014
National	69.3%	66.3%	60.4%
Hampshire	75.2%	72.6%	67.5%

- 4.2. For all key published statistics, Hampshire's performance can be compared to a group of local authorities that are statistically most like Hampshire. The group is selected on the basis of the 10 authorities most like Hampshire, with 5 being more advantageous and 5 being less so.
- 4.3. The group is set up so that Hampshire's performance should be in line with the group average, with the County being placed in 6th position on the group ranking. For this measure, performance is above the group average, resulting in 2nd place in the ranking.
- 4.4. This strong performance has been as a result of the work that the Early Years team have carried out in Hampshire schools that has focussed particularly on helping teachers understand the requirements of the standard and how to structure learning to enable pupils to learn to that level. The team has also provided significant support for early years providers across Hampshire

5. Key Stage 1 Performance

- 5.1. The performance standard at Key Stage 1 has changed this year. Levels are no longer used to assess performance and have been replaced by a new, more challenging measure known as the expected standard. This means that the figures this year cannot be compared to those in any previous years.
- 5.2. Hampshire's performance against the old levels was generally 3 or 4% above that nationally. However, performance relative to the national figures in this new standard has improved in all subject areas so that it is now 4 or 5% above.

Expected standard or above	reading	writing	mathematics
National	74%	65%	73%
Hampshire	80%	70%	77%

- 5.3. The performance against these measures is above the statistical neighbour average and places the local authority at the top of the group in all these subject areas.
- 5.4. There is evidence that indicates that Hampshire schools have been better prepared for the changes to national standards in the primary phase than has been the case nationally. This is discussed in more detail in the section on Key Stage 2 performance but it is worth noting that HIAS inspectors spent significant time over the past couple of years working with schools to help them develop an accurate understanding of these new, more challenging standards. In particular, the thorough, developmental approach taken to moderation – unlike that used in some local authorities - has underpinned this work. The Standards and Testing Authority, the national body that oversees the quality of testing and moderation arrangements in schools and local authorities, was complimentary about our processes when they reviewed our arrangements in the summer term.

6. Key Stage 2 Performance

- 6.1. Performance measures for Key Stage 2 also changed this year. Schools are now measured on the proportion of pupils who reach the expected standard, or age related expectation (ARE) as it is known, in reading, writing and mathematics combined.
- 6.2. This is a more challenging standard than that previously and again, this hinders any easy comparison with previous years' performance.
- 6.3. Performance across Hampshire was well above that nationally, with 59% of pupils reaching ARE against 54% nationally. It was above the average for our statistical neighbours and placed us top of our group.
- 6.4. Performance in the individual subject areas was also strong, with 71% of pupils reaching ARE in reading, 80% in writing and 72% in mathematics against national figures of 66%, 74% and 70%. Performance in all three subject areas topped the group of statistical neighbours.

	Percentage of Pupils attaining age related expectations in reading, writing and mathematics	Percentage of Pupils attaining age related expectations in reading	Percentage of Pupils attaining age related expectations in writing	Percentage of Pupils attaining age related expectations in mathematics
Hampshire	59%	71%	80%	72%
National	54%	66%	74%	70%

- 6.5. Having said this, there was considerable variation at an individual school level, with some schools achieving high levels of performance and others disappointingly low figures.
- 6.6. There are many factors that might lead to this set of circumstances. However, a careful analysis indicates that this year, a significant element to schools' success lay with understanding the challenge inherent in the new standards and translating them into the classroom.
- 6.7. Over the past couple of years the Local Authority has run training across Hampshire to build this understanding. This training has had three elements: moderation sessions to deepen understanding about the standards; assessment updates to ensure that schools have been fully informed of the processes and related information from the DfE; and work on using the standards to plan schemes of work, teach them and assess children accurately.
- 6.8. The analysis shows no one strand was more important than any other. The key lies with the amount of exposure to this thinking, as indicated by the number of courses and sessions that were attended.
- 6.9. For schools that attended up to three meetings across the range offered, there was a 2.4% relative improvement. The comparative figure for the group that attended between 4 to 6 meetings was 3.4%, and those that attended 7 or more improved by 6.6% relative to the national. (The relative improvement was calculated by taking the difference between the difference between school's 2016 performance and the national average, and the difference between the school's 2015 performance and the national average).
- 6.10. Generally, in the schools in which relative performance slipped, this drop can be tracked back to a relative fall in mathematics. Follow up visits that inspectors have carried out to these schools show that generally whilst the work was of a higher standard in books than it had been previously, pupils struggled to answer questions in the tests in which they had to apply this knowledge to solve problems. Further training is being made available to schools from the mathematics team to support this for this coming year.
- 6.11. We will also be focussing elements of the Leadership and Learning Partner's annual visit to help schools understand why performance was as it was in 2016, challenging underperformance and providing support for schools that need it.

7. Key Stage 4 performance

- 7.1. We have now entered a period of change regarding the nature of GCSE courses and their assessment, the way in which pupils' performance is measured and the overall metric for schools. New, more challenging courses are now either being taught in schools ready for first examination in 2017, or are being prepared ready to be taught in the near future. Gradings will change to a number based system with the old C grade being replaced by a more challenging number based level. These changes will undoubtedly take time to bed down in schools, as well as presenting

challenges for understanding the performance of schools and the system over time.

- 7.2. 2016 marked the first of the changes with a significant redesign of the secondary school metric. The proportion of children being awarded 5 or more GCSEs (including English and mathematics) at grade C or above has been replaced by four measures which are explained in more detail below. To summarise, these are the proportion of pupils achieving a C or better grade in both English and mathematics; the proportion of children achieving the English baccalaureate (EBacc), attainment 8 (A8) and progress 8 (P8).
- 7.3. Colleges and employers will still want to know pupils' performance in terms of 5A*-C (E+M). Indeed pupils will not necessarily be told of their individual A8 or P8 result. These figures have been expressly designed as a way of measuring the performance of institutions. This is a significant divergence. The measures for individual institutions are now different to those for individual pupils. The tension is that pupils might be curtailed in pursuing a curriculum that plays to their strengths and interests because of the potential to lower the school's A8 or P8 score. This is a situation that needs careful monitoring.

8. Percentage of pupils attaining 5 GCSEs at A*-C, including English and mathematics

- 8.1. The DfE has now ended the publication of this figure nationally. Data is still available but there have been changes to the way in which English performance data has been included. This has caused confusion this year for some schools which have published figures which are not comparable to those in previous years, without realising the changes that have taken place.
- 8.2. The performance of Hampshire is given below against the national figures

	Hampshire	National
2014	58.9%	56.8%
2015	59.7%	57%
2016	60.3%	57%

- 8.3. GCSE performance remains above that nationally and has improved at a faster rate than the national figures over the past three years.
- 8.4. This performance is underpinned by strong performance in Hampshire schools in English and mathematics (see below).

9. The "Basics"

- 9.1. This is the first of the "new" measures and indicates the proportion of pupils who have achieved a C or better grade in both an English and mathematics qualifying qualification.

	Hampshire	National
--	-----------	----------

2014	61.0%	59.1%
2015	62.1%	59.5%
2016	66.3%	62.8%

- 9.2. Again, Hampshire schools perform above those nationally and have also improved at a greater rate over the past three years. Performance is above the average for our statistical neighbours such that we are placed 3rd in the group.

This is as a result of strong performance in English and mathematics GCSE separate subjects:

9.3. English:

	Hampshire	National
2014	70.7%	69.1%
2015	70.1%	69.4%
2016	77.4%	74.7%

9.4. Mathematics:

	Hampshire	National
2014	69.8%	67.8%
2015	71.4%	68.5%
2016	72.0%	68.5%

- 9.5. Performance in both these key subjects has improved at a faster rate than nationally over the past three years and is now approximately 3% above the national average in each subject.
- 9.6. Improvements at Key Stage 4 of this nature can be due to pupils entering secondary school with higher levels from Key Stage 2, better teaching through the years of secondary education, or a combination of both.
- 9.7. A review of this cohort's Key Stage 2 performance in 2011 shows that it improved by 1% on the 2010 figures in both English and mathematics. This suggests that the improvement is due to better attainment on entry and better teaching of those pupils. Unfortunately, the DfE no longer produce the three levels of progress dataset which can be used to confirm this view.
- 9.8. Given the difficulties reported by schools in recruiting appropriate mathematics teachers in particular, this is a particularly significant improvement.

10. The English Baccalaureate

- 10.1. The EBacc measures performance across a tightly defined group of academic subjects. To qualify, pupils must take both English Language and literature and obtain A*-C in one of them; reach A*-C in mathematics; obtain 2 A*-C grades in the sciences; an A*-C in a language (either modern or ancient) and an A*-C in either history or geography.

- 10.2. 25.8% of pupils achieved the EBacc this year against 24.6% nationally, with Hampshire performing largely in line with its statistical neighbours.
- 10.3. Not all pupils qualify for the EBacc as specific courses need to be followed. There has been much conversation nationally about whether this is a qualification for an academic “elite” or not. There have also been associated discussions about how many pupils should be entered, with there being some thought that to focus a smaller number of pupils into this qualification and ensuring all of them achieve it is better than taking a broader approach to entry.
- 10.4. In Hampshire, a higher proportion of children than nationally qualified for the EBacc (41.2% against 39.7%). However, the pass rate for these children is still higher than that nationally (62.6% versus 61.9%).
- 10.5. Schools in Hampshire show no correlation between the proportion of the overall cohort that qualified for EBacc and those of whom achieved it.
- 10.6. There is significant variation between schools in performance against this measure.
- 10.7. The county data suggests two main reasons for this – areas that we will be working with schools to develop over the coming year.
- 10.8. First of all, there is a need for greater co-ordination of pupils’ performance across a basket of subjects
- 10.9. Secondly, data from the individual subject areas shows that Hampshire schools on average perform better than those in our statistical neighbours in English, mathematics and the sciences but not so in the humanities.

11. Attainment 8

- 11.1. The calculation of A8 is complex, looking at pupils’ average performance across eight subjects from a tightly defined set that includes English, mathematics, three EBacc subjects and three other subjects. A8 is not a threshold measure, but gives the average grade that pupils have achieved across the basket of subjects. As it is an indication of the average grade, the performance of all pupils is significant. Just focussing on pupils who are on the C/D borderline will only have a slight impact on this measure. The performance of all pupils across a wide range of subjects really does count towards this measure.
- 11.2. Dividing the school’s or local authority’s A8 number by 10 gives the average grade on an eight point scale (G = 1, A* = 8). In 2016, the A8 for Hampshire schools was 51.0, which is equivalent to the average grade being just above a C grade. The national figure was 49.9 – equivalent to an average grade just below a C grade. Another way of looking at this is to say that on average, a pupil in Hampshire achieved one grade better in one of their subjects than was the case nationally.
- 11.3. Hampshire schools also outperformed their statistical neighbours, with their performance placing them third in the group.

- 11.4. There is significant variation in the performance of individual schools. There will always be a range of school specific reasons for this, yet two themes emerge at a local authority level.
- 11.5. In some schools, the way in which they timetabled their Key Stage 4 options they limited their chances of maximising the A8 score. As identified earlier, though, there is an argument that says schools should structure their Key Stage 4 curriculum to enable pupils to pursue their interests and aspirations rather than to maximise the school's A8 score.
- 11.6. The other theme relates to pupils' performance in humanities. The overall performance of pupils in this subject area was below the statistical group average. Schools in Hampshire entered proportionally more children into these subjects than did schools in the group of statistical neighbours. This might mean that the cohort opting to study these subjects in Hampshire was more "comprehensive" than elsewhere. However, this area warrants further investigation once a full dataset has been published.

12. Progress 8

- 12.1. P8 as a measure of the progress pupils have made across the A8 basket of subjects relative to their peers nationally. National performance information is used to estimate the A8 score of each pupil based on their Key Stage 2 performance. This is subtracted from their actual A8 score and the mean of the difference calculated across the school. P8 is therefore a relative measure, dependant on pupils' performance nationally. Schools cannot predict with any accuracy what it might be ahead of the examinations.
- 12.2. In a school with a P8 of zero, pupils have on average performed in line with pupils with similar starting points nationally. If the score is positive, then pupils have made more progress from their starting points than nationally; if it is negative, then pupils have made correspondingly less progress. A P8 score of +0.5 means that pupils have on average achieved half a grade better across the eight subjects than pupils with similar starting points, nationally. A score of -0.5 means that pupils have underachieved by half a grade against pupils with similar starting points nationally.
- 12.3. P8 in Hampshire was very slightly negative (-0.03) in 2016. Whilst this was a fraction below the group average, the local authority's performance placed it in the middle of its group. Hampshire schools have also performed in line with the national average, which was also -0.03.
- 12.4. In general, the performance of the different subject elements of P8 is in line with that nationally. Pupils made better progress in mathematics in Hampshire than they did nationally, but marginally less progress in English.
- 12.5. Again, at a school by school level, there is greater variation than this. One of the themes that emerges is that the weaker elements of P8 performance tend to lie in the EBacc and other subjects than they do in the core. Schools have worked hard in the past to secure strong outcomes in the core and will need to work with equal rigour in the foundation subjects.

- 12.6. The challenge for schools in improving pupils' progress, and thus the school's P8, score lies with building effectively on the high levels of Key Stage 2 attainment. Setting appropriately high expectations through Key Stage 3 so that pupils are well-placed to start GCSE courses is key. Our work with primary schools has shown that developing an understanding of the new higher expectations and translating them into effective teaching has enabled children to perform well against the new higher standards at Key Stages 1 and 2.
- 12.7. Consequently, we have initiated a programme across all secondary school subject areas that develops this understanding of the expectations now required and of pupils' standards at Key Stage 2 and how to use this information to plan and teach lessons that challenge all pupils appropriately.

13. Conclusions

- 13.1. Overall, the school system in Hampshire continues to perform well. In a period which has seen significant changes to the curriculum, assessment processes and school metrics, the performance of Hampshire schools against the national performance and that of statistical neighbours has improved. There is significant evidence that the partnership between schools and Hampshire Inspection and Advisory Service has meant that schools have been well-prepared for these changes and that this has played a key role in the relative improvement.

14. Recommendations

- 14.1. That Cabinet note the attainment of children in Hampshire Schools in 2015/16 set out in the report, recognises their outstanding achievement and the continued trend of Hampshire schools outperforming the national average across all levels.

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:**Links to the Corporate Strategy**

Hampshire safer and more secure for all:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Maximising well-being:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Enhancing our quality of place:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

DocumentLocation

None

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equality Duty

1.1. The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:

Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;

Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;

Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular to:

The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant characteristic connected to that characteristic;

Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic different from the needs of persons who do not share it;

Encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

1.2. Equalities Impact Assessment:

No decisions are required to be made on the basis of this report

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

2.1. None

3. Climate Change:

How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

No decisions are required to be made on the basis of this report, so there is no impact

How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

See above