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# CHILDREN \& LEARNING OVERVIEW \& SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AGENDA 

### 7.30 pm

## Thursday 26 January 2012

## Town Hall

Members 14: Quorum 6

## COUNCILLORS:

Sandra Binion (Chairman)
Gillian Ford (Vice-Chair)
Dennis Bull

Nic Dodin
Robby Misir
Pat Murray

Statutory Members representing the Churches

Phillip Grundy, Church of England Jack How, Roman Catholic Church

Billy Taylor
Frederick Thompson
Linda Trew

## Statutory Members representing parent governors

Julie Lamb, Special Schools Anne Ling, Primary Schools Garry Dennis, Secondary Schools

Non-voting members representing local teacher unions and professional associations: Bev Whitehead (NUT), Margaret Cameron, (NAHT), Keith Passingham, (NASUWT)

## What is Overview \& Scrutiny?

Each local authority is required by law to establish an overview and scrutiny function to support and scrutinise the Council's executive arrangements. Each overview and scrutiny committee has its own remit as set out in the terms of reference but they each meet to consider issues of local importance.

They have a number of key roles:

1. Providing a critical friend challenge to policy and decision makers.
2. Driving improvement in public services.
3. Holding key local partners to account.
4. Enabling the voice and concerns of the public.

The committees consider issues by receiving information from, and questioning, Cabinet Members, officers and external partners to develop an understanding of proposals, policy and practices. They can then develop recommendations that they believe will improve performance, or as a response to public consultations.

Committees will often establish Topic Groups to examine specific areas in much greater detail. These groups consist of a number of Members and the review period can last for anything from a few weeks to a year or more to allow the Members to comprehensively examine an issue through interviewing expert witnesses, conducting research and site visits. Once the topic group has finished its work it will send a report to the Committee that created it and it will often suggest recommendations to the executive.

## Terms of Reference

The areas scrutinised by the Committee are:

- School Improvement (BSF)
- Pupil and Student Services (including the Youth Service)
- Children's Social Services
- Safeguarding
- Adult Education
- 14-19 Diploma
- Scrutiny of relevant aspects of the LAA
- Councillor Calls for Action
- Social Inclusion


## AGENDA ITEMS

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS
(if any) - receive.

## 2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Members are invited to declare any interests in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting. Members may still declare an interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.

## 3 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

4 MINUTES (Pages 1-8)
To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 November 2011 and authorise the Chairman to sign them.

## 5 SEN TRANSPORT UPDATE

6 SCHOOL STANDARDS 2011 (Pages 9-40)
7 CHILDCARE SUFFICIENCY ASSESSMENT 2011-14 (Pages 41-50)

## 8 FUTURE AGENDAS

Committee Members are invited to indicate to the Chairman, items within this Committee's terms of reference they would like to see discussed at a future meeting. Note: it is not considered appropriate for issues relating to individuals to be discussed under this provision.

## 9 URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any other item in respect of which the Chairman is of the opinion, by reason of special circumstances which shall be specified in the minutes, that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.
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## Public Document Pack Agenda Item 4

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CHILDREN \& LEARNING OVERVIEW \& SCRUTINY COMMITTEE Town Hall <br> 10 November 2011 (7.30-9.30 pm)

Present:<br>Councilllors: Sandra Binion (Chairman), Gillian Ford (Vice-Chair), Nic Dodin, Robby Misir, Pat Murray, Billy Taylor, Frederick Thompson, Linda Trew and Wendy Brice-Thompson<br>Co-opted Members: Phillip Grundy, Jack How, Julie Lamb and Anne Ling<br>Non-voting Member: Bev Whitehead<br>The Chairman advised those present of action to be taken in the event of an emergency evacuation of the building becoming necessary<br>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dennis Bull, co-opted member Margaret Cameron, Keith Passingham and Garry Dennis.

## 4 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## 5 UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF SEN TRANSPORT CHANGES IN SEPTEMBER 2011 - PRESENTATION

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Director, Commissioning and the Project Manager regarding the implementation and early stages of the new SEN Transport arrangements.

Members were informed that at Corbets Tey and Dycorts Schools the use of meeting points had seen a reduction in the number of routes being taken, representing a significant saving. At Quarles Campus of Havering College of Further and Higher Education, a similar saving had been achieved through the merger of three routes into two. Hall Mead School had seen a shift from the use of buses to taxis; Oglethorpe Pupil Referral Unit had had two routes merged into one as had been the case at Gaynes and James Oglethorpe Schools.

Since the new policy had been in place, 121 assessments had been carried out for pupils at Corbets Tey and Dycorts Schools and these had returned the following results:

- 69 pupils were to continue to have a home pick-up.
- 47 pupils were to use a meeting point.
- 3 Dycorts pupils had been assessed as ready for travel training.
- 32 pupils were to be reassessed for travel training within the next two years.
- Following the assessment meeting, 5 parents had agreed to take their child to and from school themselves.

These assessments and the new policy in general meant that Corbets Tey School routes had been reduced from seven to five with an average of 17 pupils per vehicle and two vehicles having welfare escort officers. Similar savings and reductions had been achieved at Dycorts.

At Corbets Tey School, Transport Observers were on each vehicle for the first two days of term to monitor punctuality and record any issues. The average journey time in July 2011 (based on figures recorded by PTS) was 43.09 minutes, whilst average journey time in September 2011 was 43.00 minutes.

Since the start of term, 33 parents have contacted the Council with queries or problems with the new arrangements; these were broken down in terms of the seriousness of the issue and its resolution, as follows:

- 10 queries were easily answered.
- 12 problems were resolved by agreeing an alternative meeting point.
- 4 issues were resolved by altering the bus route or moving the child to a different bus, without adversely impacting the journeys of other children on the route.
- 4 appeals were rejected.
- 1 appeal was upheld (taxi provided).

Overall, officers remained in constant contact with parents and staff at schools to monitor problems and to constantly review the service.

The Committee heard that at Quarles Campus, due to students' timetables being more aligned this year; it was possible to reduce the number of routes from 3 buses to 2 larger vehicles. There were issues with punctuality during the first few weeks, due to timetable changes from the college which resulted in frequent reconfiguration of the routes. We are aware of some remaining punctuality issues and are monitoring this closely whilst considering possible solutions. This had been resolved and both vehicles are taking students onto the campus.

The Committee noted changes that had taken place at Hall Mead and Redden Court Schools and further noted that Havering Council has started a six-month pilot scheme with DABD to provide independent travel training.

During this phase, referrals were being sought from mainstream secondary schools that could put forward pupils with special educational needs who were currently transported by Council bus or taxi. If assessed by DABD as suitable and ready for training, pupils would receive a 12-week one-to-one training programme which it was hoped would enable them to travel to and from school or college independently.

Numerous points were raised regarding the update; Members expressed some concern that siblings with younger children would pick-ups but this was not reflected in assessment results and it was queried what the average journey time was for a child picked up at 7.30 am . It was explained that siblings did not have an automatic qualification and that for a 7.30am the range would be up to 8.45 to 8.50 depending upon the circumstances. On the subject of journey times there was conflicting information regarding the punctuality and efficiency of the new arrangements around journey times and it was requested that officers bring more information around journey times.

There was discussion around the location of meeting points, with some expressing concern that the location of the points was dangerous and unrealistic for vulnerable young people, but it was explained that many points had already been moved that were deemed unsuitable and the location of the meeting points would be continuously reviewed.

Further questions revealed that the projected savings of the new arrangements were on course, with $£ 40,000$ per bus being saved. Chaperones were available on some routes, but where pick-up points had been moved nearer to pupils' homes then it was not possible to provide chaperones at every point. Where taxis were being used the Council was ensuring that it had contracts with a small number of fully accredited companied which had been vetted to quality standards.

More generally, the borough did have an ambition to improve information on journey times and pick-up points were compared with other boroughs to maximise efficiency. The Cabinet Member for Children \& Learning had travelled on the longest route to gain first-hand experience of the service. Time logs were kept by each school to monitor standards.

A record of journey times from the Headteacher of Dycorts was circulated via a Member, the information of which was thought to demonstrate the potential range of journey times for journeys to the school and was not an actual record of journeys to and from the school. This was to be looked at further by officers outside of the meeting.

The Committee received a statement from the Chair of Positive Parents regarding their view of the new arrangements. This statement was to be circulated to Members outside of the meeting and the Council response was to be drafted and also circulated.

## 14-19 UPDATE

The Committee received and considered a report from the 14-19 Strategy Manager to update Members on developments within the 14-19 programme.

The Committee noted that on 13 April 2011, the Minster for Further Education, Skills and Lifelong Learning made an announcement giving details about proposals for a new all-age careers service in England by April 2012. The Department of Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) would continue to fund careers services for adults both online and through helpline services; from September 2011 these would be linked to similar services for young people, so there would be a single point of access for all users of each service. The department would also fund a network of public, private and voluntary organisations to provide careers guidance to adults. From April 2012 these services would be known as the National Careers Service.

From September 2012, the Education Bill would place a new duty on schools to secure access to impartial and independent careers guidance for every pupil in Years 9 to 11. Schools will have the freedom to decide how best to fulfil this duty. Schools would be able to access the National Careers Service for this purpose. Schools would be expected to make provision for careers guidance from within the Dedicated Schools Grant.

The DfE had issued statutory guidance to local authorities on targeted support services for young people and a communication to schools on changes to the delivery of careers guidance. Boroughs would not be expected to provide universal careers service once the new careers service was established and the duty on schools had commenced. However, local authorities would still need to support vulnerable young people to engage in education and training,

Local authorities, working with schools, Academies and colleges would additionally be expected to track and record young people's participation post-16 on the local Client Caseload Information System (CCIS) in order to ensure there is reliable data available centrally on young people at risk of being NEET. They will also be required to maintain close links with JobCentre Plus to ensure young people NEET are given appropriate support.

During the transition process, schools were being encouraged to think about putting in place new arrangements for careers guidance in advance of September 2012. Havering was currently in discussion with the current Connexions contractor (Prospects) with regard to a possible extension to the existing arrangements which come to a conclusion in March 2012.

The London Borough of Havering was currently drafting a strategy aimed at helping young people to succeed in learning and finding a job. As part of
this process, a draft Youth Commissioning document would be published later in 2011. The Youth Commissioning document would outline the nature of the commissioned activity that would deliver the Local Authority's responsibilities outlined above from September 2012.

Regarding post-16 participation, the Committee considered data showing that $87 \%$ of 16 and 17 year olds were in education and work based learning. This was a significant improvement in each of the last two years since 2007 when the comparative figures were $81 \%$ and $84 \%$. 16 year old participation increased to $91 \%$, and 17 year old participation increased to $83 \%$.

Further data showed information from the YPLA and DMAG regarding recruitment rates in 2011 for the 16-19 population. This showed a predicted drop in numbers over the next eight years. The predicted drop would almost cancel out a rise in the participation age to full participation in 2015. Local data from the Census showed a small reduction in the size of the Year 11 cohort in Havering between 2010 and 2014 (about 80 young people by 2014); it then begins to rise again.

The population measure and the Year 11 cohort sizes were measuring two different groups of young people. There was a view in London that the Census data may provide a more reliable measure for predicting future 1619 demand in London than the ONS data.

In terms of access to Higher Education the latest information available from UCAS showed that an increasing number of young people were making applications to University, and whilst the acceptance rate was staying relatively static, the total number of young people being accepted was increasing from 964 in 2003 to 1,233 in 2009.

The Committee noted the report.

## 7 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES ANNUAL COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS REPORT 2010/11

The Committee received a report from the Interim Head of Children and Young People's Services regarding the numbers and types of complaints handled by the Children and Young People's Service during 2010/11 and how they were dealt with to minimise the impact of justifiable concerns and to reduce the likelihood of future complaints.

The Committee noted that the key reasons for reporting complaints on Children and Young People's Services separately was because they were handled under specific regulations that individually define the statutory process into 3 formal stages (Stage 1, 2 and 3). Havering introduced an informal Pre Stage 1 process in 2005 to support a better complaints practice and avoid complaints escalating to statutory processes.

Some of the key messages that arose from the report during 2010/11 were that:

- The overall number of complaints was around 176 (46 matters raised by MP's and Councillors).
- The Pre Stage 1 process (40) had been very successful in resolving many initial concerns, with both more handled through that process and with none moving from that stage to the formal stage 1 process.
- The overall number of Stage 1 complaints had increased from the previous year by 32. There had been an increase in complaints made by the Children's Advocacy Service.
- The number of Stage 1 complaints, that escalated to a Stage 2 complaint had increased in 2010/11 by 6 complex complaints.
- There were two Stage 3 complaints for the financial year 2010/11. However one had rolled over to 2011/12 due to the complexity.
- For 2010/11 7 Compliments were received, these were in relation to the good work Children and Young People's Services had carried out.
- 7 complaints were submitted to the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO). The outcomes from these complaints were: 4 referred back as a premature complaint and investigated locally as a statutory Stage 1 complaint. 1 complaint was investigated by the LGO and no maladministration was found. 1 LGO Discretion - no or insufficient injustice. 1 LGO on going.
- Most complaints were initiated by parents and very few by children and young people.
- The majority of complaints related to the alleged behaviour of staff or the quality of service.
- A number of future actions had been identified as a result of the Annual Complaints and Compliments Report 2010/11. These were set out on page 7 of the appendix 1 . Most were continuous development matters, but with one or two specific new actions. Key was the continuation of a staff training programme.

The Committee noted that following a major restructure within Social Care \& Learning Directorate, there would be new arrangements whereby Children's and Adult complaints had now merged. It was envisaged that the annual report of 2011/12 would include combined data and more effective comparisons about performance in managing and dealing with complaints across all services. Proposals were being considered to bring complaints services within Social Care and Learning (Learning and Achievement, Adult Social Care and Children and Young People's Services) together in the future and as part of that change consideration would be given to how a wider service report can be provided.

The Committee noted the report.

## Chairman
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## SUMMARY

This report summarises the 2011 performance of Havering primary and secondary schools/academies in key stage assessments, tests and examinations.

2011 was another successful year for Havering schools at all levels. Overall attainment at all Key Stages in 2011 remains above the national average for each of the main national attainment measures in each Key Stage and is higher than the performance of our statistical neighbours. (see ANNEX 1).

During 2010-11, primary and secondary schools/academies receiving targeted support improved more significantly than those schools not in receipt of support.

Havering was also one of only 2 Local Authorities in the country (out of 150) to have no schools performing below the new government 'floor standard' in 2011.

## RECOMMENDATION

That the committee notes and commends the real achievements of its children and young people in achieving such high standards, and recognises the highly successful contribution that is made to the borough by headteachers, teachers and governors.

## REPORT DETAIL

## 1. Foundation Stage

Foundation Stage Profile
\%

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Havering | 82.1 | 61.2 | 58.6 | 81.8 | 58.6 | 92 | 67 | 27.5 |
| Hav. +/- | -1.4 | -0.9 | -0.9 | -0.9 | -0.9 | -2 | 0 | 1.3 |
| National | 79/+2 | 62/+3 | 59/+3 | 79/+2 | 59/+3 | 90 | 61.8 | 31.4/1.3 |

DfE: National Curriculum Assessments at EYFSP in England, 2010/11 (Provisional) - Released 01/12/11
1.1 Performance overall in all measures in the Foundation Stage in 2011 maintained much of the progress seen in recent years. Although Havering results for 2011 are marginally lower than our best ever outcomes in 2010, we are confident that the 2011 results are more accurate and more robust than in previous years, thanks to the improved moderation procedures that are being developed.
1.2 Last year, we reported on the significant narrowing of the gap between the average FSP scores and those of the lowest $20 \%$ of pupils in the Authority, and we are pleased to report that this gap has narrowed still further in 2011.

## 2. Key Stage 1

Key Stage 1
\%

|  | Level 2+ |  |  | Level 2B+ |  |  | Level 3 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Re | Wr | Ma | Re | Wr | Ma | Re | Wr | Ma |
| Havering | 89 | 86 | 92 | 79 | 68 | 78 | 28 | 13 | 22 |
| Hav. +/- | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| National | $85 /=$ | $81 /=$ | $90 /+1$ | $74 /+2$ | $61 /+1$ | $74 /+1$ | $26 /=$ | $13 /+1$ | $20 /=$ |

DfE: National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 1 in England, 2010/11 (Provisional) - Released 29/09/11
2.1 Overall performance at the Levels $2+$, 2B+ and $3+$ benchmarks at Key Stage 1 improved once again. This improvement maintains our place above the national average and is in keeping with the improving trend in the national picture.
2.2 As is the case for the Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1 assessments are all teacherassessed rather than tested, as they are at the subsequent key stages; and again, like at the Foundation Stage, schools have been supported in recent years to improve the accuracy of the teacher assessments. As a result of this robust process of cross moderation these judgements are now as accurate as they can be.

## 3. Key Stage 2

Key Stage 2 (SATs)
\%

|  | Level 4 + |  |  | Level 5+ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eng | Ma | Eng \& Mat | Eng | Ma | Eng \& Mat |
|  | 86 | 82 | 77 | 33 | 36 | 22 |
| Hav. $+/-$ | 5 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 1 | - |
| National | $81 /+1$ | $80 /+1$ | $74 /+1$ | $29 /-4$ | $35 /+1$ | $21 /-2$ |

DfE: National Curriculum Assessments at Key Stage 2 \& 3 in England, 2010/11 (Provisional)
3.1 In 2010 there was industrial action taken by some headteachers in Havering and across the country that led to the English and Maths SATs not being administered in approximately half of all Havering schools. Comparing the 2011 results with those of 2010 is therefore probably of less value than comparing progress in the trends over recent years.
3.2 Level 4+ attainment in both English and maths combined rose to 77.1\% - above 2009 and higher than this year's national average figure of $74 \%$, which has remained relatively static for a number of years. Level $5+$ performance rose to $22.1 \%$ - well above previous years. This places us, once again, above the national average, which dropped back again this year following a significant rise last year. Raising the achievement of our most able learners remains a focus in all of our schools.
3.3 In English, Level 4+ attainment rose to a best ever $85.7 \%$, well above the static national average figure of $81 \%$. Level $5+$ performance increased to $33 \%$ : well above both our 2009 result and the national average.
3.4 In mathematics, Level 4+ attainment rose to 82.3\% - just $0.1 \%$ below our highest ever results of 2009 and above the national average. Level $5+$ rose to $35.8 \%$, to remain above the national average.
3.5 No primary schools in Havering fell below the government's new floor standard - a minimum measure of both attainment and progress. Havering was one of only two Local Authorities country-wide to have no schools deemed 'underperforming' on this measure.
4. Key Stage 4

## Key Stage 4

\%

|  | EnBacc | 5 A*-C (inc. $^{\text {Eng \& Mat) }}$ | 5 A*-C $^{*}$ | Pupils making <br> expected <br> progress from <br> KS2 to KS4 in <br> English | Pupils making <br> expected <br> progress from <br> KS2 to KS4 in <br> Maths |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Havering | 18.7 | 64.2 | 78.9 | 75.3 | 71.7 |
| Hav. +/- | 0.4 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 2.2 |
| National | $16.5 /+0.9$ | $58.3 /+2.8$ | $78.8 /+3.4$ | $72.8 /+1.8$ | $65.7 /+2.3$ |

DfE: GCSE and Equivalent Results in England 2010/11 (Provisional) - Released 20/10/11
4.1 Following the significant rise in our Key Stage 4 results in 2010, we are very pleased to report that these results improved yet again in 2011 - the $5^{\text {th }}$ year of sustained improvement, with the key measure of $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English and maths rising by a full 10 percentage points over that time.
4.2 The key measure of $5+A^{*}$ - C including English and maths rose to $64.2 \%$; still well above the rising national average figure of $58.3 \%$.
4.3 The measure of $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ also rose again, representing a sustained year-on-year improvement. The national average figure matched the Havering figure for the first time ever this year. However, the national improvement is the result of many schools around the country adopting a variety of courses which carry multiple GCSE "equivalencies" but which the current government do not favour and they are looking to either phase out or reduce their equivalency. Havering schools continue to offer a broad and balanced curriculum which is still GCSE-based for the majority of learners, with an appropriate offer of other courses for some students. As such, our schools are well placed, going forward, and the apparent catching up by the national figure in this particular measure is not a concern.
4.4 Not only is attainment in Havering continuing to improve, but students' progress in English and in mathematics continues to rise and outstrips national performance.
4.5 This is the second year that the English Baccalaureate measure is being reported. This rewards those students who achieve an A*-C in English, maths, 2 sciences, a modern foreign language and either history or geography. This measure was introduced retrospectively last year and still does not reflect any changes in curriculum take up.

## 5. Key Stage 5

|  | APS / Student | APS / Examination Entry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Havering | 834.7 | 215.4 |
| Hav. + /- | 4.8 | 1.6 |

5.1 Outcomes for $6^{\text {th }}$ form students in Havering improved in both key measures in 2011.
5.2 APS per student and per examination are two headline measures used to assess the performance of sixth forms. Whilst it is important to compare individual year results with national scores (the latest national scores are for 2010) it is equally important to note the trend over time to ensure these scores are improving.
5.3 The average point score per student provides a measure of the average number of A level equivalents studied and the grades achieved. The more qualifications undertaken by a student and the higher the grades achieved, the higher the average point score per student. For Havering schools, APS per student remains significantly higher than the national average though trends over time vary for each school/academy.
5.4 The average point score per examination gives an indication of the average A level grade achieved by students at an institution. The higher the grade, the higher the points score per examination entry. For Havering schools APS per examination remains higher than the national average though trends over time vary for each school/academy.
6. Performance of primary schools supported by Hsis

| Key Stage 2-2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subject | Targeted <br> Schools | Universal <br> Schools |  |  |
|  | \%L4+ | + or - | \%L4+ | + or - |
| English \& Mathematics | 73.4 | 2.6 | 78.3 | -2.4 |
| English | 86.6 | 8.6 | 85.4 | -0.4 |
| Mathematics | 77.3 | 0.1 | 84.0 | -1.5 |

6.1 The Hsis Senior Leadership Team undertakes a rigorous process twice a year for deciding which category of support is needed for each school in consultation with each school's School Improvement Partner (SIP) and other colleagues across Children's Services. Schools are allocated a category from 1 - a light touch school, to 3 - needing significant support. Category 3 schools are subdivided into $3(a) /(b) /(c)$.

- Category 3 (a): requires Priority Support at a whole school level; at risk of being identified as requiring an Ofsted "Notice to Improve".
- Category 3 (b): identified by Ofsted as "Notice to Improve" or at risk of being identified as requiring Special Measures.
- Category 3 (c): those issued with an LA Formal Warning.

Category 3(b)/(c) schools are the LA's Schools Causing Concern, ie those in which the Authority has statutory powers to intervene. Schools who are designated as Category 3 receive additional targeted support to effect whole school improvements.
6.2 In addition to the above, schools also receive support to improve performance in a particular subject, or a combination of subjects. Support is also targeted according to need: Priority Support; Additional Support; Standard Support.
6.3 Fifteen schools were part of the LA's Targeted Support Programme in 2010-11 and these schools made improvements in both English and Maths at Level 4+.

## 7. Performance of secondary schools supported by Hsis

| Key Stage 4-2010-2011 Progress |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subject | Targeted Schools |  | Universal Schools |  |
|  | GCSE A*-C | + or - | GCSE A*-C | + or - |
| 5+ GCSE's incl. English \& Maths | 58.2 | 5.0 | 70.9 | -1.5 |
|  | 71.7 | 8.5 | 81.6 | 0.9 |
| Mathematics | 66.5 | 4.9 | 75.0 | -2.1 |

7.1 10 secondary schools/academies were supported by Hsis during 2010-11; these schools/academies showed significant improvements in English, Maths and at 5+ A*C GCSEs including English and Maths.
8. Interventions for pupils below age-related expectations
8.1 The service continues to promote programmes and strategies that target students who are below expectations or who are not making sufficient progress. This is achieved in various ways: use of data intelligence to identify schools with the largest number of students; proportional funding allocations for personalisation and intervention; School Improvement Partner challenge and evaluation of school-based provision; in-school consultancy support; training sessions on all major intervention programmes (eg 1-1 Tuition, Every Child a Reader (ECaR), Every Child a Writer (ECaW), Every Child Counts (ECC), Study Plus, etc). The tracking of these students also forms a major part of the school improvement agenda each term.
9. Support for groups and Closing the Gap (see ANNEX 1)
9.1 All groups are tracked (eg ethnic groups, FSM, boys and girls, EAL, SEN, etc) to ensure that any under-achievement in any group that does exist is challenged. School Improvement Partners in their visits to schools use group performance data as they support and challenge schools to review progress and narrow the attainment gap for all groups but particularly for those pupils in receipt of FSM and identified as having special needs.
9.2 The Local Authority has a full programme of training and consultancy to support the achievement of a range of groups (for example, the Home-School Workers and Learning Mentors across our 6 localities provide intervention specifically to address attendance, motivation and barriers to learning, particularly for our most vulnerable groups). 'Super Output Areas' data continues to be used to challenge perceptions in Foundation Stage schools.
9.3 Below is the performance of some key groups for 2011, showing the proportions reaching the national attainment levels and the expected rates of progress. In Havering, although attainment gaps do exist - in some cases quite significantly - our gaps in almost all cases are narrowing, and are also lower than the national average. Many of our vulnerable groups still perform 'significantly better' when compared to national figures (exceptions in red). Our gaps are greater at KS4 (FSM/CLA).

## Key Stage 1:

L2B+ Reading:

|  | Havering | National | + or - | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 79 | 74 | +5 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 75 | 68 | +7 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering = 8\% |
| FEMALE | 83 | 79 | +4 | Gap - Boys and Girls Nationally $=11 \%$ |
| FSM | 62 | 57 | +5 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM in Havering $=20 \%$ |
| NON-FSM | 82 | 78 | +4 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM Nationally $=21 \%$ |

L2B+ Writing:

|  | Havering | National | $\boldsymbol{+}$ or - | Comment |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 68 | 61 | +7 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 61 | 53 | +8 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering $=14 \%$ |
| FEMALE | 75 | 70 | +5 |  |
| FSM | 49 | 42 | +7 | Gap - FSM $\vee$ Non-FSM in Havering $=22 \%$ |
| NON-FSM | 71 | 66 | +5 | Gap - FSM $\vee$ Non-FSM Nationally $=24 \%$ |

L2B+ Mathematics:

|  | Havering | National | $\boldsymbol{+}$ or - | Comment |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 78 | 74 | +4 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 78 | 73 | +5 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering $=1 \%$ |
| FEMALE | 79 | 76 | +3 |  |
| FSM | 63 | 58 | +5 | Gap - FSM $\vee$ Non-FSM in Havering $=18 \%$ |
| NON-FSM | 81 | 78 | +3 |  |

## Key Stage 2:

## L4+ English:

|  | Havering | National | + or - | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 86 | 81 | +5 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 83 | 77 | +6 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering = 6\% |
| FEMALE | 89 | 86 | +3 | Gap - Boys and Girls Nationally =9\% |
| FSM | 75 | 67 | +8 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM in Havering = 13\% |
| NON-FSM | 88 | 84 | +4 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM Nationally $=17 \%$ |

L4+ Mathematics:

|  | Havering | National | $\boldsymbol{+}$ or - | Comment |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 82 | 80 | +2 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 84 | 80 | +4 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering $=3 \%(B)$ |
| GEMALE | 81 | 80 | +1 |  |
| FSM | 70 | 67 | +3 | Gap - FSM $\vee$ Non-FSM in Havering $=14 \%$ |
| GON-FSM | 84 | 83 | +1 |  |

## L4+ English and Mathematics:

|  | Havering | National | + or - | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 77 | 74 | +1 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 76 | 72 | +4 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering = 2\% |
| FEMALE | 78 | 77 | +1 | Gap - Boys and Girls Nationally = 5\% |
| FSM | 62 | 58 | +4 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM in Havering = 18\% |
| NON-FSM | 80 | 78 | +2 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM Nationally $=20 \%$ |

PROGRESS: English Key Stage 1-2 (2 levels of progress):

|  | Havering | National | $\boldsymbol{+}$ or - | Comment |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 86 | 83 | +1 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 85 | 81 | +4 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering $=3 \%$ |
| FEMALE | 88 | 86 | +1 |  |
| FSM | 86 | 79 | +4 | Gap - FSM $\vee$ Non-FSM in Havering $=0 \%$ |
| NON-FSM | 86 | 84 | +2 |  |

PROGRESS: Mathematics Key Stage 1-2 (2 levels of progress):

|  | Havering | National | + or - | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 83 | 82 | +1 | Broadly similar to national |
| MALE | 86 | 83 | +3 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering = 6\% (B) |
| FEMALE | 80 | 82 | -2 | Gap - Boys and Girls Nationally $=1 \%$ (B) |
| FSM | 79 | 75 | +4 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM in Havering = 5\% |
| NON-FSM | 84 | 84 | = | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM Nationally $=9 \%$ |

## Key Stage 4:

5 A*-C Grades (inc English and Mathematics):

|  | Havering | National | + or - | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 63 | 57 | +6 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 61 | 54 | +7 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering = 5\% |
| FEMALE | 66 | 61 | +5 | Gap - Boys and Girls Nationally $=7 \%$ |
| FSM | 38 | 34 | +4 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM in Havering = 28\% |
| NON-FSM | 66 | 61 | +5 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM Nationally $=27 \%$ |

PROGRESS: English Key Stage 2-4 (3 levels of progress):

|  | Havering | National | + or - | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 74 | 71 | +3 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 70 | 66 | +4 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering = 9\% |
| FEMALE | 79 | 76 | +3 | Gap - Boys and Girls Nationally = 10\% |
| FSM | 53 | 55 | -2 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM in Havering = 24\% |
| NON-FSM | 77 | 74 | +3 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM Nationally $=19 \%$ |
| CLA (13) | 54 | 37 | +17 | Gap - CLA v Non-CLA in Havering = 20\% |
| Non-CLA | 74 | 71 | +3 | Gap - CLA v Non-CLA Nationally $=34 \%$ |

PROGRESS: Mathematics Key Stage 2-4 (3 levels of progress):

|  | Havering | National | + or - | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | 71 | 64 | +7 | Significantly above national |
| MALE | 71 | 62 | +9 | Gap - Boys and Girls in Havering = 0\% |
| FEMALE | 71 | 66 | +5 | Gap - Boys and Girls Nationally = 4\% |
| FSM | 46 | 45 | +1 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM in Havering = 27\% |
| NON-FSM | 73 | 67 | +6 | Gap - FSM v Non-FSM Nationally $=22 \%$ |
| CLA (13) | 23 | 29 | -6 | Gap - CLA v Non-CLA in Havering = 48\% |
| Non-CLA | 71 | 64 | +7 | Gap - CLA v Non-CLA Nationally = 35\% |

* Note: CLA = Children Looked After


## IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

## Financial Implications and risks:

In previous years there has been specific grant from the DFE to support school improvement and national strategies in literacy and numeracy but this ceased from start of the 2011/12 financial year. Some central support was available to schools for the summer term (the term in which the tests referred to in this report were taken) from grant that was carried forward from the 2010/11 financial year. The grant has, however, now ceased and the size of Havering's School Improvement Team (HSiS) reduced accordingly. A package of support is offered to schools on a traded basis but the reduction in grant may put at risk the progress made by schools in future years.

## Legal Implications and risks:

There are no legal implications from noting the contents of this Report.

## Human Resources Implications and risks:

There are no HR implications from noting the contents of this Report.

## Equalities Implications and risks:

Schools are aware of their responsibilities regarding equality of opportunity and the need to narrow attainment gaps for some groups of pupils where these exist. This remains a key part of the national agenda, and attainment gaps do exist in Havering schools (eg between boys and girls; FSM and non-FSM). However, these gaps are narrowing in Havering and they remain smaller in almost all cases than the size of the gaps nationally. This remains a key priority within the school improvement service.

## CHERYL COPPELL

 Chief Executive
## Background Papers List

None.
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## Annex 1

Percentage of pupils attaining or surpassing each level in 2011 in Key Stage 1 for all national curriculum subjects by pupil type
Havering LA School (3119999)
Percentage of Key Stage 1 pupils achieving level 2b or above
This report shows the percentage of pupils in the school and nationally who attain or surpass the required standard for each level. Significance tests have been performed.

|  | Reading |  |  |  | Writing |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| All Pupils | 2,666 | 79 | 74 | Sig+ | 2,666 | 68 | 61 | Sig+ | 2,666 | 78 | 74 | Sig+ |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,366 | 75 | 68 | Sig+ | 1,366 | 61 | 53 | Sig+ | 1,366 | 78 | 73 | Sig+ |
| Female | 1,300 | 83 | 79 | Sig+ | 1,300 | 75 | 70 | Sig+ | 1,300 | 79 | 76 | Sig+ |
| Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FSM | 401 | 62 | 57 | Sig+ | 401 | 49 | 42 | Sig+ | 401 | 63 | 58 | Sig+ |
| Non FSM | 2,265 | 82 | 78 | Sig+ | 2,265 | 71 | 66 | Sig+ | 2,265 | 81 | 78 | Sig+ |
| 2011 Unvalidated data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RAISEonline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 1 |
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Percentage of pupils attaining or surpassing each level in 2011 in Key Stage 1 for
all national curriculum subjects by pupil type
Havering LA School (3119999)

| Reading |  |  | Writing |  |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |



 \begin{tabular}{l}
English as a First <br>
\hline Language <br>

\hline | English or believed to |
| :--- |
| be English |
| Other than English or |
| believed to be other |
| Unclassified |
| Special Educational |
| Needs |
| No Identified SEN |
| SEN without a |
| statement |
| School Action |
| School Action plus |
| SEN with a statement | ?

\end{tabular}

[^0]Percentage of pupils attaining or surpassing each level in 2011 in Key Stage 1 for
all national curriculum subjects by pupil type
Havering LA School（3119999）

| Reading |  |  | Writing |  |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National |  | Sig |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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| Ethnicity Group |
| :--- |
| White |
| British |
| Irish |
| Traveller of Irish |
| Heritage |
| Gypsy／Roma |
| Any other White |
| background |
| Mixed |
| White \＆Black |
| Caribbean |
| White \＆Black African |
| White \＆Asian |
| Any other mixed |
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－
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Percentage of pupils attaining or surpassing each level in 2011 in Key Stage 1 for
all national curriculum subjects by pupil type
Havering LA School (3119999)

| Reading |  |  |  | Writing |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |


| Indian | 42 | 88 | 83 |  | 42 | 76 | 74 |  | 42 | 83 | 81 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pakistani | 24 | 71 | 68 |  | 24 | 54 | 55 |  | 24 | 54 | 65 |  |
| Bangladeshi | 22 | 77 | 71 |  | 22 | 77 | 59 |  | 22 | 77 | 69 |  |
| Any other Asian background | 36 | 72 | 76 |  | 36 | 72 | 67 |  | 36 | 78 | 77 |  |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 56 | 63 | 68 |  | 56 | 50 | 53 |  | 56 | 55 | 63 |  |
| Black African | 172 | 83 | 73 | Sig+ | 172 | 74 | 59 | Sig+ | 172 | 79 | 68 | Sig+ |
| Any other Black background | 49 | 76 | 69 |  | 49 | 61 | 56 |  | 49 | 73 | 64 |  |
| Chinese | 8 | 75 | 78 | - | 8 | 75 | 72 | - | 8 | 100 | 85 | - |
| Any other ethnic group | 12 | 67 | 65 | - | 12 | 58 | 54 |  | 12 | 67 | 67 | - |
| Unclassified - Refused | 16 | 81 | 75 | - | 16 | 63 | 63 |  | 16 | 75 | 75 | - |

Percentage of pupils attaining or surpassing each level in 2011 in Key Stage 1 for all national curriculum subjects by pupil type
Havering LA School (3119999)

| Reading |  |  |  | Writing |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| 46 | 63 | 48 | Sig+ | 46 | 50 | 35 | Sig+ | 46 | 65 | 49 | Sig+ |
| 847 | 84 | 80 | Sig+ | 847 | 74 | 70 | Sig+ | 847 | 83 | 81 |  |
| 897 | 81 | 74 | Sig+ | 897 | 71 | 62 | Sig+ | 897 | 82 | 75 | Sig+ |
| 922 | 72 | 67 | Sig+ | 922 | 59 | 53 | Sig+ | 922 | 70 | 66 | Sig+ |


| Term of Birth |
| :--- |
| Autumn |
| Spring |
| Summer |

2011 Unvalidated data
RAISEonline
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## Percentage of Key Stage 2 pupils achieving level 4 or above

This report shows the percentage of pupils in the school and nationally who attain or surpass the required standard for each level.
Significance tests have been performed.

| All Pupils | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  | English\&Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
|  | 2,711 | 86 | 81 | Sig+ | 2,711 | 82 | 80 | Sig+ | 2,711 | 77 | 74 | Sig+ |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,377 | 83 | 77 | Sig+ | 1,377 | 84 | 80 | Sig+ | 1,377 | 76 | 72 | Sig+ |
| Female | 1,334 | 89 | 86 | Sig+ | 1,334 | 81 | 80 |  | 1,334 | 78 | 77 |  |
| Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FSM01 | 403 | 75 | 67 | Sig+ | 403 | 70 | 67 |  | 403 | 62 | 58 |  |
| Nones. | 2,308 | 88 | 84 | Sig+ | 2,308 | 84 | 83 |  | 2,308 | 80 | 78 | Sig+ |
| Attafotnent at KS1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low | 402 | 43 | 37 | Sig+ | 402 | 43 | 40 |  | 402 | 28 | 25 |  |
| Middle | 1,532 | 92 | 90 | Sig+ | 1,532 | 86 | 86 |  | 1,532 | 81 | 81 |  |
| High | 676 | 100 | 100 | - | 676 | 99 | 99 |  | 676 | 99 | 99 |  |
| English as a First Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| English or believed to be English | 2,457 | 86 | 82 | Sig+ | 2,457 | 83 | 81 | Sig+ | 2,457 | 77 | 75 | Sig+ |
| Other than English or believed to be other | 248 | 83 | 77 | Sig+ | 248 | 80 | 77 |  | 248 | 74 | 70 |  |
| Unclassified | 6 | 100 | 51 | - | 6 | 83 | 50 | - | 6 | 83 | 43 | - |
| Special Educational Needs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Identified SEN | 2,137 | 95 | 93 | Sig+ | 2,137 | 91 | 91 |  | 2,137 | 88 | 87 |  |
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Percentage of pupils attaining or surpassing each level in 2011 in Key Stage 2 for all
national curriculum subjects by pupil type
Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  | English\&Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| SEN without a statement | 522 | 54 | 51 |  | 522 | 52 | 53 |  | 522 | 37 | 38 |  |
| School Action | 356 | 63 | 57 | Sig+ | 356 | 58 | 58 |  | 356 | 44 | 43 |  |
| School Action plus | 166 | 34 | 41 |  | 166 | 39 | 46 |  | 166 | 23 | 31 | Sig- |
| SEN with a statement | 52 | 27 | 20 |  | 52 | 23 | 21 |  | 52 | 15 | 15 |  |
| Ethnicity Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| British | 2,079 | 85 | 82 | Sig+ | 2,079 | 83 | 81 | Sig+ | 2,079 | 77 | 75 | Sig+ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Irish } \end{array}$ | 8 | 88 | 87 | - | 8 | 100 | 85 | - | 8 | 88 | 80 | - |
| Travelder of Irish | 7 | 86 | 38 | - | 7 | 71 | 39 | - | 7 | 57 | 30 | - |
| Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gyproproma | 2 | 50 | 30 | - | 2 | 50 | 33 | - | 2 | 50 | 23 | - |
| Any other White background | 102 | 85 | 74 | Sig+ | 102 | 80 | 77 |  | 102 | 75 | 68 |  |
| Mixed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White \& Black Caribbean | 51 | 80 | 79 |  | 51 | 78 | 77 |  | 51 | 71 | 70 |  |
| White \& Black African | 11 | 91 | 83 | - | 11 | 82 | 79 | - | 11 | 73 | 74 | - |
| White \& Asian | 13 | 77 | 86 | - | 13 | 85 | 85 | - | 13 | 62 | 80 | - |
| Any other mixed background | 34 | 88 | 84 |  | 34 | 88 | 81 |  | 34 | 82 | 76 |  |
| Asian or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indian | 32 | 94 | 87 | - | 32 | 91 | 86 | - | 32 | 91 | 82 |  |
| Pakistani | 25 | 72 | 76 |  | 25 | 76 | 75 |  | 25 | 68 | 68 |  |

Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  | English\&Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| Bangladeshi | 12 | 92 | 82 | - | 12 | 83 | 79 | - | 12 | 83 | 74 | - |
| Any other Asian background | 23 | 96 | 82 | - | 23 | 96 | 84 | - | 23 | 96 | 77 | Sig+ |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 49 | 90 | 78 |  | 49 | 80 | 73 |  | 49 | 76 | 67 |  |
| Black African | 160 | 89 | 79 | Sig+ | 160 | 80 | 76 |  | 160 | 76 | 70 |  |
| Any other Black background | 31 | 81 | 77 |  | 31 | 71 | 73 |  | 31 | 65 | 67 |  |
| Chinese | 12 | 100 | 88 | - | 12 | 100 | 94 | - | 12 | 100 | 86 | - |
| Anyther ethnic grotb | 23 | 78 | 73 |  | 23 | 78 | 78 |  | 23 | 70 | 68 |  |
| Unclassified - Refused | 28 | 82 | 81 |  | 28 | 71 | 80 |  | 28 | 71 | 75 |  |
| Unclassified Information not obtained | 9 | 100 | 57 | - | 9 | 78 | 56 | - | 9 | 78 | 49 | - |


| Percentage of Key Stage 2 pupils achieving level 5 or above |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This report shows the percentage of pupils in the school and nationally who attain or surpass the required standard for each level. Significance tests have been performed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  | English\&Mathematics |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| All Pupils | 2,711 | 33 | 29 | Sig+ | 2,711 | 36 | 35 |  | 2,711 | 22 | 21 |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,377 | 28 | 23 | Sig+ | 1,377 | 39 | 37 |  | 1,377 | 21 | 18 | Sig+ |
| Female | 1,334 | 39 | 35 | Sig+ | 1,334 | 33 | 33 |  | 1,334 | 24 | 23 |  |
| Free School $_{\text {cheals }}$ <br> 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FSMÔ (D) | 403 | 18 | 14 | Sig+ | 403 | 19 | 19 |  | 403 | 10 | 8 |  |
| Non_SM <br> Attai <br> Attainment at KS1 | 2,308 | 36 | 32 | Sig+ | 2,308 | 39 | 38 |  | 2,308 | 24 | 24 |  |
| Low | 402 | 2 | 1 |  | 402 | 2 | 4 |  | 402 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Middle | 1,532 | 23 | 19 | Sig+ | 1,532 | 29 | 27 |  | 1,532 | 12 | 10 |  |
| High | 676 | 75 | 72 |  | 676 | 74 | 77 |  | 676 | 59 | 60 |  |
| English as a First Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| English or believed to be English | 2,457 | 33 | 30 | Sig+ | 2,457 | 36 | 35 |  | 2,457 | 22 | 21 |  |
| Other than English or believed to be other | 248 | 29 | 23 | Sig+ | 248 | 35 | 33 |  | 248 | 23 | 18 | Sig+ |
| Unclassified | 6 | 17 | 17 | - | 6 | 0 | 18 | - | 6 | 0 | 10 | - |
| Special Educational Needs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Identified SEN | 2,137 | 41 | 37 | Sig+ | 2,137 | 44 | 44 |  | 2,137 | 28 | 27 |  |
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|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  | English\&Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| SEN without a statement | 522 | 4 | 5 |  | 522 | 7 | 9 |  | 522 | 2 | 2 |  |
| School Action | 356 | 5 | 5 |  | 356 | 7 | 9 |  | 356 | 2 | 2 |  |
| School Action plus | 166 | 3 | 5 |  | 166 | 8 | 9 |  | 166 | 2 | 3 | - |
| SEN with a statement | 52 | 4 | 3 | - | 52 | 4 | 5 | - | 52 | 2 | 2 | - |
| Ethnicity Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| British | 2,079 | 34 | 30 | Sig+ | 2,079 | 36 | 35 |  | 2,079 | 23 | 21 |  |
|  | 8 | 25 | 37 | - | 8 | 25 | 44 | - | 8 | 13 | 29 | - |
| Traध角er of Irish Heritage | 7 | 29 | 3 | - | 7 | 0 | 6 | - | 7 | 0 | 1 | - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Gyp } \$ \not \subset R o m a ~ \\ \text { O. } \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 0 | 4 | - | 2 | 0 | 6 | - | 2 | 0 | 2 | - |
| Any other White background | 102 | 22 | 25 |  | 102 | 33 | 35 |  | 102 | 16 | 19 |  |
| Mixed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White \& Black Caribbean | 51 | 33 | 25 |  | 51 | 31 | 27 |  | 51 | 22 | 16 |  |
| White \& Black African | 11 | 27 | 31 | - | 11 | 18 | 34 | - | 11 | 9 | 22 | - |
| White \& Asian | 13 | 38 | 38 |  | 13 | 38 | 46 |  | 13 | 23 | 30 | - |
| Any other mixed background | 34 | 24 | 33 |  | 34 | 47 | 37 |  | 34 | 18 | 23 |  |
| Asian or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indian | 32 | 31 | 35 |  | 32 | 53 | 47 |  | 32 | 25 | 28 |  |
| Pakistani | 25 | 24 | 20 |  | 25 | 28 | 27 |  | 25 | 24 | 14 | - |

[^3]Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  | English\&Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| Bangladeshi | 12 | 33 | 23 | - | 12 | 33 | 32 | - | 12 | 25 | 17 | - |
| Any other Asian background | 23 | 48 | 31 |  | 23 | 43 | 47 |  | 23 | 43 | 26 | Sig+ |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 49 | 10 | 20 |  | 49 | 20 | 20 |  | 49 | 8 | 11 |  |
| Black African | 160 | 33 | 23 | Sig+ | 160 | 36 | 28 | Sig+ | 160 | 21 | 15 | Sig+ |
| Any other Black background | 31 | 26 | 22 |  | 31 | 26 | 24 |  | 31 | 10 | 14 | - |
| Chingse | 12 | 67 | 45 |  | 12 | 67 | 67 | - | 12 | 42 | 41 | - |
| Any尺尺t ther ethnic group | 23 | 30 | 22 |  | 23 | 26 | 35 |  | 23 | 22 | 17 | - |
| Unclessified - Refused | 28 | 29 | 31 |  | 28 | 39 | 37 |  | 28 | 25 | 22 |  |
| Unclassified Information not obtained | 9 | 22 | 17 | - | 9 | 22 | 20 | - | 9 | 0 | 11 | - |

## Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 performance - expected progress

Havering LA School (3119999)

This report shows the percentage of pupils making expected progress between Key Stage 1 and 2.
Significance tests have been performed on the data.

|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| All Pupils | 2634 | 86 | 83 | Sig+ | 2633 | 83 | 82 |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1337 | 85 | 81 | Sig+ | 1342 | 86 | 83 | Sig+ |
| Female | 1297 | 88 | 86 | Sig+ | 1291 | 80 | 82 |  |
| Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FSM | 392 | 86 | 79 | Sig+ | 393 | 79 | 75 |  |
| Non FSM | 2242 | 86 | 84 | Sig+ | 2240 | 84 | 84 |  |
| Children Looked After |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLA | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not CLA | 2634 | 86 | - | - | 2633 | 83 | - | - |
| Deprivation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLA or FSM | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Not CLA or FSM | 2242 | 86 | - | - | 2240 | 84 | - | - |
| Attainment at KS1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low | 402 | 83 | 78 | Sig+ | 402 | 68 | 65 |  |
| Middle | 1532 | 91 | 88 | Sig+ | 1532 | 85 | 85 |  |
| High | 676 | 78 | 77 |  | 676 | 87 | 89 |  |
| English as a First Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| English or believed to be English | 2419 | 86 | 83 | Sig+ | 2417 | 83 | $82^{-7}$ |  |
| Other than English or believed to be other than English | 209 | 91 100 | 87 58 |  | 210 | 89 | 85 59 |  |
| Unclassified | 6 | 100 | 58 | - | 6 | 83 | 59 | - |
| Special Educational Needs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Identified SEN | 2080 | 89 | 87 | Sig+ | 2078 | 88 | 88 |  |
| SEN without a statement | 503 | 80 | 77 |  | 504 | 67 | 68 |  |
| School Action | 345 | 83 | 80 |  | 345 | 69 | 70 |  |
| School Action Plus | 158 | 73 | 71 |  | 159 | 63 | 64 |  |
| SEN with a statement | 51 | 49 | 42 |  | 51 | 47 | 41 |  |
| Ethnicity Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| British | 2058 | 86 | 83 | Sig+ | 2057 | 83 | 82 |  |
| Irish | 6 | 83 | 87 | - | 6 | 67 | 87 | - |
| Traveller of Irish Heritage | 7 | 86 | 65 | - | 7 | 71 | 61 | - |

## Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 performance - expected progress

Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| Gypsy/Roma | 2 | 50 | 59 | - | 1 | 100 | 53 | - |
| Any Other White Background | 86 | 87 | 85 |  | 88 | 85 | 86 |  |
| Mixed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White and Black Caribbean | 50 | 80 | 83 |  | 50 | 76 | 79 |  |
| White and Black African | 10 | 80 | 85 | - | 10 | 80 | 82 | - |
| White and Asian | 12 | 83 | 85 | - | 11 | 91 | 86 | - |
| Any other Mixed Background | 34 | 82 | 85 |  | 34 | 94 | 84 |  |
| Asian or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indian | 31 | 90 | 88 | - | 32 | 94 | 89 | - |
| Pakistani | 21 | 90 | 86 | - | 21 | 90 | 82 | - |
| Bangladeshi | 11 | 100 | 89 | - | 11 | 82 | 85 | - |
| Any other Asian Background | 18 | 100 | 88 | - | 17 | 100 | 90 | - |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 44 | 86 | 83 |  | 45 | 76 | 77 |  |
| Black African | 149 | 90 | 87 |  | 149 | 85 | 84 |  |
| Any Other Black Background | 29 | 83 | 82 |  | 28 | 79 | 80 |  |
| Chinese | 12 | 92 | 91 | - | 12 | 100 | 95 | - |
| Any Other Ethnic Group | 19 | 89 | 85 | - | 19 | 89 | 87 | - |
| Unclassified - Refused | 26 | 92 | 82 | - | 26 | 88 | 82 | - |
| Unclassified - Information Not Obtained | 9 | 100 | 65 | - | 9 | 78 | 66 | - |

The calculation of expected progress changed in 2011 to include Key Stage 2 teacher assessments, where no appropriate test level is available.
The definitions of low, middle, high are based on the Key Stage 1 results attained by pupils on completion of the key stage. Low attaining are those below Level 2 at Key Stage 1 (APS<12). Middle attaining are those at Level 2 at Key Stage 1 ( $12 \leq$ APS $<18$ ). High attaining are those above Level 2 at Key Stage 1 (APS $\geq 18$ ).

## Key Stage 4, attainment, thresholds by pupil characteristics

Havering LA School (3119999)

## Percentage of candidates achieving 5 or more $A^{*}$ to $C$ (inc English and Maths) at GCSE and equivalent

This report provides analysis of pupils performance at GCSE and equivalent. The percentage of pupils gaining 5 or more A* to C (inc English and Maths) in 2011 by pupil characteristic is shown. Significance tests have been performed on the data.

Percentage of pupils achieving 5 or more A* to C (inc English and Maths) at Key Stage 4


|  | Cohort | Percentage of cohort gaining 5 or more $\mathrm{A}^{*}$ to C (inc English and Maths) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | School | National | Difference | Significance |
| All pupils | 3,081 | 63 | 57 | 6 | Sig+ |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,603 | 61 | 54 | 7 | Sig+ |
| Female | 1,478 | 66 | 61 | 5 | Sig+ |

Free School Meals

| FSM | 287 | 38 | 34 | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non FSM | 2,794 | 66 | 61 | 5 | Sig+ |

English as a First Language

2011 Unvalidated data
RAISEonline

## Key Stage 4, attainment, thresholds by pupil characteristics

Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | Cohort | Percentage of cohort gaining 5 or more $A^{*}$ to $C$ (inc English and Maths) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | School | National | Difference | Significance |
| English or believed to be English | 2,865 | 64 | 58 | 6 | Sig+ |
| Other than English or believed to be other | 204 | 60 | 55 | 5 |  |
| Unclassified | 12 | 75 | 18 | 57 | - |

Special Educational Needs


SEN without a statement

| School Action | 215 | 26 | 27 | -1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Action plus | 116 | 24 | 19 | 5 |
| SEN with a statement | 90 | 9 | 8 | 1 |

Ethnicity Group

| White |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| British | 2,479 | 63 | 58 | 5 | $\mathrm{Sig}^{+}$ |
| Irish | 17 | 71 | 65 | 6 |  |
| Traveller of Irish Heritage | - | - | 17 | - | - |
| Gypsy/Roma | - | - | 11 | - | - |
| Any other White background | 91 | 59 | 54 | 5 |  |
| Mixed |  |  |  | 7 |  |
| White \& Black Caribbean | 36 | 56 | 49 | 12 |  |
| White \& Black African | 16 | 69 | 57 | 3 |  |
| White \& Asian | 14 | 71 | 68 | 10 |  |
| Any other mixed background | 36 | 72 | 62 | -8 |  |

2011 Unvalidated data
RAISEonline

## Key Stage 4, attainment, thresholds by pupil characteristics

Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | Cohort | Percentage of cohort gaining 5 or more $\mathrm{A}^{*}$ to C (inc English and Maths) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | School | National | Difference | Significance |
| Pakistani | 15 | 80 | 52 | 28 | Sig+ |
| Bangladeshi | 10 | 30 | 59 | -29 | - |
| Any other Asian background | 23 | 57 | 62 | -5 |  |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 39 | 59 | 48 | 11 |  |
| Black African | 139 | 72 | 57 | 15 | Sig+ |
| Any other Black background | 40 | 68 | 52 | 16 | Sig+ |
| Chinese | 23 | 83 | 78 | 5 |  |
| Any other ethnic group | 17 | 65 | 53 | 12 |  |
| Unclassified - Refused | 36 | 64 | 59 | 5 |  |
| Unclassified - Information not obtained | 3 | 33 | 19 | 14 | - |

2011 Unvalidated data
RAISEonline

## Key Stage 4, attainment, thresholds by pupil characteristics

Havering LA School (3119999)

## Percentage of candidates achieving English Baccalaureate at GCSE and equivalent

This report provides analysis of pupils performance at GCSE and equivalent. The percentage of pupils gaining in 2011 by pupil characteristic is shown. Significance tests have been performed on the data.

Percentage of pupils achieving English Baccalaureate at Key Stage 4


## Key Stage 4, attainment, thresholds by pupil characteristics

Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | Percentage of cohort gaining English Baccalaureate |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Difference | Significance |
| Other than English or believed to be other | 204 | 20 | 14 | 5 | Sig+ |
| Unclassified | 12 | 67 | 4 | 63 | - |
| Special Educational Needs |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Identified SEN | 2,660 | 21 | 19 | 2 | Sig+ |
| SEN without a statement |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Action | 215 | 1 | 3 | -2 |  |
| School Action plus | 116 | 3 | 2 | 0 | - |
| SEN with a statement | 90 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - |



2011 Unvalidated data
RAISEonline

## Key Stage 4, attainment, thresholds by pupil characteristics

Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | Percentage of cohort gaining English Baccalaureate |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Difference | Significance |
| Bangladeshi | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | - |
| Any other Asian background | 23 | 13 | 19 | -6 | - |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 39 | 10 | 8 | 3 | - |
| Black African | 139 | 14 | 11 | 3 |  |
| Any other Black background | 40 | 15 | 10 | 5 | - |
| Chinese | 23 | 57 | 34 | 22 | Sig+ |
| Any other ethnic group | 17 | 12 | 15 | -3 | - |
| Unclassified - Refused | 36 | 19 | 17 | 3 |  |
| Unclassified - Information not obtained | 3 | 33 | 5 | 29 | - |

2011 Unvalidated data
RAISEonline

## Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 performance - expected progress

Havering LA School (3119999)

This report shows the percentage of students making expected progress in English, mathematics.
The value added methodology has changed in 2011 for the Expected Progress reports.
Significance tests have been performed on the data.

|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| All Pupils | 3005 | 74 | 71 | Sig+ | 3001 | 71 | 64 | Sig+ |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1560 | 70 | 66 | Sig+ | 1563 | 71 | 62 | Sig+ |
| Female | 1445 | 79 | 76 | Sig+ | 1438 | 71 | 66 | Sig+ |
| Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\overline{\text { FSM }}$ | 277 | 53 | 55 |  | 273 | 46 | 45 |  |
| Non FSM | 2728 | 77 | 74 | Sig+ | 2728 | 73 | 67 | Sig+ |
| Children Looked After |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLA | 13 | 54 | 37 | - | 13 | 23 | $29^{-7}$ |  |
| Not CLA | 2992 | 74 | 71 | Sig+ | 2988 | 71 | 64 | Sig+ |
| Free School Meals Or Children Looked After |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLA or FSM | 290 | 53 | 54 |  | 286 | 45 | 44 |  |
| Not CLA or FSM | 2715 | 77 | 74 | Sig+ | 2715 | 74 | 67 | Sig+ |
| Attainment at KS2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low | 367 | 54 | 47 | Sig+ | 362 | 27 | 26 |  |
| Middle | 1462 | 72 | 70 |  | 1461 | 68 | 64 | Sig+ |
| High | 1111 | 86 | 87 |  | 1111 | 89 | 85 | Sig+ |
| English as a First Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| English or believed to be English | 2830 | 74 | 71 | Sig+ | 2818 | 70 | 63 | Sig+ |
| Other than English or believed to be other than English | 164 | 82 | 77 |  | 172 | 83 | 75 | Sig+ |
| Unclassified | 11 | 73 | 26 | - | 11 | 82 | 24 | - |
| Special Educational Needs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Identified SEN | 2603 | 79 | 78 |  | 2604 | 76 | 73 | Sig+ |
| SEN without a statement | 316 | 53 | 52 |  | 315 | 37 | 39 |  |
| School Action | 203 | 52 | 56 |  | 206 | 40 | 43 |  |
| School Action Plus | 113 | 55 | 43 | Sig+ | 109 | 32 | 31 |  |
| SEN with a statement | 86 | 24 | 26 |  | 82 | 22 | 20 |  |
| Ethnicity Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| British | 2454 | 73 | 70 | Sig+ | 2443 | 70 | 63 | Sig+ |
| Irish | 14 | 79 | 77 | - | 14 | 79 | 71 | - |

## Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 performance - expected progress

Havering LA School (3119999)

|  | English |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort | School | National | Sig | Cohort | School | National | Sig |
| Traveller of Irish Heritage | - | - | 34 | - | - | - | 23 | - |
| Gypsy/Roma | - | - | 25 | - | - | - | 18 | - |
| Any Other White Background | 77 | 77 | 75 |  | 79 | 70 | 73 |  |
| Mixed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White and Black Caribbean | 36 | 69 | 66 |  | 35 | 57 | 54 |  |
| White and Black African | 16 | 88 | 73 | - | 14 | 71 | 67 | - |
| White and Asian | 13 | 62 | 79 | - | 14 | 71 | 73 | - |
| Any other Mixed Background | 36 | 69 | 75 |  | 36 | 75 | 70 |  |
| Asian or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indian | 45 | 80 | 86 |  | 46 | 78 | 84 |  |
| Pakistani | 13 | 92 | 73 | - | 14 | 93 | 68 | - |
| Bangladeshi | 9 | 78 | 79 | - | 8 | 50 | 74 | - |
| Any other Asian Background | 17 | 76 | 81 | - | 21 | 81 | 84 | - |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 37 | 84 | 70 |  | 37 | 70 | 62 |  |
| Black African | 128 | 84 | 80 |  | 127 | 89 | 77 | Sig+ |
| Any Other Black Background | 37 | 81 | 75 |  | 38 | 82 | 66 | Sig+ |
| Chinese | 21 | 86 | 88 | - | 22 | 95 | 95 | - |
| Any Other Ethnic Group | 14 | 86 | 77 | - | 15 | 80 | 76 | - |
| Unclassified - Refused | 35 | 77 | 72 |  | 35 | 63 | 66 |  |
| Unclassified - Information Not Obtained | 3 | 33 | 26 | - | 3 | 33 | 23 | - |

Expected Progress is defined as making 3 levels of progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4. Significance tests have been performed on the data. A blank space means that a significance test has been carried out and the result for school or ethnic group is not significantly different from the national average. If the formula indicates that the test cannot be run on the particular dataset, then a dash is displayed.
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Section 11 Childcare Act 2006 requires Local Authorities to produce a Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (CSA) on a 3 year basis. The last Assessment was published on 1 April 2011. This report provides an update on the Local Authority's actions in meeting those recommendations and provides additional information on the consultation document on the delivery of Free Early Education for 2,3 and 4 year olds and on securing sufficient childcare across the Borough.

## SUMMARY

Under Section 6 (1) of the Childcare Act 2006, local authorities have a duty to ensure there is sufficient childcare in their area, so far as is reasonably practicable. The findings from the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (CSA) published on 1 April 2011 enabled the Local Authority to draw up an Action Plan aiming to narrow the gaps in childcare provision as highlighted.

This report details the progress towards meeting those actions as published. It also provides an opportunity to inform Councillors of the recently published consultation document which calls for significant changes in the way the Local Authority must ensure sufficiency in the childcare market and the Local Authority's statutory role on the delivery of free Early Education for 2,3 and 4 year olds.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1) To note the progress of the Local Authority in meeting the recommendations of the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment; and
2) To note the Local Authority's role in securing sufficient childcare, and the challenges faced, and its forthcoming statutory duty to provide Free Early Education for 2, 3 and 4 year olds.

## REPORT DETAIL

## Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (CSA) - Background

The current CSA is a lengthy document that meets the DFE toolkit requirements. However the key findings from the report to note and consider are:

1) Havering's Childcare Sufficiency Review 2011 reports that on the whole, the Local Authority is maintaining its commitment to high quality services and its local vision of "Havering: a place where every child and young person matters".
2) The quality of childcare provision available in the Borough continues to be higher than the national average in relation to Ofsted inspection outcomes. An increasing number of providers have successfully achieved Basic Skills Quality Assurance status. This allows for childminders to offer Early

Education Entitlement (EEE) creating additional flexibility for families accessing childcare.
3) The Local Authority is meeting its sufficiency duty as, the availability of childcare on a Borough wide basis continues to outstrip the number of 3 and 4 year olds in Havering.
4) In terms of inclusive access to childcare, the Local Authority has made available a variety of funding opportunities to provisions to ensure that all children can access suitable childcare. By April 2011 the Local Authority had supported a number of settings to become Disability Access Champions and completed works to ensure those settings were accessible to disabled children and their parents/carers.
5) The re-accredited Family Information Service provides an impartial and consistent quality service to local families and childcare providers and promotes and reports an increase in the take-up by local families accessing Working Tax Credit to help with their childcare costs.

## Childcare Sufficiency Assessment - Action Plan (2011-2014)

The Childcare Sufficiency Assessment, as published in April 2011, made the following recommendations:

- The Local Authority continues to support provisions in offering more flexible places.
- The Local Authority continues to pro-actively support the development of holiday provision and promote its availability to parents in the borough.
- The Local Authority continues to promote Early Education Entitlement for 3 and 4 year olds, the pilot scheme providing funded places for 2 year olds and other help available to support childcare costs to eligible families. Eligibility is classified by the DfE as the term after which the children attains the required age e.g. 2,3 or 4.
- The Local Authority continues supporting childcare providers to access training, including training on caring for children with disabilities and special educational needs, in line with the Local Authority's budget.
- The Local Authority continues to support new and existing childcare providers with achieving and maintaining the delivery of quality childcare.

An update of the Actions Taken and Planned in support of these recommendations is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

## Supporting Families in the Foundation Years: Proposed Changes to the Entitlement to free Early Education and Childcare Sufficiency

On the 11 November 2011 the Department for Education (DfE) published a consultation document setting out its proposals on the new entitlement for two year olds from September 2013, including which children will be eligible. It also includes proposals on the quality and flexibility of the entitlement for two, three and four year olds. The consultation will close on 3 February 2012 and comments will be collected from the Early Years Provider Reference Group, a statutory body of representatives from across the sector

Streamlined statutory guidance is planned to be introduced in September 2012 in readiness for the new entitlement for 2 year olds from September 2013, already passed in the Education Act 2011 ( but not yet commenced) and to the making of new detailed regulations.

This report asks Councillors to note the following proposed changes currently subject to consultation.

1) The Local Authority to provide 500 places for eligible 2 year olds from

September 2013. The funding route for delivery is still being considered but will potentially be Early Intervention Grant.
2) To increase the number of free hours for 2 year olds from 10 per week to 15 per week by September 2013.
3) Introduce an eligibility criteria that considers the potential to qualify for Free School Meals as an indicator of economic disadvantage.
4) Looked After Children and children with Special Educational Needs to be given the legal entitlement to Free Early Education at age 2 regardless of economic disadvantage.
5) Allow local authorities to fund providers to deliver free hours between 7am and 7 pm (but retain the suggested limit of 10 hours per day)
6) Remove the limit that the full 15 free hours should be taken over no few than three days.
7) Replace the current quality assurance system with a "basket" of eligibility criteria approach, under which local authorities would require providers of free early education to meet.
8) No free provision to be based in OfSTED "inadequate" settings.
9) Streamline the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment and propose that local authorities report annually on their Section 6 sufficiency duty to elected council members and parents. [ Is this in draft Regulations or Guidance. I couldn't find it.]
10) Repeal the Section 11 duty to undertake a nationally prescribed assessment every 3 years.

## IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

## Financial implications and risks:

## Caroline May - Corporate Finance

The recommendations implemented to date have been funded from within existing Learning and Achievement resources.

The ten changes listed above as a result of the Education Bill will bring new responsibilities that do carry financial implications. From Sept 2013 there will be a need to realign Learning and Achievement budgets to support the new responsibilities, so some re-modelling of resources will be necessary. The service are planning for this and further scoping will take place in the period to Sept 2013. It is currently forecast that the implications can be contained within Learning and Achievement resources. This will be monitored on an ongoing basis, and risks around budget realignment considered in a timely manner.

## Legal implications and risks:

## Stephen Doye - Legal Services

The Childcare Act 2006 places specific duties on the local authority to secure sufficient childcare and to carry out a Childcare sufficiency Assessment. The purpose is to enable parents to take up or remain in work and to undertake education or training which could lead to work

Failure to secure any shortfall in childcare provision highlighted by the CSA would render the local authority liable to a challenge that it was not meeting its statutory duties under the Childcare Act 2006.

The findings of the CSA demonstrate that there is an appropriate match between demand and supply for childcare within Havering and the local authority is, therefore, meeting its duty.

Human Resources implications and risks:
Eve Anderson - HR Business Partner
There are no human resource implications or risks attached to this report.

Equalities implications and risks:

The Childcare Sufficiency consultation process was carefully considered to allow access and participation from all communities to ensure full representation. An Equality Impact Assessment was drafted and approved and attached at Appendix 2.

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

Supporting Families in the Foundation Stage consultation Document Childcare Sufficiency Assessment 2011

## APPENDIX 1

## Actions Taken and Planned in Support of the Recommendations of the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment 2011-2014

## Recommendation 1 - The Local Authority continues to support provisions in offering more flexible places

The significant majority of settings delivering the Early Education Entitlement (EEE) are providing this entitlement flexibly. Of the 121 Private, Voluntary and Independent School (PVI) Providers and Maintained Schools with Nursery Classes, 113 (93\%) provide this offer flexibly or in accordance with parental needs. (figures as at April 2011);

All settings are requested to carry out an annual survey of parental requirements and to submit these to the Local Authority to demonstrate their continued consultation with parents in regards to their needs.

Havering's Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF), the funding mechanism for Providers delivering EEE, includes a supplement for those Providers that have carried out this survey and are meeting parental needs, as far as is reasonably practicable. The high numbers of settings delivering a flexible offer may mean that this supplement can be reviewed and some funding re-prioritised to supplement the Quality and/or Deprivation Supplement.

No complaints have been received from parents unable to access a flexible offer;
The Family Information Service continues to offer a brokerage service to parents that includes identifying settings that can meet particular needs.

The draft revised Code of Practice for delivery of EEE, which is currently under consultation from the Department for Education, is proposing an extension of the hours of early education/childcare from $8 \mathrm{am}-6 \mathrm{pm}$ to $7 \mathrm{am}-7 \mathrm{pm}$ and enabling the entitlement to be taken over 2 days rather than the current 3 days. Assuming that these changes are including in the final published Code of Practice, officers will be working with Providers to support this delivery.

Recommendation 2 -The Local Authority continues to pro-actively support the development of holiday provision and promote its availability to parents in the borough.

The Foundation Years and Independent Advice Service (FYIAS) Education Advisers and Officers continue to support holiday provisions and out of school clubs in meeting the requirements of the Early Years Foundation Stage;

The re-structure of the FYIAS team to work on a Partnership/Locality basis, will greatly assist the identification and options to meet local needs and specific projects around sufficiency which are being developed;

Bespoke training is being made available for these provisions during the Spring Term 2012 which provides particular support around the delivery of the Early Years Foundation Stage.

The Family Information Service continues to provide information on the provision available and sustainability consideration is given to holiday provisions where there is a threat of closure.

Recommendation 3 - The Local Authority continues to promote Early Education Entitlement (EEE) for 3 and 4 year olds, the pilot scheme providing funded places for 2 year olds and other help available to support childcare costs to eligible families

The EEE will continue to be promoted through the Family Information Service, its Brokerage Service and through promotion in the Partnership/Locality areas;

The pilot 2 Year Old Offer for the 15\% most disadvantaged children has been very successful in Havering. The Local Authority met its target of 71 placements per term and it has been possible to extend this to 95 places pending the Government's announcement of its statutory scheme.

Following the passing of the Education Act 2011, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Autumn Statement announced that the 2 Year Old Offer would be extended to $40 \%$ of all 2 Year Olds, from September 2013. For Havering this is expected to represent 500 children. The offer is also being extended from a maximum of 10 hours per week to 15 hours per week. This significant extension of the 2 Year Old Offer will require careful planning and (as expected by the Government) a build up to the expected number of places. This planning is in progress and includes identification of places available, action to increase places where needed, ensuring quality of settings and training for Providers. The 2 Year Old Offer will play a significant role in the Local Authority's Prevention and Intervention Strategy by identifying those most at need at the very earliest stage.

The Disability Access Champions' works project has been completed and will be further reviewed to ensure the best promotion of these settings to ensure disabled children are able to access suitable early education/childcare;

Whilst the Local Authority has sufficient childcare places across the Borough as a whole, there are some areas, particularly Hylands, Cranham and Mawney Wards that have insufficient places in the immediate area. Support will be given to new businesses, particularly seeking to start-up in these areas. Officers will work with other Local Authority Departments, for example Planning, to ensure that the Authority's statutory duty to provide sufficient childcare places is met, wherever possible, when making or recommending decisions.

Recommendation 4 -The Local Authority continues supporting childcare providers to access training, including training on caring for children with disabilities and special educational needs, in line with the Local Authority's budget

The Local Authority's Training Programme for PVI Providers has been reviewed in order to move to a fully identified targeted programme from 2012/13 and to continue to meet efficiency savings.

Additional training options for Providers including a number of Business Support Courses such as Business Planning and Business Sustainability will be available and in addition, a wider range of "sign-posted" courses will be included.

Additional targeted free training will continue to be provided for specific priorities such as Disability and Elklan. The continuation of the WELLCOMM programme will extend during 2012/13 after extensive evaluation shows the programme to be adding value.

## Recommendation 5 - The Local Authority continues to support new and existing childcare providers with achieving and maintaining the delivery of quality childcare

The corporate target of $70 \%$ of settings having a "Good" or above Ofsted Inspection outcome has been achieved. This target is to be reviewed to ensure continuous improvement for 2012/13.

The number of PVI Providers judged to be Green (under a RAG rating system) as part of the Targeted Support Package has increased each year since 2009 Currently $71 \%$ of all PVI providers are judged to be Green by the Local Authority (as at 7 December 2011). To this end they receive the maximum funding available under the Early Years Single Funding Formula (EYSFF) and the least support from the Council, thus moving in the same direction as the Havering 2014 agenda working with those most at need. At the other end of the scale are the settings judged to be Red, currently $4 \%$ who receive the lowest level of funding but the highest level of training and targeted support.

The Targeted Support Package for PVI Providers has been reviewed for 2012, to ensure continuous improvement. The EYSFF Includes a Supplement for Quality. The level of funding will be reviewed following the Government's own review of School Funding.
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