

CHILDREN & LEARNING OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Subject Heading:

School Standards Report, 2013

CMT Lead:

Joy Hollister

Report Author and contact details:

Grahame Smith
School Improvement Manager
Havering School Improvement Services (Hsis)
01708 433813
grahame.smith@havering.gov.uk

Policy context:

Education

SUMMARY

This report summarises the 2013 performance of Havering primary and secondary school pupils in key stage assessments, tests and examinations, and the performance of schools in their most recent Ofsted inspections.

The 2012 / 2013 school year was generally a positive year for Havering schools. Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) results were strong, and once again Havering enjoyed its best ever results at key stage one and equalled the previous best (2012) at key stage two. Following a fall at GCSE in 2012, the 5 A*-C grades (including English and Maths) pass rate also increased in 2013. There was only one Havering school in the primary sector below the government floor standard (at least 60 per cent achieving Level 4+ in Reading, Writing and Mathematics) and none below floor in the secondary sector.

Overall attainment at key stages one, two and four remains above the national average for each of the main attainment measures and is higher than the average performance of our statistical neighbours.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the committee also notes some of the challenges faced in Havering (see section nine of this report), while commending the achievements of its pupils and students in their achievements, and the successful contribution that is made to this by head teachers, teachers, support staff in schools and governors

REPORT DETAIL

Havering's Statistical Neighbours (SN):

Bexley	Thurrock
Essex	Bury
Kent	Solihull
Medway	Staffordshire
Swindon	Stockport

1 Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS)

1.1 There is now a new way of calculating outcomes for the early years foundation stage (EYFS). The main measure now is the proportion of children achieving a 'good level of development' (GLD), assessed at the 'expected' or 'exceeding' grade in all the primary learning goals, and in literacy and mathematics.

1.2 The previous measure was less demanding, hence the drop in the percentage of pupils around the country judged to be 'school ready' for Year 1 in September 2013.

Table 1: EYFS assessment: pupils attending Havering schools 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	56	59	64	52
Inner London	52	58	64	53
Outer London	56	60	65	53
Statistical neighbours	57	61	66	56
Havering	60	59	60	59
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	33	65	106	18

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

1.3 Table 1 shows that pupils in Year R in Havering schools did particularly well in 2013, under the new measure – better than in London (a high- performing area), its 'statistical neighbours' (see the list at the top of the page) and England. Our four year olds performed better than those in 134 out of 152 'top tier' LAs – 18th, which is near to the top 10 per cent.

2 Key Stage One

2.1 Results at key stage one (pupils in year two, aged seven) were best ever achieved in Havering. For simplicity, only the mathematics performance is exemplified, but it is worth noting that performance improved in reading and writing in 2013, and there was also a pleasing increase in the proportion of pupils achieving level three (the highest level).

Table 2: key stage one mathematics: % attaining 'expected' level (L2B+); pupils attending Havering schools 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	73	74	76	78
Inner London	69	70	74	77
Outer London	73	75	77	79
Statistical neighbours	76	76	79	80
Havering	78	78	81	81
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	18	19	6	18

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

2.2 Table 2 shows that Year 2 pupils in our schools performed at a consistently high level against all comparator groups, and within the top half of the top quartile in 2013 – very close to the top 10 per cent in England. In 2012, we were within the top five per cent. Performance in writing was first class – consistently within the top 10 per cent over the last four years, and fourth best out of 152 English LAs in 2012.

3 Key Stage Two

3.1 There are two key measures at key stage two – progress and attainment. With regard to **progress**, this is now measured in three areas – reading, writing and mathematics (commonly known as RWM in primary schools). Comparisons for reading and writing are only available for the last two assessments (2012 and 2013) so, again, mathematics is used to exemplify progress of pupils in our schools between the two key stages.

Table 3: key stage two progress (mathematics – 'expected' 2 levels of progress +) 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	82	83	87	88
Inner London	87	87	91	92
Outer London	85	85	89	90
Statistical neighbours	81	82	86	88
Havering	83	88	91	91
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	57	77	56	24

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

3.2 The table shows that pupil performance here is now very good, and, moreover, has improved in the four year period shown. Performance is better than that in most

the comparator groups, and significantly better than most. Inner London boroughs have, on average, overtaken us, but this is within the context of Inner London being the area that is the most improved in the country, and is extremely well funded.

3.3 In reading and writing, performance was very good when compared with statistical neighbours (SN) – first in reading and second best progress in writing - but only second quartile against all LAs and slightly lower than the London average.

3.4 In terms of **attainment**, the key measure at key stage two is the percentage of pupils who achieve ‘level 4’ or better in all three subjects (RWM).

Table 3: key stage two attainment – % L4+ reading, writing, mathematics 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	64	75	75	76
Inner London	66	77	78	78
Outer London	68	77	77	77
Statistical neighbours	65	74	74	76
Havering	66	77	77	79
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	56	32	33	7

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

3.5 The performance of year 6 pupils attending our primary schools last year was exceptionally good – much better than pupils in every comparator group, and the seventh best of all English LAs. This is within the best five per cent. We are third in our SN comparator group, a position we have retained for the last three years.

4 Key Stage Four

4.1 Again, the two key performance indicators are progress pupils have made since key stage two, and their attainment. To take **progress** first, there are two main measures – progress made in mathematics and progress made in English.

Table 4: key stage four progress (maths ‘expected’ 3 levels progress+) 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	62	65	69	71
Inner London	68	73	75	77
Outer London	70	73	75	77
Statistical neighbours	63	66	70	71
Havering	69	71	73	74
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	24	29	40	44

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

4.2 Key stage four progress in mathematics is improving in absolute terms, although declining slightly in comparative ranking – from top quartile to ‘top second quartile’ progress. The decline is primarily due to the excellent improvement in London as a whole.

Table 5: key stage four progress (English ‘expected’ 3 levels progress+) 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	69	72	68	70
Inner London	72	76	74	76
Outer London	76	78	74	77
Statistical neighbours	71	73	70	70
Havering	70	75	64	72
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	69	41	123	58

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

4.3 Progress in English is less good, while remaining sound. There was a marking ‘borderline shift’ issue in 2012 that particularly affected pupils here; but in 2013 progress was better than that nationally and amongst Statistical Neighbours.

4.4 The main performance measure of the English system is the percentage of pupils in Year 11 who achieve 5 GCSE s at grade C or better, including English and maths.

Table 6: Pupils with 5 A-C including English and mathematics 2010 - 2013*

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	54	59	59	61
Inner London	58	62	62	64
Outer London	59	63	63	65
Statistical neighbours	57	59	61	62
Havering	62	64	62	65
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	17	22	44	39

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

4.5 The table shows Havering pupils continuing good performance. Our ‘national league table’ position has fallen to just outside the top quartile as progress in all comparator groups has improved more – our three-point improvement in the period is bettered nationally (a seven point increase).

4.6 It is worth mentioning that the national tables include ‘equivalencies’ to GCSEs. The government is removing these from future tables, and when the ‘average points score’ of pupils is considered, our average points score is significantly better than the national average. The detailed table is Table 3 in the Annex to this report.

5 Narrowing the gap: pupils entitled to free school meals and ‘pupil premium’

5.1 Narrowing the attainment gap between pupils entitled to free school meals (FSM) and all other pupils (non-FSM) is a key government priority. While there are other important factors – for example, movement between many schools; being in care; race; and sex – analysis shows that poverty is often the key factor. For example, the progress and attainment of white boys has often been cited as a cause for concern. However, it is actually white boys whose parents are poor who are most at risk

5.2 It is for this reason that the pupil premium was introduced. The ‘cohort’ for pupil premium is not the same as pupils currently entitled to free school meals, however: it includes all pupils in the cohort who have been entitled to a FSM at any time in the last six years; children ‘looked after’ by the state; pupils who have been adopted and pupils with a parent who is, or has been within a prescribed period, in military service.

5.3 Both progress and attainment are measured in the same way as for all pupils. However, the standard way of presenting the performance is the ‘gap’ between the percentage of FSM-entitled pupils achieving expected levels and that of all others.

5.4 Pupils attending Havering schools had a larger gap in attainment in 2013 between those currently eligible for FSM and Non-FSM pupils than is found nationally at both key stage two and key stage four. Additionally, the gap widened at both key stages compared with 2012 figures.

Table 7: KS2 achievement gap – pupils entitled to FSMs and all others 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	-21	-20	-17	-19
Inner London	-14	-12	-10	-10
Outer London	-19	-19	-15	-17
Statistical neighbours	-22	-24	-19	-22
Havering	-14	-18	-19	-23
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	10	37	79	102

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

5.5 The gap was relatively small in 2010, which was particularly creditable given the good performance overall at key stage two. In terms of the narrowness of the gap, ours was smaller than almost 19 out of 20 English LAs. However, our ‘gap’ has increased whilst nationally and in London it has narrowed. Taken together, these trends have led to our ‘ranking’ dropping to mid third quartile, our lowest headline figure compared with all other key education indicators.

5.6 However, the 2013 gap needs to take account of all pupils for whom a ‘premium is paid (see paragraph 5.1 above). In 2013, 64 per cent of this group at key stage two reached the expected level in RWM, compared with 63 per cent nationally. As 83 per cent of all other pupils in Havering reached this level, against only 81 per cent in all LAs in England, the gap was only one point more. But the attainment level of this group is still higher than nationally, which is important for life-chances.

5.7 Table 8 (below) shows the performance (measured by the ‘gap’) of FSM entitled pupils at key stage four (5A*-C inc E/M). Aside from the gap narrowing in 2012, it has remained similar, although it has declined by one point since 2010.

Table 8: KS4 achievement gap – pupils entitled to FSMs and all others 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	-28	-28	-26	-27
Inner London	-11	-12	-13	-14
Outer London	-24	-24	-22	-22
Statistical neighbours	-30	-30	-28	-29
Havering	-29	-28	-21	-30
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	78	58	27	90

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

5.8 Nationally, the gap has narrowed by one point in the period, but it was a point lower than Havering’s in 2010, and as our gap has increased, it is now three points more. Moreover, the performance of inner and outer London improved significantly.

5.9 Again, though, if the performance of all pupil premium eligible groups in 2013 is used, 43 per cent achieved the benchmark level for key stage four. This is three points higher than the national average. The performance of all other pupils is 68 per cent against the same measure, is only one point higher than nationally. This means the gap here, at 25 per cent, is two points lower than nationally.

5.10 Irrespective of comparisons with other LAs in England, the gap is still high, and our aspiration should be to reduce it to zero. Therefore, the quality assurance team has produced a narrowing the gap action plan and has identified target schools and academies where the gaps are largest. Quality assurance visits have been scheduled to assess the effectiveness of the school’s systems and ensure that the pupil premium resource is targeted correctly and funds high impact intervention strategies.

6 Key Stage Five – post-16 results

6.1 The tables in this section set out the performance of the FE and sixth-form colleges, and our secondary schools with sixth forms. The movement of post-16 students in London is considerable, and therefore these tables should not be relied upon to give an accurate measure of the performance of Havering students.

Table 9: the average points score (APS) of students at A level – 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	745	746	733	709
Inner London	643	658	644	623
Outer London	722	736	718	689
Statistical neighbours	725	727	721	691
Havering	757	747	667	643
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	29	44	113	113

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

6.2 Table 9 shows that the APS declined here, but because it has done so at a greater rate and from a higher level, the performance of the system here has declined from top to third quartile, and below all comparator groups bar inner London.

Table 10: the percentage of students achieving at least two level 3s, 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	95	94	94	90
Inner London	92	93	92	88
Outer London	96	97	95	91
Statistical neighbours	95	94	95	91
Havering	99	98	88	86
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	4	12	131	120

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

6.3 A level three qualification is an advanced (A) level or equivalent. This is shown in Table 10 above. In 2010, 99 per cent of students in post-sixteen institutions here achieved this benchmark. This was top-class – within the top three per cent of areas in performance. However, performance has declined since then, along with our ranking, which is now in the lower quartile, and below all the comparator groups. While all of these have declined, this is at a much lower rate than in Havering.

6.4 It is important to note Havering's school sixth forms tend to perform more highly than the colleges. This is largely due to the colleges accepting a lower tariff on entry and offering a higher proportion of non-A-level subjects. The lower levels of attainment on entry mean that generally students from the colleges attain lower levels at the end of their sixth form courses. Tables 11 and 12 below show this difference.

Table 11: Average point score per A level entry (full-time equivalent),, 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all schools and colleges	214.4	216.2	212.8	215.7
England - state funded schools and colleges	211.1	213.1	209.3	211.2
Local Authority - Havering	208.3	206.5	200.4	198.2
Havering 6th Forms	215.3	216.0	215.8	213.2
Havering Colleges	205.6	201.7	192.0	184.8

Table 12: Average point score per A level student (full-time equivalent), 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all schools and colleges	744.9	746	733.3	802.4
England - state funded schools and colleges	726.6	728.3	714.5	785.6
Local Authority - Havering	756.6	746.5	667.4	732.7
Havering 6th Forms	839.3	830.1	841.4	821.6
Havering Colleges	723.1	705.8	600.3	639.6

7 The outcome of Ofsted inspections of settings and schools

7.1 There are three key phases – early education, primary and secondary. The regulator’s judgement is a key indicator of the health of an area’s range of provision.

Table 11: % of children in early education in good or better settings 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded settings	69	72	74	77
Inner London	61	66	70	71
Outer London	70	73	75	77
Statistical neighbours	68	71	72	74
Havering	70	75	74	75
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	59	45	64	86

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

7.2 The table shows that, in Havering, three-quarters of children are in settings that are good or better. This is below average, meaning that our settings are in the third quartile when compared with all other English LAs, and are above average only against our SNs. While there has been a five point increase here in the last four years, Havering settings have improved much less quickly against this indicator than settings in every comparator group.

Table 12: the percentage of children at good or better primary schools 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	67	69	69	78
Inner London	71	75	76	82
Outer London	68	70	73	80
Statistical neighbours	62	64	64	74
Havering	73	75	78	79
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	48	46	30	75

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

7.3 The same general trend is apparent with primary schools. While four out of five Havering primary schools are now good or better, with improvement every year, schools in all other comparator groups have improved at a faster rate. The result is that Havering primaries are in the second quartile.

7.4 Our secondary schools have, in aggregate, improved their Ofsted ratings at a much faster rate (16 points, an almost 30 per cent improvement) than all comparator groups except inner London (22 points, 32 per cent). However, they have done this from a lower base.

Table 13: the percentage of children at good or better secondary schools 2010 - 2013

Area	2010	2011	2012	2013
England - all state funded schools	64	66	66	72
Inner London	69	70	75	91
Outer London	73	79	82	84
Statistical neighbours	68	68	67	77
Havering	56	59	65	72
Havering – ranking against all 152 LAs	103	110	88	82

(Note that first quartile is 1-38, second 39-76, third 77 – 114 and bottom from 115-152).

7.5 Although in line with the national average, the percentage of schools that are good or better in Havering, is lower than our statistical neighbours and across London.

8 Schools causing concern

8.1 The Havering School Improvement Services (Hsis) has developed a comprehensive quality assurance framework. Following an assessment, including a comprehensive analysis of detailed performance data, every school – including

academy schools – is placed in one of five categories. Category 1 schools are those expected to remain good or outstanding at their next inspection, while Category 2 schools are expected to be ‘good’ at their next inspection

8.2 It is schools in category three that are ‘of concern’ to the LA. Category three schools are split into three sub-categories as follows:

- **3a:** schools at risk of being categorised by Ofsted as ‘requiring improvement to be good (RI)’ – note that ‘requires improvement’ has replaced ‘satisfactory, and means a school judged RI will be judged to be ‘grade four’, requiring intervention, if it is RI at two subsequent inspections;
- **3b:** schools at risk of failure – defined as schools issued with a formal warning notice by the LA; graded as RI by Ofsted; or at risk of being judged to have ‘serious weaknesses’ by Ofsted at its next inspection; and
- **3c:** schools in special measures or judged to have serious weaknesses; or that fell below the relevant Department for Education (DfE) ‘floor standard’ in the last assessment.

8.3 The table below (Table 14) shows the numbers and percentages of primary and secondary schools in each category:

Table 14: primary and secondary schools by LA category

Area	1	2	3a	3b	3c
Primary schools - number	45	3	4	4	2
Primary schools - percentage	78	5	7	7	3
Secondary schools - number	3	6	8	1	0
Secondary schools - percentage	17	33	44	6	0

8.4 In summary, 17 per cent of primary schools and half our secondary schools are ‘of concern’. While it is the case that we need to improve the number of good schools from four out of five to more like nine out of ten, and to help to move more good primary schools to ‘outstanding’, it is the secondary (and post-16) sectors where consolidation is most urgent.

8.5 Currently, almost a third of secondary-age pupils attend a school that is not yet good or better. Table 14, though, shows the risk currently is that this proportion could increase rather than decrease. Local Authority quality assurance staff are working closely with a number of schools on improvements in key areas that will reduce the risks of a decline in Ofsted categorisation of secondary schools that are currently rated as good, and assist those currently judged to be satisfactory or (where inspections have been since September 2012) requires improvement to be good.

9 Key challenges

9.1 Our main challenges in the short and medium term are to improve the:

- progress pupils make between key stages two and four;
- attainment of pupils at key stage four in secondaries on some measures;
- attainment of pupil premium eligible children at key stages two and four;
- percentage of secondary schools judged at least 'good' by Ofsted;
- percentage of schools judged outstanding; and
- performance of schools and colleges providing for 16 to 19 year olds

IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial implications and risks:

There are no financial implications arising from the report. All work undertaken will be within budget allocations, or paid for by schools where services are traded.

Caroline May, Strategic Finance Business Partner, Children and Adults

Legal implications and risks:

The local authority has legal duties and powers in respect of all schools in its area by virtue of the Education Act, 1996, the School Standards and Framework Act, 1998 and (in respect of all maintained, trust and aided schools) the Education and Inspections Act, 2006. *Stephen Doye, Legal Manager*

Human resources implications and risks:

In cases where the local authority withdraws delegated powers from schools, council officers assume the direct management of the head teacher concerned, and therefore assume responsibility for recruitment and the performance management of senior school staff. *Eve Anderson, Strategic HR Business Partner*

Equalities implications and risks:

There are considerable equalities and social inclusion implications highlighted in this report, with pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds, e.g. whose parents are on low incomes, pupils on free school meals entitlement, children who are looked after, and certain minority groups, e.g. Travellers being most disproportionately affected, i.e. make less progress and achieve at lower levels when compared with all other pupils. Tackling the 'gap' in attainment between the above groups and all other pupils is of major concern and therefore a priority for the Quality Assurance team who have produced a narrowing the gap action plan and have identified target schools and academies where the gaps are largest.

The key challenges identified are listed on page 12 above. Currently, the equality and social inclusion implications for other groups with protected characteristics cannot be fully assessed due to lack of pupil diversity profile data. It is therefore recommended that a robust collection and analysis of pupil diversity profile data is implemented and informs the development of future action plans and mitigating measures.

Andreyana Ivanova, Diversity Advisor

Staff Contact:	Grahame Smith
Designation:	School Improvement Manager (Hsis)
Telephone No:	01708 433813
E-mail address:	grahame.smith@havering.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Havering RAISE Online, 2013
2. Quality Assurance Team – Narrowing the Gap Action Plan
3. The School Quality Assurance Framework
4. Performance indicators for all key stages against comparator LAs