

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Report

Committee:	Education Advisory Panel
Date:	28 June 2017
Title:	Report on Educational Outcomes for Children and Young People from Disadvantaged Backgrounds or with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities in Hampshire
Report From:	Director of Children's Services

Contact name: Brian Pope, Assistant Director – Education & Inclusion

Tel: 02392 441471

Email: brian.pope@hants.gov.uk

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. This report details the 2016 outcomes for children and young people from two vulnerable pupil groups and seeks to draw comparisons between those groups in Hampshire, nationally and in relation to statistical neighbours. Where possible the report also indicates any trend in the performance of these groups. It primarily uses final, national data sets which were not published until the spring of 2017; some data is not available nationally and has therefore been calculated where possible by the Children's Services Data and Information Team. Summary data tables are shown in Appendix One. The report identifies ways in which schools and the School Improvement Team (SIT) of Children's Services are seeking to raise the attainment of the two pupil groups.

2. Contextual Information

2.1. Educational outcomes for children and young people overall in Hampshire are strong, with performance better than national comparators across the vast majority of indicators in all age phases. However, when the overall picture is broken down in to different groups of pupils, some variations begin to emerge. For two groups in particular, Hampshire aspires to secure better educational outcomes; those who are disadvantaged and those who have special educational needs or disabilities (SEND). Although for some indicators these two groups now perform broadly in line with the comparative national picture, for other indicators they fall below. Furthermore, we aspire to give all pupils the best life chances when they leave education and to do this we wish to raise the attainment of these two groups.

2.2. The group 'disadvantaged' includes pupils who are, or have been, eligible for free school meals within the last six years (FSM6), those who are, or have been, in care for one day or more, and those who are adopted from care. The

group 'SEND' includes those who have a Statement of Special Educational Needs or Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP), also those who are deemed to require the lower level of additional resource classed as 'SEND support'.

2.3. The school census 2016 shows the following proportion of pupils in each group:

Disadvantaged	National 26.2%, Hampshire 20.5%
SEND	National 14.3%, Hampshire 13.6%.

2.4. In Hampshire 4.5% of the whole school population fell within both categories of disadvantaged and SEND for the 2016 census.

2.5. New measures of performance introduced across Key Stage One (KS1), Two (KS2) and Four (KS4) in 2016 are more challenging and appear to have had a greater impact on these two pupil groups than others, both nationally and locally. The changes also make most trend analyses meaningless, as the comparison is not like for like. Where possible, the report looks at the difference between Hampshire outcomes and those nationally and makes a comparison to the difference in previous years, albeit using a different measure.

2.6. The preferred performance indicator of the DfE for disadvantaged pupils is the comparison between their outcomes locally (Hampshire) and those of their non disadvantaged peers nationally. This is because it is this difference ('gap') that the DfE believes needs to diminish collectively across the country, for disadvantaged pupils to do as well as others.

2.7. National figures in this report are for all state funded schools unless stated.

2.8. It may be helpful to cross reference this report to that for the attainment of all pupils (author David Hardcastle) and for children in care (author Anwen Foy).

3. Section One: The Performance of Disadvantaged Pupils

3.1. Summary

3.2. Educational outcomes overall are strong in Hampshire, with pupils performing well against statistical neighbours and national averages in the new, more challenging performance measures, across the vast majority of indicators. For disadvantaged pupils, however, performance is more variable and continues to require a strong focus from both schools and the local authority, to improve outcomes for this group further. In the primary phase the performance of this group shows improvement in recent years, albeit with different measures now in place. In the secondary phase outcomes are proving more stubborn to shift.

3.3. Non disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire generally outperform non disadvantaged pupils nationally, sometimes by a significant margin. As this is

not the case for disadvantaged pupils generally in Hampshire, relative to their disadvantaged peers nationally, the gap between the two groups is wider in Hampshire than nationally. Closing the gap or 'diminishing the difference', to use the new DfE terminology, is one of the challenges for Hampshire.

However, it is important to recognise that raw attainment for disadvantaged pupils, not simply the gap between them and their non disadvantaged peers, is critical. The relative measure that 'the gap' or 'the difference' offers can, in any case, be mis-leading. For example, in a few schools the gap is smaller because the non disadvantaged pupils are under-performing as well as the disadvantaged. Hampshire aspires to raise the attainment of the disadvantaged to improve their life chances as a group, regardless of the comparison to their non disadvantaged peers. Whilst the gap persists across many indicators and phases in Hampshire, there has been an upward trajectory in the achievements of the disadvantaged pupils in several measures in previous years and greater alignment to the outcomes of disadvantaged peers nationally. Nevertheless, improving the outcomes for this group across all phases and indicators remains a priority for Hampshire.

- 3.4. As pupils move through their education, comparisons are made to how they performed at previous statutory assessment points, with this information used to measure rates of progress. It is also used to sort pupils in to 'prior attainment' categories; those with low, middle or high prior attainment. Some of the data available now details the performance of vulnerable groups in this way, with the intention of highlighting where particular attainment groups need to be targeted further. For the purposes of this report the analysis does not go to that level of detail, leaving that to individual schools and to the SIT, to inform their work. The headline is that the relative under-achievement of disadvantaged pupils pervades all prior attainment groups across the various indicators. As for all pupils, it is more prevalent for those with low prior attainment but it is not exclusive to that group.
- 3.5. There is a substantial variance in performance across schools, with a tendency to see disadvantaged pupils perform better where the proportion of them is lower, therefore in schools predominantly serving more advantaged areas. However, this is not always the case; indeed there are some notable exceptions across primary and, to a lesser extent, secondary phases, with the SIT drawing on their successes and some out of county, to help improve others. A further challenge for schools, however, is to sustain the improvements and good performance for disadvantaged pupils year on year. There are numerous examples of schools with fluctuating outcomes for this group, underlining the complexity of the issue. What is a successful approach with one cohort, or indeed some pupils, may not be successful with others; however there is a core of high expectation, aspiration and moral purpose that needs to under-pin any strategies employed, if they are to be effective and sustained. Curricular provision, its relevance, breadth and balance presents as a key factor in tackling educational disadvantage. For the secondary phase in particular, the impact of recent changes to requirements and qualifications, including those that are recognised in performance tables, cannot be overlooked. In too many cases there appears to be a tension

between the curriculum that is right for a particular pupil and the curriculum which will maximise league table performance. Schools must also guard against low expectations of disadvantaged pupils, which can have the effect of perpetuating a narrower or less academic offer for some pupils, which in turn limits their options and scope of achievement. There is a good range of approved qualifications now available which are recognised in performance tables. Some schools need greater creativity and flexibility in using these, to secure a broad and relevant curriculum for all, whilst also addressing the demands of whole school accountability measures and grappling with budgetary pressures.

3.6. Where the SIT has provided a higher level of additional support and intervention to schools over the last two to three years, as a generality those schools have improved outcomes for disadvantaged pupils at a greater rate than schools without extra SIT resource.

4. Performance Summary for Disadvantaged Pupils by Key Stage

4.1. Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) Performance

- The main performance indicators for this phase are the proportion of pupils achieving a Good Level of Development (GLD) and the proportion achieving at least the expected standard in all of the Early Learning Goals.
- In Hampshire 53% of disadvantaged pupils achieved GLD in 2016 compared to 54% nationally; for non disadvantaged the figure was 77% and 72% respectively. There has been a 6% increase in disadvantaged outcomes since 2014 locally, compared to a 9% increase nationally.
- For the expected standard in all of the Early Learning Goals, Hampshire's outcome for disadvantaged pupils matched that nationally at 52%; however for non disadvantaged pupils 76% gained the expected standard in Hampshire, compared to 70% nationally.
- The data for EYFS, both now and over time, suggests that, even from this early stage in school, there is a notable difference between the achievements of disadvantaged pupils and their non disadvantaged peers, both locally and nationally, with the local difference being greater. The SIT is working closely with the SfYC (Services for Young Children) team to promote stronger outcomes in this phase.

4.2. Key Stage One (KS1) Performance

- The new key performance measure for KS1 in 2016 is the proportion of pupils that reach the expected standard (age-related expectation) or above in reading, writing and mathematics combined. All pupils in Hampshire outperformed all pupils nationally by a considerable margin of 6% in this measure in 2016; 66% compared to 60%. Disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire also outperformed disadvantaged pupils nationally, although by a lesser margin of 2%, with 48% gaining reading, writing and mathematics at the expected standard in Hampshire, compared to 46% nationally.
- When using the DfE preferred comparator of disadvantaged outcomes in Hampshire relative to non disadvantaged peers nationally, the picture is inevitably less positive. The expected standard achieved by 48% of

Hampshire disadvantaged pupils compared to 64% for non disadvantaged peers nationally, gives a difference of 16%. The national difference, however, is greater at 18%.

- The strongest of the three subjects for disadvantaged pupils in KS1 has historically been mathematics; however in 2016 reading was the strongest and also had the lowest gap (12%) to non disadvantaged peers nationally. The significance of this one year variation in mathematics is uncertain; however mathematics attainment in 2016 was also the weaker of the three subjects in KS2, relative to non disadvantaged peers. Targeted improvement work needs to focus on all three strands of the measure; the greatest gains from the 2016 starting point are to be made in mathematics.

4.3. Key Stage Two (KS2) Performance

- As for KS1, the main performance measure for KS2 in 2016 is the proportion of pupils that reach the expected standard (age-related expectation) or above in reading, writing and mathematics combined; previously the measure was Level 4 and above in these combined subjects. Similar to KS1, all pupils in Hampshire outperformed all pupils nationally by a considerable margin of 5% in 2016; 59% compared to 54%.
- In the new measure, disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire attained 39% in reading, writing and mathematics combined, which exactly matches the outcome for disadvantaged pupils nationally. This suggests a continued trajectory of improvement in reading, writing and mathematics combined for disadvantaged pupils locally, relative to the national picture. Between 2013 and 2015 Hampshire had closed the gap in the performance of its disadvantaged pupils relative to those nationally from 3% to 1%; it had improved outcomes for disadvantaged by 9%, which was a greater rate than the 7% improvement nationally.
- When comparing to statistical neighbours the picture is also positive, with the group average for disadvantaged being 6% below the Hampshire outcome (33% compared to 39%) and Hampshire being joint top of the group.
- For the separate subjects Hampshire's disadvantaged pupils have performed in line or above those nationally in reading for three consecutive years. Writing and mathematics performance has been broadly in line with national counterparts since 2014, although mathematics fell below by 4% in 2016.
- The difference between disadvantaged and non disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire is generally greater than that nationally across each indicator; this is because non disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire outperform non disadvantaged pupils nationally in KS2 by a greater margin than that for disadvantaged peers.
- There is recognition that under the new, toughened measure the difference between the attainment of disadvantaged and their non disadvantaged peers has widened, both locally (26%) and nationally (22%). The reasons for this are complex and linked to the nature of the change in measure; this relates to the identification of gaps in pupils' learning, new assessment methodologies and the more challenging standard being applied. Whilst the greater difference in attainment due to the new measure is disappointing,

both in Hampshire and nationally, the improvement in actual attainment of disadvantaged KS2 pupils in Hampshire compared to those nationally over recent years is encouraging.

- There is a significant range in outcomes across Hampshire KS2 schools in the reading, writing and mathematics combined measure for disadvantaged pupils; from 95% achieving the expected standard to 0% (when only including schools with cohorts of 5 or more disadvantaged pupils). Data shows that the schools that received support and intervention from the SIT improved outcomes for disadvantaged pupils on average at a greater rate than those that did not over the previous two years.
- Hampshire schools and the local authority continue their focus on improving the progress of KS2 disadvantaged pupils relative to their starting points, in order to raise their raw attainment further. Progress was below average locally in 2016 for reading, writing and mathematics separately, with mathematics being the weakest subject. This below average progress for Hampshire's disadvantaged pupils compared to national non disadvantaged pupils applies to each of the prior attainment groups, although those with low prior attainment at the end of KS1 are more affected relatively, as are their non disadvantaged peers. Increasing the rate of progress will have a positive impact on raw attainment and this remains a focus for primary schools.

4.4. Key Stage Four (KS4) Performance

Attainment 8

- Attainment 8 (A8) looks at pupils' average performance across eight subjects comprising; English, mathematics, three EBacc (English Baccalaureate) subjects from the 'EBacc element' and three other subjects from the 'open element'. It gives an average grade that pupils have achieved across subjects. It is a new measure, consequently no data is available for trend analysis.
- In 2016 the A8 for all pupils in Hampshire was 51.1 compared to 50.1 nationally, both equivalent to the average grade being just above a grade C. For disadvantaged pupils a score of 39.0 gave an average grade in Hampshire of just below a grade D, compared to 41.1, which is just above a grade D, nationally. This suggests that, whilst Hampshire outperformed the national picture in this measure when considering all pupils collectively, the story was reversed for disadvantaged pupils. This continues the emerging pattern of reversal in the primary phase. It also explains the difference between disadvantaged pupils and their non disadvantaged peers being wider in Hampshire than nationally (14.8 and 12.1 respectively), because once again it is the non disadvantaged group in Hampshire that is playing the greater part in keeping the overall picture positive, relative to nationally. When comparing with statistical neighbours, Hampshire is middle of the group for disadvantaged pupil A8 outcomes, with a match to the group average of 39.0.
- The A8 performance is affected by its component parts, with further detail on some of these later in this report. One of the tensions of this new measure has been for schools to secure the most appropriate eight subjects for each pupil in order to best meet their needs, whilst also being

mindful of the composition of the elements which contribute to A8 as a key accountability measure for the institution.

- There is some variation in A8 performance for different groups based on prior attainment (using KS2 outcomes); however the relative under-performance of disadvantaged is broadly prevalent across all ability groups in the A8 elements.
- Some schools have not been as quick to respond to the new measure and have found the identification of appropriate qualifying qualifications for the 'open element', in particular, challenging; more so for disadvantaged pupils. The curriculum offer for some pupils is limiting the chances for some schools to maximise their A8 score. Interestingly the average number of qualifications entered in 2016 for all Hampshire pupils was 9.58, with an average of 5.18 points gained per qualification. For disadvantaged pupils, however, the average entered falls to 8.54, with average points falling to 4.23. This suggests a narrower offer and therefore greater limitations to the A8 potential for disadvantaged pupils. It also raises the question of aspiration for these pupils, whilst underlining the tension of an institutional measure potentially in conflict with the needs and interests of individuals. This is a debate being brought to the fore with and by schools. Two key questions to be asked in relation to disadvantaged pupils are firstly, 'is there sufficient aspiration in each and every school for each and every pupil?' and secondly, 'does the school offer an appropriate breadth of relevant qualifications for both the needs and interests of all students and the school accountability measure?'
- There is variation in performance across schools; broadly the schools with better outcomes for disadvantaged are often those which have lower proportions of disadvantaged in the cohort. There were 39 Hampshire schools which had a better A8 score for disadvantaged in 2016 than the national comparator. The score for disadvantaged in mainstream Hampshire schools ranged from 50.4 to 29.2. The fluctuations in results for this group year on year in individual schools render it difficult to identify many schools with consistently good performance for disadvantaged pupils over time (using the different indicators), particularly in less affluent areas where cohorts are typically larger.

'The Basics'

- This measure indicates the proportion of pupils who have achieved a grade C or better in an eligible English and mathematics qualification.
- For all Hampshire pupils in 2016 performance was above that nationally in this measure; 66.7% compared to 63.3%. For disadvantaged pupils Hampshire fell below the national figure; 39.2% compared to 43.0%. However, Hampshire schools have secured greater improvement since 2014 in this measure for disadvantaged pupils, compared to the rate nationally. This suggests that over the last two years the focused work of schools, with the support of the local authority, has had a greater, more positive impact on improving English and mathematics combined for disadvantaged pupils locally than nationally.
- In line with the national picture, English attainment was stronger than mathematics in 2016 for Hampshire's disadvantaged pupils; 54% gained a

good pass in English compared to 58% nationally and 47% gained a good pass in mathematics compared to 50% nationally.

- The SIT is clear that the recent accelerated rate of improvement in the Basics needs to be built on, in order to reduce school to school variance and secure better performance for disadvantaged pupils in this measure. This is significant, given that a good pass in both these subjects is a key factor in future success and sustained education, employment or training post 16.

EBacc

- The EBacc measures performance across a defined group of academic subjects. To qualify pupils must: take both English Language and English Literature and obtain an A*-C grade in one of them; reach A*-C in mathematics; obtain two A*-C grades in the sciences; gain A*-C in a language (either modern or ancient) and gain A*-C in either history or geography.
- In 2016 there was a 4% rise in the proportion of Hampshire disadvantaged pupils entered for EBacc since 2014 (17% to 21%), although this remains 4% below the entries for disadvantaged pupils nationally (25%) and 25% below entries for non disadvantaged pupils both locally and nationally.
- The proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving EBacc in 2016 was 9% in Hampshire (an increase of 1% on the previous 2 years), compared to 12% nationally; for non disadvantaged this figure was 30% both locally and nationally, representing a broadly static picture since 2014.
- A debate for Hampshire schools – and a challenge the SIT is putting to them – is whether low EBacc entries for disadvantaged pupils reflects discerning choices about the curriculum offer for individuals' needs (with this then having greater impact in relation to EBacc on those disadvantaged) or whether it reflects poor aspiration for this group of pupils. Almost certainly there is a combination of both factors at play across the county.

Progress 8

- Progress 8 (P8) is a new measure of the progress pupils have made across the A8 subjects. It is a relative measure dependent on pupils' performance nationally; a positive score means more progress from the starting point than nationally and a negative score means less progress from the starting point nationally.
- In 2016 P8 for all pupils in Hampshire was very slightly negative (-0.03), placing it in the middle of its statistical neighbour group and in line with the national figure, which was also -0.03.
- For disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire P8 was -0.52, exactly matching the statistical neighbour group average. This means disadvantaged pupils made an average of broadly half a grade less progress than pupils with similar starting points nationally. The national P8 figure for disadvantaged was -0.38, meaning the P8 nationally was better than that locally.
- Below average performance when compared to non disadvantaged peers nationally is an issue affecting all prior attainment groups of disadvantaged pupils for P8 overall.

- The progress of disadvantaged pupils was slightly stronger in mathematics (-0.34) in 2016 than in English (-0.47), which is a reverse of the picture for the primary phase.
- In order to secure stronger progress from starting points, the SIT has been providing support and challenge to schools, particularly in relation to maximising learning in Key Stage Three (KS3). This is because, historically, there appears to be a local and national slowing of pace in learning during these years; this generally appears to have greater impact on disadvantaged pupils than their non disadvantaged peers. Stronger provision in KS3 should lead to stronger future KS4 performance; however this is dependent on schools securing the improvement at KS3 and consequently raising expectations at KS4. Low expectations arising from low prior attainment and other stereotypical features of disadvantaged pupils also need to be challenged. These are key priorities for schools and the local authority moving forward.

4.5. Sustained Destinations Post 16

- Sustained destination data is not yet available for the 2016 Y11 cohort in relation to disadvantaged students; however, data is available for the previous three years, which suggests an improving trajectory. In 2013/14 the destinations of 2012/13 Y11 pupils showed that 82% of disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire were in a sustained education or employment/training destination. This is compared to 85% of disadvantaged pupils nationally and 94% of non disadvantaged pupils both locally and nationally. In 2014/15 the Hampshire disadvantaged figure increased to be in line with the national figure of 88% for disadvantaged, compared to 96% of non disadvantaged pupils both locally and nationally. In 2015/16 the destinations of 2014/15 disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire rose slightly once more to 89%, again in line with the national figure and closing the gap relative to non disadvantaged peers to 7%. We aspire to continue this trend of reducing the proportion of Hampshire disadvantaged pupils who are not in education, employment or training, through improved educational attainment and high quality post 16 advice to schools and pupils.

4.6. Other Factors Which May Affect Performance

Attendance

- The attendance rate in Hampshire schools 2015/16 was 95%. There was a difference of 4.1% in the attendance of Hampshire's disadvantaged pupils (91.7%) compared to their non-disadvantaged peers locally (95.8%). Furthermore there is a significant difference between the two groups in relation to persistent absenteeism rates (pupils with absence of 10% or more); 13.5% compared to 4.2% in the primary phase and 26.5% compared to 8.7% in the secondary phase. This broadly replicates the picture in previous years. Inevitably a lack of regular attendance has a negative impact on outcomes; hence more needs to be done to secure better engagement and attendance of disadvantaged pupils. This needs to form a key strand of the county's attendance strategy. The relevance and interest of the curriculum offer is also a factor, as is aspiration (pupil, family and school) for this group.

Exclusion

- There was a significant difference in the prevalence of fixed period exclusions (FPE) for disadvantaged pupils compared to their non-disadvantaged peers in 2016 (no national comparator available). The number of FPEs, expressed as a percentage of the cohort, for all pupils in Hampshire in 2016 was 6.5%; for disadvantaged pupils the figure was 18.7%, compared to 3.6% for non-disadvantaged peers. This marked difference needs to be addressed by schools. The SIT will continue to work alongside EIS (Education and Inclusion Service) to reduce FPEs and, most notably, those affecting the disadvantaged group. This will also, to an extent, assist the attendance issue.

5. Section Two: The Performance of Pupils with Special Educational Needs or Disabilities (SEND)

5.1. Summary

Where it is possible to make comparisons, outcomes for pupils with SEND have seen some improvement in recent years, to bring them closer to those of peers with SEND nationally. At KS2 attainment in the combined measure is now slightly above the statistical neighbour average, whereas at KS4 the score for A8 is below the average. Both remain below the national comparator.

Clearly there is a need to strengthen further the focus on improving outcomes for this group. Many of the issues and strategies to address them are aligned to those for the disadvantaged group.

6. Performance Summary for Pupils with SEND by Key Stage

6.1. Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) Performance

- The proportion of pupils with SEND in Hampshire achieving GLD in 2016 was 3% above that nationally; 25% compared to 22% respectively. This represents local improvement on the previous two years.
- Hampshire pupils with SEND also outperformed those nationally in the attainment of at least the expected standard in all of the Early Learning Goals; 24% compared to 22% nationally. In this phase Hampshire pupils with SEND are therefore exceeding their peers nationally.

6.2. Key Stage One (KS1) Performance

- At KS1, 17% of Hampshire pupils with SEND gained the expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics combined, which is 1% above the figure nationally. Of note was that Hampshire pupils with SEND outperformed those nationally by 4% in reading, which is a critical skill under-pinning future learning. The KS1 performance for SEND pupils overall, using the previous measure and standard, had shown an upward trajectory in performance between 2013 and 2015.

6.3. Key Stage Two (KS2) Performance

- At KS2 12% of Hampshire pupils with SEND gained the expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics combined compared to 14%, therefore

slightly below peers nationally but slightly above the average of 11% for our statistical neighbour group. The strand which adversely affected this outcome locally was mathematics, which was 5% below the outcome for disadvantaged pupils nationally, whereas reading and writing were broadly in line with the national comparator for this group. Pupils without SEND did not experience this variation to the same extent, suggesting the new measure in mathematics has had a disproportionate impact on pupils with SEND (as it did for disadvantaged pupils) in Hampshire; the teaching methods and content for this group potentially need further adaptation to address this issue. This is an area for mathematics specialists within the SIT to pursue alongside schools.

- The KS2 performance for SEND pupils overall, using the previous measure and standard, had shown an upward trajectory in performance between 2013 and 2015, with the outcome for reading writing and mathematics combined at Level 4 and above rising by 6% over these years. Hampshire had reduced the negative difference relative to the national outcome for pupils with SEND from 5% in 2013 and 2014 to 4% in 2015. With this difference now being 2%, albeit under a different measure, it might be suggested that Hampshire is improving outcomes for this group at a faster rate in KS2 than nationally.
- A further breakdown of the data suggests that in KS2 Hampshire pupils with a statement or EHCP outperform their counterparts nationally; whereas at the lower level of SEND support, pupils nationally outperform those in Hampshire. This has been the case for three consecutive years; consequently a greater focus on the performance of pupils in the category of SEND support is required.

6.4. Key Stage Four (KS4) Performance

- Attainment 8
- Hampshire schools attained a score of 29.8 for pupils with SEND in this measure, compared to 31.2 nationally and 32.1 for the average of the statistical neighbour group. Hampshire is equal eighth of this group of 11 authorities for this measure. As for the KS2 attainment measure, pupils with a statement or EHCP performed slightly better locally than nationally (36.2 and 34.3 respectively), yet the picture was reversed for those on the lower level of SEND support (17.0 and 17.9 respectively).
- Hampshire pupils with SEND support were entered in to an average of 8.2 qualifications in 2016 and those with a statement or EHCP were entered in to an average of 4.47; this is in comparison to 9.92 for pupils with no SEND. These figures are broadly in line with those nationally. Across the special school sector there is variation in the qualifications achieved. Whilst some variation will be expected dependent on the nature of provision, there may be an issue of low expectation in some instances; similarly in mainstream and particularly with SEND support pupils.

'The Basics'

- As was the case for a number of indicators for the disadvantaged group, when looking at all pupils overall Hampshire outperformed the national figure in this measure; however for pupils with SEND it fell below at 21% compared to 24%. Acknowledging the need for a broad, balanced and

relevant curriculum, it is critical that pupils achieve well in these two subjects, in order to access a wider breadth of opportunities in the future. The local authority LLP (leadership and learning partner) process needs to be used to challenge expectations and outcomes for this group more robustly.

EBacc

- A low proportion of pupils with SEND are entered for EBacc; 7.5% in Hampshire and 12% nationally in 2016 compared to 46% and 45% respectively of non SEND peers. Of those SEND pupils entered, 3% achieved EBacc in Hampshire compared to 5% nationally. For non SEND pupils the figures are 29% and 28% respectively.

Progress 8

- In 2016 Hampshire pupils with SEND achieved a P8 score of -0.60 compared to -0.55 for pupils with SEND nationally. When broken down into those with a statement or EHCP and those with SEND support, the pattern of the former doing slightly better than nationally whilst the latter do slightly worse is again evident; -1.06 locally compared to -1.03 nationally for those with a statement/EHCP and -0.43 locally compared to -0.38 nationally for those with SEND support. Interestingly pupils with SEND support had a better P8 score than disadvantaged pupils in Hampshire.

6.5. Other Factors Which May Affect Performance

Attendance

- In Hampshire the attendance of pupils with SEND in 2016 was 93.8%, compared to 95.8% for local peers with no SEND. For those in Hampshire with a statement or EHCP, attendance was 92.7%, slightly lower than the national figure of 93.9%. For those with SEND support attendance of 94% locally was in line with the 93.8% nationally. The proportion of unauthorised absence was low and aligned to the national comparator. Persistent absenteeism, however, was relatively high at 17% for Hampshire pupils with SEND (no national comparator). A factor in this is the absence of pupils for medical reasons/illness; however persistent absenteeism for this group appears relatively high and requires further interrogation, as part of the attendance strategy.

7. Conclusion and Way Forward

- 7.1. Improving outcomes for these two vulnerable groups is a continuing priority for Hampshire, as it is for a considerable number of other authorities. There is a pattern of Hampshire having stronger performance than nationally for non disadvantaged and non SEND pupils, but performance which is just in line with or sometimes below that nationally for disadvantaged and/or SEND pupils. This has been prevalent across a number of indicators and phases. The difference between peers needs to be reduced, by these two vulnerable groups doing better. This has been known to the authority in recent years and there are signs that the action taken thus far is having some positive impact; however we aspire to a greater pace of improvement and more sustained impact across phases, on a greater number of schools and pupils.

- 7.2. Research shows that weaker teaching has a disproportionate impact on disadvantaged pupils. A key factor in improving outcomes for this group and for those with SEND will be continuing to drive up standards of teaching, in order that good schools are good for all pupils.
- 7.3. A plethora of professional development opportunities are available to schools, to support improved outcomes for disadvantaged pupils and those with SEND; a broad universal offer for all schools, a targeted offer for various groups of schools (for example, localised within a district or those with a common need) and a bespoke offer for specific individual schools. One example of the very many opportunities available currently is a one year programme for secondary schools, which comprises seminars, action research, in-school challenge, school to school support and a range of evaluation tools. It is led jointly by HIAS (Hampshire Inspection and Advisory Service) and NET (National Educational Trust), an organisation with a proven track record nationally in tackling educational disadvantage. Fourteen secondary schools (maintained and academy) have chosen to take part in this project which was launched in February 2017.
- 7.4. The LLP process entitles all maintained schools (also offered to academies) to a one day robust 'support and challenge' visit from a member of the SIT annually. These visits are now prioritising outcomes for these two vulnerable groups where they need to improve. The SIT is clear that, whilst the vast majority of Hampshire schools are now 'good', we need to ensure that they are equally good for all pupils. This focus will support the drive to secure an even greater proportion of schools which are good and outstanding across Hampshire. HIAS more broadly also has a heightened emphasis on these two groups when working with schools, regardless of focus or specialism. For example, localised, subject specific network meetings led by HIAS should have a strong element of improving outcomes for these groups at their core.
- 7.5. The SIT is working with schools collectively and individually to secure a broad, balanced and relevant curriculum offer for all pupils, particularly in the secondary phase. Responding to schools' requests and need for guidance, in relation to approved qualifications and new specifications across a range of subjects, is a focus. Retaining sufficient breadth for all pupils whilst meeting budgetary challenges is an important strand of HIAS work with schools currently.
- 7.6. The HIAS mathematics team is interrogating outcomes in this area further, to ascertain whether teaching methods/new content in the primary phase are disproportionately having a negative impact on the outcomes for disadvantaged pupils and those with SEND and to address this with schools accordingly.
- 7.7. Members of HIAS have developed audit tools to support schools in evaluating and improving their provision and outcomes for disadvantaged pupils and those with SEND. These are available to all schools, by commissioning a

member of HIAS to work initially alongside senior leaders, to model the use of the audit tool and then for schools to embed that tool within their practice.

- 7.8. HIAS is increasing its capacity in relation to supporting and challenging schools and their provision/outcomes for pupils with SEND. There are SEND specialists within the team, with more being appointed; additionally the wider team is receiving further training to strengthen its expertise in this area. This will support, in particular, the drive to improve outcomes for those pupils at the lower level of SEND support within mainstream settings, across the full range of subjects and broader provision.
- 7.9. A rise in overall fixed period exclusions is potentially not a coincidence since the introduction of the new accountability measures for schools. This returns to the issue of an appropriate curriculum for all and the tension between whole school performance and the needs of individuals. An ever deepening challenge for the local authority is the inclusivity of schools and their commitment to those in vulnerable groups, who potentially may have a negative impact on whole school performance statistics. Additionally, a rise in exclusions is not uncommon during times of austerity, when the negative impact on some families is seen in pupils' behaviour patterns in schools. The wider Inclusion Team will therefore also be contributing to improved outcomes. For example, the county attendance strategy will have a specific strand which relates to improving the attendance of these two groups. Additionally there are some benefits to be explored in greater alignment of services around particular families, in order to tackle the impact of disadvantage more broadly. Greater synergies between the SIT, the SEN team, the Inclusion team and the Virtual School & College should strengthen the collective focus on outcomes for these two groups. Consideration must also be given to how more alignment with the Children and Families Branch might also affect change in a broader sense. There are potentially some avenues to be explored in the context of Transformation 2019, particularly in relation to the High Needs Workstream.

8. Recommendation

- 8.1. That the Education Advisory Panel note the contents of this report and an update is provided and considered annually.

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

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

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

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

DocumentLocation

None

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equality Duty

- 1.1. The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

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

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

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

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

2. Equalities Impact Assessment:

- 2.1. Race and equality impact assessment has been considered in the development of this report and no adverse impact has been identified.

3. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

- 3.1. No impact on crime and disorder as a result of this report has been identified.

4. Climate Change:

- 4.1. No impact on climate change as a result of this report has been identified.

Appendix One: Summary Data Tables

EYFS EXP+ ELG	Hampshire	National
All	74%	67%
Disadvantaged	52%	52%
Non Disadvantaged	76%	70%
SEND	24%	22%
Non SEND	72%	72%

KS1 EXP+ RWM	Hampshire	National
All	66%	60%
Disadvantaged	48%	46%
Non Disadvantaged	69%	64%
SEND	17%	16%
Non SEND	75%	68%

KS2 EXP+ RWM	Hampshire	National	Stat. Neighbour
All	59%	54%	52%
Disadvantaged	39%	39%	33%
Non Disadvantaged	65%	61%	58%
SEND	12%	14%	11%
Non SEND	66%	62%	60%

Attainment 8	Hampshire	National	Stat. Neighbour
All	51.1	50.1	50.8
Disadvantaged	39.0	41.1	39.0
Non Disadvantaged	53.8	53.3	53.4
SEND	29.8	31.2	32.1
Non SEND	54.1	53.2	54.1

Progress 8	Hampshire	National	Stat. Neighbour
All	-0.03	-0.03	-0.01
Disadvantaged	-0.52	-0.38	-0.52
Non Disadvantaged	+0.08	+0.11	+0.11
SEND	-0.60	-0.55	-0.52
Non SEND	+0.05	+0.06	+0.09

Basics	Hampshire	National
All	66.7%	63.3%
Disadvantaged	39.2%	43.0%
Non Disadvantaged	72.8%	70.6%
SEND	21.2%	24.2%
Non SEND	73.1%	69.7%

EBacc	Hampshire	National
All	26%	25%
Disadvantaged	9%	12%
Non Disadvantaged	30%	30%
SEND	3%	5%

Appendix One: Summary Data Tables

Non SEND	29%	28%
----------	-----	-----

The Difference (Gap) for Disadvantaged *	Hampshire	National	Stat. Neighbour
EXP+ RWM KS1	21%	18%	-
EXP+ RWM KS2	26%	22%	25%
A8	14.8	12.2	14.4
P8	0.60	0.49	0.63
Basics	33.6%	27.6%	-

* The difference (gap) shown in the table above is local to local (ie Hampshire disadvantaged v non disadvantaged, National disadvantaged v non disadvantaged, and statistical neighbour disadvantaged v non disadvantaged).

The Difference (Gap) for Disadvantaged **	Hampshire	National
EXP+ RWM KS1	16%	18%
EXP+ RWM KS2	22%	22%
A8	14.3	12.2
P8	0.63	0.49
Basics	31.4%	27.6%

** The difference (gap) shown in the table above is local to national (ie. Hampshire disadvantaged v National non disadvantaged).

Hampshire Attendance	Attendance	Persistent Absence
All	95.8%	8.7%
Disadvantaged	93.4%	19.5%
Non Disadvantaged	96.4%	6.2%
SEND	93.8%	17.0%
Non SEND	96.2%	7.4%

Hampshire Exclusions - Primary	All (103385)	Dis (17569)	Non Dis (85816)
No. of FPE as % of cohort	1.7%	5.7%	0.9%
No. of days lost	2676	1573	1103
No. of pupils with 1+ day FPE as % of cohort	0.7%	2.3%	0.4%
No. of PEX	5	2	3

Hampshire Exclusions - Secondary	All (66039)	Dis (12577)	Non Dis (53462)
No. of FPE as % of cohort	6.5%	18.7%	3.6%
No. of days lost	8649	4922	3727
No. of pupils with 1+ day FPE as % of cohort	3.32%	8.25%	2.16%
No. of PEX	27	15	12