

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Item no: 18 | Classification: OPEN | Committee: Education, Youth & Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee | Date: 14 January 2003 |
| From: Head of Corporate Strategy | | Title: Performance Reports | |

Introduction

1. The Executive receives quarterly reports on the performance of Council services. The first quarterly performance report was received by the Executive on 8 October 2002 and is attached as Appendix 6. The second was received on 3 December 2002 and is attached as Appendix 7. A third is scheduled for February 2003.
2. The reports contain a commentary on key service issues and performance monitoring data against a basket of indicators for each policy priority of the current administration. Of particular relevance to this sub-committee are the performance indicators for the policy priority of "raising standards in our schools".
3. The Executive also receives a more detailed annual report on education performance, including exam results at Key Stages 1-4. The 2002 Education Performance Report was received on 3 December and is attached as Appendix 5.

Decisions for the sub-committee

Quarterly Performance Reports

Context

4. With regard to the first quarterly report of 8 October 2002, the Executive noted the poor performance in (among other areas) childcare places and agreed the proposals for addressing poor performance set out in the report. In addition, they resolved that the Strategic Director of Education enter into discussions with Ofsted to identify their areas for improvement and report back to the Executive Member for Education Youth & Leisure for consideration and action.
5. With regard to the second quarterly report of 3 December 2002, the Executive noted and endorsed the action taken following the previous quarterly review in the area of childcare places (among others).
6. Explanatory notes on the performance data are contained within the performance reports.

Decisions

7. A decision is needed on how members wish to receive these reports in the future. For example:
 - Circulated on paper
 - Light touch presentation
 - Full officer presentation
 - Presentation by Executive Member, with officer support

8. Members of the sub-committee may simply note the contents of these reports (for their information) or may wish to consider making recommendations to the Executive. For example:

- To challenge performance against any given indicator
- To propose alternative or additional indicators

Education Performance Report 2002

Context

9. This report provides a comprehensive overview of educational outcomes in the borough for 2002. Explanatory notes (with graphics and tables attached as Appendices 1 through 4) to assist members in interpreting the data are set out below.

10. Following consideration of the report on 3 December, the Executive made two specific resolutions:

- That officers be required to provide the Executive Member for Education, Youth & Leisure with detailed reports on a monthly basis as to the actions taken and delivery against the improvement plan for Key Stage 2.
- That particular attention be paid to addressing the poorer performance of boys identified as being of African/Caribbean origin and that this should be included in the monthly performance report to the Executive Member.

Decisions

11. Members of the sub-committee may simply note the contents of this report and the resolutions of the Executive (for their information) or may wish to consider making recommendations to the Executive. For example:

- To challenge performance in any area
- To propose changes in policy to improve performance

12. Members may also wish to make use of any of the performance data presented in the three reports to Executive to inform preparations for their annual meeting with the Executive Member in February and/or the selection of future scrutiny topics for the 2003/4 work programme of the sub-committee (a planning meeting is scheduled for April).

Explanatory notes on the Education Performance Report 2002

Background

13. The advice received from the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) is that the national standards for parents to judge their child's progress are:

14. a typical 7-year-old is expected to achieve level 2 at the end of Key Stage 1;

15. a typical 11-year-old is expected to achieve level 4 at the end of Key Stage 2.

16. a typical 14-year-old is expected to achieve level 5 at the end of Key Stage 3.

17. The tests consist of a 7-year-old being assessed in English (reading, reading comprehension, spelling and writing) and in mathematics. An 11-year-old will be

tested in English (Reading, writing, spelling and handwriting), mathematics (with and without a calculator) and in science. The duration of the tests at Key Stage 1 is about 3 hours, designed to fit in with other schoolwork. At Key Stage 2 the tests are more like a short examination and consist of about 5 hours of tests 14 year old pupils take national tests in English, mathematics and science.

18. The LEA is required to publish Key Stage 2 results in the form of Performance tables on a school-by-school basis which are circulated to libraries and schools and available to the public. The Department for Education and Employment (DfES) publish performance tables for the public on GCSE results and for the first time this year Key Stage 3 and value added results. These results do not include data relating to gender or ethnicity issues, which are included in this report.

19. Key Stage 1 (Appendix 1)

Appendix 1 (Fig. 1 to Fig. 8) shows the Key Stage 1 result for the pupils who took the tests in 2002.

20. Fig. 1 shows that performance in Reading has improved in 2002. Southwark test results show 78% of pupils reaching the required level in 2002. The figure of 78% is below the provisional national average, but higher than that achieved by most of Southwark's statistical neighbours* in 2002 and on par with inner London average. It is worth noting that a significant proportion of the year 2 cohort had English as an additional language and were not fluent in English. This may account in part for different levels of attainment between reading, writing and mathematics.

*Southwark's statistical neighbours are defined by Ofsted to be those LEAs who against a range of 18 indicators, have broadly similar socio-economic circumstances to Southwark. Southwark's Statistical Neighbours are Islington, Lambeth, Lewisham, Hackney and Haringey.

21. Fig. 2 shows that the results for Southwark pupils in writing at Key Stage 1 has remained the same in 2002. The 2002 figure is below the provisional national average but is again in line with that achieved by Southwark's statistical neighbours in 2002 and 1% point below the inner London average.

22. Fig.3 shows that Southwark mathematics results remained the same in 2002. The 2002 figure is now 4% points below the provisional national average and higher than that achieved by most of Southwark's statistical neighbours in 2002 and on par with inner London average.

23. There is no science test at Key Stage 1, but Fig 4 shows that the teacher assessed science results have remained same in 2001. Nationally teacher assessment for science also remained the same. The 2002 figure is 7% points below the national average but in line with that achieved by most of Southwark's statistical neighbours in 2002 and 1% point below inner London average.

24. The results show that Southwark, pupils have about the same performance in 2002 across the three subjects, although reading levels have improved in contrast to National levels. However the results are below the national average. Raising levels of achievement in Literacy and Numeracy at Key Stage 1 is an integral part of the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategies being implemented in Southwark schools.

Gender

25. Appendix 1 (Fig. 5 to Fig. 7) show the Key Stage 1 teacher assessment results for boys and girls in English, mathematics and science.
26. In previous years, girls have out-performed boys in all three subjects at age 7.
27. Fig. 5 shows girls continue to out-perform boys in English. 83% of girls achieved Level 2 or above in 2002 compared with 72% of boys. There is a slightly wider gap than in 2001. However, it also shows performance in English has remained effectively constant over three years. The gap between boys' and girls' performance has also remained much the same.
28. Fig. 6 shows girls out-performing boys in mathematics by 4% points in 2002 this is a smaller gap than the previous year. In 2001 the gap was 7% between boys and girls attainment. It also shows that boys' performance has improved by 2% points in 2002.
29. Fig. 7 shows girls out-performing boys in science in 2002. The gap is smaller at 6% than in 2001. It also reflects the attainment of girls has dropped but the attainment of boys has remained the same.
30. Narrowing the difference in performance between boys and girls is a key priority in the EDP.

Contextualisation of Results - Key Stage 1

31. Contextualisation of the results requires a choice of likely factors that may affect the performance of pupils in Year 2. Identified factors include the ethnicity of pupils, the number of pupils who are eligible for free meals, the number who have had previous nursery experience and the mobility of pupils. This list of factors is not exhaustive, but does provide further insight into the results.
32. Fig. 8 shows the performance of pupils in the various ethnic groupings. The figures need to be considered cautiously due to some very small numbers in certain ethnic groups. Consideration of the largest pupil populations shows that in 2002 English/Scottish/Welsh pupils performance has improved in 2002 in English and Maths but slightly dropped in science. African pupils' performance remained well above the Southwark average for English, mathematics and science. Caribbean pupils performed well below the LEA average across all 3 subjects.
33. Eligibility for free schools meals (FMS) is an accepted proxy measure of social deprivation.
34. Figure. 9 shows that in each of the subjects, pupils eligible for free school meals performed less well than their peers by 13% in English, 8% in maths and 12% in science. These findings are consistent with the analysis of the previous three years' data.
35. Fig.11 shows that children fluent in English perform better than those who are not. The gap has increased further in English and Maths and narrowed slightly in Science in 2002.
36. Fig. 12 and 13 shows the adverse effect of mobility on performance. The adverse impact of mobility is starting to be recognised by the DfES. The effect is significant for a number of schools and argues for careful consideration of the impact of Housing and Regeneration proposals on educational outcomes.

Key Stage 2 (Appendix 2)

37. Appendix 2 shows the Key Stage 2 test results.
38. Fig. 1 shows that achievement in English has increased in 2002 at Key Stage 2. The figure of 67% is below the provisional national average by 8% points but in line with that achieved by Southwark's statistical neighbours although 2% points lower than the inner London average.
39. Fig. 2 shows that in Maths the gap with provisional national average is 11% points, below all of Southwark's statistical neighbours and 6% points below the inner London average.
40. Fig.3 shows that Southwark science result has dropped by 4% points compared to 2001. There is also a gap of 9% points compared to 2002 provisional national results, below most of Southwark's statistical neighbours and 4% points below the inner London average.

Gender

41. Fig.5 shows progressive improvement in girls' performance in English. Girls continue to out-perform boys with 72% of girls achieving Level 4 or above in 2002 compared to 62% of boys. The gap between boys and girls has narrowed by 1% in 2002.
42. Figs. 6 and 7 show in 2002 there is a 2% performance difference between boys and girls in mathematics and science. The difference is slightly wider than in previous years.

Contextualisation of Results - Key Stage 2

43. Contextualisation of the Key Stage 2 results for the purposes of this report has been restricted to Ethnicity, Free School Meals (FMS), Mobility (years in school) and fluency in English. These factors have been used to provide further insight into Key Stage 2 results for 2002.
44. Analysis of the three largest ethnic groups (Fig. 8) for 2002 shows that the performance of English/Scottish/Welsh pupils is in line with the borough average at 67% in English, but is below in mathematics by 1% and 3% above in science. African pupils were above the LEA average in English (4%) and maths (2%) and below with the LEA average in science. The performance of Caribbean pupils was below the LEA averages in English (-7%), mathematics (-9%), science (-5%). The gap between Caribbean pupils and Southwark performance is higher in 2002. Traveller attainment in KS2 English rose 2 percentage points from 15% in 2001 to 17% in 2002 and rose in Maths from 8% to 21%, an increase of 13 percentage points between 2001 and 2002.
45. Fig.9 shows that the performance of pupils who are eligible for FSM is lower than their peers in each subject. Their performance was 19% lower in English, 14% lower in mathematics and 17% lower in science. The gap in all the subjects is wider than in 2001.
46. Fig.10 shows the adverse effect of mobility on performance. Pupils who have been in the same school for less than 2 years perform significantly worse than those in the same school for the full Key Stage period.

47. Fig 11 shows that children fluent in English perform better than those who are not. The gap at Key Stage 2 is significantly greater than that noticed at Key Stage 1.

Key Stage 3 (Appendix 3)

48. Appendix 3 (Fig. 1 to Fig 3.) shows the Key Stage 3 test result for the pupils who took the tests in 2002. This data for both Southwark and nationally is provisional (final data expected later in December 2002).

49. Fig. 1 shows that there has been an increase of 9 percentage points in English between 2001 and 2002. This is in comparison to a fall of 1% between 2000 and 2001. The 2002 figure of 49% of pupils achieving the expected level is below the provisional national average of 66%, a gap of 17%. The gap between Southwark and national performance in English has closed by 17 percentage points since 2001.

50. Fig. 2 shows that the results for Southwark pupils in mathematics at Key Stage 3 rose by 1%. This is the same as the provisional national rise of 1%. The 2002 figure was below the national average by 22%.

51. Fig.3 shows that Southwark science results increased by 3% in 2001. The 2002 figure is 44% compared to the provisional national average of 66% of pupils attaining level 5 and above, a gap of 22% in 2002 compared to 22% in 2001.

52. The results show that Southwark pupils' performance in Science and mathematics has improved over the last 3 years and that there has been significant improvement in English in the last year. However performance in all three core subjects remain well below the national average.

53. Provisional data on statistical neighbours at KS3 is shown at Appendix A. This shows that Southwark's performance in all three subjects is below that achieved by most of the statistical neighbours.

Gender

54. Appendix 3 (Fig. 4 to Fig. 6) show the Key Stage 3 test results for boys and girls in English, mathematics and science.

55. In previous years, girls have out-performed boys in all three subjects at age 14.

56. Fig. 4 shows girls continue to out-perform boys in English. 59% of girls achieved Level 5 or above in 2002 compared with 38% of boys. It also shows that girls' performance in English increased in 2002 by 9 percentage points, and boys' performance increased by 7 percentage points. Improving the performance of boys in English in the secondary phase is one of the key purposes of the Education Development Plan, and the increase in boys' performance between 2000 and 2001 has been sustained, and further increased, between 2001 and 2002.

57. Fig. 5 shows that the boys' performance in maths is 2% below girls' performance.

58. Fig. 6 shows girls out-performing boys in science by 4% in 2002.

59. Narrowing the difference in performance between boys and girls is a key priority for the department.

Contextualisation of Results - Key Stage 3

60. Fig. 7 shows the performance of pupils in the various ethnic groupings. The figures need to be considered cautiously due to some very small numbers in certain ethnic groups. Consideration of the largest pupil populations shows that in 2002 English/Scottish/Welsh pupils performed below the Southwark average in all three subjects. African pupils' performance was above the Southwark average for all three subjects, being 9% above in English. Caribbean pupils continued to perform below the LEA average in 2002.

GCSE (Appendix 4)

61. At the time of writing comparative final national figures for GCSE have not yet been released by the DfES, however provisional early statistics that are still in the process of being checked by schools were available and have been used throughout were applicable. Southwark figures are also still provisional but have been adjusted to take account of overseas pupils.

62. The proportion of the average age cohort gaining one or more GCSE A*- G has improved year-on-year from 1994 and by 11 percentage points overall between then and 2002. This is in the context of a National percentage increase of 3% between 1994 and 2002. There is no data available for this year to compare Southwark's performance with its statistical neighbours.

63. In terms of the percentage of the age cohort gaining five or more GCSE's grade A* - G there has been a progressive increase from 70% in 1994 to 87% in 2002. This is in the context of a 3 percentage point national increase between 1994 and 2002 bringing Southwark to only 2% below national levels in 2002.

64. In terms of percentage of the age cohort gaining five or more GCSE's grade A* - C the figure has improved progressively from 18% in 1994 to 36% in 2002. This is in a context of a national eight percentage point increase from 1994 to 2002.

65. The average point score has continued to improve over the last three years, from 30 in 1999 to 34 in 2002.

66. The overall progress in respect of the proportion of the cohort gaining one or more GCSE grades A* - G has met the target set out in the Education Development Plan for 2002. In respect to GCSE five + A*-C grades, the target of 35% in the EDP has been exceeded by actual performance by 1%. The target for 2001 was 33% of pupils gaining this measure, and 35% for 2002/2003. Given that the results will be adjusted further to take into account asylum seekers/refugee pupils, we have reason to believe that the LEA target of 35% will be met when the DfES publish performance tables in December.

67. The percentage of children looked after achieving at least 1 A* - G GCSE/ GNVQ or equivalent increase by 12 percentage points from 34% in 2001 to 46% in 2002.

Gender

68. Girls out-performed boys consistently in respect of the percentage gaining one or more A* - G, five or more A* - G and five or more A* - C. In 2002 the percentage of boys gaining 5+A*-C has improved by 2%. However, the gap between boys and girls increases to 13% compared with a gap of 11% in 2001.

Ethnic Differences

69. Although the situation is complex English/Scottish/Welsh pupils are achieving 8% below the Southwark average at 5 or more A* - C. Caribbean pupils are also achieving below the Southwark average (13%). African pupils are achieving above the Southwark average on all measures. The percentage of Traveller pupils achieving 1 or more A* - G increased by 13 percentage points from 17% in 2001 to 30% in 2002. The percentage achieving 5 or more A* - C remained at 0%.

Subject Differences

70. In terms of pass rates for individual subjects there are wide variations from 64 percent of those entering and gaining an A* - C grade for Drama to 17 percent for Science: Single Award. Drama, D&T Electrn. Prods, and Media Studies have the highest attainment, where more than half of pupils entered achieve a grade A* to C. In terms of the core subjects of English, Mathematics and Science it should be noted there is an average variation of the order of 9 percentage points between the 44% A*-C grades for English and the 35% for Mathematics. There is also a 7 percentage points difference between the 37% A*-C for double Science and English (44%). It is evident that if figures for Maths and Science could be pushed up to equal those of English, then this will bring about a healthy improvement in the five or more A* - C measure.

Within and Between School Variations

71. In addition to the gender and subject variations there are also marked variations between individual schools. A number of schools have been able to show a clear improvement trend over a period of years. Others have produced an inconsistent performance in which gains have not been sustained. Some schools have managed a significant achievement in 2002, e.g. Kingsdale raising attainment of 5+A*-C by 25% (from 16% to 41%), and St. Saviour and St. Olaves improving on last year by 20% for pupils gaining 5+A*-C (from 40% to 60%).

72. As well as improvements in 5+A*-C there are important improvements in 5+A*-G. For example, both Walworth and Archbishop Michael Ramsey achieved an additional 12% of pupils gaining at least 5 GCSE grades compared to last year.

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|--|
| Lead Officer | Ian Hughes | Head of Corporate Strategy |
| Report Author | Graeme Gordon | Adviser to the Education, Youth and Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee |

| Background Papers | Held at | Contact |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| Minutes of the Executive meetings on 8 th October 2002 and 3 rd December 2002 | Southwark Town Hall Peckham Road SE5 8UB | Paula Thornton 020 7525 4395 |
| Education Performance Report December 2002 Information Pack | John Smith House 144 – 152 Walworth Road London SE17 1JL | Maria Nawrocka 020 7525 5032 |