



**Buckinghamshire County Council**  
**Select Committee**

Education, Skills and Children's Services Select Committee

---

## **Report to the Education, Skills and Children's Services Select Committee**

<b>Title:</b>	Standards in Buckinghamshire schools
<b>Committee date:</b>	01/07/14
<b>Author:</b>	Pauline Cue
<b>Contact officer:</b>	<b>Chris Munday 01296 387849</b> <b>ccmunday@buckscc.gov.uk</b>
<b>Report signed off by Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>Mike Appleyard</b> <b>Cabinet Member for Education and Skills</b>
<b>Electoral divisions affected:</b>	<b>All</b>

### **Purpose of Agenda Item**

- To inform Members of the 2013 results attained by pupils in Buckinghamshire schools in the Foundation Stage, Key Stages 1, 2, 4 and post-16. This report includes analysis of results of underachieving groups as well as the overall picture on standards and achievement.
- To enable Members to consider the issues for Buckinghamshire raised by this analysis.

### **Background**

- A report on standards in Buckinghamshire schools is presented to Members every year.
- Full details of results and sources of information are provided in the accompanying appendix.



## Summary

As in previous years, schools in Buckinghamshire achieved overall results which were generally well above the national average and above those of similar authorities (Statistical Neighbours – see page 2).

There are, however, underperforming groups of pupils, as detailed below.

**NB. Changes to the measures.** In 2013, there were major changes in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and at KS2. Therefore trend data is not always available.

## STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS

The Statistical Neighbours [SNs] noted in this report are a group of eleven Local Authorities (including Buckinghamshire) that, by a basket of measures, are deemed by OFSTED to be similar in context. They are: Bedfordshire (Central), Bracknell Forest, Cambridgeshire, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, Oxfordshire, Surrey, West Berkshire, Windsor & Maidenhead and Wokingham.

## STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Where this is available (from the Local Authority RAISE document), statistical significance is noted to show a statistically significant difference between the local authority data for a particular group and national data for the same group. The smaller the group, the greater the difference has to be before it is shown to be statistically significant. LA RAISE also states that the performance of specific groups should always be compared with the performance of all pupils nationally as well as the particular group nationally.

## 1. OVERALL RESULTS

### 1A EARLY YEARS FOUNDATION STAGE (EYFS):

- The EYFS Profile (EYFSP) summarises and describes children's attainment at the end of Reception. It is based on ongoing observation and assessment.
- A new EYFSP was introduced in September 2012. 2013 is therefore the first year of results using the new Profile. Results are not directly comparable to those recorded using the old profile.
- To reach a good level of development at the end of Reception, children need to reach at least the expected level in **all** aspects of the prime areas of learning (Communication, Physical Development and PSE), Literacy and Numeracy. This is a broader definition than in previous years.
- **55% reached a good level of development which is 3% above national.** (*Appendix section 1a*)
- The average total points per pupil was also above national.
- The gap between the average score of the lowest 20% and the median points score of all pupils was smaller than national because the average total points of the lowest 20% was higher than the national figure.
- Percentages reaching a good level of development were 5<sup>th</sup> in the list of statistical neighbours, while the gap is 9<sup>th</sup> smallest.

## 1B PHONICS CHECK

- **The percentage of pupils attaining the expected standard in the Y1 phonics test, introduced in 2012, was 66%, which was an increase on 2011 but still 3% below national.** (*Appendix section 1b.*) Results were 9th of Statistical Neighbours (8<sup>th</sup> in 2012). Three other Statistical Neighbours were also below national – this was not the case at other Key Stages.
- Pupils who do not reach the expected standard in Y1 have to take the check again in Y2. **85% of pupils in the 2013 Y2 cohort had passed the check either in Y1 or Y2. This percentage was the same as national,** and results were 6<sup>th</sup> of Statistical Neighbours.

## 1C KEY STAGE 1

- **Results were the same as in 2012, except for reading at level 3, which increased by 2%.**
- **All results were significantly above national.** 91% reached level 2+ in reading, 87% in writing and 93% in maths, against 89%, 85% and 91% nationally. (*Appendix section 1c.*)
- The statistical neighbour position was higher at level 3 (3rd to 5th position) than at level 2+ (7th or 8th position).

## 1D KEY STAGE 2

- **The accountability measures at Key Stage 2 changed** from level 4+ English and Maths to Level 4+ Reading, Writing and Maths, with progress measured in each of these components separately. An additional test, the Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling test was introduced but was reported separately in 2013 rather than being aggregated into the measures above. (Some earlier data has been reworked to enable comparisons.)
- **At level 4+, 80% attained level 4+** in all of reading, writing and maths, 1% higher than in 2012. This was because of an increase in writing results; results for reading and maths were the same as in 2012. (*Appendix section 1d*)
- **Results were above national.** (80% level 4+ R/W/M, against 75% nationally). In the new Grammar, Punctuation and spelling test, results were 7% above national (81%, against 74% nationally). Compared to statistical neighbours, level 4+ results in R/W/M combined were second.
- More pupils made expected progress in reading than last year, and in writing and maths the percentage as were the same as last year. **Progress in reading was significantly above national (90%, against 88% nationally) and first of Statistical Neighbours (SNS), maths (88%) was the same as national and fourth of SNS, and writing progress (90%) was 1% below national** (significantly below) and 6<sup>th</sup> of SNS.
- **5 schools were below the government's floor target** of below 60% achieving 4+ in all of reading, writing and maths and below the national median for 2 levels progress in reading, writing and maths from KS1. In 2012, six schools were below the same standard.

## 1E KEY STAGE 4

- **Results at 5+ A\*-C inc. E/M (71.3%) were up on last year** and were well above the national figure of 59.2%. (*Appendix section 1e*).
- The aspirational target of 73% was not met.
- As last year, results at 5+ A\*-C inc. E/M and in the English Baccalaureate were first of statistical neighbours. Results at any 5 A\*-C were fourth of Statistical Neighbours. All were significantly high.
- The gender gap was smaller than national.
- **Percentages making expected progress were higher than in 2012.** More pupils made expected progress from KS2 than nationally in both English and maths; both subjects were significantly high and first of SNS. (English 78.1%, against 70.4% nationally, maths 81% against 70.7% nationally)
- Results in grammar schools (98.5% 5+ A\*-C inc E/M) were slightly above 2012, after a dip that year. In upper schools, results rose by 3.1% to 56.2%. Both types of school did better than similar schools nationally.
- **Two schools were below the floor target** (below 40% attaining 5+ A\*-C including English and maths, and progress in English and in maths from KS2 below the national median.) This figure is the same as in 2012 and 2011, although numbers below the floor have fallen over the longer term despite increases in the target.

## 1F POST-16

- Results per entry for students taking level 3 qualifications (A level and equivalent) increased slightly in 2013, although overall results per candidate fell.
- **Results were above national and highest of Statistical Neighbours**, both for Average Points Score per candidate, Average Points Score per student, and the measures of grades AAB in academic A levels, with and without “facilitating subjects”. (*Appendix section 1f*)
- **The gender gap was smaller than national** and smallest of statistical neighbours.
- Contextual information is not available for this age-group.

## UNDERPERFORMING GROUPS OF PUPILS

Although standards overall were high, there was still a wide variation in the performance of individual groups of pupils.

There are three measures of deprivation, **Free School Meals (FSM)** in current year, **Pupil Premium** (Free School Meals at any time in the last six years, and Looked-After Children – although no yeargroup had more than sixteen Looked After Children), and **ACORN** (which measures deprivation by postcode). For FSM and Pupil Premium, the Government focuses on **gaps between those eligible and those not eligible** – the narrower the gap the better. Gaps in Buckinghamshire are wider than national – this is partly because results of other pupils are very high, but also because focus groups in most Key Stages have lower results than national.

Pupils in some **minority ethnic and language groups** also have lower results than others. Results of these groups are analysed below and in the Appendix.

## 2. PUPIL PREMIUM AND FSM

**The Pupil Premium/ non-Pupil Premium attainment gap narrows slightly after the Early Years Foundation Stage, but then widens again in secondary schools; the KS4 gap is the widest. This is the case nationally as well, but the Buckinghamshire gaps are wider. The same pattern is found for FSM in current year.**

## **2A EARLY YEARS FOUNDATION STAGE**

- In the Early Years Foundation Stage, the gap between results for pupils with pupil premium (PP) and others was **wider than at later Key Stages**. (there was a 25% gap in achieving a good level of development)

## **2B PHONICS CHECK**

- **In the Y1 Phonics Check, results of both Pupil Premium and non- PP pupils were below national**, and the gap (20%) was wider than national.
- **Although results by the end of Y2 were higher, the gap was still 20%.**

## **2C KEY STAGE 1**

- **Results of pupil premium pupils were significantly below** national in reading and writing, while those of non-PP pupils are significantly high in reading and maths. (*Appendix section 2c*) The gap in Buckinghamshire was 18% in reading, 19% in writing and 11% in maths.

## **2D KEY STAGE 2**

- **Pupil Premium results at level 4+ were the same as national at 63%**, although the gap was wider than national (at 20%) because non-PP pupils in Buckinghamshire had significantly higher results than national.
- In 2012, under the previous measure (level 4+ English and maths), the gap was 24%.
- Gaps in progress for PP pupils in Buckinghamshire were smaller than the gaps for attainment, but **progress was below national in all subjects**, and significantly low for both groups in writing and maths. (Progress gaps were 9% in reading, 7% in writing and 8% in maths.)
- For **FSM in current year**, the percentage reaching level 4+ reading, writing and maths was 61%, which was 1% above national and above the 2014 CYP Plan Target. The gap narrowed from 27% to 21% because FSM results were up by 7% from 2012. The gap is 2% larger than national.
- Compared to statistical neighbours, FSM results were second highest and the gap second smallest. This is an improvement on 2012.

## **2E KEY STAGE 4**

- **For pupil premium, the results at 5+A\*-C inc. E/M were 41%, which was the same as national**. Progress of pupil premium pupils was above national in English and significantly above in maths. (*Appendix section 2e*)
- However, **the results and progress of non- pupil premium pupils were all significantly high**, and gaps between results and progress of pupil premium pupils and others in Buckinghamshire were wider than in primary schools. (Gaps were 35% for attainment, 23% for English progress and 27% for maths progress.)
- Although Pupil Premium results were not below national, FSM in current year was below national. For **FSM**, results at 5+ A\*-C inc. E/M were 34.3%, with a gap of 39.6%

(national gap 26.7%). Although the target of 40% was not met and results were below national, results were up 4.7% from 2012 and the gap narrowed.

- In 2013, results of FSM pupils were 5th of statistical neighbours, but the gap was the 10th smallest. The gap was the second widest nationally. In 2012, the gap was the widest in the group and the widest in England.

### 3. ETHNICITY

**It must be noted that the numbers of pupils in these groups are small and some fluctuations in year on year trends are to be expected.**

#### 3A EYFS

- Results of White British and Mixed White-Black Caribbean pupils were above national, while results of Pakistani and Black Caribbean pupils were below national as they were in 2012 for the previous measure.

#### 3B PHONICS

- **At Y1, all ethnic groups were below national** but the difference in Y1 was greatest for pupils of Pakistani and Black Caribbean origin. (*Appendix section 3b.*)
- **By the end of Y2, White British and Black Caribbean pupils were above national**, and other groups were below. By the end of Y2, there was little difference between ethnic groups nationally, but in Buckinghamshire the gaps between groups were wider. (NB. this data refers to 2013 Y2, while Y1 refers to 2013 Y1).

#### 3C KS1

- The results of **White British** pupils did not change from 2012 and were significantly above national.
- The lowest attaining of the focus ethnic minority groups were those of Pakistani and Mixed White Black Caribbean origin.
- **Results of Pakistani** pupils were lower than in 2012 in reading and writing and were significantly low compared to national in all subjects.
- The small number of **Black Caribbean** pupils had higher results than 2012 in reading and writing, and were above national in those subjects. Results in maths were the same as last year and below national. (*Appendix section 3c*)
- **Mixed White-Black Caribbean (MWBC)** pupils had lower results than in 2012 and were significantly below national in reading and writing.

#### 3D KS2

- **Results of White British pupils were significantly high, and above other groups** at level 4+ reading, writing and maths. **The gaps for progress between White British and other groups were generally much smaller than the gaps for attainment**, as the pupils in the focus minority ethnic groups had lower KS1 results. However, all groups had lower percentages making expected progress than White British pupils.
- **Results of Pakistani pupils at L4+ were the same as national** (as they were in 2012 for the previous measure) but 10% below white British pupils. Progress in reading was above national, but progress in writing was significantly low. Progress in maths was just below national.
- The lowest attaining groups were those of Black Caribbean and MWBC origin.

- **Black Caribbean pupils were below national for all measures**, and significantly below national for progress in maths, while **Mixed White-Black Caribbean pupils were below national for all measures**. (*Appendix section 3d*)

### 3E KS4

- **Results of minority ethnic groups were varied:** At 5+ A\*-C inc. E/M, results of White British and Pakistani pupils increased from 2012. Results of MWBC and Black Caribbean pupils fell, after an increase in 2012. Results of White British pupils were significantly high compared to national, and those of MWBC pupils were significantly low. (*Appendix section 3e*)
- **Progress** in English and maths was significantly above national for White British pupils
- For pupils of Pakistani origin, progress was the same as national in English and above national in maths.
- Progress of Black Caribbean and Mixed White-Black Caribbean pupils was below 2012 and below national for both English (significantly low for both groups) and maths.

## 4. ETHNICITY, PUPIL PREMIUM AND GENDER

Because of small numbers in other groups, this analysis is presented only for pupils of White British and Pakistani origin. Even for these groups, numbers can be relatively low and this must be borne in mind when considering results. Except in the EYFSP and maths at KS1, the group with lowest results was White British boys on Pupil Premium (PP). Thus, although gender is not an issue in overall results, it emerges in these disadvantaged groups.

### 4A EYFSP

- When ethnicity and PP are combined, **boys of Pakistani origin who are eligible for PP had the lowest results** (17% reached a good level of development, against 25% of White British boys on PP.)

### 4B KS1

- **White British boys on PP had the lowest results in reading and writing**, (reading 64% against 93% for non-PP White British boys, writing 55% against 88%). Pakistani boys on PP had the lowest results in maths (69%)
- KS1 is used as the baseline for progress at KS2. To achieve results similar to other pupils at KS2, groups with low KS1 results will have to make greater progress.

### 4C KS2

- When gender and PP are both taken into account, **White British boys eligible for FSM Pupil Premium had lower results than Pakistani boys** (57%, Pakistani boys on FSM 65%) or than girls of either group. Progress of Pakistani PP pupils by gender is greater in almost all subjects than for similar British pupils. (*Appendix section 4c*)

### 4D KS4

- **At KS4, as at KS2, the lowest achieving group when gender, ethnicity and PP are all taken into account was White British boys eligible for pupil premium.** Only 32% attained 5+A\*-C inc. E/M, as against 72% of non-PP White British boys. The gap between PP and non-PP pupils was much greater for White British pupils than for Pakistani pupils. (*Appendix section 4d*)

- In English, White British boys on PP had the lowest **progress** of all. In maths, the percentages making expected progress were slightly above White British girls. But progress for both White British boys and girls with PP were below Pakistani pupils, although for non-PP pupils it was the White British pupils with the highest percentage making expected progress.

## 5. ETHNICITY AND ACORN GROUPS *(Appendix section 5)*

- Except in the EYFSP, **the results of White British pupils in the lowest ACORN group (group 5) were below those of Pakistani pupils.** In the highest groups, however, attainment was highest for White British pupils. Relative progress varied but in ACORN groups 4 and 5 progress was higher for Pakistani pupils than for White British pupils at both KS2 and KS4.

## 6. LANGUAGE *(Appendix section 6)*

- Results by language group show that, as expected, **the differences in attainment between language groups diminished between the Early Years and KS2. However, gaps then increase at KS4.**
- At the end of the EYFS, no language groups had higher results than pupils whose first language was English. This is likely to be because some of the assessment has to be in English.
- At KS2, Tamil speakers have higher results than English speakers.
- At KS4, Tamil, Hindi and Gujarati speakers all had higher results than English speakers.
- A number of groups showed greater progress than English speakers at both KS2 and KS4, particularly in maths.

## 7. MIND THE GAP – AN ANALYSIS OF THE FSM GAP IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL BY PROFESSOR STEVE STRAND

Although the methodology is different, **much of the findings in this Select Committee paper support those of the Strand report.** The Strand report uses complex modelling, with 3-year averages 2010-12 using fine-grade pupil-level KS2 and KS4 scores and an appendix looking at 2013 data. In order to provide analysis over several years, it uses data for FSM in current year except for the 2013 figures.

This Select Committee report uses publicly available data focusing on levels and GCSE grades, mainly for 2013, with some additional pupil group analysis. There is more emphasis on the Pupil Premium measure (Free School Meals at any time in the last six years, and Looked-After Children) as it is now used extensively by the DfE and Ofsted as an accountability measure because of the funding attached to Pupil Premium. This report also considers other underperforming groups, including minority ethnic groups, with some cross-reference to Pupil Premium.

The Strand report looks at KS2 and KS4; this report also considers the results of younger groups.



**The data in this report supports the Strand report's finding that the FSM gap (and the PP gap) is larger than the national average, and is generally larger at KS4 than at KS2. Additionally, however, the gaps are wide at the EYFSP and narrow slightly in the later primary years.** Since progress in KS2 is lower for PP pupils than others, the early disadvantage will have an impact on later results, although it must be stressed that each set of results relates to different cohorts.

The Strand reports also picks out **particularly low achievement by boys entitled to FSM, and by those in focus ethnic groups (including White British).** This Select Committee report highlights the underachievement of White British boys on FSM, Pupil Premium and in the lowest ACORN socio-economic group. Ethnic group analysis shows underachievement compared to national which is not necessarily related to FSM.

This Select Committee report did not look at school – level factors, but the Strand report picked out isolated FSM pupils as a particular issue, and other LA analysis supports this.

**In 2013, the Strand report notes that KS2 results for pupils on FSM improved,** as noted here - results for Pupil Premium pupils also improved. However, both analyses note that the KS4 results were not so positive. KS4 FSM results were still below national, although results for PP pupils were the same as national. As the results of other pupils are so high, the gap is still very wide.

**The Strand reports also notes that the improvement at KS2 was due to improvements in results of minority ethnic pupils on FSM.** The PP/ethnicity analysis in this select committee report is for one year only, but picks out attainment of White British boys on PP as a particular issue.

Finally, the Strand report 2013 annex notes that progress by different ability groups varies and that analysis of future data would be useful. Different ability groups eligible for FSM or Pupil Premium are small, and further data would enable more robust conclusions.

## **Resource implications**

### **Next steps**

- This is a paper for information. There are no specific financial and resource implications for schools.