

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Report

Committee/Panel:	Children and Families Advisory Panel
Date:	6 October 2015
Title:	Education Outcomes for Children in Care
Reference:	6915
Report From:	Director of Children's Services

Contact name: Anwen Foy, Senior Inspector Inclusion

Tel: 01962-835227

Email: anwen.foy@hants.gov.uk

1. Summary

- 1.1. Attainment for children in care in the early years has improved since 2014.
- 1.2. Attainment at Key Stage 1 (KS1) is in line with predictions from schools but the percentage of children attaining level 2 and above in the combined reading, writing and mathematics measure has fallen since 2014.
- 1.3. Attainment at Key Stage 2 (KS2) has improved in the combined reading writing and maths measure, with an increase of 6.2% compared with 2014 (r70).
- 1.4. Attainment at Key Stage 4 (KS4) is not in line with predictions from schools and shows a significant decline compared with 2014 results (r71). In 2014, two sets of results were reported for GCSE – 'first' and 'best.' From 2015, the DfE changed the reporting of GCSE results so that where students had sat an examination in a subject more than once, only their 'first' results were reported rather than their 'best' results as in previous years. Therefore this report reports 'first' results and compares this to the same measure for 2014.
- 1.5. A summary of Hampshire attainment in each Key Stage may be seen in Appendices 1-4.
- 1.6. Summary attainment data for children in the care of the Isle of Wight is included for reference in Appendix 5 however please note that the commentary in this report refers only to the Hampshire data.

2015 Hampshire Results

- 1.7. The 2015 results are provisional and are subject to change. Given the small numbers involved, any change in the cohort will have a significant impact on the data therefore these statistics need to be treated with caution. The DfE will return validated data to us sometime in December 2015.

- 1.8. These results relate to the 'OC2' cohort of children who were in care for 12 months continuously up to the 31 March 2015, and in this report, attainment is compared to that of 2014. We will be able to compare our results with those of statistical neighbours and the national average following the DfE release of "Outcomes for children looked by local authorities in England, as at 31 March 2015" later this year.

2. Early Years

There were 40 children in care in Year R who were eligible to sit Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFSP) assessments. This is 12 more children than in 2014. 35% achieved a 'good level of development' in 2015 compared with 30% in 2014.

3. Key Stage 1

- 3.1. There were 35 children in care in the Key Stage 1 (KS1) OC2 cohort. This is ten more children than 2014 (Published figures) ten more than 2013 and nine above the five year average.

- 3.2. Of the OC2 cohort, 65.7% (23 children) achieved Level 2 or above in reading, 60% (21 children) achieved Level 2 or above in writing and 62.9% (22 children) achieved Level 2 and above in Maths. 51.4% (18 children) achieved Level 2 and above in all 3 subjects. The larger cohort of children in 2015 and the fact that fewer children achieved in all 3 subjects this year means that the overall percentage has dropped from 81% in 2014 to 51.4% in 2015. As such, Key Stage 1 results are likely to be below the national average for children in care. A summary of attainment may be seen in Appendix 2.

- 3.3. Key stage 1 results are disappointing for 2015, but are broadly in line with predictions from schools with the exception of the percentage and number of children expected to achieve Level 2 in all three subjects. There are likely to be a number of contributory factors. Overall 54% (19/35) of the cohort are recognised as having SEN compared with 41% in 2014. 20% (7/35) of the 2015 cohort have a statement of SEN compared with 14% the previous year. 12 of the cohort are recorded as having 'abnormal' SDQ (Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire) scores compared with 6 the previous year, and 6 have a 'borderline' score compared to 4 the previous year. (The SDQ will provide predictions about how likely it is that a child or young person has significant emotional and or mental health needs.) 11 children are summer born compared to 7 in 2014.

3.4. Action

The Virtual School is undertaking a detailed analysis of the cohort who were predicted by schools to achieve Level 2 in all three subjects, both for those children who did achieve this and those who did not, taking into account a wide range of contextual data and information. We will also monitor the Autumn term predictions carefully and contact schools to carry out some further quality assurance of predictions as appropriate.

4. Key Stage 2

- 4.1. There were 49 children in the Key Stage 2 (KS2) OC2 cohort. This is the same as in 2014 and five more than the four year average. (A four year average is used here reflecting the change to reporting the combined result of Reading Writing and Mathematics RWM from 2011 onwards). Overall, 67.3% (33/49) of the cohort are recognised as having SEN, which is a 2% increase on 2014. 18.4% of the cohort have a statement of SEN a decrease of 3.2% on 2014. A summary of attainment may be seen in Appendix 3.
- 4.2. Of the 49 children in the OC2 cohort, 63.3% (31 children) attained Level 4+ (L4+) in reading, 55.1% (27 children) attained L4+ in writing and 65.3% (32 children) attained L4+ in maths). Although achievement in individual subjects varies slightly, the percentage of children achieving L4+ in all three subjects (National Indicator r70) has increased by 6.2% and is the highest in the last 4 years. This suggests that the improved attainment at Key Stage 1 from previous years has been consolidated and sustained over Key Stage 2. An overview may be seen in Appendix 3. Attainment for the combined subjects is likely to be above the national average for children in care. Predictions from schools were broadly in line with children's attainment for 2015.
- 4.3. Progress made between key stage 1 and key stage 2 fell in reading and mathematics. However, progress improved in writing after a fall in 2014.

4.4. Action

As for Key Stage 2, the Virtual School is undertaking a detailed analysis of the cohort who were predicted by schools to achieve Level 4, comparing any changes in achievement patterns to the previous 3-5 years due to the small numbers in each cohort. We will also examine progress data from Key Stage 1 to 2 to identify how many of the cohort were in care during Key Stage 1 compared with previous cohorts. Finally we will monitor the Autumn term predictions carefully and contact schools to carry out some further quality assurance of predictions as appropriate.

5. Key Stage 4

- 5.1. There were 94 young people in the KS4 OC2 cohort compared with 77 in 2014. This year, 14 young people were predicted by their schools to achieve five or more GCSEs at grades C and above, including English and Maths. For comparison, 18 out of the 77 in the 2014 OC2 cohort were predicted to attain using the same measure.
- 5.2. Of the 14, nine young people did not achieve in line with predictions from schools. This means that the percentage of the OC2 cohort that attained 5 A*-C GCSEs, including English & mathematics, (r71) based on 2015 provisional results is 4.3%. This result is likely to be below the national average. A summary of attainment may be seen in Appendix 4
- 5.3. This result is very disappointing and there are likely to be a number of contributory factors. In terms of wider context, within the OC2 cohort as a

whole, 26 young people had an 'abnormal' SDQ score and 13 had a 'borderline' score compared with 22 and 7 respectively for the previous year. In terms of percentages, the 'abnormal' scores are broadly similar from 2014-15 but the 'borderline' scores are higher this year than last. In the 2015 cohort, 65 children out of the 94 (or 69%) are recorded as having SEN, with 34 young people (or 36%) recorded as having a statement of SEN. The overall percentage of young people with SEN is lower than 2014, whilst the number with statements is broadly similar. It is interesting to note however that 22% of the 2015 cohort are recorded as having 'SEN support' compared with 0% in this category the previous year. Considering this, together with the borderline SDQ scores, there may have been some instances where the social, emotional or learning needs of individual young people were missed, particularly where these may have been 'masked' by behavioural issues.

5.4. Action

At the current time, a detailed analysis of the cohort of students predicted to reach national benchmarks is underway. A series of anonymised case studies and pen portraits will be available in due course together with a comprehensive action plan to improve GCSE attainment - which will be informed by the experiences of this year's children in care year 11 cohort.

The early findings from this investigation suggest that of the 9 who did not attain in line with their predictions:

- Two young people experienced traumatic events close to the exam period which are highly likely to have negatively affected their GCSE outcomes.
- One student attained a grade D in English whilst her other results were higher grades. It is likely that this student was affected by the grade boundary issue widely reported within the iGCSE in English.
- Two students were on the roll of a school judged to be 'inadequate' by OFSTED. Neither achieved a grade C in English despite the fact that at Key Stage 2 they both achieved level 4. Looked after children need the best quality teaching. It is likely that the overall quality of teaching will have affected final GCSE outcomes for these students.
- The chaotic care circumstances of one student is likely to have been a strong contributory factor in poor achievement across the board.
- In the case of the remaining three students, there is an emerging issue with the accuracy and reliability of predictions provided by their schools for Maths and English results. This is currently being investigated further with HIAS subject specialists.
- In terms of wider contributing factors, at least one student found the examination period overwhelming and stressful, and another student was ill and had to return home during one of her exams.
- In 3 cases, individual schools experienced a drop in their overall standards or within English or Maths. The Virtual School analysis will need to take this into account, not least because our looked after children are often working at the C/D border.

Whilst this analysis takes place, we will be contacting all of these students, their foster carers and social workers to make sure they have the opportunity to resit and gain the grades they missed. Where appropriate, papers are being remarked. Furthermore, Corporate Parent visits are now arranged to all schools where students were predicted to attain. This includes schools where students did achieve in line with their predictions so that good practice case studies can be produced and shared more widely.

Recommendation

That the Children and Family Advisory Panel note the report and the actions being taken.

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:	no
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.)

No document to add

Document

Location

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:

- a) The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant characteristic connected to that characteristic;
- b) Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- c) 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.

1.2. Equalities Impact Assessment:

This report highlights the educational achievement of children in the care of Hampshire Local Authority. It raises awareness of the barriers faced by this group of children in terms of their education and learning. Although children in care as a group are not recognised as being within the 'protected characteristics' they are a vulnerable group and 'age' should be considered as they are children. The impact of raising awareness is likely to be positive for the following reasons:

- Ensuring that children have a 'voice' and that the educational needs of children in care are highlighted and prioritised within the Local Authority.
- Highlighting that educational outcomes affect life chances of children.

- Highlighting the link between health and wellbeing and educational outcomes.

The impact on race as a protected characteristic is likely to be low since only a minority of children in care come from ethnic minority groups.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

- 2.1. Ensuring that every child has a suitable education in place that meets their needs and that educational outcomes are continuously monitored and improved are likely to have a positive impact on life chances and reduce the number of children in care who enter the criminal justice system.

3. Climate Change:

- a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

The Virtual School for children in care tracks and monitors educational outcomes of Hampshire children no matter where they are placed. The use of technology and remote methods of working is likely to have a positive impact on our carbon footprint and energy consumption.

- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

It achieves this through developing sustainable ways of working, as described above.

Summary of provisional results for Hampshire children in care 2015

Appendix 1

Early Years Foundation Stage Profile (EYFS) : Performance of Children in Care in Year R

Cohort	Number of CiC in Year R eligible to sit EYFSP assessments 2015	Good Level of Development			
		2015		2014	
		Num	%	Num	%
OC2 Cohort	40	14	35.0%	12	30.0%

Appendix 2

Key Stage 1: Number and percentage of children achieving level 2 and above

Academic Year	Number of CiC in Year 2 eligible to sit Key Stage 1 teacher assessments	Attaining Level 2 or above							
		Reading		Writing		Mathematics		All Tests / Tasks	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
2011	21	16	76.2%	13	61.9%	17	81.0%	12	57.1%
2012	24	14	58.3%	10	41.7%	16	66.7%	10	41.7%
2013	25	20	80.0%	15	60.0%	20	80.0%	15	60.0%
2014	29	23	79.3%	23	79.3%	23	79.3%	23	79.3%
2014 published figures	25		81%		81%		81%		81%
2015 provisional figures	35	23	65.7%	21	60%	22	62.9%	18	51.4%

Appendix 3

Key Stage 2: Number and percentage of children achieving level 4 and above

Year	Number of CiC in Year 6 eligible to sit Key Stage 2 tasks and tests	Attaining Level 4 or above							
		Reading		Writing TA		Maths		L4+ Reading, Writing and Maths	
2012	40	23	57.5%	19	47.5%	23	57.5%	12	30.0%
2013	40	25	62.5%	21	52.5%	24	60.0%	20	50.0%
2014	49	34	69.4%	28	57.1%	32	65.3%	23	46.9%
2014 published figures	45	73%		60%		71%		49%	
2015 provisional figures	49	31	63.3%	27	55.1%	32	65.3%	26	53.1%

4. Appendix 4:- Overview of achievement at Key Stage 4

Year	Number of CiC in Year 11 eligible for Key Stage 4 Assessment	Achieving standard											
		Number who sat any exam		Received at least 1 GCSE at A*-G		5+ GCSEs* at A* - G		5+ GCSEs (Inc. Eng & Math) at A* - G		5 GCSEs (or equivalent*) at grade A* to C		5+ GCSEs (Inc. Eng & Math) at A* - C	
		Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
2010	87	84	96.6%	57	65.5%	41	47.1%	32	36.8%	18	20.7%	10	11.5%
2011	106	80	75.5%	75	70.8%	56	52.8%	47	44.3%	19	17.9%	7	6.6%
2012	88	73	83.0%	70	79.5%	46	52.3%	42	47.7%	20	22.7%	8	9.1%
2013	107	82	76.6%	76	71.0%	56	52.3%	53	49.5%	21	19.6%	10	9.3%
2014 'Best'	77	57	74.0%	56	72.7%	33	42.9%	33	42.9%	16	20.8%	13	16.9%
2014 'First'													13.8%
2015	94	63	67.0%	61	64.9%	36	38.3%	30	31.9%	9	9.6%	4	4.3%

5. Appendix 5 : Summary of provisional results for Isle of Wight children in care 2015

Key Stage 2: Number and percentage of children achieving level 4 and above

Year	Number of CiC in Year 6 eligible to sit Key Stage 2 tasks and tests	Attaining Level 4 or above						
		Reading		Writing TA		Maths		L4+ Reading, Writing and Maths
2015 OC2	9	6	66.7%	5	55.6%	6	66.7%	
2014 (SFR Dec 2014)	0							0

Appendix 5 : Summary of provisional results for Isle of Wight children in care 2015

Key Stage 4 overview

Year	Number of CiC in Year 11 eligible for Key Stage 4 Assessment	Achieving standard											
		Number who sat any exam		Received at least 1 GCSE at A*-G		5+ GCSEs* at A* - G		5+ GCSEs (Inc. Eng & Math) at A* - G		5 GCSEs (or equivalent*) at grade A* to C		5+ GCSEs (Inc. Eng & Math) at A* - C	
		Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
2015	24	19	79.2%	16	66.7%	9	37.5%	8	33.3%	4	16.7%	2	8.3%
2014 (SFR Dec 2014)	15											0	0