2021-2022 Spring Term Data Report

* Key OFSTED action: *‘Introduce an assessment system, which allows teachers to record clear evidence of progress against pupils’ personalised small steps of learning in their re-written Education, Health and Care Plans, reflecting the whole breadth of the curriculum in the school.’*
* The report is based on data returns for 200 of the 206 students on roll
* Teachers are required to make two judgements:
  + For each EHCP target, is the student ‘on track’ to reach their ‘Expected Outcome’?
* If the student is ‘not on track’, why?
* Teachers’ deadline for submission of data was 1.4.22.
* Week commencing 4th April, AHT’s conducted learning conversation meetings with individual teachers in their pathway to:
  + Verify their returns.
  + Review the evidence-base for their judgements.
  + Agree strategies to address underachievement.
* The data presented in this report is analysed against the three criteria used in previous reports:
  + EHCP domain.
  + Pupil Premium/LAC.
  + Curriculum Pathway.

Further analysis of the VI cohort has been included in this report due to the weaker data sets of the physical and sensory domain.

* To aid Governors’ challenge, data from Autumn 21/22 is included.
* COVID update: During the Spring term, classes were shut on a rota system due to increased staff absence and covid outbreaks within school.

**Section 1 – EHCP Domain**

**Spring Term 21/22**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EHCP Domains** | **Not on Track** | **On Track** | **Grand Total** |
| Cognition and Learning | 80 | 595 | 675 |
| Independence | 39 | 354 | 393 |
| Physical and Sensory | 20 | 133 | 153 |
| Social, Emotional Wellbeing | 42 | 345 | 387 |
| Speech, Language and Communication | 60 | 443 | 503 |
| **Grand Total** | **241** | **1870** | **2111** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EHCP Domains** | **Not on Track** | **On Track** | **Grand Total** |
| Cognition and Learning | 117 (17%) | 538 (83%) | 655 |
| Independence | 55 (13%) | 356 (87%) | 411 |
| Physical and Sensory | 22 (15%) | 125 (85%) | 147 |
| Social, Emotional Wellbeing | 66 (16%) | 335 (84%) | 401 |
| Speech, Language and Communication | 60 (12%) | 453 (88%) | 513 |
| **Grand Total** | **320** | **1807** | **2127** |

**Autumn Term 21/22**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EHCP Domains** | **Not on Track** | **On Track** | **Grand Total** |
| Cognition and Learning | 67 | 516 | 583 |
| Independence | 68 | 300 | 368 |
| Physical and Sensory | 27 | 124 | 151 |
| Social, Emotional Wellbeing | 44 | 298 | 342 |
| Speech, Language and Communication | 59 | 352 | 411 |
| **Grand Total** | **265** | **1590** | **1855** |

**Summer Term 20/21**

**‘Not On Track’ Breakdown**



‘Attendance non-covid’, ‘inappropriate expectation’ and ‘unable to make provision’ are the most significant reasons for underperformance, with over 20% of ‘not on track’ targets attributing to these factors.

Factors attributing to these are:

**Attendance non-covid**: Generally there has been an increase in other illnesses: D&V, chicken pox, colds and coughs.

Further analysis showed that for one student, ‘not on track’ had been selected for 14 out of 15 targets. He appears to have regressed in 6 targets below his initial baseline assessment, reviewed within SLT.

**Inappropriate expectations**: large proportion are year 7 students, targets we have ‘inherited’ from primary settings.

**Unable to make provision**: Large proportion from 2 classes; one class selected this reason code 33 times, another class selected this 22 times.

Staff absences have been the main reason for teachers being unable to provide an appropriate provision. Covid isolation was still a large factor in daily staffing concerns, childcare and other illnesses are also common occurrences for staff absence.

**Section 2: Pupil Premium and LAC**

Pupil Premium v non-Pupil Premium

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Spring 2021-2022** | | **Autumn 2021-2022** | |
|  | **Non pupil premium** | **Pupil premium** | **Non Pupil Premium** | **Pupil Premium** |
| Not On Track | 10.2% | 15.5% | 8.7% | 13.8% |
| On Track | 89.8% | 84.5% | 91.3% | 86.2% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Summer 2020-2021** | |
|  | **Non Pupil Premium** | **Pupil Premium** |
| Not On Track | 14.6% | 15.4% |
| On Track | 85.4% | 84.6% |

LAC Spring term

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not On Target** | **On Target** | **Total** |
| **Non LAC** | 14.8% | 85.2% | 100.0% |
| **LAC** | 20.5% | 79.5% | 100.0% |
| **Total** | **15.0%** | **85.0%** | 100.0% |

Spring 21/22 Domain Breakdown

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Non Pupil Premium** | | **Pupil Premium** | |
|  | **On Track** | **Not On Track** | **On Track** | **Not On Track** |
| CL | 86.6% | 13.4% | 77.4% | 22.6% |
| I | 88.9% | 11.1% | 85.4% | 15.6% |
| PS | 82% | 18% | 86.7% | 13.3% |
| SEW | 90.8% | 9.2% | 85% | b15% |
| SLC | 94.2% | 5.8% | 87% | 13% |

In Autumn, data shows an attainment gap of 5.1% in favour of non-pupil premium students. The Spring data demonstrates a 5.3% overall attainment gap between pupil premium and non pupil premium students.

The domain that represents the biggest difference between non-pupil premium and pupil premium students is cognition and learning. There is a 9.2% difference in ‘not on track’ students when comparing the two cohorts.

**Comparison by Pathway**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Spring 2021-2022** | | **Autumn 2021-2022** | |
|  | **Not on Track** | **On Track** | **Not on Track** | **On Track** |
| Formal | 17.6% | 82.4% | 7.5% | 92.5% |
| Semi Formal | 16.9% | 83.1% | 13.1% | 86.9% |
| Braided | 13.3% | 86.7% | 12.3% | 87.7% |
| Pre Formal | 6% | 94% | 10.8% | 89.2% |
| **Grand Total** | **15%** | **85%** | **11.4%** | **88.6%** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Summer 2020-2021** | |
|  | **Not on Track** | **On Track** |
| Formal | 3.3% | 96.7% |
| Semi Formal | 20% | 80% |
| Braided | 12.8% | 87.2% |
| Pre Formal | 21.1% | 78.9% |
| **Grand Total** | **14.3%** | **85.7%** |

The best performing pathway for the Autumn term is the ‘pre formal’ cohort. Previously, the formal pathway has had the highest percentage of students ‘on track’ to achieving their targets; this term it has the highest percentage of students ‘not on track.’ A new schema has been introduced within the formal pathway, not all students have converted to the new schema; this will continue to roll out over the next two terms.

**Section 5: Visual impairment**

Historically, the ‘Physical and Sensory’ domain has held a high percentage of ‘not on track’ students. This term the physical and sensory domain sits mid table for the first time. This domain now has clear oversight and management, coinciding with the organisation and structure of the other bubble areas.

VI data has now been collected and analysed for over an academic year year. Historically, the VI cohort had a higher proportion of students who were ‘not on track’ compared with Non-VI students who were ‘not on track.’ The gap in attainment has been narrowing over time. The current data report suggests that VI students are now performing better than non-VI students.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Spring 2021-2022** | | **Autumn 2021-2022** | |
|  | **Not on Track** | **On Track** | **Not on Track** | **On Track** |
| VI | 13% | 87% | 15.4% | 84.6% |
| Non VI | 15.7% | 84.3% | 10.5% | 89.5% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Summer 2020-2021** | |
|  | **Not on Track** | **On Track** |
| VI | 20.9% | 79.1% |
| Non VI | 12.2% | 87.8% |

VI data analysis suggests that VI students who have been categorised as having ‘moderate’ visual impairment, have the largest proportion of students not on track.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not On T | On T | Total |
| Mild (4) | 9.9% | 90.1% | 8.6% |
| Moderate (3) | 25.0% | 75.0% | 4.6% |
| None | 15.7% | 84.3% | 81.7% |
| Profound (1) | 12.3% | 87.7% | 3.1% |
| Severe (2) | 0.0% | 100.0% | 2.0% |
| **Grand Total** | **15.2%** | **84.8%** | **100.0%** |

**Actions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Action from Autumn | Update | Actions from Spring |
| VI teacher to provide additional support to ‘Severe’ VI students.  Deep dive into physical and sensory domain.  Set whole school expectations re: PLG’s | VI targets analysed to generate long term data overview. VI teacher is supporting in classes, to provide CPD and hands on support, whilst having oversight of provision offer. Follow up after VI awareness and CVI training. Snack attack sessions being ran twice weekly. | Completion of VI action plan that is linked to specific target in SDP to improve provision. |
| Whole school training re: physical and sensory PLG’s.  Deep dive into P&S domain.  Continuation of initiatives within independence bubble | New P&S leader has developed an action plan to support provision. Whole school guidelines sent out to support PLG’s | Ongoing review of P&S targets. |
| Review learning conversations as part of the monitoring cycle, to produce appropriate actions. Specifically, quantity of evidence and quality of annotations. | Assessment lead reviewed sample learning conversations based on data review. Actions created and shared. | Re-establish guidance with SLT prior to learning conversations.  Include middle leaders in learning conversations. |
|  |  |  |

Additional Actions

1. Guidance will be provided for preformal pathway to ensure a challenging ‘expected outcome’ is set.
2. Ensure EfL ‘mop up’ has been completed to ensure a smooth transition to INSIGHTS.