



Department
for Education



OUTCOMES BENCHMARKING

Academic Year 2012–13 Data

SUMMARY REPORT

November 2014

Author: *Bob Denman*

Date: November 14 2014

Version: Summmary

Status: for Website

SUMMARY

- 1 The main purpose of the NatSIP outcomes benchmarking project is to provide reliable data for use by local authority (LA) Sensory Support Services to evidence their impact and inform development needs. The project forms one of the NatSIP workstreams currently being supported through a contract with the DfE.
- 2 A total of 72 Sensory Support Services covering 83 LAs (i.e. over 50% of LAs) participated in the fourth (2014) NatSIP outcomes benchmarking exercise. This represented an increase of 12 LAs (16.9%) from the 2013 exercise; one more than was required to exceed the 15% increase target specified within NatSIP's contract with the DfE.
- 3 Data relating to the 2012/13 academic year on a range of performance indicators (PIs – ref. Appendix) was submitted between September 2013 and June 2014 by:
 - 67 Hearing Impairment (HI) Teams (covering 78 LAs)
 - 56 Vision Impairment (VI) Teams (covering 66 LAs)
 - 31 Multi-sensory Impairment (MSI) Teams (covering 37 LAs).
- 4 There were 14 PIs for both HI and MSI and 15 for VI, which included an additional reading measure for Braille users only. The PIs spanned all Key Stages.
- 5 PI scores were calculated for mild, moderate, severe and profound HI and VI as well as composite scores for HI and VI. The MSI data was collected without any differentiation according to the degree of sensory loss given the very small cohorts that are involved. The scores for children with and without cochlear implants were identified at the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) in the case of HI and the VI data was differentiated between Braille users and non-Braille users throughout the Key Stages.
- 6 The PI scores for each of the participant LAs were extracted from the overall data set and forwarded so that individual Sensory Support Services could benchmark their data against the data sets presented in the full report. The results of each Sensory Support Service remained confidential to the LA/service.
- 7 Apart from an analysis of the data from the current exercise, a comparison between the 2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13 data was carried out. A comparison was also drawn between the NatSIP data and the DfE data for all children on the majority of the PIs for the four academic years in question. This analysis was intended to provide evidence in relation to closing the gap between the outcomes for children and young people with sensory impairment and their peers – a central aim in the work of NatSIP.

8 Main findings

Although not tested for statistical significance, (on account of LAs submission of combined rather than individual pupil data), the main findings from the exercise were:

8.1 HI results

- For the 11 PIs relating to educational achievement/progression, the overall pattern was one in which the mild HI and moderate HI cohorts shared the highest average ranking, followed by severe HI and profound HI with the lowest average ranking. This overall pattern of rankings was similar to that in the 2011/12 exercise except for the mild HI cohort holding the highest ranking by itself. In the 2010/11 exercise the average ranking for the profound HI cohorts was higher than that for the severe HI cohorts.
- The most noticeable pattern in the PI scores was that all four end of KS2 PIs followed exactly the same sequence of rankings with the mild HI cohort achieving the highest ranking, followed by the moderate HI, severe HI and profound HI cohorts. It was also noted that whilst the mild cohorts held the top rank on all four end of KS2 PIs, the moderate HI cohorts held the top rank on the two PIs at the EYFS and the severe HI cohorts held the top rank on the two PIs relating to progression (English and Mathematics) from KS2- KS4.
- At the EYFS, pupils with profound HI with cochlear implants outscored, on average, pupils with profound HI without cochlear implants. This finding was consistent with the results in the two previous exercises for which the cochlear implant data was available.
- With regard to the 'All HI' cohort PI scores, the percentage of pupils achieving the specified scoring criteria in the PIs relating to educational achievement/progression ranged from 28.0% - 78.6%. The 'All HI' pupil cohort sizes for the relevant PIs ranged from 654 to 898.

8.2 VI results

- For the 11 PIs relating to educational achievement/progression (excepting the Braille Reading measure), the overall pattern of average rankings was one in which the profound VI cohorts achieved the top ranking, closely followed by the severe VI cohorts, then the mild and moderate VI cohorts. These findings contrast with the 2011/12 exercise in which the mild VI cohorts achieved the top ranking and the profound VI cohorts the bottom ranking with the moderate and severe cohorts sharing an equal ranking in between.
- The most noticeable pattern in the PI scores was that all four end of KS2 PIs followed exactly the same sequence of rankings (i.e. profound VI cohort followed by the severe, mild and moderate VI cohorts). It was also noted that

whilst the profound VI cohorts held the top rank on all the end of KS2 PIs shown, the severe VI cohorts held the top rank on all the PIs relating to GCSE results at the end of KS4.

- On the three progression measures (Reading, Writing and Mathematics) at KS2, the average score for the profound VI Braille users' cohort was consistently higher than that for the profound VI non-Braille users' cohort. The opposite was the case for the profound VI cohorts on the two progression measures (English and Mathematics) from KS2 – KS4.
- Whilst the profound VI Braille users' cohort consistently scored higher than the profound VI non-Braille users' cohort on the end of KS2 PIs in the current exercise, the opposite was the case for the end of KS2 PIs in the last exercise, although the PIs in question were not exactly equivalent. This observation, coupled with the change in the overall pattern of the VI PI rankings cited above, reinforced the importance of considering year on year results for trends in the data.
- With regard to the 'All VI' cohort PI scores, the percentage of pupils achieving the specified scoring criteria in the PIs relating to educational achievement/progression ranged from 29.0% - 82.1%. The 'All VI' cohort sizes for the relevant PIs ranged from 283 to 357. (The end of KS2 Braille reading PI was not included as data was returned for only four pupils).
- In relation to the data for PI 12, concerned with education and employment paths being in place at the end of KS 4, contrary to what might have been anticipated with regard to an expected increasing priority for young people to have planned paths according to the severity of their vision impairment, the PI scores decreased with severity of loss.

8.3 MSI results

For the PIs relating to educational achievement/progression:

- The percentage of MSI pupils achieving the specified scoring criteria in the PIs ranged from 25.0% - 66.7%.
- The MSI cohort sizes ranged from 10 to 22 pupils.
- Although the returns covered 37 LAs in total, the number of LAs with MSI pupils ranged from 7 – 12 across the PIs.
- Two-thirds or more of the LAs that submitted MSI data made a nil return on individual PIs (i.e. they did not have any MSI pupils within the specified cohort).

8.4 Comparison of HI, VI and MSI results

- With regard to the 'All HI', 'All VI' and 'All MSI' scores on each of the 11 PIs related to educational achievement/ progression, the 'All VI' cohorts achieved the top rank (with eight 1st rankings and three 2nd rankings), followed by the 'All HI' cohorts with the 'All MSI' cohorts occupying the bottom rank (having recorded the lowest score on each of the 11 PIs).
- In relation to the PI 12 scores, which relate to education and employment paths being in place at the end of KS 4, all the small MSI cohort (i.e. 10 pupils) had plans in place compared with 97.2% of the 'All Combined VI' cohort and 94.4% of the 'All HI' cohort.

8.5 Trend data

HI data

- With regard to the 'All HI' results for the 6 PIs related to educational achievement/ progression for which there was comparable data, when the year on year scores were ranked for each of the PIs, the overall ranking ran in order from 2009/10 to 2012/13 with the former holding the top rank and the latter the bottom rank. There was little spread between the average ranking scores however (i.e. 2.0 – 2.7) reflecting the variable pattern of ranking across the individual PIs.
- The year on year increase in the number of LA HI Services involved in the exercise was reflected in the consistent increase in the 'All HI' cohort range sizes.
- In relation to the year on year data for PI 12, concerned with education and employment paths being in place at the end of KS 4, it was noted that 2012/13 was the first year in which not all the cohort of pupils with profound HI had planned education or employment paths in place, the PI score being 96.9%.

VI data

- With regard to the 'All VI' results for the 6 PIs related to educational achievement/ progression for which there was comparable data, when the year on year scores were ranked for each of the PIs, the overall ranking showed that 2011/12 achieved the top rank, closely followed by 2012/13 which was again closely followed by 2010/11, with 2009/10 ranked bottom. A good deal of variability was however apparent on inspection of the individual PI rankings.

MSI data

- With regard to the MSI results for the 6 PIs related to educational achievement/progression for which there were three years of comparable data, when the year on year scores were ranked for each of the PIs, the overall ranking showed that 2012/13 achieved the top ranking followed by 2010/11 with 2011/12 ranked bottom. An even spread between these rankings was apparent.
- The very low incidence of MSI was reflected in the small size of the 'All MSI' cohorts although it should be remembered that pupils with MSI who had severe or profound and multiple learning difficulties were not included within the exercise. The year on year increase in the number of LA participants was mirrored in the increase in the 'All MSI' cohort range sizes.

8.6 Closing the gap

HI data

- With respect to PIs related to educational achievement/progression, PIs 1, 2, 4.1, 4.2 and PI 6 were included for the first time in the 2012/13 exercise. The scores for the 'All HI' cohort were all lower than the equivalent DfE scores. The smallest gap (12.2%) was for PI 4.1 (progressing by two or more levels in Reading at KS2); the largest gap (46.2%) was for PI 2 (achieving a Good Level of Development at the end of the EYFS).
- In relation to the six PIs (5, 7-11) concerned with educational achievement/progression for which year on year data was available, the gap between the 'All HI' data and the DfE data for all children reduced for one and increased for four of the PIs between 2011/12 and 2012/13, whilst there was no change or a small increase in the other depending on the type of calculation employed.
- Whilst in 2011/12 there was a reduction in the gap between the NatSIP and DfE results in all three of the PIs relating to GCSE results, 2012/13 saw an increase in the gap in all three.

VI data

- With respect to PIs related to educational achievement/progression, an identical pattern emerged with 'All VI' data in relation to PIs 1, 2, 4.1, 4.2 and PI 6, which were included for the first time in the 2012/13 exercise, i.e. the scores for the 'All VI' cohort were all lower than the equivalent DfE scores with the smallest gap (9.8%) again arising for PI 4.1 (progressing by two or more levels in Reading at KS2) and the largest gap (44.2%) being for PI 2 (achieving a Good Level of Development at the end of the EYFS).

- In relation to the six PIs (5, 7-11) concerned with educational achievement/progression for which year on year data was available, the gap between the 'All VI' data and the DfE data for all children reduced for two and increased for four of the PIs between 2011/12 and 2012/13.

MSI data

- With respect to PIs 1, 2, 4.1, 4.2 and PI 6, which were included for the first time in the 2012/13 exercise, the scores for the 'All MSI' cohort were all lower than the equivalent DfE scores. The smallest gap (26.1 %) was for PI 4.1 (progressing by two or more levels in Reading at KS2), the largest gap (51.9%) was for PI 2 (achieving a Good Level of Development at the end of the EYFS).
 - In relation to the six PIs (5, 7-11) concerned with educational achievement/progression for which year on year data was available, the gap between the 'All MSI' data and the DfE data for all children reduced for five and increased for one of the PIs between 2011/12 and 2012/13.
- 9 NatSIP will continue to build upon its outcomes benchmarking work and encourage further involvement from more Sensory Support Services in its aim to provide reliable data for Services to evidence their impact and inform development needs.

APPENDIX: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Key Stage	PI no.	Performance Indicator
EYFS	1	Average total point score for all 17 Early Learning Goals in the EYFS Profile achieved by children with (sensory) impairment at the end of the EYFS
EYFS	2	% of children with (sensory) impairment achieving a Good Level of Development at the end of the EYFS
KS2	3	% of Braille users in Year 6 with age appropriate or better Braille Reading scores on the Neale Analysis of Reading Ability (NARA) University of Birmingham Braille Version
KS2	4.1	% of children with (sensory) impairment progressing by two or more levels in Reading at KS2
KS2	4.2	% of children with (sensory) impairment progressing by two or more levels in Writing at KS2
KS2	5	% of children with (sensory) impairment progressing by two or more levels in Mathematics at KS2
KS2	6	% of children with (sensory) impairment achieving Level 4 or above in Reading, Writing and Mathematics at the end of KS2
KS2 to KS4	7	% of young people with (sensory) impairment progressing by three or more levels (i.e. making expected progress) in English from the end of KS2 to the end of KS4
KS2 to KS4	8	% of young people with (sensory) impairment progressing by three or more levels (i.e. making expected progress) in Mathematics from the end of KS2 to the end of KS4
KS4	9	% of young people with (sensory) impairment achieving 5 or more A* - G GCSEs (or equivalent), including English and Mathematics, by the end of KS4
KS4	10	% of young people with (sensory) impairment achieving 5 or more A* - C GCSEs (or equivalent), including English and Mathematics, by the end of KS4
KS 4	11	% of young people with (sensory) impairment achieving 5 or more A* - C GCSEs (or equivalent), in any subjects, by the end of KS4
KS4	12	% of young people with (sensory) impairment with planned education or employment paths in place by the end of KS4
All KS Exclusions	13	% of children and young people with (sensory) impairment who had at least one, fixed period exclusion from school during the last academic year
All KS Exclusions	14	% of children and young people with (sensory) impairment who were permanently excluded from school during the last academic year

The generic term ‘(sensory) impairment’ has been used for brevity. Each of the SI categories listed in the table below can therefore be substituted for ‘(sensory)’.

SI categories for data collection

HI	VI	MSI
Mild HI (Sub-divided into pupils with and without cochlear implants at the EYFS)	Mild VI (Sub-divided into Braille users and non-Braille users)	MSI (i.e. all pupils with MSI/deafblindness excepting those with SLD/PMLD)
Moderate HI (Sub-divided into pupils with and without cochlear implants at the EYFS)	Moderate VI (Sub-divided into Braille users and non-Braille users)	
Severe HI (Sub-divided into pupils with and without cochlear implants at the EYFS)	Severe VI (Sub-divided into Braille users and non-Braille users)	
Profound HI (Sub-divided into pupils with and without cochlear implants at the EYFS)	Profound VI (Sub-divided into Braille users and non-Braille users)	