

DfE Contract April 2016 – March 2017

---

**Outcomes Benchmarking  
Academic Year 2015-16 Data  
Summary Report**

***August 2017***

**Authors:** *Bob Denman*

**Date:** *August 2017*

**Version:** *v1*

**Status:** *For website/general circulation*

## Preface



This report was prepared using funding provided by the Department for Education under contract with NatSIP, the National Sensory Impairment Partnership:



### Contact:

Lindsey Jane Rousseau, NatSIP Facilitator

T: 07711 030711

E: lindsey.rousseau@natsip.org.uk

W: www.natsip.org.uk

**Copyright** © NatSIP 2017



This document is copyright © NatSIP 2017, and is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. For more details please see <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

You are free to share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format, adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially, under the following terms:

**Attribution** — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

**Share Alike** — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original.

**No additional restrictions** — You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

## 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 has been supported through grant funding from the DfE.
2. A total of 86 sensory support services covering 102 authorities participated in the seventh (2017) NatSIP outcomes benchmarking exercise. The target of 100+ LAs within the NatSIP contract was therefore achieved although this was two fewer than in the previous exercise. All but three of the returns were from English LAs i.e. 65.1 % of LAs in England participated.
3. Data relating to the 2015/16 academic year on a range of performance indicators (PIs) was submitted between September 2016 and March 2017 by:
  - 79 Hearing Impairment (HI) Teams (covering 93 LAs)
  - 71 Vision Impairment (VI) Teams (covering 86 LAs)
  - 39 Multi-Sensory Impairment (MSI) Teams (covering 50 LAs).
4. There were 15 PIs for both HI and MSI and 16 PIs for VI, which included an additional reading measure for Braille users only (ref. Appendix). The PIs spanned the Early Years Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1, Key Stage 2, Key Stage 4 and Post-16. A revision of the set of PIs had been undertaken in response to changes in the DfE's assessment and reporting arrangements. The revised set included eight PIs employed for the first time within the exercise.
5. The current exercise also saw the introduction of the online Outcomes BenchMarking Returns System (OBMRS) which automated the processing of the data submissions.
6. 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. The VI data was differentiated between Braille users and non-Braille users throughout the key stages.
7. 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. A separate document displaying the NatSIP PI scores, prepared in the same format as the LA reports to facilitate some of the benchmarking, was also circulated. This document also included a table of the equivalent DfE outcomes scores for all pupils, where available.
8. Apart from an analysis of the data from the current exercise, a comparison of the seven years of data from 2009/10 to 2015/16 was carried out on those PIs in the current set which had been employed in previous years. A comparison was also drawn between the NatSIP data and the DfE data for all children on 12 of the PIs, eight of which had been introduced in the current exercise. On the other four PIs, for which there were three or more years of data, further analysis was performed to study changes in the difference between the NatSIP and DfE scores. 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.

## 9. Main findings

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

### 9.1 HI results

- For the 11 PIs relating to educational achievement/progression for children and young people with HI, the overall pattern was one in which the mild HI cohorts achieved the first average ranking for their PI scores, the moderate HI cohorts were ranked second, the severe HI cohorts third and the profound HI cohorts fourth.
- It was noted that:
  - the profound HI cohorts were credited with only one first rank – for PI 8: the average Progress 8 score. In contrast the profound HI cohort was ranked fourth on PI 9: the average Attainment 8 score
  - the reverse was the case for mild HI, which was allocated its only fourth ranking on PI 8: the average Progress 8 score, whilst, in contrast, it was allocated first rank on PI 9: the average Attainment 8 score.
- With regard to the 'All HI' cohort PI scores, the percentage of pupils satisfying the specified scores criteria (where these existed) in the PIs relating to educational achievement/progression ranged from 7.8% (PI 6: % of children with HI achieving at a 'high' standard across English reading, English writing and mathematics at the end of KS2) – 70.7% (PI 11: % of young people with HI achieving 5 or more A\* - G grades [i.e. new grades 8 – 1] GCSEs [or equivalent], including English and mathematics, by the end of KS4).
- For the full set of PIs the 'All HI' cohort sizes ranged from 504 to 1,159 pupils except for the cohorts of 4,994 and 5,333 for fixed period and permanent exclusions (PIs 14 and 15) respectively.

### 9.2 VI results

- For the 11 PIs relating to educational achievement/progression (NB not including the Braille Reading measure), the overall pattern of average rankings was one in which the severe VI cohorts held the first average ranking, the profound VI cohorts the second ranking, the mild VI cohorts the third ranking and the moderate VI cohorts the fourth ranking.
- In looking for particular patterns in the rankings it was noted that:
  - the severe and profound VI cohorts were assigned ten out of eleven of the first rankings
  - the mild and moderate VI cohorts were assigned ten out of eleven of the fourth rankings
- With regard to the 'All VI' cohort PI scores, the percentage of pupils satisfying the specified scores criteria in the PIs relating to educational achievement/progression ranged from 7.8% (PI 6: % of children with VI achieving at a 'high' standard across English reading, English writing and mathematics at the end of KS2) – 75.5% (PI 11: % of young people with VI

achieving 5 or more A\* - G grades [i.e. new grades 8 – 1] GCSEs [or equivalent], including English and mathematics, by the end of KS4).

- For the full set of PIs (excluding PI 4 which related only to Braille users) the 'All VI' cohort sizes ranged from 221 to 535 pupils, apart from the cohorts of 2,631 and 2,621 pupils for PIs 14 and 15 respectively (PIs for fixed term and permanent exclusions).

### 9.3 MSI results

- For the PIs relating to educational achievement/progression, the percentage of pupils satisfying the specified scores criteria in the PIs relating to educational achievement/progression ranged from 0.0% (PI 6: % of children with MSI achieving at a 'high' standard across English reading, English writing and mathematics at the end of KS2) – 50.0% (PI 11: % of young people with MSI achieving 5 or more A\* - G grades [i.e. new grades 8 – 1] GCSEs [or equivalent], including English and mathematics, by the end of KS4).
- Although the returns covered 50 LAs in total, the number of LAs with MSI pupils for individual PIs ranged from 5 – 25.
- The number of LAs making a nil return for individual PIs ranged from 16 – 36 (i.e. they did not have any MSI pupils within the specified cohort).
- For the full set of PIs the 'All MSI' cohort sizes ranged from 5 to 22 pupils except for the cohort of 87 pupils for PIs 14 and 123 pupils for PI15, the fixed period and permanent exclusions PIs respectively.

### 9.4 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:

- In the overall average rankings, the 'All VI' cohorts achieved the first rank, the 'All HI' cohorts were credited with the second rank and the 'All MSI' cohorts were assigned the third rank.
- It was noted that whilst the 'All MSI' cohorts were allocated third ranking on ten of the eleven PIs, the All MSI cohort was credited with the first ranking on PI 7 (Average progress in English reading from the end of KS1 to the end of KS2). However, as there were only 6 pupils in the MSI cohort, compared with 856 HI pupils and 406 VI pupils, the reliability of this result is clearly low.

### 9.5 Trend data

#### 9.5.1 HI data

With regard to the 'All HI' results for the PIs related to educational achievement/ progression, given the changes in the revised set of PIs, there were only three PIs for which there were three or more years of comparable data:

- On PI 3, year on year improvement in performance on achieving the 'expected' standard of phonic decoding at the end of KS1 was evident over the three years of available data.
- On PIs 11 (% achieving 5 or more A\* - G GCSE including English and mathematics) and 12 (% achieving 5 or more A\* - C GCSEs including English and mathematics), five years of data were available. Considering the combined rankings of these two PIs, 2011/12 held the first rank, 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15 shared the second rank, and 2015/16 was allocated the fifth rank. These rankings reflected a decline in the PI scores for both PIs 11 and 12 from 2011/12 to 2015/16.

### 9.5.2 VI data

With regard to the 'All VI' results for the PIs related to educational achievement/ progression, given the changes in the revised set of PIs, there were only three PIs for which there were three or more years of comparable data:

- Considering PI 3 (% achieving the 'expected' standard of phonic decoding) for which three years of data were available, 2014/15 held the first rank (i.e. the highest PI score), 2015/16 the second rank and 2013/14 the third rank.
- Considering PI 4 (% 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) for which four years of data were available, 2012/13 held the first rank, 2013/14 the second rank, and 2014/15 and 2015/16 shared the third rank. NB The reliability of this comparison was however limited by the small number of pupils (i.e. below 10) in two of the four years of data.
- On PIs 11 (% achieving 5 or more A\* - G GCSE including English and mathematics) and 12 (% achieving 5 or more A\* - C GCSEs including English and mathematics) there five years of data were available. Considering the combined rankings of these two PIs, 2011/12 and 2013/14 shared the first rank, 2015/16 held the third rank, and 2012/13 and 2014/15 shared the fourth rank.

### 9.5.3 MSI data

With regard to the 'All MSI' results for the PIs related to educational achievement/ progression, given the changes in the revised set of PIs, there were only three PIs for which there were three or more years of comparable data:

- On PI 3, year on year decline in performance on achieving the 'expected' standard of phonic decoding at the end of KS1 was evident over the three years of available data.
- On PIs 11 (% achieving 5 or more A\* - G GCSE including English and mathematics) and 12 (% achieving 5 or more A\* - C GCSEs including English and mathematics), six years of data were available. Considering the combined rankings of these two PIs, 2014/15 held the first rank, 2013/14 the second rank, 2011/12 the third rank, 2010/11 the fourth rank, 2012/13 the fifth rank and 2015/16 the sixth rank.

## 9.6 Closing the gap

### 9.6.1 HI data

- Given the changes to the set of PIs there was only one PI, (PI 3: % achieving the 'expected' standard of phonic decoding at the end of key stage 1) concerned with educational achievement/progression for which there was more than one year of NatSIP and DfE data. The analysis showed that the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data reduced from 2014/15 to 2015/16, (as it did from 2013/14 to 2014/15).
- With regard to the exclusions data:
  - for PI 14, the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data increased with the NatSIP cohort having fewer fixed period exclusions than the DfE cohort.
  - for PI 15, the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data increased with the NatSIP cohort having more permanent exclusions than the DfE cohort.
- At post-16 (PI 16: % meeting the duty to participate under the Raising the Participation Age legislation), the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data increased with the NatSIP cohort having a higher participation rate than the DfE cohort.

### 9.6.2 VI data

- Given the changes to the set of PIs there was only one PI, (PI 3: % achieving the 'expected' standard of phonic decoding at the end of key stage 1) concerned with educational achievement/progression for which there was more than one year of NatSIP and DfE data. The analysis showed that the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data reduced from 2014/15 to 2015/16, (as it did from 2013/14 to 2014/15).
- With regard to the exclusions data:
  - for PI 14, the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data increased with the NatSIP cohort having fewer fixed period exclusions than the DfE cohort.
  - for PI 15, the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data increased with the NatSIP cohort having more permanent exclusions than the DfE cohort.
- At post-16 (PI 16: % meeting the duty to participate under the Raising the Participation Age legislation), the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data increased with the NatSIP cohort having a higher participation rate than the DfE cohort.

### 9.6.3 MSI data

NB: The reliability of the findings is limited by the typically small cohorts of 'All MSI' pupils. In 2015/16, except for the exclusions data (i.e. PIs 14 and 15), the cohort sizes ranged from 5 - 22.

- Given the changes to the set of PIs there was only one PI, (PI 3: % achieving the 'expected' standard of phonic decoding at the end of key stage 1) concerned with educational achievement/progression for which there was more than one year of NatSIP and DfE data. The analysis showed that the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data reduced from 2014/15 to 2015/16, (as it did from 2013/14 to 2014/15).

- With regard to the exclusions data:
    - for PI 14, there was no change in the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data, the NatSIP (MSI) cohort having no fixed period exclusions for the third year in succession.
    - for PI 15, there was no change in the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data, the NatSIP (MSI) cohort having no permanent exclusions for the sixth year in succession.
  - At post-16 (PI 16: % meeting the duty to participate under the Raising the Participation Age legislation), the gap between the DfE and NatSIP data increased with the NatSIP (MSI) cohort having a participation rate of 100% for the third year in succession.
10. 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 Indicator Reference Table

PI 1	% of children with (sensory) impairment achieving the 17 Early Learning Goals in the EYFS Profile at an 'expected' level or 'exceeding' level
PI 2	% of children with (sensory) impairment achieving the Communication and Language area of learning of the EYFS Profile at an 'expected' level or 'exceeding' level
PI 3	% of children with (sensory) impairment at the end of KS1 achieving the expected standard of phonic decoding
PI 4	% 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
PI 5	% of children with (sensory) impairment achieving the 'expected' standard or above across English reading, English writing and mathematics at the end KS2
PI 6	% of children with (sensory) impairment achieving at a 'high' standard across English reading, English writing and mathematics at the end KS2
PI 7	Average progress of children with (sensory) impairment in English reading from the end of KS1 to the end of KS2
PI 8	Average Progress 8 score achieved by young people with (sensory) impairment at the end of KS4
PI 9	Average Attainment 8 score achieved by young people with (sensory) impairment at the end of KS4
PI 10	% of young people with (sensory) impairment achieving the threshold in both English and mathematics, (currently a C grade), in their GCSEs (or equivalent)
PI 11	% of young people with (sensory) impairment achieving 5 or more A* - G grades (i.e. new grades 8 – 1) in their GCSEs (or equivalent), including English and mathematics, by the end of KS4
PI 12	% of young people with (sensory) impairment achieving 5 or more A* - C grades (i.e. new grades 8 – 5) in their GCSEs (or equivalent), including English and mathematics, by the end of KS4
PI 13	% of young people with (sensory) impairment with planned education, training or employment paths in place by the end of KS4
PI 14	% of children and young people (sensory) impairment who had at least one, fixed period exclusion from school during the last academic year
PI 15	% of children and young people with (sensory) impairment who were permanently excluded from school during the last academic year
PI 16	% of 16 year olds (i.e. Year 12 or equivalent) with (sensory) impairment meeting the duty to participate under the Raising the Participation Age (RPA) legislation (as reported to the DfE by the LA for June 2016)

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**

<b>HI</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>MSI</b>
<b>Mild HI</b>	<b>Mild VI</b>	<b>MSI</b> (all pupils with MSI/ deaf blindness excepting those with SLD/PMLD)
<b>Moderate HI</b>	<b>Moderate VI</b>	
<b>Severe HI</b> (Sub-divided into pupils with and without cochlear implants at the EYFS)	<b>Severe VI</b> (Sub-divided into Braille users and non-Braille users)	
<b>Profound HI</b> (Sub-divided into pupils with and without cochlear implants at the EYFS)	<b>Profound VI</b> (Sub-divided into Braille users and non-Braille users)	