

Corporate Parenting Board - 18 January 2010

Title of paper:	Educational attainment of children in care	
Director(s)/ Corporate Director(s):	Andy Downing Ian Curryer	Wards affected: All
Contact Officer(s) and contact details:	Kate Marron, Head of Curriculum and Strategy 8-13	
Other officers who have provided input:	Julie Lewis, Head of Children in Care Michael Allcock, Principal Analyst (Schools)	
Relevant Council Plan Strategic Priority:		
World Class Nottingham		
Work in Nottingham		x
Safer Nottingham		x
Neighbourhood Nottingham		x
Family Nottingham		x
Healthy Nottingham		
Serving Nottingham Better		x
Summary of issues (including benefits to customers/service users):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only small improvement in outcomes for children in care in 2009 • Information about actions in partnership with schools to secure improved outcomes for children in care in 2010 		
Recommendation(s):		
1	The Board is asked to consider the information presented in the report.	

1 **BACKGROUND**

1.1 Data collection issues

Because not all children in the care of Nottingham City are educated in city schools, data collection is not straightforward. In fact, the DCSF will not publish national information for 2009 for comparison until April 2010. Therefore, figures used in this report have been compiled by the Children's Services Improvement and Policy officer from a range of sources.

Key Stage 1 (pupils aged 7)

Key Stage 1 assessments are non-statutory and overviews are compiled by each local authority from Teacher Assessments from their own schools. These KS1 results therefore refer to children in care in Nottingham City schools only.

There were 8 children in this category in 2009

Reading Level 2+: 5 children

Writing Level 2+: 4 children

Mathematics Level 2+: 6 children.

These children overall achieved better outcomes in each aspect of the assessment than the 12 children in this group in 2008. However, because of the small numbers it is not possible to draw conclusions about trends. No comparative information about children in the care of other authorities is available at this time. However, there is a gap on all three measures between children in care and children in Nottingham overall. The gap is widest in writing.

1.2 Key Stage 2 (pupils aged 11)

Data for Key Stage 2 pupils can include children in Nottingham's care who attend schools outside the city if we have the child's correct Unique Pupil Number. However, the results can be inaccurate if a new school allocates a new or temporary UPN which is used to register pupils for the tests. It is possible to search by name, gender and date of birth but this depends on there being no changes of name, no transcription errors in relation to the child's name and no errors in the date of birth.

This information includes children out of city where it was possible to extract data from the national database.

20 pupils were assessed at this age in 2009 compared with 23 in 2008. The results are broadly similar.

English Level 4+: 10 pupils

Maths Level 4+ : 10 pupils

Science Level 4+: 12 pupils

The gap between the attainment of looked after children and children in Nottingham generally is broadly similar to the gap in 2008. There is no national comparison available at this time.

Key Stage 4 (pupils aged 16)

1.3

The Improvement and Policy Service requests that all schools/establishments, whether in the city or elsewhere, faxes back information about the outcomes for young people in care.

38 pupils were eligible for assessment at end of KS4. 20 (53%) sat at least 1 GCSE or equivalent exam. 6 (16% of 38) achieved level 2 (5+ A*-C Passes), 13 (34%) achieved level 1 (5 or more passes) and 19 (50%) at least one pass. 3 pupils (8%) obtained Level 2 including GCSE English and Maths.

Year on year comparisons should be treated with care because of the relatively small numbers in the cohorts. There was some small improvement in the entry rate and in Level 1 and Level 2 achievement; but the gap between the outcomes for children in care and 16 year olds generally continues to be unacceptable.

Gaps between Children in Care and all Nottingham pupils

Key Stage 1

Reading	-15%
Writing	- 24%
Maths	- 11%

Key Stage 2

English	-24%
Maths	-26%
Science	-23%

Key Stage 4

Level 2+ (5A-C)	- 50%
Level 1+ (5A-G)	- 52%
One pass	- 46%

2 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)

2.1 N/A

3 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 N/A

4 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (INCLUDING VALUE FOR MONEY)

4.1 N/A

5 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES (INCLUDING LEGAL IMPLICATIONS, CRIME AND DISORDER ACT IMPLICATIONS AND EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS)

5.1 To mitigate the risk of 2010 outcomes showing similar slow improvement these actions have been put in place:

- The formation of a new team of Achievement Consultants, beginning work in January 2010
- Interim work by support staff and IT staff to transfer data bases, clean data and integrate social care and education information about children in care for use by Achievement Consultants
- The publication of advice to headteachers about new statutory duties for schools and the necessity to have a Designated Teacher from September 2009
- Making the attainment and progress of a Looked After Child a priority in formal termly discussions between headteachers, Chairs of Governors and School Improvement Partners
- A one-term project for Achievement Consultants to contact Designated Teachers in and outside the city and give advice and support on the content and quality of each child's Personal Education Plan, in particular the suitability of targets to support progress and higher attainment
- The development of a One Nottingham Early Intervention Project to recruit an officer charged with developing activities to raise aspirations and achievement of looked after children within the city. Scoping activities and commissioning have taken place and recruitment will be complete in January 2010.

6 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION

6.1 Briefing notes prepared by Improvement and Policy

7 PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

7.1 None