| Appen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ref | Indicator Description | Reported | Polarity | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Harrow } \\ \text { target } \\ 2011 / 12 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Harrow } \\ \text { actual } \\ \text { 2011/12 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { RAG } \\ \text { Status } \\ \text { 2011/12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SN AVG } \\ & \text { 2012/13 } \end{aligned}$ | England 2012/13 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Harrow } \\ \text { target } \\ 2012 / 13 \end{gathered}$ | Q3 RAG Status | Harrow actual Q4 2012/13 | Direction of Travel | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q4 RAG } \\ & \text { Status } \end{aligned}$ | Commentary |
| E1 | Termly rate of Permanent Exclusions as \% of Harrow school population | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \% \\ \text { (spring } \\ \text { 2011-12) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \% / \\ 11 \\ \text { (spring } \\ 2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HR } \\ \text { (spring } \\ \text { 2011-12) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Termly rate } \\ \text { not published } \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Termly rate } \\ \text { not } \\ \text { published } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \% \\ (\text { spring } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0.02 \% / 8 \\ \text { (spring 2012 } \\ 13) \end{array}\right\|$ | $\mid$ | HG | The number of permanent exclusions in Harrow's schools continue to fall from 12 in the autumn term to 8 ( $0.02 \%$ of the school population) in the spring term. <br> Whilst the local authority works as closely as possible with local providers, progression for this indicator largely relies on the work of Academies and schools in order to improve outcomes. |
| E2 | Termly rate of Fixed Term Exclusions as \% Harrow school population | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \% \\ (\text { spring } \\ 2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 1.09 \% / \\ 333 \\ \text { (spring } \\ 2011-12) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LR } \\ (\text { spring } \\ \text { 2011-12) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Termly rate } \\ \text { not published } \end{array}$ | Termly rate not published | $\begin{gathered} 0.97 \% \\ \text { (spring } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0.61 \% / 197 \\ \text { (spring } 2012 \\ 13 \text { ) } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\uparrow$ | HG | The number of fixed term exclusions in Harrow's schools continue to fall from 260 in the autumn term to $197(0.61 \%$ of the school population) in the spring term. <br> Whilst the local authority works as closely as possible with local providers, progression for this indicator largely relies on the work of Academies and schools in order to improve outcomes. This outcome could, on further analysis, relate to the previous one as if the most challenging learners are permanently excluded they will not have long or frequent FT exclusions. This will be reviewed. |
| E3 | Termly rate of overall absence in primary schools | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | - | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 4.03 \% \\ \text { autumn } \\ \text { 2011-12) } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HG } \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text { (autumn } \\ \text { 2011-12) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Termly rate not published | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Termly rate } \\ \text { not } \\ \text { published } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.5 \% \\ (\text { spring } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|} 4.73 \% \\ \text { (spring 2012 } \\ 13) \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\uparrow$ | LR | A more challenging target has been set, which has resulted in a low red rag status for this indicator. The 2012-13 spring absence in primary schools is lower than the previous autumn term that has just passed. The LA is introducing a range of statutory intervention options for supporting school attendance |
| E4 | Termly rate of overall absence rate in secondary schools | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | - | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 5.2 \% \\ \text { (autumn } \\ 2011-12) \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HG } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { (autumn } \\ \text { 2011-12) } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Termly rate } \\ \text { not published } \end{array}$ | Termly rate not published | $\begin{gathered} 5.0 \% \\ \text { (spring } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{gathered}$ | LR | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 5.68 \% \\ \text { (spring 2012 } \\ 13) \end{array}$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | A more challenging target has been set, which has resulted in a high red rag status for this indicator. The 2012-13 spring absence in secondary schools is slightly higher than the previous autumn term. The LA is introducing a range of statutory intervention options for supporting school attendance |
| E5 | Primary schools judged by Ofsted as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | 95\% | 100\% | HG | $98.9 \%$ (up to 31st Dec 2010) | 93.8\% | 95\% | HG | 100\% | $\leftrightarrow$ | HG |  |
| E6 | Secondary schools judged by Ofsted as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | 90\% | 100\% | HG | $\quad 88.1 \%$ (up to 31st Dec 2010) | 81.6\% | 100\% | LR | 90\% | $\leftrightarrow$ | LR | One new secondary converter academy has received the overall judgement of requires improvement |
| E7 | SEN-statements issued within 26 wks (excl. exceptions) | Quarterly (Children's Scorecard) | $\wedge$ | 95\% | 100\% | HG | $\begin{gathered} 95 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | 95\% | 95\% | HG | 98.5\% | $\downarrow$ | LG | We have been successful in exceeding our target by continuing to monitor workload demands. Staffing levels have been stable and we have been in a position to offer meetings in a timely manner. Our cumulative actual for April to March is also above target at $98.2 \%$, Service to continue to ensure proposed statements are issued on time in order to provide the service with the full eight weeks period of time for consultation. |
| E8 | SEN statements issued within 26 wks (all statements) | Quarterly (Children's Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | 90\% | 90\% | LG | $\begin{gathered} 84 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | 87\% | 85\% | HG | 88.8\% | $\downarrow$ | LG | The service had some particularly difficult cases in which much liaison and discussions were required before school placement could be specified. Just under a third of the cases fitted the criteria for exceptions. <br> This is further impacted upon by the change in schools to academies, the pressure on special school places and changes in SEN funding. Our cumulative actual for April to March is above target at $88.1 \%$. The service worked well with parents and educational professionals to achieve conclusions to placements but due to professionals' commitments and additional meetings that had to take place we were unable to work within the 26 week period framework for all cases. The service will continue to issue proposed statements within the 18 week timescale. The managers to ensure that for complex cases, where possible, meetings are set up in advance. Officers to make telephone contact with families/schools. |
| E9 | Achievement of at least 78 points across the Early Years Foundation Stage with at least 6 in each of the scales in Personal Social and Emotional Development and Communication, Language and Literacy | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{c\|} 56 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}\right.$ | LG | $\begin{gathered} 64 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 58 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{array}$ | LG | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | LG |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { E10-- } \\ \text { Equalities } \end{gathered}$ | Narrowing the gap between the lowest achieving 20\% in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile and the rest of the cohort | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 37 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 36.5 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}\right\|$ | LG | $\begin{gathered} 31.1 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31.3 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34.5 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 30.8 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | HG |  |
| E11 | Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4 or above in both English and maths in Key Stage 2 tests | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | - | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} 78 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | A | $\begin{gathered} 81 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 82 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LG | $\begin{gathered} 83 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | LG | The DfE has stated that comparisons with previous years should be made with care as particularly significant changes have been made to the arrangements in 2012. Most notable of these is the new measure of overall attainment in English. This measure is composed of Reading test results and Writing teacher assessments; it is not comparable with any English measures published in previous years. |


|  | 4 Children's Families Improvement Board |  |  |  |  |  | Education | corecard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ref | Indicator Description | Reported | Polarity | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Harrow } \\ \text { target } \\ 2011 / 12 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Harrow } \\ \text { actual } \\ \text { 2011/12 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { RAG } \\ \text { Status } \\ \text { 2011/12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SN AVG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { England } \\ & \text { 2012/13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Harrow } \\ \text { target } \\ 2012 / 13 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Q3 RAG } \\ \text { Status } \end{array}$ | Harrow actual Q4 2012/13 | Direction of Travel | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q4 RAG } \\ & \text { Status } \end{aligned}$ | Commentary |
| E12 | Progression by 2 levels in English between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | - | $\begin{gathered} 90 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\begin{gathered} 91 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LG | $\begin{gathered} 91 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | LG | The DfE has stated that comparisons with previous years should be made with care as particularly significant changes have been made to the arrangements in 2012. Most notable of these is the new measure of overall attainment in English. This measure is composed of Reading test results and Writing teacher assessments; it is not comparable with any English measures published in previous years. |
| E13 | Progression by 2 levels in mathematics between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\begin{gathered} 88 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LG | $\begin{gathered} 90 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | LG |  |
| E14 | Number of primary schools not reaching the KS2 floor standard and therefore underperforming <br> A school is below the primary school floor standard if (i) less than 60 per cent of pupils achieve level 4 or above in both English and mathematics, (ii) less than the median percentage make expected progress in English (2012 national median =92\%) , and (iii) less than the median percentage make expected progress in mathematics (2012 national median $=90 \%$ ). | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{0}{(2011-12)}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | HR | One primary school fell below the 2012 KS2 Standard. Although this is not a consistent pattern the LA ihas been working with the school, through the HSIP, to ensure progress. |
| E15 | Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers, based on pupils achieving level 4 or above in both English and mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \% \\ (2010 / 11) \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 15 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LR | $\begin{gathered} 16 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | LR | Progress on the target in this year is very significant. We are ambitious for our vulnerable groups. The $15 \%$ target fell between Fischer Family Trust estimates A and B. Estimate D, bearing in mind our previous performance, would have been a challenging and probably unrealistic target to achieve in one year |
| E16 | Achievement gap between pupils with special educational needs and their peers, based on pupils achieving level 4 or above in both English and mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | No target | $\begin{array}{\|c} 47.8 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 46 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.5 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LR | $\begin{gathered} 44 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | LR | Progress on the target in this year is very significant. We are ambitious for our vulnerable groups. The $40.5 \%$ target fell between Fischer Family Trust estimates A and B. Estimate D, bearing in mind our previous performance, would have been a challenging and probably unrealistic target to achieve in one year |
| E17 | \% Black African minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving level 4+ in English \& Mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual | - | $\begin{gathered} 73 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | HR | Not published | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { published } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75.9 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\begin{gathered} 74.9 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | A |  |
| E18 | \% Black Caribbean minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving level 4+ in English \& Mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual | - | $\begin{gathered} 76 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | LR | Not published | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Not } \\ & \text { published } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.8 \% \\ & (2011-12) \end{aligned}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 64.1 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | Narrowing the Gap for underachieving pupil groups remains a Local Authority and school priority. Despite significant work by schools, this decrease is disappointing. Individual schools where the achievement gap is wide continue to be a focus. Work to support schools will be commissioned by the Local Authority and will be delivered by the Harrow School Improvement Partnership (HSIP). The EPT and ESSO are working closely on a data based rationale for commissioning to address this aspect. |
| E19 | \% Any Other Black Background minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving level 4+ in English \& Mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 78 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | HG | Not published | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Not } \\ & \text { published } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\begin{gathered} 73.5 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | A |  |
| E20 | \% Any Other White Background minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving level 4+ in English \& Mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | A | Not published | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { published } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 84.6 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | HG |  |
| E21 | Percentage of pupils at the end of KS4 achieving $5+A^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ inc. English \& mathematics GCSEs at GCSE or equivalent | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64.6 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\begin{gathered} 62.5 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.4 \% \\ & (2011-12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 63.6 \% \\ 12) \end{array}\right\|$ | $\downarrow$ | A |  |
| E22 | Expected progression in English between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 91 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79.3 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 74.9 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67.7 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 82 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 81.2 \%(2011 \\ 12) \end{array}\right\|$ | $\uparrow$ | A |  |
| E23 | Expected progression in maths between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) <br> Scorecard) | - | $\begin{gathered} 89 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 78.5 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 76.6 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68.5 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LG | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 79.4 \%(2011 \\ 12) \end{array}\right\|$ | $\uparrow$ | LG |  |
| E24 | Number of secondary schools not reaching the KS4 floor standard and therefore underperforming <br> a school would be seen as "underperforming" if its Key Stage 4 results are: <br> - fewer than $40 \%$ of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 (KS4) achieving 5 or more GCSEs A*-C (or equivalents) including English and maths GCSE; and <br> - below average \% of pupils at the end of KS4 making expected progress in English (national median for $2012=70 \%$ ); and - below average \% of pupils at the end of KS4 making expected progress in maths (national median for $2012=70 \%$ ). |  | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \% \\ & (2011-12) \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{(2011-12)}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | One high academy school fell below the 2012 KS4 Standard. This is not a consistent pattern and the academy is not far below the threshold. The LA has engaged with the academy and is working out a support package with a range of providers. DfE Open Academies Performance department is also engaged with the school. |
| E25 | Percentage of pupils at the end of KS4 achieving the English Baccalaureate (GCSEs/iGCSE at grades A*-C in English, mathematics, sciences, a language and a humanities subject.) | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | - | No target | $\begin{gathered} 23.7 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 21.8 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.1 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 21.8 \%(2011 \\ 12) \end{array}\right\|$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | Harrow performs relatively well (25th) on this measure nationally. The direction of travel relates to a very high starting point. As the 16-19 Programme of Study develops this measure will become more significant nationally. |


| Ref | Indicator Description | Reported | Polarity | Harrow target 2011/12 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Harrow } \\ \text { actual } \\ 2011 / 12 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { RAG } \\ \text { Status } \\ \text { 2011/12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SN AVG 2012/13 | England <br> 2012/13 | Harrow target <br> 2012/13 | Q3 RAG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Harrow } \\ & \text { actual Q4 } \\ & 2012 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | Direction of Travel | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q4 RAG } \\ & \text { Status } \end{aligned}$ | Commentary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E26 | Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers, based on pupils achieving 5 or more $\mathrm{A}^{*}$ to C grade GCSEs including English and mathematics GCSEs | Annual | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 26.7 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}\right\|$ | LR | $\begin{gathered} 21.9 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26.4 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 28.8 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | Narrowing the Gap for underachieving pupil groups remains a Local Authority and school priority. Despite significant work by schools, this decrease is disappointing. Individual schools where the achievement gap is wide continue to be a focus. Work to support schools will be commissioned by the Local Authority. The EPT and ESSO are working closely on a data based rationale for commissioing to address this aspect. |
| E27 | The Special Educational Needs (SEN)/non-SEN gap - achieving 5 A* $^{*}$ C GCSE inc. English and Maths GCSEs | Annual | $\nabla$ | No target | $\begin{array}{c\|} 51 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 45.1 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47.0 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\begin{gathered} 46.3 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | A | Narrowing the Gap for underachieving pupil groups remains a Local Authority and school priority. Despite significant work by schools, this decrease is disappointing. Individual schools where the achievement gap is wide continue to be a focus. Work to support schools will be commissioned by the Local Authority. The EPT and ESSO are working closely on a data based rationale for commissioing to address this aspect. |
| E28 | \% Black African minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English \& mathematics GCSEs at Key Stage 4 | Annual | - | $\begin{gathered} 73 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 48.2 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}\right\|$ | HR | Not published | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { published } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LR | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 53.4 \% \\ (201-12) \\ \text { Provisional } \end{array}$ | $\uparrow$ | LR | Harrow needs to give greater attention to this target. The EPT and ESSO are working closely on a data based rationale for commissioing to address this aspect. |
| E29 | \% Black Caribbean minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English \& mathematics GCSEs at Key Stage 4 | Annual | - | $\begin{gathered} 76 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 55.6 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}$ | HR | Not published | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Not } \\ & \text { published } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 49.6 \% \\ (2011-12) \\ \text { Provisional } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | Harrow needs to give greater attention to this target. The EPT and ESSO are working closely on a data based rationale for commissioing to address this aspect. |
| E30 | \% Any Other Black Background minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving 5+ $\mathrm{A}^{*}-$ C including English \& mathematics GCSEs at Key Stage 4 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 57.4 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}$ | HR | Not published | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Not } \\ & \text { published } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 44.7 \% \\ (2011-12) \\ \text { Provisional } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | Harrow needs to give greater attention to this target. The EPT and ESSO are working closely on a data based rationale for commissioing to address this aspect. |
| E31 | \% Any Other White Background minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving $5+A^{*}$-C including English \& mathematics GCSEs at Key Stage 4 | Annual | - | $\begin{gathered} 62 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 55.1 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}\right.$ | HR | Not published | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { published } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 57.8 \% \\ (2011-12) \\ \text { Provisional } \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | Narrowing the Gap for underachieving pupil groups remains a Local Authority and school priority. Despite significant work by schools, this decrease is disappointing. Individual schools where the achievement gap is wide continue to be a focus. Work to support schools will be commissioned by the Local Authority . Harrow needs to give greater attention to this target. |
| E32 | Annual rate of Permanent Exclusions as \% of Harrow school population | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 0.07 \% / \\ 23 \\ (2010-11) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | LG | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \% \\ & (2010-11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | Below $2011-12$ <br> Actual | HR | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 0.10 \% / 33 \\ (2011-12) \end{array}$ | $\downarrow$ | HR | Permanent exclusions increased in 2011-12 to 0.10\% (33) from 0.07\% (23) in 2010-11. |
| E33 | Annual rate of Fixed Term Exclusions as \% Harrow school population | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.85 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3.66 \% / 11 \\ 43 \\ (2010-11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 3.74 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.34 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | Below <br> 2011-12 <br> Actual | HG | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 3.06 \% / 969 \\ (2011-12) \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\uparrow$ | HG | Fixed term exclusions (969-3.06\%) are the lowest they have been in the last 5 years. |
| E34 | Annual rate of overall absence in primary schools | Annual (Corporate Scorecara) | $\nabla$ | - | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 5.15 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{array}$ | - | - | - | $\begin{gathered} 5.4 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 4.57 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | HG |  |
| E35 | Annual rate of overall absence rate in secondary schools | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | - | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 5.93 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}\right.$ | - | - | - | $\begin{gathered} 6 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 5.32 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | HG |  |



| RAG STATUS |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HR |  | Needs prompt attention |
| LR |  | Poor |
| AG |  | Adequate |
| HG |  | Good |

