| Ref | Indicator Description | Reported | Polarity | Harrow target 2012/13 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Harrow actual } \\ 2012 / 13 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { RAG } \\ \substack{\text { Status } \\ \text { 2012/13 }} \end{gathered}$ | SN AVG | England 2012/13 | Harrow target 2013/14 | Harrow actual <br> Q3 2013/14 | Direction of Travel | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q2 RAG } \\ \text { Status } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Q3 RAG } \\ \text { Status } \end{array}$ | Commentary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1 | Ofsted School Inspection "Overall effectiveness" Outcomes | Quarterly Scorecard Scorecard) |  | No target |  |  |  |  | No target |  |  |  |  | Harrow schools' Ofsted Inspection judgments of their 'Overall Effectiveness' as at January 2014 were as follows: <br> Outstanding - 53\% (31 schools) <br> Good - 39\% (23 schools) <br> Required Improvement - 7\% (4 schools) <br> Inadequate - 2\% (1 school) <br> All schools are discussed at the LA's Schools' Monitoring Group Meeting (SMG) to ensure that there is appropriate support and challenge provided to them and that any risks are identified early and acted upon. <br> Source: HSIP's Ofsted School Inspection January 2014 Update |
| E2 | Outcomes of Ofsted inspections in Schools since 1st September 2012 | Quarterly Scorecard Scorecard) | - | No target | - | - | - |  | No target |  |  | - | - | Canons High School - Outstanding <br> St Joseph's RC Primary School - Outstanding <br> Whitchurch Junior School - Outstanding <br> Alexandra School - Outstanding <br> Park High School - Outstanding <br> Pinner Park Infant school - Outstanding <br> Woodlands First and Middle School - Outstanding <br> Hatch End High - Good <br> Whitefriars Community School - Good <br> Norbury School - Good <br> Elmgrove Primary School - Good <br> Pinner Park Junior School - Good <br> Kenmore Park Junior School - Good <br> Camrose Primary School - Good <br> Stanburn Junior School - Good <br> Krishna Avanti Primary school - Good <br> Vaughan Primary School - Good <br> Salvatorian RC College - Requires improvement <br> St John's CofE - Requires improvement Grange Primary - Requires improvement Weald Infant - Requires improvement <br> Aylward Primary School - Inadequate <br> All schools are discussed at the LA's Schools' Monitoring Group Meeting (SMG) to ensure that there is appropriate support and challenge provided to them and that any risks are identified early and acted upon. |
| E3 | Percentage of Early Years providers achieving a Good or Outstanding Ofsted judgement | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | 66\% | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 66 \% \\ \text { (Childminders) } \\ 73 \% \\ \text { PVI setting } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LG } \\ & \text { HG } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{-}$ | - | 66\% | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 67 \% \\ \text { (Chilminders) } \\ \text { 79\% } \\ \text { PVI setting } \end{array}$ | $\uparrow$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HG } \\ & \text { HG } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LG } \\ & \text { HG } \end{aligned}$ | The childcare development team continue to provide advice and support to childminders and this is reflected in the rising trend. All providers are invited to termly forums on Early years strategy, leadership, SEN and EYFS workshops. Providers that are judged Satisfactory or Inadequate continue to receive targeted support from the LA. <br> As at the end of Q3, for Childminders $67 \%$ are Good/Outstanding. (in Q2 this was 69\%) <br> Although this is a reduction since quarter 2 it is still within the target of $66 \%$ good/outstanding for 2013/2014. <br> For PVI settings, 79\% are Good/outstanding.(in Q2 this was 76\%) For the PVI settings they have a rigourous quality assurance system in place: Settings that go to Satisfactory get enhanced support. Settings that go to Inadequate get intense targeted support. <br> Overall there have been 4 children centre inspections since 2010 with $50 \%$ of these Good/Outstanding. There was 1 Children centre inspection in Q1 which was Good. Childrens Centre Managers continue to work with HSIP and the Performance team to ensure they are prepared well for future Ofsted inspections. |
| E4 | Primary schools judged by Ofsted as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | 95\% | 100\% | HG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 98.9 \% \\ \text { (up to } 31 \text { st Dec } \\ 2010 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 93.\% | 95\% | 97.7\% | $\downarrow$ | LG | LG | One primary school has received the overall judgement of requires improvement |
| E5 | Secondary schools judged by Ofsted as having good or outstanding standards of behaviour | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard | $\triangle$ | 90\% | 100\% | HG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 88.1 \% \\ \text { (up to } 31 \text { st Dec } \\ 2010 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 81.6\% | 100\% | 90\% | $\downarrow$ | LR | LR | One secondary converter academy has received the overall judgement of requires improvement |


| Ref | Indicator Description | Reported | Polarity | Harrow target 2012/13 | Harrow actual 201213 | $\begin{gathered} \text { RAG } \\ \text { Status } \\ \text { 2012/13 } \end{gathered}$ | SN AVG 2012/13 | England 2012/13 | Harrow target 2013/14 | Harrow actual <br> Q3 2013/14 | Direction of Travel | Q2 RAG Status | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Q3 RAG } \\ \text { Status } \end{array}$ | Commentary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E6 | Termly rate of Permanent Exclusions as \% of Harrow school population population | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \% \\ \left.\begin{array}{c} \text { (autunn } \\ \text { (2012-13) } \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \% / 12 \\ \text { (autunn } \\ 2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HR } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { (autumn } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | Termly rate not published | Termly rate not published | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \% \\ \left.\begin{array}{c} \text { (autum } \\ \text { (2013-14) } \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \% / 8 \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text { (autunn } \\ \text { 2013-14) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\uparrow$ | - | LG | The number of permanente exclusions has dropped to $8(0.02 \%$ of the both the 2012-13 summer term ( $10-0.02 \%$ ) as well as the 2012-13 autumn term (12-0.04\%). <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. The LA seeks to improve its work to ensure that there is more regular engagement with schools on this measure and to continue to explore with schools |
| E7 | Termly rate of Fixed Term Exclusions as \% Harrow school population | Quarterly <br> (Corporate <br> Scorecard | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.70 \% \\ \left.\begin{array}{c} \text { (autum } \\ 2012-13) \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | 0.86\% / 278 (autumn 2012-13) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { HR } \\ \text { (autumn } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{gathered}$ | Termly rate not <br> published | Termly rate not published | $\begin{gathered} 0.70 \% \\ (\text { (autum } \\ 2013-14) \end{gathered}$ | xxx\% / xxx (autumn 2013-14) | - | - | - | The number of fixed term exclusions in the 2013-14 autumn term are not available and will reported at the Q4 Improvement Board. |
| E8 | Termly rate of overall absence in primary schools | Quarterly Scorecard) | V | $\begin{gathered} 4.5 \% \\ \left.\begin{array}{c} \text { (autum } \\ \text { (2012-13) } \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.94 \% \\ \text { (autumn } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LR } \\ \left.\begin{array}{c} \text { (autumn } \\ 2011-12) \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Termly rate not } \\ \text { pubbished } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Termly rate } \\ \text { not published } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 4.2 \% \\ (\text { autumn } \\ \text { (at13-14) } \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | HG | HG | Attendance in primary schools has improved in the 2013-14 autumn term (4.2\%), falling from $4.94 \%$ in the 2012-13 autumn term. The new Attendance Intervention Model (AIM), which was piloted last year, is now being rolled out across all schools (including Academies) It is likely to have a positive impact on attendance overall. The OFSTED attendance guidance this year (2014) says: When deciding whether attendance is consistently low, inspectors should consider how it compares with the attendance figures for the lowest $10 \%$ of schools. In 2011/12, this was $94.24 \%$ in primary schools and $92.61 \%$ in secondary schools. <br> This is a minimum requirement for the low attendance threshold and Harrow seeks to continue to promote the highest possible attendance. |
| E9 | Termly rate of overall absence rate in secondary schools | Quarterly (Corporate Scorecard | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.0 \% \\ \left.\begin{array}{c} \text { (autunn } \\ \text { (2012-13) } \end{array}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.17 \% \\ & \begin{array}{c} 5 u(u) \\ \text { (autun } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { (autumn } \\ \text { 2011-12) } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Termly rate not } \\ \text { published } \end{array}\right\|$ | Termly rate | $\begin{gathered} 5.0 \% \\ (\text { (autumn } \\ \text { 2012-13) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.6 \% \\ (\text { autumn } \\ \text { 2013-14) } \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | HR | HG | Attendance in high schools has improved in the 2013-14 autumn term $(4.6 \%)$, falling from $5.17 \%$ in the 2012-13 autumn term. The new Attendance Intervention Model (AIM), which was piloted last year, is now being rolled out across all schools (including Academies). It is likely to have a positive impact on attendance overall. The OFSTED attendance guidance this year (2014) says: When deciding whether attendance is consistently low, inspectors should consider how it compares with the attendance figures for the lowest $10 \%$ of schools. In 2011/12, this was $94.24 \%$ in primary schools and $92.61 \%$ in secondary schools. <br> This is a minimum requirement for the low attendance threshold and Harrow seeks to continue to promote the highest possible attendance |
| E10 | SEN-statements issued within 26 wks (excl. exceptions) | Quarterly Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | 95\% | 100\% | HG | $\begin{gathered} 95 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | 95\% | 95\% | 100\% | $\uparrow$ | LG | HG | We have been successful in exceeding our target by continuing to monitor workload demands. <br> Staffing levels have been relatively stable and we have been in a position to offer meetings in a timely manner. We have a high number of statements written in Q2 as it over laps with the summer holidays. Our cumulative actual for April to September is $\mathbf{9 9 \%}$. 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. |
| E11 | SEN statements issued within 26 wks (all statements) | Quarterly (Children's Scorecard | $\triangle$ | 85\% | 92.3\% | LG | $\begin{gathered} 84 \% \\ (2010-11) \end{gathered}$ | 87\% | 85\% | 93.8\% | $\downarrow$ | HG | HG | The service had some particularly difficult cases in which much liaison and discussions were required before school placement could be specified. For the second year I have lowered the target from $90 \%$ to $85 \%$ as cases are becoming increasingly complicated. This is impacted upon the change in schools to academies, the pressure on special school places and changes in SEN funding. Our cumulative actual for April to September is $\mathbf{9 3 . 7 \%}$. <br> Number of statements which attracted exceptions .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. 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. |


| Ref | Indicator Description | Reported | Polarity | $\begin{gathered} \text { Harrow } \\ \text { target } \\ 2012 / 13 \end{gathered}$ | Harrow actual 2012113 | $\begin{gathered} \text { RAG } \\ \text { Status } \\ \text { 2012/13 } \end{gathered}$ | SN AVG | England $2012 / 13$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Harrow } \\ \text { target } \end{gathered}$ $2013 / 14$ | Harrow actual <br> $\mathbf{0 3} 201314$ | Direction of Travel | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q2 RAG } \\ & \text { Status } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Q3 RAG } \\ \text { Status } \end{array}$ | Commentary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E12 | The \% of children with a good level of development. Children are meeting or exceeding the Early Learning Goals in the following areas: <br> 1. Communication \& Language; 2. Literacy; 3. Maths; 4. Personal, Social \& Emotional Development; 5. Physical Development | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { (Corporate } \\ \text { Scorecard) } \end{gathered}$ | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{New} \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | The EYFS was changed by the DfE commencing September 2012. Therefore the 2012/13 (academic year) result is the baseline data for this indicator. <br> ESSO has undertaken an analysis of school data, and put the attainment of individual schools into the broader context of EAL, gender and poverty and are working jointly with HSIP during the Autumn term to share that analysis with individual schools and explore the implications for leadership, provision and practice in the light of the recent changes to the Ofsted inspection schedule. Specific targets have been set to reduce the deficit with national data ifor 2014 and to be above national data in 2015. HSIP has been commissioned to deliver these improved outcomes for children at the age of five and the commission has a clear focus on building the capacity of specific schools to deliver provision and practice compliant with the nationa statutory framework and at the same time improve outcomes for all children, including those most at risk of exclusion and/or underachievement. |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { E13- } \\ \text { Equalities } \end{array}$ | The percentage inequality gap in achievement across all the Early Learning Goals at EYFS | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35.7 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.6 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37.9 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | The EYFS was changed by the DfE commencing September 2012. Therefore the 2012/13 (academic year) result is the baseline data for this indicator. |
| E14 | Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4 or above in both Reading test, Writing TA and maths test at Key Stage 2 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Annual } \\ \text { (Corporate } \\ \text { Scorecard) } \end{gathered}$ | $\triangle$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { indicator } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77 \% \\ (2012-13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (2012-13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{array}{c}\mathrm{New} \\ \text { indicator }\end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | The Key Stage 2 assessment was changed by the DfE commencing September 2013. Therefore the 2012/13 (academic year) result is the baseline data for this indicator. |
| E15 | Progression by 2 levels in Reading between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 91 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | The Key Stage 2 assessment was changed by the DfE commencing September 2013. Therefore the 2012/13 (academic year) result is the baseline data for this indicator. |
| E16 | Progression by 2 levels in Writing between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { indicator } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 93 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{New} \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 93 \% \\ (2012-13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 92 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} 92 \% \\ (2021-13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | New indicator | New indicator | The Key Stage 2 assessment was changed by the DfE commencing September 2013. Therefore the 2012/13 (academic year) result is the baseline data for this indicator. |
| E17 | Progression by 2 levels in mathematics between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Anual } \\ & \text { (Children's } \\ & \text { Scorecard) } \end{aligned}$ | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 88 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LG | $\begin{gathered} 90 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 91 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 92 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | LG | LG | Harrow's 2012-13 outcome (92\%) is its highest result so far, continuing to increase year on year from $84 \%$ in 2008. Harrow ranked top amongst its statistical neighbours. |
| E18 | Number of primary schools not reaching the KS2 floor standard and therefore underperforming $60 \%$ of pupils achieve level 4 or above in Reading $\&$ Writing \& mathematics, (ii) less than the median percentage make expected progress in Reading (2013 national median $=\mathbf{9 1 \%}$ ), (ii) less than the median percentage make expected progress in Writing ( 2013 national median $=95 \%$ ) and (iii) less than the median percentage make expected progress in mathematics (2013 national median $=\mathbf{9 2 \%}$ ). | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { (Corporate } \\ \text { Scorecard) } \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{New} \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1-3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | One primary school's 2013 KS2 results fell below the DfE's national 'floor standard'. |
| E19Equalities | Achievement gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and their peers, based on pupils achieving level 4 or above in Reading \& Writing and mathematics at Key Stage 2 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Annual } \\ \text { (Children's } \\ \text { Scorecard) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\nabla$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { indicator } \end{aligned}$ | New indicator | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} 17 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | New indicator | New indicator | 66\% of pupils with FSM attained level 4 or above in Reading \& Writing and mathematics at KS2 compared to $83 \%$ of their peers who were not eligible for FSM. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { E20- } \\ \text { Equalities } \end{gathered}$ | Achievement gap between pupils with special educational needs and their peers, based on pupils achieving level 4 or above in Reading \& Writing and mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { indicator } \end{aligned}$ | New indicator | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} 50.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} 48.8 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | New indicator | New indicator | 41.2\% of pupils with SEN provision School Action, School Action Plus or Statement attained level 4 or above in Reading \& Writing and mathematics at KS2 compared to $90 \%$ of their peers with no SEN. |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { E21- } \\ \text { Equalities } \end{array}$ | \% Black African minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving level $4+$ in Reading \& Writing and mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { indicator } \end{aligned}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | Not published | $\begin{gathered} 75 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71.7 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | 71.7\% of Black African pupils attained level 4 or above in Reading \& Writing \& mathematics at KS2 compared to $80.1 \%$ of their peers, and $75 \%$ of Black African pupils nationally. <br> 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. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { E22- } \\ \text { Equalities } \end{gathered}$ | \% Black Caribbean minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving level $4+$ in Reading \& Writing and mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { indicator } \end{aligned}$ | New indicator | New indicator | Not published | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74.5 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | 74.5\% of Black Caribbean pupils attained level 4 or above in Reading \& Writing \& mathematics at KS2 compared to 79.6\% of their peers, and $70 \%$ of Black Caribbean pupils nationally. |
| E23- <br> Equalities | \% Any Other Black Background minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving level $4+$ in Reading \& Writing and mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { indicator } \end{aligned}$ | New indicator | New indicator | Not published | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} 73.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | New indicator | New indicato | $73.3 \%$ of Black other pupils attained level 4 or above in Reading \& Writing \& mathematics at KS2 compared to $79.5 \%$ of their peers, and $70 \%$ of Black other pupils nationally. |
| E24Equalities | \% Any Other White Background minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving level $4+$ in Reading \& Writing and mathematics at Key Stage 2 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { indicator } \end{aligned}$ | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{New} \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | Not published | $\begin{gathered} 68 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68.8 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | New indicator | New indicator | $\begin{gathered} \text { New } \\ \text { indicator } \end{gathered}$ | $68.8 \%$ of White other pupils attained level 4 or above in Reading \& Writing \& mathematics at KS2 compared to $80.2 \%$ of their peers, and $68 \%$ of White other pupils nationally. |
| E25 | Percentage of pupils at the end of KS4 achieving $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ inc. English \& mathematics GCSEs at GCSE or equivalent | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Annual } \\ \text { (Corporate } \\ \text { Scorecard) } \end{array}$ | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63.6 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\begin{aligned} & 66.3 \% \\ & (2012-13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60.8 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(2012-13)}{66 \%}$ | $\underset{(2012-13)}{65 \cdot 4 \%}$ | $\uparrow$ | A | A |  |
| E26 | Expected progression in English between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 | Annual Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 82 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 81.2 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\begin{gathered} 79.4 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71.7 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79.7 \% \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | LR | A | The drop in this result from last year is the effect of a few schools, now all of which are reporting improvement trends. |


| Ref | Indicator Description | Reported | Polarity | Harrow target 2012/13 | Harrow actual 2012/13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RAG } \\ & \text { Status } \\ & \text { 2012/13 } \end{aligned}$ | SN AVG | England | Harrow target 2013/14 | Harrow actual Q3 2013/14 | Direction of Travel | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q2 RAG } \\ \text { Status } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \text { Q3 RAG } \\ \text { Status } \end{array}$ | Commentary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E27 | Expected progression in maths between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 | Annual (Children's Scorecard) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (20.41-12) } \end{gathered}$ | LG | $\begin{gathered} 79.9 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72.0 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 79 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | LG | HG |  |
| E28 | Number of secondary schools not reaching the KS4 floor standard and therefore underperforming <br> A school is below the floor standard if: <br> less than $40 \%$ of pupils achieve $5+A^{*}-C$ including English and mathematics <br> and the expected progress between key stage 2 and key stage 4 <br> is less than the median of $73 \%$ in English <br> and less than the median of $73 \%$ in mathematics. | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\underset{(2011-12)}{0}$ | $\stackrel{1}{(2011-12)}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 1.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{0}{(2012-13)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | - | HG |  |
| E29 | 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) | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 21.8 \%(2011- \\ 12) \end{array}\right\|$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 31.0 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.9 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32.2 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | - | A | There is no legal requirement for this qualifiation but there is an expectation from the government. This qualification does not really reflect the ability of all children |
| $\underset{\text { Equalities }}{\text { E3 }}$ | 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 | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.8 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 22.6 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26.7 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.9 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | - | HG | 49.4\% of pupils with FSM attained 5 or more $\mathrm{A}^{*}$ to C grade GCSEs including English and mathematics GCSEs compared to 69.3\% of their peers who were not eligible for FSM. |
| $\underset{\text { Equalities }}{\text { E31- }}$ | The Special Educational Needs (SEN)/non-SEN gap - achieving 5 A $^{*}$ - C GCSE inc. English and Maths GCSEs | Annual | V | $\begin{gathered} 45 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46.5 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | A | $\underset{(2012-13)}{45.2 \%}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47.2 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 45 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.1 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | - | LR | $\mathbf{2 8 . 6 \%}$ of pupils with the SEN provision School Action, School Action plus or Statement attained $5+$ A $^{*}$-C GCSEs incl English \& Maths, compared to $77.7 \%$ of their peers who had no SEN provision. <br> 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. |
| $\underset{\text { Equalities }}{\text { E32 - }}$ | \% Black African minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving $5+A^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English \& mathematics GCSEs at Key Stage 4 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 59 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55.3 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | LR | Not published | $\begin{gathered} 61.2 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56.1 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | - | A | $56.1 \%$ of Black African pupils attained $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}$-C GCSEs incl Eng \& Maths, compared to $66.5 \%$ of their peers, and $61.2 \%$ Black African pupils nationally. <br> 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 commissiong to address this closely on a data based rationale for commissioing to address this |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { E33- } \\ \text { Equalities } \end{gathered}\right.$ | \% Black Caribbean minority ethnic group (containing more than 30 pupils) achieving 5+ A*-C including English \& mathematics GCSEs at Key Stage 4 | Annual | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (20.611-12) } \end{gathered}$ | HR | Not published | $\begin{gathered} 53.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47.6 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | - | HR | 47.6\% of Black Caribbean pupils attained $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}$-C GCSEs incl English \& Maths, compared to $66.5 \%$ of their peers, and $53.3 \%$ Black Caribbean pupils nationally. |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { E34- } \\ \text { Equalities } \end{gathered}\right.$ | \% 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 | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 53 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.7 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HR | Not published | $\begin{gathered} 54.6 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | - | HR | $31.3 \%$ of Black other pupils attained 5+ A*-C GCSEs incl English \& Maths, compared to $65.9 \%$ of their peers, and $54.6 \%$ of Black Other pupils nationally. |
| E35Equalities | \% 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 | $\triangle$ | $\begin{gathered} 68 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59.4 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HR | Not published | $\begin{gathered} 55.4 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58.2 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | - | HR | $58.2 \%$ of White other pupils attained $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}$-C GCSEs incl English \& Maths, compared to $65.9 \%$ of their peers, and $55.4 \%$ of White Other pupils nationally. |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { E36- } \\ \text { Equalities } \end{array}$ | The percentage of $16-18$ years olds who are in education, training or employment at 97\% by March 2014 | Annual | $\triangle$ | 97\% | 98\% | LG | - | - | 97\% | 98.3\% | $\leftrightarrow$ | LG | LG | Harrow's NEET outcome remains one of the lowest in the country. |
| E37 | Annual rate of Permanent Exclusions as \% of Harrow school population | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { (Corporate } \\ \text { Scorecard) } \end{gathered}$ | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10 \% / 33 \\ & (2011-12) \end{aligned}$ | HR | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.09 \% / 30 \\ & (2012-13) \end{aligned}$ | $\uparrow$ | HG | HG | Permanent exclusions dropped in 2012-13 to $0.09 \%$ ( 30 ) from $0.10 \%$ (33) in 2011-12 |
| E38 | Annual rate of Fixed Term Exclusions as \% Harrow school population | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Anual } \\ & \text { (Corporate } \\ & \text { Scorecard) } \end{aligned}$ | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.85 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 3.24 \% / 1,020 \\ (2011-12) \end{array}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 3.40 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.05 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.06 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.43 \% / 790 \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\uparrow$ | HG | HG | Fixed term exclusions dropped significantly from 969-3.06\% in 201112 to $790-2.43 \%$ in 2012-13 - they are the lowest they have been in the last 5 years. |
| E39 | Annual rate of overall absence in primary schools | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.4 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.57 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 4.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.4 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 4.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.57 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | LR | LR | The new Attendance Intervention Model (AIM), which was piloted last year, is now being rolled out across all schools (including Academies) It is likely to have a positive impact on attendance overall. |
| E40 | Annual rate of overall absence rate in secondary schools | Annual (Corporate Scorecard) | $\nabla$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.32 \% \\ (2011-12) \end{gathered}$ | HG | $\begin{gathered} 5.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.9 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.3 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.50 \% \\ (2012-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\downarrow$ | A | A | The new Attendance Intervention Model (AIM), which was piloted last year, is now being rolled out across all schools (including Academies) It is likely to have a positive impact on attendance overall. |



