

Appendix 1 – Hillingdon Secondary School Comparators – DfE Performance Tables Jan 2016

DfE Performance Tables Jan 2016 - Hillingdon School comparators for CYPOC																		
School	OfSTED rating	Contextual - APS on entry	Contextual - %EAL	Contextual FSM E6	Contextual % Low Attainers	Contextual % Middle Attainers	Contextual % High Attainers	Contextual % mobility - Year 10 or Year 11	NOR Year 11	School position within similar schools group/55	5ACEM 2015	5ACEM Disad 2015	5ACEM Other 2015	VA - overall 2014	VA - overall 2015	VA - Best 8 Disadvantaged pupils	VA - Best 8 - other pupils	
<b>NATIONAL AVERAGE</b>		<b>27.4</b>	<b>14.20%</b>	<b>27.30%</b>	<b>15.90%</b>	<b>51.70%</b>	<b>32.30%</b>	<b>3.00%</b>	NA	/55 (last year)	57.10%	36.70%	64.70%	NA	NA	976.3	1008.8	
Abbotsfield	3 (2013 - 14)	26.9	40.00%	32.00%	21%	56%	24%	5%	105	42/55 (19)	40	47%	37%	1001	981.2	969.7	987.4	
Barnhill	2 (2011 - 12)	26.2	61.00%	53.00%	23%	55%	21%	1%	229	39/55 (36)	44	31%	59%	993.3	999.3	982.7	1018.1	
Bishop Ramsey	1 (2006 - 7)	29.3	6%	11.00%	4%	46%	50%	0%	184	39/55 (20)	71	25%	76%	1026.1	1007.8	961.6	1013.5	
Bishopshalt	2 (2011 - 12)	27.8	24.00%	25.00%	11%	58%	31%	1%	185	17/55 (21)	63	34%	73%	1018.8	1018.1	1004.2	1022.9	
Guru Nanak	2 (2013 - 14)	28.6	99.00%	15.00%	8%	55%	37%	0%	121	38/55 (12)	62	33%	67%	1049.6	1018.3	1011.4	1019.5	
Harlington	2 (2014 - 15)	25.8	80.00%	60.00%	24%	58%	18%	8%	169	18/55 (17)	50	41%	64%	1034.5	1011	1001.2	1028.7	
Haydon	1 (2006 - 7)	29.2	23.00%	18.00%	8%	44%	49%	3%	301	38/55 (27)	70	43%	77%	993.9	1003.3	965.5	1011.7	
Hewens	2 (2011 - 12)	25.4	48.00%	44%	29%	64%	7%	2%	48	2/55 (8)	58	48%	67%	1030.1	1049.2	1051.8	1047.3	
Northwood	2 (2013 - 14)	27.2	45.00%	31.00%	12%	67%	21%	9%	55	2/55 (2)	75	71%	76%	1038.3	1026.7	1018.9	1031.7	
Parkside	2 (2014 - 15)	24	6%	52%	39%	52%	9%	0	33	47/55	6	0%	13%	NK	943.3	929.8	957.7	
Queensmead	1 (2007 - 8)	27.6	26%	26.00%	17%	44%	39%	2%	236	11/55 (15)	69	48%	76%	1037.6	1026.2	1002.2	1035.1	
Rosedale	2 (2011 - 12)	27.4	71.00%	43.00%	20%	47%	33%	0%	80	1 (1=)	83	76%	87%	1053.8	1032.6	1018.1	1043.7	
Ruislip High	1 (2010 - 11)	28.2	19.00%	14.00%	11%	46%	43%	3%	148	39/55 (15)	61	50%	63%	1010.5	996.2	986.8	997.7	
Stockley Academy	4 (2014 - 15)	26.2	22.00%	47%	25%	56%	19%	2%	168	41/55 (46)	38	26%	47%	970.2	976.8	954.1	993.6	
Swakeleys	1 (2013 - 14)	28	38.00%	26%	10%	54%	35%	3%	176	22/55 (1)	65	56%	70%	1037.2	1011.5	1000.3	1018.1	
The Douay Martyrs	2 (2013 - 14)	27.9	36%	19.00%	13%	58%	30%	2%	221	45/55 (20)	54	49%	56%	1011.5	1001.8	980.8	1007.3	
The Harefield Academy	3 (2013 - 14)	27.8	8.00%	35.00%	13%	56%	31%	1%	140	49/55 (22)	51	55%	48%	971.5	978.8	984.7	975.4	
Uxbridge High	3 (2013 - 14)	26.3	38.00%	35.00%	24%	56%	20%	3%	203	39/55 (19)	39	24%	48%	979.9	982.2	960.5	995.3	
Vyners	2 (2013 - 14)	29.1	10.00%	4.00%	9%	46%	45%	0%	180	6/55 (31)	82	43%	86%	1013.4	1035.9	1024.6	1036.8	

**Appendix 2 Case Study for raising attainment of disadvantaged students – Some pupils are represented in multiple data sets.**

Attendance is a major focus for Harlington, as we are in the bottom quintile nationally. There are 100 students who qualify for E6FSM at Harlington who have an attendance rate of less than 90%.

<b>Of this 100:</b>	
1) 39 are from a White English (WENG ) background	This is the one group of students who we have not yet got to the national average for performance
2) 39 have SEND needs	SEND students are value positive in outcomes for the past two years. The school receives additional funding for High Needs students, which contributes, but does not fully fund provision.
3) 1 is a Looked After Child	These children, irrespective of whole school strategies, should have individual funded PP programmes as part of their PEP. Funding is provided for this purpose.
4) 18 are in some kind of alternative provision	This includes our in –house provisions, as well as provision paid for off – site. These provisions include support for behaviour issues and alternatives to exclusion, provision for students who may be undergoing statutory EHCP asesment and ‘Nurture’ provision. All of these provisions require not insignificant funding from the main school budget.
5) 40 are Low Ability Students	These students are taught, wherever possible, in small intensive groups in a mainstream setting, with in class support if identified as SEND. The school does provide ‘catch up’ classes in Year 7, via targeted funding.
6) 24 are Mid Year Admissions	This is a significant drain on resources, as any student who comes on roll after PLASC is not funded for up to 7 months, as funding is lagged. These students often have EAL needs, or additional issues that require support and intervention, from existing resources. The LA are working hard to develop a funding model that mitigates the impact of Mid Year Admissions.

