

# Questions for users of primary RAISEonline summary reports

Extract from the introduction to each school's RAISEonline summary report

## Using the summary report

All tables and charts in this new style of summary report are intended for use by schools, governors and inspectors. Users may find it helpful to look first at Ofsted's Inspection dashboard for a broad overview before looking at the more detailed tables and charts in this RAISEonline summary report.

In this summary report, users may find it helpful to look first at the summary tables for a key stage to give them an overview for all and disadvantaged pupils by prior attainment. Users may then find it helpful to consult the separate tables and charts for each subject. The key stage 2 charts show group progress in descending order, with lines indicating if progress is in the top or bottom 10% of all pupils nationally. Details can then be followed up in the scatterplots and transition tables, including for pupils assessed using P scales.

When consulting tables and charts, users may wish to ask questions such as those below in relation to the past data and consider any implications for current pupils.

## The summary tables for the key stage enable users to ask questions such as:

At key stage 2

- Was the overall progress of all pupils and disadvantaged pupils statistically above or below zero (shaded)? Was it in the top or bottom 15%? How did this vary across subjects?
- Was the progress of all high prior attainers statistically above or below zero (shaded)? How did this vary across subjects? How did this compare with the progress of low and middle prior attainers?
- Was the progress of high prior-attaining disadvantaged pupils statistically above or below the national for other pupils (shaded)? How did this vary across subjects? How did this compare with the progress of low and middle prior-attaining disadvantaged pupils?
- How far from national figures was the progress? Could small cohort size have prevented the progress from being statistically above or below national figures?
- What additional information does the attainment data provide about the numbers of pupils represented by the difference from national figures (bearing in mind that larger cohorts of middle prior attainers are more likely to be shaded than smaller low or high prior-attaining cohorts)?

At key stage 1

- How did the overall percentage of all pupils attaining the expected standard or above compare with the national figure? How did the difference vary across subjects? How did this compare with percentages attaining greater depth?
- How did the overall percentage of disadvantaged pupils attaining the expected standard or above compare with the national figure for other pupils? How did the difference vary across subjects? How did this compare with percentages attaining greater depth?
- For disadvantaged pupils and for all pupils, how did attainment vary across early learning goal development groups? Is any difference shaded (bearing in mind that larger cohorts are more likely to be shaded than smaller ones)? How did attainment vary across subjects? How different was it for attaining the expected standard and attaining greater depth?

### **Possible follow-up questions about disadvantaged pupils**

- How effectively has the school identified the main barriers faced by different disadvantaged pupils, in particular those with high prior attainment and those with low prior attainment who need to catch up?
- How was the pupil premium funding spent to address the different barriers and how effective were the various approaches?
- How might the progress and attainment of disadvantaged pupils in all current year groups compare with the 2016 progress and attainment?

### **The tables and charts showing progress and attainment for each subject enable users to ask questions such as:**

- Which groups made the most progress and which groups made the least? Did this vary between subjects? Which groups made statistically above or below average progress (confidence interval does not touch zero)? Did any groups make progress in the top or bottom 10% when compared with all pupils nationally?
- Did enough pupils attain the expected and high standard/greater depth at key stages 1 and 2? How did this vary between subjects, by groups, and by starting points/early years development overall and for subjects?
- Was the percentage of year 1/year 2 pupils achieving the expected standard in phonics above the national figure? Was it rising? How did the attainment of disadvantaged pupils compare with the national figure for other pupils? How did attainment vary between groups of pupils?
- How did the phonics marks in year 2 compare with those in year 1 for pupils who did not meet the expected standard in year 1? What strategies are now in place to help such pupils?
- How did attainment in key stage 1 reading, year 1 phonics and early years reading compare for the same cohort, for all pupils and for disadvantaged pupils?
- Were children well enough prepared for year 1 (did enough achieve a good level of development in the Early Years Foundation Stage Profile?) How well did they do in literacy, mathematics, and communication and language? Did FSM children achieve as well as non-FSM children nationally? If not, what approaches are in place now to raise attainment of FSM children?

### **Scatterplots and transition tables enable users to ask questions such as:**

- How much progress did individual disadvantaged pupils make? How did it vary for different prior attainment? Was the progress very low or very high for any pupils?
- How well did all pupils and disadvantaged pupils with prior attainment at level 2c do (in the transition tables and in the 12.0-13.9 group in scatterplot tables)? How did this vary across subjects? How did it vary for different starting points?
- How well did the pupils who were assessed using P scales progress?

### **Absence and exclusion tables enable users to ask questions such as:**

- Was absence above or below average for all pupils and for disadvantaged pupils? How much was it diminishing? Did any groups have particularly high absence?
- Was the proportion of persistent absentees above or below average for all pupils and for disadvantaged pupils? Could high persistent absence for any group have had an impact on progress?
- Was the proportion of pupils with repeat exclusions (two or more in the year) above or below average? How did this differ for disadvantaged pupils and for other groups?
- Was the difference between the proportion with repeat exclusions and the proportion excluded at least once too small? Was it appropriate?