**Using Perspective Lite to complete final Sense checking EYFSP data 2014**

The following are activities that will support the check of the data currently submitted to the LA.

1. **(All schools) In area pupils list by setting –home page**

* Check children’s names and the number of children in the cohort are correct. It has been found that one school submitted data for 60 children and only 1 child was recorded in Perspective Lite, resulting in the school with GLD OF 0%.
* Are all the scores the correct ones submitted by the teacher – an example noticed that where children had achieved a score of 3 these were all recorded as 2 on the submitted data.

1. **(All schools) Select KEY PAS to view data comparisons for GLD and EYFSP Average Total Points Score (Mean) using the performance of data against trends from 2013 to 2014 of :**

* Contextually similar schools
* Local Authority;
* National

Are those schools performing better or less well than your school? Look at the trend 2013 to 2014.

Does the GLD match the school’s expected results?

1. **If your GLD is under 40% check through and review your data as follows:**

* Any child with a total score of 35 + points and not achieving GLD.
* A child who is just missing the GLD by 1 or 2 ELG’s particularly in the prime areas.
* Use the quality assurance guidance in the EYFSP handbook section 7 to consider any links between ELG’s or unusual patterns
* Consider if a ‘best fit’ judgment has been made and that ‘equal mastery’ of all of the ELG is not required. Has the teacher been too hesitant with overall judgments?

**4. If your school has a similar GLD in comparison with contextually similar schools but has a significantly lower EYFSP total points score in comparison with contextually similar schools:**

* Look at any children with a total score of 35+ but not achieving GLD
* Look at any child with a total score of only 17, who **may** be at ‘expected’ level (2) within some Prime ELG’s especially.
* Reconsider any more able children who **may** be working beyond the goal (3) in some ELGs. See exceeding statements in EYFSP particularly within the prime ELG’s.
* Consider the range of the scores within each ELG (vertical checks of the columns).Do any columns look significantly different from any other ELGs e.g. more 1’s or no 3’s which might look unusual?
* Are all 17 ELG’s being considered equally or are EA&D and UW ELG’s lower than those included within the GLD?
* See appendix- EYFSP summary comparisons for Bradford, National and school for use.

**5. If your school is not performing as well as contextually similar schools in both % of children achieving GLD and the EYFSP average total points score (therefore underachieving)**

* See all the notes for both 3 and 4 above to quality assure

**6. If the school is performing above national and similar schools against GLD and EYFSP average total points score and also has increased from the 2013 position. It is less likely any amendments will be necessary.**

**If you wish to make any changes to the submitted data.**

Please inform Chris Holroyd and a complete data set will need to be uploaded to the LA. Also recheck to ensure that the changes have been received and are on the LA system by Wednesday 2 July.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix**  **EYFSP Summary for Bradford, National and school** | | | | | | | |
| **GLD** | | **49%** | **52%** |  | | | |
| **Understanding and using data over time can help to provide a more secure data set over time.** | | Bradford | National | School | | | |
| **2013** | **2013** | **2013** | **+ or –**  **To National** | **2014** | **+ or –**  **To National** |
| **C&L** | | 67% | 72% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG1 | L&A | 73% | 80% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG2 | U | 74% | 81% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG3 | Sp | 71% | 78% |  |  |  |  |
| **PD** | | 76% | 83% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG4 | M&H | 82% | 87% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG5 | H&SC | 82% | 88% |  |  |  |  |
| **PSED** | | 71% | 76% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG6 | SC&SA | 79% | 85% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG7 | MF&B | 77% | 83% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG8 | MR | 80% | 85% |  |  |  |  |
| **Literacy** | | 55% | 61% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG9 | Reading | 63% | 71% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG10 | Writing | 56% | 62% |  |  |  |  |
| **Mathematics** | | 60% | 66% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG11 | Number | 63% | 69% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG12 | SS&M | 67% | 75% |  |  |  |  |
| **Understanding the World** | | 63% | 75% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG13 | P&C | 70% | 81% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG14 | TW | 70% | 81% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG15 | Tech | 78% | 88% |  |  |  |  |
| **Expressive Arts & Design** | | 68% | 78% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG16 | E&UM&M | 73% | 83% |  |  |  |  |
| ELG17 | BI | 72% | 81% |  |  |  |  |

* Was last year’s GLD above, near or below National?
* How did each ELG % compare with National (above, at or below)?
* Do any of the ELG’s differences between school and National look unusual? Consider why?
* Is this year’s cohort similar, more able or disadvantaged or different in any way? Consider how this might affect your data?
* Are there any other reasons why data might be different this year?