**Attendance data analysis 2016/2017**

**Overall attendance data:**

**Table A**

**SECONDARY SCHOOL DATA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Autumn/Spring 2016/17** | **Overall Absence** | **Overall Attendance** |
| **Essex Average** | 4.90% | 95.10% |
| **National Average** | 5.10% | 94.80% |
| **Shenfield High School average** | 4.40% | 95.50% |

Our attendance is on par with Essex averages and slightly above National averages.

**Table B**

**Absence data analysis:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Authorised Absence** | **Unauthorised Absence** | **Gap** |
| **Autumn/Spring 2015/16** | | | |
| **Essex Average** | 5.0% | 3.8% | 1.2% |
| **Shenfield High School average** | 3.7% | 0.7% | 3.0% |
| **Autumn/Spring 2016/17** | | | |
| **Essex Average** | 5.5% | 3.8% | 1.4% |
| **Shenfield High School average** | 3.3% | 1.1% | 2.2% |

This table shows that we tend to authorise more absences than we unauthorise. This is a focus for 2017 – 2018, where the policy has been changed to only authorise evidenced illnesses/medical appointments. The impact of this policy has enabled us to reduce our authorised absences significantly, with virtually no gap between authorised and unauthorised. This is a positive impact because it means that there is less likely to be an acceptance of absences, and this will impact on attendance overall as parents who worry about attendance data for their child are more reluctant to accept unauthorised labels. We also have a policy of NOT sending work home if absences are unauthroised, and this impacts more on potential longer term absentees or school refusers. There is a limit to the impact of this policy however, because if parents do not worry about the unauthorised label, then they do not respond to this pressure. Table G shows that the impact of penalty notices for irregular attendance is extremely limited – therefore, the school is better off focusing resources on those with borderline persistent absenteeism, than those who are irrevocably PA. The strategy is therefore to try and prevent students from becoming PA, and moving those who do not respond to our range of interventions to outside agency intervention quickly.

**Groups absence analysis and comparison to Essex data:**

**Table C**

**Authorised absence comparison by gender:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Autumn/Spring 2016/17** | **Essex** | **Shenfield** | **Essex** | **Shenfield** |
| **% of absent sessions due to:** | **BOYS** | **BOYS** | **GIRLS** | **GIRLS** |
| Illness (NOT medical or dental appointments) | 2.9 | 2.7 | 3 | 2.8 |
| Medical/dental appointments | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Religious observance | 0.1 | 0.008 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Study leave | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traveller absence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agreed family holiday | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.02 |
| Excluded, no alternative provision | 0.2 | 0.05 | 0.1 | 0.01 |
| Other authorised circumstances | 0.3 | 0.174 | 0.3 | 0.195 |
| **Total authorised absence** | **3.8** | **3.2** | **3.8** | **3.3** |

Our main category for authorised absences is illness. We have very few exclusions, and we do not allow study leave. These are also important safeguarding measures, since we almost never authorise absences where a child can be ‘free’ to leave the care of their parents and the school and therefore become vulnerable to outside influences.

**Table D:**

**Absence by disadvantaged category:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FSM** | **Essex** | **Shenfield** |
| Authorised ab | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| Unauthorised ab | 3.4 | 3.9 |
| Overall ab | 8.5 | 9 |

As in Essex generally, our disadvantaged students are more likely to be PA than non-disadvantaged students, and of those students as shown in **Table E**, there is a correlation between white British students and disadvantaged students who have a higher absent rate than others. We think that white British disadvantaged students have higher levels of attendance interventions, hence the higher rate of authorised absences – we focus on those students – see their parents more at school based meetings, or visit them more on home visits and so we have a better understanding of why those students tend to be absent. Our most successful interventions are either getting parents into school, or interacting with parents on home visits. However, these meetings tend be limited by resource limitations, and the impact of those meetings tend to be time limited – students can do extremely well for a period of time, but those with less reliance tend to drop attendance more quickly and the disadvantaged tend to have less reliance. This term we are running two resilience based workshops in Y7, aimed to some extent at our disadvantaged PAs in that cohort to see if attendance can be impacted by specifically teaching students how to improve their resilience.

**Table E:**

**Absences by ethnicity data**:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EAL** | **Believed to be English**  **ESSEX** | **Believed to be other than English**  **ESSEX** | **Believed to be English**  **SHENFIELD** | **Believed to be other than English**  **SHENFIELD** |
| Authorised ab | 4 | 3.1 | 5.2 | 3.1 |
| Unauthorised ab | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1 |
| Overall ab | 5.3 | 4.4 | 6.9 | 3.2 |

**Impact of our strategies:**

We have focused on students vulnerable to becoming PA and have aimed a key resource at students with an attendance between 91 and 94%

**Tables F I - V**

**Postcard initiative – to stop students becoming PA**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yr7** |  |  |  |
| **NAME** | **Att % at 10 /10/17** | **Att % at 12/12/17** | **IMPACT** |
| HA | 91.6% | 90.6% | -1.0% |
| LC | 91.6% | 94.5% | 2.9% |
| BH | 91.6% | 96.8% | 5.2% |
| RL | 91.6% | 96.8% | 5.2% |
| EM | 91.6% | 96.8% | 5.2% |
| FN | 91.6% | 86.7% | -4.9% |
| JZ \* | 93.7% | 81.2% | -12.5% |
|  |  |  | 12.6 |

JZ is an outlier with a key deterioration in attendance due to unexpected family illness, which was life changing for the family member concerned and has impacted directly on the immediate family. Without his data the impact is extremely positive.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yr8** |  |  |  |
| **NAME** | **Att % at 11/10/17** | **Att % at 12/12/17** | **IMPACT** |
| LB | 91.7% | 95.2% | 3.5% |
| AC | 91.6% | 96.8% | 5.2% |
| IC | 91.6% | 96.8% | 5.2% |
| LE | 91.6% | 93.6% | 2.0% |
| RG | 91.6% | 88.8% | -2.8% |
| PH | 91.6% | 84.1% | -7.5% |
| LH | 91.6% | 95.2% | 3.6% |
| OL | 91.6% | 90.4% | -1.2% |
| HN | 91.6% | 90.4% | -1.2% |
| JO | 91.6% | 93.6% | 2.0% |
|  |  |  | 9.4 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yr9** |  |  |  |
| **NAME** | **Att % at 12/10/17** | **Att % at 12/12/17** | **IMPACT** |
| TD | 92.0% | 87.3% | -4.7% |
| RG | 92.0% | 92.0% | 0.0% |
| TH | 92.0% | 93.6% | 1.6% |
| GH | 92.0% | 93.6% | 1.6% |
| SH | 92.0% | 92.0% | 0.0% |
| PR | 92.0% | 96.8% | 4.8% |
| OT | 92.0% | 93.6% | 1.6% |
| CO | 94.0% | 89.6% | -4.4% |
|  |  |  | 0.3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yr10** |  |  |  |
| **NAME** | **Att % at 11/10/17** | **Att % at 12/12/17** | **IMPACT** |
| CB | 91.6% | 95.2% | 3.6% |
| BB | 91.6% | 95.2% | 3.6% |
| CD | 91.6% | 96.8% | 5.2% |
| DE | 91.6% | 93.6% | 2.0% |
| MG | 91.6% | 95.2% | 3.6% |
| HH | 91.6% | 95.2% | 3.6% |
| RM | 91.6% | 93.6% | 2.0% |
| AM | 91.6% | 93.6% | 2.0% |
| KM | 91.6% | 88.1% | -3.5% |
| MM | 91.6% | 90.4% | -1.2% |
|  |  |  | 19.9 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yr11** |  |  |  |
| **NAME** | **Att % at 12/10/17** | **Att % at 12/12/17** | **IMPACT** |
| HB | 92.0% | 95.2% | 3.2% |
| MB | 92.0% | 88.8% | -3.2% |
| JE | 92.0% | 93.6% | 1.6% |
| RH | 92.0% | 95.2% | 3.2% |
| HH | 92.0% | 96.8% | 4.8% |
| JL | 92.0% | 95.2% | 3.2% |
| VS | 92.0% | 96.8% | 4.8% |
| KH | 94.0% | 94.4% | 0.4% |
|  |  |  | 18 |

In all year groups apart from Y9, this initiative had a significant impact on preventing the majority of the students picked for the exercise, in terms of improving their attendance and preventing those students from becoming PA. This term, therefore we will widen the scope of the initiative and target those just in PA (87%+, where a small improvement in attendance will take them out of PA.

**Penalty notice impact:**

**Table G:**

**Penalty Notices for irregular attendance Analysis September – December 2017.**

These are all KS4 students, 3 of which are disadvantaged and white British, linking with tables D and E. Three have had oasis intervention, three have had VT tutor intervention and all have had a disproportionate amount of pastoral manager time. All have had school based attendance meetings and three have had home visits where part of the time invested has been on removing the barriers to their attendance issues. Two have been referred to outside agencies for support specifically aimed at improving attendance.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME** | **Yr Group** | **Att at PN Issue** | **Att 6 wks.’ later** | **IMPACT** |
| RJ | 10 | 75.6 | 74.6 | -1 |
| TB | 10 | 74.3 | 76.8 | 2.5 |
| JS | 11 | 67.5 | 52 | -15.5 |
| TP | 11 | 80 | 84 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  | -13 |

This shows that Local Authority impact on the attendance of students at our school is very limited. We have better impact by targeting students who might improve with encouragement rather than focusing on outliers that affect our attendance significantly, but without much hope for improvement. All of these students have had a huge number of interventions designed to support them and their families within school. However, by the time student attendance gets to penalty notices for irregular attendance, whether it is paid or not has very little impact overall.
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