

**From:** [redacted]

**Sent:** 13 February 2019 16:24

**To:** [redacted]

**Subject:** RE: National Performance Framework Review - National Indicator text for Scotland Performs

Thanks [redacted],

I'll have a look through. Seems to be new people working on it from the NPF side so some of the knowledge of the background has been lost from that side too.

[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]

**Sent:** 13 February 2019 16:20

**To:** [redacted]

**Subject:** FW: National Performance Framework Review - National Indicator text for Scotland Performs

[redacted]

I've just been looking back through my emails on the NPF and found this chain below on how we ended up with the basket of 7. [redacted] suggestion below seems to be why we went with the majority approach and he makes reference to a similar approach taken in health.

I think this answers the question about the scenario you described in your email – that would come out as maintaining. We should be able to come up with a more detailed way of describing the approach in the technical note.

Combining the measures – I don't know how we could do this, even if we wanted to, so I don't know how to explain the reasoning. I've had a look in the NIF and the consultation we had on the gap measures. These are three of the principles mentioned which I think are relevant here:

- focusing on a single measure is neither helpful or meaningful and would provide a false and limited picture;
- the focus should be across the age ranges – from 3-18;
- they should be a credible set of measures – understood to fairly reflect progress in closing the poverty-related attainment gap;

And here is an edited extract from the consultation:

Data makes it clear that there is a gap in achievement/ attainment/development between children and young people from the least and most disadvantaged backgrounds across the system measures that we have e.g. health and wellbeing,

attendance, achievement of CfE levels, national qualifications and 16-19 year olds participation measure.

Following discussion with stakeholders and analysis of approaches taken in other jurisdictions, we do not believe that it is realistic to assess the performance of our system via a single measure. Such a measure, e.g. one focused on senior phase or leavers' data, will not be sufficient to demonstrate progress if we are trying to measure the impact of the system as a whole. A single measure could also generate perverse behaviours by becoming the single focus of activity in schools. Nor do we favour the approach of using a complex algorithm to bring together a range of measures to produce a small number of indicators of progress – such an approach is neither straightforward nor transparent.

For that reason, we have based our proposals on using a range of measures that reflect the breadth of issues that can impact on attainment. Our proposal is to identify a basket of key, mainly attainment measures supported by a set of submeasures which include detailed attainment measures and factors known to have an impact on attainment. These measures will allow us to assess progress in closing the attainment gap across the 3-18 age range. This is a complex area and therefore having relevant measures that are agreed and clearly defined for the correct range of areas that we want to focus on is considered the most effective way forward.

I think we can use this to add something to the technical note, presumably in the justification section, which already makes reference to the NIF.

As for displaying it, do you have some ideas? Maybe a bar chart showing the change in each measure on an annual basis?

Anyway, happy to discuss this once you've had a read through this email chain.

**[redacted]**