## Report of: Director of Children and Families

Report to: Scrutiny Board (Children's Services)
Date: 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ November 2017


## Subject: Scrutiny Inquiry- The Impact of Child Poverty on Attainment, Attendance

 and Achievement (with a specific focus on data analysis)| Are specific electoral wards affected? <br> If relevant, name(s) of ward(s): | $\square$ Yes | $\boxed{\text { No }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and <br> integration? | $\boxed{\text { Yes }}$ | $\square$ No |
| Is the decision eligible for Call-In? | $\square$ Yes | $\boxed{\text { No }}$ |
| Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? <br> If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: <br> Appendix number: | $\square$ Yes | $\boxed{\text { No }}$ |

## 1. Summary of main issues

This report will discuss the impact of child poverty on Attainment, Achievement and Attendance (The 3As) with a data analysis that looks at child poverty and deprivation on a school, local and national level.

The report is based on an in-depth data analysis of poverty across Leeds, and as such it will look at school characteristics and the relationship with poverty, consider pupils with SEND as a primary need against deprivation factors and explore the relationship between poverty and English as an additional language by looking at lower layer super output areas.

We will consider the trends over time and undertake a gap analysis for groups at key assessment points, at aged 5, 11, 16 and 19. If we are to address the effects of poverty we also need to be cognisant of the large proportion of children not captured by the government's definition (Free School Meals in the last 6 years FSM6). We know that in areas where poverty is high, but eligibility for pupil premium is less so, that there is often a high degree of in year movement in classes, high levels of English as an Additional Language (EAL) and increased numbers of children with a Special or specific Educational Need or Disability (SEND)

## 2. Recommendations

2.1. Members are recommended to:

- Consider and comment on the information provided:
- Using the recommendations provided to agree school visits.
- Identifying the information they would want at future meetings.


## 3. Purpose of this report

3.1. This report supports Children's and Families Scrutiny inquiry into the impact of poverty on children's learning, focussing on a data analysis of childhood poverty.

## 4. Background information

4.1. This report:

- Examines the attainment and achievement of disadvantaged children, within the contexts of clusters and schools using both Leeds and national data.
- The data that is presented in this report highlights the gap between children from disadvantaged backgrounds and their peers, it also highlights the fact that the longevity of disadvantaged experienced has a clear effect on attainment and achievement.
- Provides an overview of the multiple complexities when categorising disadvantaged children as one group, emphasising the importance of considering Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), ethnicity and English as an Additional Language (EAL).
- Acknowledges that the reasons for the existence of a gap between more and less disadvantaged children, and the impact of approaches to reduce this, are complex and multi-faceted. It is a topic that has a recognised national focus, and one that has challenged policy makers and educationalists for decades.


## 5. Main issues

5.1. Relative and Absolute Poverty
5.2. Relative Poverty measures the number and proportion of individuals who have household incomes below 60\% of the median average in that year.
5.3. Relative low income measures the number and proportion of individuals who have household incomes below $60 \%$ of the median average in that year - and is used to look at how changes in income for the lowest income households compare to changes in incomes near the average. The population in relative low income falls if income growth at the lower end of the income distribution outstrips average income growth.
5.4.Absolute Poverty measures the number and proportion of individuals who have household incomes 60\% below the median average in 2010/11, adjusted for Consumer Price Inflation (CPI).
5.5. Absolute low income measures the proportion of individuals who have household incomes $60 \%$ below the median average in 2010/11, adjusted for inflation. It is used to look at how changes in income for the lowest income households compare to changes
in the cost of living. The year 2010/11 is used in order to measure absolute low income in line with the Child Poverty Act 2010. Absolute poverty falls if individuals with the lowest incomes see their income rise more than inflation.

### 5.6. Child Poverty

5.7. The principal measure of child poverty has, for many years, been based on relative income. In the recent recession there has been a reduction in median earnings. Therefore, this has had the effect of reducing the value of the relative poverty line which is measured against the median earnings figure. This has resulted in people being taken out of the relative poverty figures even though their earnings position may not have changed. The latest national figures showed that 300,000 fewer children were in relative income poverty between 2009-10 and 2010-11 largely due to reductions in median incomes. At the same time absolute poverty remained unchanged, implying that the living standards of children did not improve over this period.
5.8. The Children in Low-Income Families Local Measure shows the proportion of children living in families in receipt of out-of-work (means-tested) benefits or in receipt of tax credits where their reported income is less than $60 \%$ of UK median income. This measure provides a broad proxy for relative low-income child poverty as set out in the Child Poverty Act 2010 and enables analysis at a local level.
5.9. Pupils are described as disadvantaged if they have either been eligible for free school meals in the last six years or if they are aged $5-15$ years of age and have been continuously looked after by the local authority for one day or more in the period 1st April 2014-31st March 2015, or recorded as adopted from care, or who have left care under a special guardianship or residence order.
5.10. Pupils who are persistently disadvantaged are pupils who are eligible for FSM for $80 \%$ of their time in school.

### 5.11. Free School Meals

5.12. In England in January 2017, children in state-funded schools were entitled to receive free school meals if a parent or carer were in receipt of any of the following benefits:

- Income Support
- Income-based Jobseekers Allowance
- Income-related Employment and Support Allowance
- Support under Part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999
- the guaranteed element of State Pension Credit 7
- Child Tax Credit (provided they were not also entitled to Working Tax Credit and had an annual gross income of no more than $£ 16,190$, as assessed by Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs)
- Working Tax Credit run-on - paid for 4 weeks after you stop qualifying for Working Tax Credit
- During the initial roll out of the benefit, Universal Credit (this category was added from 29 April 2013)
- Additionally, all infant pupils were entitled to receive free school meals from September 2014.


### 5.13. National Context

5.14. This section focuses on the attainment and achievement of disadvantaged children and young people as a national challenge. It is recognised that this is not a new issue and the research and analysis undertaken has been extensive. Consistent conclusions are that disadvantage impacts on a child's learning and the longevity of the disadvantage makes a difference. Disadvantaged pupils are not a single group; characteristics such as Special Education Need and Disability (SEND), ethnicity and EAL (English as an Additional Language) interact with disadvantage with varying impacts on progress rates, gaps with non-disadvantaged pupils and the long term impact of disadvantage.
5.15. Leeds is considered alongside regional and national performance data which identifies that Yorkshire and Humber is one of the regions with the greatest challenge. This is particularly reflected in the Leeds data. Whilst there are regional and local authority differences, the overall conclusion is that progress is not raising the achievement of disadvantaged pupils fast enough to close existing gaps in a reasonable time. To narrow gaps, disadvantaged pupils need to be making better progress in their learning than their non-disadvantaged peers. This is very rarely the case in schools, in local areas or nationally.
5.16. Studies on long-term disadvantage show that there is a strong link between pupils' attainment and progress, and the percentage of time they spend in school as free school meal eligible.
5.17. At all key stages, pupils who have been on free school meals have lower attainment than children who haven't been on free school meals. If a child has been eligible for free school meals on just one occasion, their attainment is still lower than their peers who haven't been free school meal eligible (see appendix 1 ).
5.18. Attainment decreases as the length of time spent on free school meals increases. Children are better off academically, the less time they spend as free school meal eligible. Studies show that only a very small percentage of schools have been able to reverse this trend, and be above national averages for attainment.
5.19. Disadvantaged pupils finish primary school over 9 months behind nondisadvantaged and finish secondary school over 19 months behind. Disadvantaged pupils fall behind by around two months each year over the course of secondary school.
5.20. The three northern areas that cover Yorkshire have gaps between disadvantaged children in their areas in comparison to non-disadvantaged children nationally. These gaps are at 21 or 22 months at the end of secondary school. Nationally there has been a slow narrowing of the gap (particularly in London); in Leeds this has not been observed as the gap is increasing.
5.21. Leeds gaps are larger than national, with the gap between children who are on free school meals and not on free school meals widening throughout their education journey. The gap at 5 years is 5.7 months, at 11 years it is 13.3 months, and at 16 years it is 22.3 months. Whilst this gap at 16 years is larger than national gaps (19.2 months) it is smaller than the average gap for Leeds' comparator cities (Bristol, Liverpool, Newcastle and Sheffield) where the average gap is 22.6 months.
5.22. When looking at the data on gaps for children on free school meals, it is clear that children who fall into this category should not be judged as an homogenous group. There are complexities within the statistics on poverty and disadvantage, and therefore it is essential when analysing educational outcomes, that there is an awareness of the impacts of ethnicity, special educational needs and disability and English as an additional language, in addition to being on free school meals.
5.23. Leeds and Yorkshire has good progress results for non-disadvantaged pupils, but it is more mixed for disadvantaged pupils, which further increases the gap in comparison to other cities (whose attainment for non-disadvantaged pupils may be lower, and therefore their gap will be smaller) and national statistics.

### 5.24. Schools analysis

5.25. Analysis has been conducted with primary schools in Leeds, to provide an overview of poverty and pupil deprivation levels. It is important to emphasise that poverty effects each child differently, and therefore each school will have its own unique context, challenges and celebrations.
5.26. One fifth of primary schools within Leeds have between $66 \%$ and $99 \%$ of their pupils living in the most deprived areas nationally and yet two fifths of primary schools have less than $5 \%$ of their pupils living in the most deprived areas (see appendix 2). The most disadvantaged schools have the highest proportion of children with Special Educational Needs (20\%), a figure that decreases on comparison with the affluence of the area. For the most affluent areas, the figure is $8 \%$.
5.27. In terms of ethnicity, the least deprived areas are generally white British. There is a strong correlation between living in a deprived area and having black, Asian or minority ethnic heritage. There is a correlation between having English as an additional language and deprivation, however, it is the schools who are within the second most deprived category that have the highest rates of children with English as an additional language. This provides some notion of the huge disparity that schools in Leeds experience in pupil population and child demographics and reflects the fact that some of our poorer communities find it very difficult to claim free school meals and as a result, classify as disadvantaged.

### 5.28. School size based on reception to Year 6 classes.

While schools of all sizes exist across the city, on average schools serving communities with higher levels of deprivation are larger. Schools with a quarter or more of their pupils from areas considered in the 10\% most deprived, have on average 337 pupils whilst those with no or very few pupils from these areas on average have 247 pupils. The difference is similar when looking at FSM eligibility.

### 5.29. Special Educational Needs and Disability Primary Schools

The proportion of pupils identified with a special educational need or disability follows a similar pattern when looking at schools grouped by pupils from 10\% on the Index for Multiple Deprivation (IMD) or by FSM eligibility. The schools with the greatest number of pupils either eligible for FSM or who live in areas of high disadvantage, have SEND percentages of $19 / 20 \%$. This drops to $15 \%$ for the next quintile and for the next 3 quintiles there is a more limited difference.

### 5.30. English as an additional language in Primary Schools

The proportion of pupils with English as an additional language (EAL) is related to deprivation. This statistic accepts that the vast majority of schools $(70 \%)$ have less than $20 \%$ of their pupils as EAL and majority ( $55 \%$ ) as less than $10 \%$.

### 5.31. Ethnicity in Primary Schools

When considering ethnicity by residency in the $10 \%$ most deprived areas there is a slightly different relationship than considering ethnicity by FSM eligibility. This is similar to EAL. In both approaches the least deprived $20 \%$ is predominately white British. The $10 \%$ most deprived shows a stronger connection with BAME heritage than FSM eligibility. In the $60 \%$ most deprived areas of Leeds there is a wide spread in the ethnic make-up of individual school populations.

### 5.32. In-year moves in Primary Schools

Whilst acknowledging that this is provisional data when considering in year moves, there is a clear indication that schools serving communities with greater levels of deprivation are on average subject to more requests for in year moves. (Withdrawn or declined requests were not included in the numbers). The relationship, whilst evident in both approaches, is more overt when considering schools grouped by IMD criteria than by FSM eligibility.

### 5.33. FSM ever Primary Schools

FSM ever considers pupils who have been eligible for FSM in the last 6 years. As this would be another way to group schools it is not surprising that there is a strong relationship between schools grouped by IMD or 2017 FSM eligibility. The relationship with home addresses is more nuanced in terms of individual schools. For example, a few schools in the middle group/quintile for children living in the $10 \%$ most deprived have over 40\% of pupils eligible for FSM in the last 6 years while some schools with the greatest proportion of pupils living in area of $10 \%$ most deprived have less $20 \%$ eligible.
5.34. The overall conclusion is that there are patterns in relation to deprivation, but they are both complex and nuanced around the circumstance of each school.

## Child Poverty and Learning Outcomes

5.35. Recently there have been significant changes in national assessment, and therefore it is difficult to compare some data from this year to previous years. That said, there is a clear relationship between deprivation and attainment, and that Leeds pupils who are considered non-disadvantaged generally perform in line with national comparators, whereas Leeds pupils who are considered disadvantaged do not.

- When looking at children who reach the expected standard, there is an overall pattern that those from the least deprived backgrounds achieve higher attainment, and those from the most deprived backgrounds (linked with FSM eligibility) achieve lower attainment.
- When looking at FSM6 (ever) pupils there is a more mixed picture in part reflecting the smaller cohorts involved. It would be expected these cohorts would be larger in the more deprived schools and this may explain their slightly more concentrated range of results.
- The relationship of FSM eligibility with attainment is reflected in national studies such as the recent August 2017 the Education Policy Institute published - Closing the Gap
- Trends in Educational Attainment and Disadvantage. Key conclusions arising from analysis of the period 2007 to 2016 were that disadvantaged pupils (eligible for free school meals in last 6 years) finish secondary school 19.2 months behind their peers. This increases with persistent disadvantage with pupils who were eligible for FSM for $80 \%$ or more of their time in school who have a wider gap of 24.3 months.
- Further information is provided in Appendix 3 including grouping schools by both deprivation and performance quintiles. The general assumption of the impact of poverty still applies but the range of individual school performance is also evident, for example, 9 schools in the least deprived quintile (IMD) were in the mid quintile for performance against the expected standard measure for reading, writing and maths.


## Demographics

5.36. In Leeds, there were 18,655 pupils of statutory school age eligible for FSM at January Census 2017. By phase of education this was 11,888 for primary age pupils ( $17.7 \%$ of the primary cohort) and 6365 for secondary pupils (16.5\%). There is a higher rate of eligibility within special establishments with $39.4 \%$ of children and young people in this setting being eligible.
5.37. The proportion of those children and young people who are FSM eligible in Leeds is following a similar trajectory to national FSM eligibility and has been steadily decreasing since 2013. The assumption is that changing eligibility not reducing need explains the decline. Leeds has a higher proportion of children and young people who are eligible for FSM compared to national.
5.38. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) release a national measure of deprivation by Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) called the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). This index ranks LSOAs in order of deprivation; with common measures being the $20 \%, 10 \%$ or $3 \%$ most deprived nationally. Leeds is ranked 25 out of 152 local authorities in terms of the proportion of LSOAs ranked in the most deprived 10\% nationally, with 105 neighbourhoods (22\% of all Leeds neighbourhoods). Whilst 22\% of the neighbourhoods in Leeds were in those 10\% most deprived LSOA's nationally; that equated to $31 \%$ of Leeds statutory school aged pupils or 33,640 children and young people.
5.39. Looking at the data in terms of clusters we find that Inner East and Open XS have the highest eligibility rates for primary aged children, with Bramley, ACES, JESS and Beeston, Cottingley and Middleton all having eligibility rates of between 25\%-30\%. Those with least eligibility are concentrated in the North and North East of the city. When considering secondary provision, the greatest eligibility rates are again, central clusters, with JESS, Inner East, Open XS and ACES all having eligibility rates of between 25\% 30\%.
5.40. The difference between the nine most deprived clusters and the rest of the city is quite clear. Generalising somewhat, these nine clusters have the most dense population of pupils, the highest rates of free school meals, the highest rates of new arrivals, and the highest proportions of BAME, EAL and SEND pupils.

## 6. Corporate considerations

### 6.1. Consultation and engagement

6.1. $\square 1$. This is an information report and does not need to be consulted on with the public. However the information in this report is available to the public through such as the Leeds Data Observatory, LCC report, DFE performance tables and DFE statistical releases. Some content FFT may not be directly available but equivalent information is.

### 6.2. Equality and diversity/cohesion and integration

6.2. $\quad$. This report is focused on poverty and it explores equality areas. Some young people are statistically more likely to have relatively poor outcomes, for example those with learning difficulties and disabilities; those from some ethnic minority backgrounds; those with English as an additional language (EAL); those living in deprived areas; poor school attenders; and those involved in the social care system. This report is intended to explore the outcomes issue and considers a number of these groups.

### 6.3. Council policies and city priorities

6.3. $\square 1$. This report provides context on a key city, regional and national challenge. Improving learning outcomes is a priority in the Children and Young People's Plan, raising attainment for all while closing the gaps that exist. This priority is reflected in all city strategies contributing to a strong economy and compassionate city, including the Best Council Plan 2015-20 and the Joint Health and Well Being Plan. Learning is seen as being central to improving future outcomes for citizens and the city.

### 6.4. Resources and value for money

6.4. $\quad$. There are no specific resource implications from this report.

### 6.5. Legal implications, access to information and call in

6.5. $\quad 1$. All performance and school population information is publicly available. This report is an information update providing Scrutiny with a summary of performance for the strategic priorities within its remit and as such is not subject to call in.

### 6.6. Risk management

6.6. $\square$. This is an information report to support a Scrutiny inquiry into the impact of poverty on learning outcomes. It is aimed at helping the city manage this risk.

## 7. Conclusions

7.1. Experiencing disadvantage impacts on a child's learning and outcomes. The length of time that a child spends as disadvantaged makes a difference to attainment and achievement. Disadvantaged children are not a single group, and characteristics such as Special Education Need and Disability, ethnicity and English as an additional
language interact with disadvantage with varying impacts on progress rates, gaps with non-disadvantaged pupils and the long term impact of disadvantage.
7.2. It is clear that the situation is a complex and multi-faceted one. Children who live in deprived circumstances are not always identified, leading to complexities with gaining an accurate picture. Additionally, changes to policy, benefits and entitlement has led to an 'iceberg' situation, where there are many more children who suffer the negative effects of poverty than are classified on a data base. Whilst these children are not eligible, or categorised as disadvantaged, they are still living in poverty, and experience all of the impacts that this brings. It is, therefore, important to support all children and young people in Leeds that could be considered vulnerable.
7.3. Children and Families has recognised the challenges faced by the increasing number of children who are experiencing poverty and deprivation within Leeds whilst recognising the complexities of SEND, EAL and BAME within this group. There is also a strong recognition that those children who are looked after or nurtured by the local authority, also need support. These are the children that as a directorate, we regard as being vulnerable. It is these children who often underachieve, fail to obtain good levels of attainment as a result of either missing school, or who are in school but not ready to learn. This report contains the stark fact that in 2016, at the end of year 6, the disadvantaged gap in Leeds was 13.3 months; this is the biggest gap between disadvantaged children and national non-disadvantaged in the whole country. Steve Walker, as the Director of Children and Families, has acknowledged this and has committed to tackling the issue.
7.4. The $3 A$ 's strategy, to improve the Attainment, Achievement and Attendance of vulnerable learners is ingraining the importance of supporting and improving the educational outcomes for all vulnerable children in the city by incorporating the strategy into all the work of the Children and Families directorate. The involvement of schools, and therefore of Learning Improvement, is seen as a vital partnership in delivering better outcomes for children.
7.5. Partnerships will also be created with directorates across the authority and key organisations in the city, as tacking childhood poverty cannot be done without a city region approach. Together, Leeds will focus on the problem of child poverty and the negative impact that it has on all markers of success. Children and Families service is committed to improving the lives and experiences of our vulnerable and disadvantaged children and young people.

## 8. Recommendations

8.1. Members are recommended to:

- Consider and comment on the information provided.
- Using the recommendations provided to agree school visits.
- Identifying the information they would want at future meetings.


## 9. Background documents

Appendix 1 National data context
Appendix 2 Analysis of primary schools by pupil poverty levels
Appendix 3 Child Poverty and Learning Outcomes: Key Stage Analysis Appendix 4 Demographics

## Appendix One - National Context

This section focuses on the attainment and achievement of disadvantaged children and young people as a national challenge. Examples of national analysis are presented, it is recognised that this is not a new issue and the research and analysis undertaken has been extensive. What is presented here therefore are only examples to highlight that the gap between children from disadvantage backgrounds and their peers is a recognised national focus and one that has challenged policy makers and educationalists over decades. Consistent conclusions are disadvantage impacts on a child's learning, the longevity of the disadvantage matters and that disadvantaged pupils are not a single group. Characteristics such as Special Education Need and Disability, ethnicity and EAL (English as an Additional Language) interact with disadvantage with varying impacts on progress rates, gaps with non-disadvantaged pupils and the long term impact of disadvantage.

Leeds is considered alongside regional and national performance highlighting that Yorkshire and Humber is one of the regions with the greatest challenge. This is reflected in Leeds. While there are regional and local authority differences the overall conclusion is that progress everywhere is not raising achievement of disadvantaged pupils fast enough to close existing gaps in a reasonable time. To narrow gaps disadvantaged pupils need to be making better progress in their learning than their peers, this is very rarely the case in schools, in local areas or nationally.

## A. Fisher Family Trust analysis of Long-term disadvantage.

Fisher Family Trust published a series of analysis by Mike Treadaway on the impact of long term disadvantage. The study concluded that:

- There is a strong link between pupils' attainment and progress, and the percentage of their time in school spent as free school meal eligible.
- That when comparing different groupings such as schools, local authorities and regions we cannot simply treat all disadvantaged pupils as a single group.
- Schools with a higher than average proportion of such pupils will have to work harder to close the gap.

A pupil will be defined as disadvantaged if they are recorded as: Eligible for Free Schools Meals (FSM) in the last six years; or Looked after continuously for 1 day or more; or Adopted from care

The chart below shows that: or all Key Stages, pupils who have been FSM-eligible at any point have lower attainment than those who have never been FSM-eligible, even if pupils have been FSM-eligible on just one occasion, their attainment is between 4\% and 7\% lower than their non FSM peers. Attainment falls steadily as the amount of time spent as FSM-eligible increases. For those who have been FSM eligible close to their whole school lives the difference is up to over 13\% for those in Key Stage 4. The analysis is based on an FFT Index that enables data over a number of
years to be compared even where there has been substantial changes to national assessment.

Difference in attainment from Never FSM group by amount of time eligible for free school meals, KS1-KS4


Another exercise considered Key Stage 4 results for pupils who had been FSMeligible by length of time FSM eligible against those pupils who were never eligible. Over the period 2008 to 2016 the pupils FSM-eligible groups for less than $60 \%$ of their time in school saw performance closing with the non-eligible group, with greater improvement for the group eligible less than $30 \%$ of the time. Those FSM-eligible for between $60 \%$ and $90 \%$ of the time saw smaller improvements while those eligible $90 \%+$ of their time in school saw their attainment, relative to the national average, actually falling.

The number of schools where disadvantaged pupils make average or better progress has been increasing however in 2016 long term disadvantaged pupils were making progress better than the national rate for all pupils in only $12 \%$ of primary schools and 7\% of secondary.

To close the gap at Key Stage 4 FSM-eligible pupils need Progress 8 Scores above the national score. One analysis looked at Progress 8 data from 1,691 secondary schools where, in 2016, there were 30 or more white British pupils who had been FSM-eligible at least once since starting their schooling. Of the 1,691 school 45 schools had higher progress 8 scores for pupils who have ever been FSM-eligible than for other pupils. Of these 22 have below average Progress 8 scores below national averages for both pupils who have ever been FSM-eligible and Never FSM pupils.

## Education Policy Institute published - Closing the Gap

In August 2017 the Education Policy Institute published Closing the Gap - Trends in Educational Attainment and Disadvantage. The report focuses on how well the education systems is serving economically disadvantaged pupils. It recognises successive governments have viewed children's education as a key component of social mobility and of securing good outcomes in later life. The report considered pupils who were:

- Disadvantaged - pupils eligible for free school meals in last 6 years
- Persistently disadvantaged - pupils eligible for FSM for $80 \%$ of their time in school
Key conclusions arising from analysis of the period 2007 to 2016 were:
- Disadvantaged pupils finish primary school over 9 months behind nondisadvantaged and finish secondary school over 19 months behind.
- Disadvantaged pupils fall behind by around two months each year over the course of secondary school. While this has narrowed over the course of the study period it will take around 50 years to fully close the gap at the current rate of closure. More detail is provided in the diagram below.
- Progress is slower and the gaps are greater for pupils who have been eligible for free school meals $80 \%$ or more of their time with a 24.3 month average gap at the end of secondary school.


Persistently disadvantaged pupils



N/A Early years

|  | N/A Early vears |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Months behind <br> awerage | 0 | 15 | | Average |
| :--- | | Months ahead |
| ---: |
| of average |



Some areas of the country are making more progress, London especially but also the south and east. Nearly all London authorities being high performing at both primary and secondary. Other areas including Yorkshire and the Humber have seen less progress. The report considered Regional School Commissioner areas, where Yorkshire is split 3 ways. The 3 northern areas that cover Yorkshire plus the South West have gaps of 21 or 22 months at the end of key stage 4 between nondisadvantaged nationally and locally disadvantaged. Graph below shows how this gap is built up across the key stages.


In Leeds the very slow narrowing of the gap trend seen nationally is not observed. Instead this gap is growing. Leeds is named in this report as a local authority where disadvantaged pupils are doing worse now than they were back in 2012. The growth and size of the gap in the primary phase is a particular concern.

When looking by pupil characteristics (ethnicity, special educational needs and disability, first language not English) the pattern is not as consistent as it is for just looking at free school meal entitlement. For example pupils with English as an additional language overall make more progress in learning and achieve higher outcomes by 16 but there is a significant proportion that have low attainment. The report acknowledges that the analysis of these characteristics is initial and limited and further work is needed.

The table below compares Leeds with statistical neighbour authorities and relevant core cities against the EPI measures, of: number of months local disadvantaged pupils are behind national non-disadvantaged; and change in gaps 2012-16. 2016 headline key stage results are included to place the EPI gaps in the context of overall local authority performance. This shows:

- Leeds gaps are larger than national, 5.7 months at 5 years, 13.3 at 11 and 22.3 at 16 .
- On the EPI methodology Leeds gaps have widened between 2012 to 2016. The greatest impact has been seen at age 11. This should be seen alongside changes in the cohort, 2012 was a small cohort reflective of the low birth years.

Comparison of key stage results with EPI Closing the Gap analysis of disadvantaged learning gaps and changes in these gaps.

| Key Stage | Foundation | KS2 | KS4 | Foundation | KS2 | KS4 | Foundation | KS2 | KS4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 results |  |  | Months local disadvantaged behind national non disadvantaged in $2016{ }^{1}$ |  |  | Change in months 2012 to 2016 with similar authorities (- good) ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
|  | \% GLD | \% RWM | Attainemnt8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 69.3 | 53.0 | 48.5 | -4.3 | -9.5 | -19.3 |  |  |  |
| Leeds | 62.5 | 48.0 | 48.4 | -5.7 | -13.3 | -22.3 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 0.9 |
| DFE COMPARABLE CORE CITIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bristol | 66.3 | 54.0 | 47.7 | -4.8 | -10.1 | -24.3 | \\| 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.4 |
| Liverpool | 59.8 | 46.0 | 47.3 | -5.8 | -10.5 | -22.1 | 1.4 | $\square 1.4$ | 0.9 |
| Newcastle | 69.5 | 57.0 | 48.6 | -3.4 | -11.8 | -21.0 | -1.2 | 2.4 | 0.1 |
| Sheffield | 68.6 | 52.0 | 48.3 | -4.7 | -11.7 | -23.2 | 0.0 | $\square 1.7$ | 1.3 |
| DFE STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bolton | 64.6 | 56.0 | 48.7 | -5.6 | -10.1 | -20.4 | 0.9 | 1.1 | -0.7 |
| Bury | 68.9 | 55.0 | 50.9 | -3.9 | -11.2 | -18.5 | -1.1 | 2.0 | -1.2 |
| Calderdale | 67.5 | 47.0 | 51.5 | -4.8 | -10.4 | -18.6 | 0.0 | $\square 1.2$ | -2.0 |
| Darlington | 69.6 | 56.0 | 48.4 | -5.2 | -12.6 | -24.8 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 8.1 |
| Derby | 66.4 | 48.0 | 46.2 | -4.4 | -8.7 | -27.1 | -0.4 | 0.2 | 6.5 |
| Kirklees | 66.9 | 49.0 | 48.9 | -4.6 | -10.2 | -21.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | ] 0.8 |
| Newcastle | 69.5 | 57.0 | 48.6 | -3.4 | -11.8 | -21.0 | $\square-1.2$ | 2.4 | 0.1 |
| North Tyneside | 69.7 | 56.0 | 51.3 | -4.4 | -10.9 | -18.1 | 0.1 | $\square 1.7$ | -2.0 |
| Sheffield | 68.6 | 52.0 | 48.3 | -4.7 | -11.7 | -23.2 | 0.0 | $\square 1.7$ | - 1.3 |
| Stockton on Tees | 64.9 | 54.0 | 49.9 | -4.4 | -11.6 | -22.0 | -0.7 | 1.9 | ] 0.6 |
| ${ }^{1}$ EPI 08-2017-Closing the Gap |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GLD - Good Level of Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RWM - Percent achieving age related expectations in reading writing and maths |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attainment 8 - average attainment 8 score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## National \& Regional Learning Gaps for disadvantaged pupils

The following tables compare the gaps between:

- local disadvantaged pupils and national non-disadvantaged pupils .
- disadvantaged and non disadvantaged pupils nationally, regionally and locally.

2016 results are compared against headline measures for Key Stage 2 and 4. This is a limited analysis of a few key measures, recognising this was a year of change in assessment practice.

In 2016 the gap between national disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged in terms of the percent of pupils reaching expected standards at the end of primary school in writing, reading and maths was $22 \%$ points with $39 \%$ of disadvantaged pupils reaching this level. Regionally this ranges from 49\% in London to 35\% in Yorkshire. Leeds was 31\%. In terms of non-disadvantaged these ranged from 66\% in London to $58 \%$ in number of regions including Yorkshire. Leeds was inline with the regional average. London has the smallest gap between local disadvantaged and national non-disadvantaged and the smallest local gap.

## 2016 Key Stage 2

Percentage or pupils reaching expected levels in reading writing and maths

|  | Disadvantaged <br> Pupils | Non Disadvantaged <br> Pupils | Gap: Local <br> Disadvantaged to <br> National Non | Gap: Local <br> Disadvantaged Non <br> Disadvantaged |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| England | 39 | 61 | -22 | -22 |
| East Midlands | 37 | 58 | -24 | -21 |
| East of England | 36 | 59 | -25 | -23 |
| London | 49 | 66 | -12 | -17 |
| North East | 43 | 66 | -18 | -23 |
| North West | 39 | 61 | -22 | -22 |
| South East | 37 | 61 | -24 | -24 |
| South West | 36 | 59 | -25 | -23 |
| West Midlands | 37 | 58 | -24 | -21 |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | 35 | 58 | -26 | -23 |
| Leeds | 31 | 58 | -30 | -27 |

Source: DFE Local Authority Interactive Tool October 2017
In terms of Key Stage 4 the key national measure is Progress 8. A progress measure provides a different perspective than an attainment measure. Again London has the best achievement for both groups of pupils and also the smallest gap between them. Leeds and Yorkshire have good progress results for nondisadvantaged pupils it is more mixed for disadvantaged pupils with consequent impact on gap measures. 2016 was the first year of Progress 8 as a key measure and time is needed for it to embed.

2016 Key Stage 4
Progress 8

|  | Disadvantaged <br> Pupils | Non Disadvantaged <br> Pupils | Gap: Local <br> Disadvantaged to <br> National Non | Gap: Local <br> Disadvantaged Non <br> Disadvantaged |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| England | -0.38 | 0.10 | -0.48 | -0.48 |
| East Midlands | -0.56 | 0.00 | -0.66 | -0.56 |
| East of England | -0.38 | 0.14 | -0.48 | -0.52 |
| London | -0.02 | 0.28 | -0.12 | -0.30 |
| North East | -0.52 | 0.02 | -0.62 | -0.54 |
| North West | -0.54 | 0.02 | -0.64 | -0.56 |
| South East | -0.47 | 0.14 | -0.57 | -0.61 |
| South West | -0.51 | 0.08 | -0.61 | -0.59 |
| West Midlands | -0.37 | 0.06 | -0.47 | -0.43 |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | -0.40 | 0.12 | -0.50 | -0.52 |
| Leeds | -0.48 | 0.15 | -0.58 | -0.63 |

Source: DFE Local Authority Interactive Tool October 2017

## Appendix 2 - Analysis of primary schools by pupil poverty levels

This analysis is intended to help understand Leeds primary schools and the characteristics of Leeds school's in relation to poverty levels. While helping in identifying schools for inquiry visits this is intended as an overview not an analysis of individual schools. The work was undertaken based on 2016 data given the point in the year when the analysis started and recognising the issues being looked at are long standing.

Primary Schools were considered in two groups with each group being divided into 5 quintile groups.

Schools ordered by the proportion of children living in areas in the 10\% most deprived nationally as defined in the 2015 Index of Multiple Deprivation.

| Quintile | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Range of pupils living in areas <br> in the 10\% most deprived | $68-95 \%$ | $24-65 \%$ | $5-24 \%$ | $1-5 \%$ | $0-1 \%$ |

2. A fifth of primary schools have over two-thirds to close to $100 \%$ of their pupils living in areas considered in the $10 \%$ most deprived nationally. Two-fifths of schools have five percent or less of their pupils living in such areas.
3. 

Schools ordered by levels of free school meal eligibility.

| Quintile | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Range of pupils eligible for <br> Free School Meals | $26-46 \%$ | $17-26 \%$ | $9-17 \%$ | $5-9 \%$ | $1-5 \%$ |

5. A fifth of primary schools have a quarter to a half of their pupils eligible for free school meals. At the other end a fifth have $5 \%$ or less.

Each group was then considered against the following factors looking at the averages for each group of schools and patterns related to deprivation:
School population 10. Size
11. Mobility

Pupil Characteristics • Free School Meal eligibility in last 6 years

- SEND
- English as an Additional Language
- Ethnicity

Attainment - Fisher
Family Trust 2016
Year 6 results • Average Scaled score Reading and Maths combined

The overall conclusion is that there are patterns in relation to deprivation but they are both complex and nuanced around the circumstance of each school. Patterns may only be evident when considering the least and most deprived groups with the three
middle groups being closer together (or two of them) other times there is a straightforward pattern that increases group by group. In all cases there are wide variations within each quintile group and patterns in averages should not obscure variations in individual schools.

- Schools with more pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds on average have higher pupil numbers, but there are wide variations.
- In the groups of schools with most pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds the percent of children with Special Education Need is $19-20 \%$. For the $2^{\text {nd }}$ quintile group this drops to $15 \%$. For the next 3 quintiles SEND rates range from $8-12 \%$.
- The relationship between ethnicity and deprivation varies slightly depending on if you are looking at IMD or FSM eligibility. This is similar to EAL. In both approaches the least deprived $20 \%$ is predominately White British. Home address being in an area of high deprivation shows a stronger connection with BAME heritage than FSM eligibility. Mixed heritage has the weakest relationship and Black heritage the strongest.
- The proportion of pupils with English as an additional language (EAL) is related to deprivation. This accepts $70 \%$ of schools have less than $20 \%$ of their pupils as EAL and some schools with high proportions of pupils from deprived backgrounds have only $3 \%$ of pupil with EAL. The connection with deprivation is stronger when looking at schools by IMD. When considering FSM eligibility it is the second group of schools not the most deprived that that have the highest EAL rates.
- FSM ever considers pupils who have been eligible for FSM in the last 6 years. As would be expected there is a very strong relationship with current FSM eligibility. The relationship with schools grouped by IMD home address is more nuanced, for example a few schools in the middle group of schools grouped by IMD have over $40 \%$ of pupils eligible for FSM in the last 6 years while some schools in the most disadvantaged group have less than $20 \%$ eligible in the last 6 years.
- There is a strong indication that schools serving communities with greater levels of deprivation are, at least on average, subject to more requests for in year moves. The relationship while evident in both approaches is greater when considering schools grouped by IMD criteria than by FSM eligibility.

School size based on reception to Year 6 classes.
While schools of all sizes exist in each quintile on average schools serving communities with higher levels of deprivation are larger. Schools with a quarter or more of their pupils from areas considered in the $10 \%$ most deprived are around 337 pupils while those with no or very few pupils from these areas on average have 247 pupils. The difference is similar when looking at FSM eligibility but less pronounced.

| Quintile | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools Grouped by pupils living in areas in the 10\% most deprived |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average School Size R-Y6 | 338 | 336 | 262 | 286 | 247 |
| Range of School Size R-Y6 | $113-633$ | $59-579$ | $175-454$ | $79-448$ | $86-630$ |
| Schools Grouped by pupils eligible for Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average School Size R-Y6 | 325 | 305 | 290 | 286 | 263 |
| Range of School Size R-Y6 | $137-564$ | $86-627$ | $59-633$ | $104-458$ | $105-630$ |




## Special Educational Needs and Disability Primary Schools

The proportion of pupils identified with a special educational need or disability follows a similar pattern when looking at schools grouped by pupils from 10\% IMD or by FSM eligibility. Although FSM entitlement has a stronger relationship than IMD. The schools with the greatest number of pupils either eligible for FSM or from homes in areas of high disadvantage have SEND percentages of 19/20\% this drops to $15 \%$ for the next quintile. For the next 3 quintiles there is more limited difference.

| Quintile | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools Grouped by pupils living in areas in the 10\% most deprived |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of pupils SEND | $19 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Range of SEND percentages | $5-42 \%$ | $2-36 \%$ | $3-23 \%$ | $0-19 \%$ | $2-21 \%$ |
| Schools Grouped by pupils eligible for Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of pupils SEND | $20 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Range of SEND percentages | $11-42 \%$ | $3-29 \%$ | $2-22 \%$ | $4-27 \%$ | $0-20 \%$ |

Schools SEND percentage by $10 \%$ IMD quintile


Schools SEND percentage by FSM eligibility quintile


## English as an additional language Primary Schools

The proportion of pupils with English as an additional language (EAL) is related to deprivation. This accepts $70 \%$ of schools have less than $20 \%$ of their pupils as EAL and $55 \%$ have less than $10 \%$. The connection is stronger when looking at schools by proportion of pupils living in communities in the $10 \%$ most deprived. When considering school FSM eligibility it is the second group (quintile) that has the highest EAL rates this might suggest further investigation of the relationship between the EAL population, mobility and FSM eligibility.

| Quintile |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools Grouped by pupils living in areas in the 10\% most deprived      <br> $\%$ of EAL pupils $46 \%$ $26 \%$ $18 \%$ $7 \%$ $3 \%$ <br> Range of EAL percentages $3-92 \%$ $3-65 \%$ $1-84 \%$ $0-27 \%$ $0-8 \%$ <br> Schools Grouped by pupils eligible for Free School Meals      <br> \% of EAL pupils $30 \%$ $34 \%$ $17 \%$ $10 \%$ $5 \%$ <br> Range of EAL percentages $3-76 \%$ $1-92 \%$ $1-84 \%$ $0-40 \%$ $0-18 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Schools EAL percentage by $10 \%$ IMD quintile



## Ethnicity Primary Schools

The relationship between ethnicity and deprivation varies slightly depending on if you are looking at IMD or FSM eligibility. This is similar to EAL. In both approaches the least deprived $20 \%$ is predominately White British. Home address being in an area in the $10 \%$ most deprived nationally shows a stronger connection with BAME heritage than FSM eligibility. Mixed heritage has the weakest relationship and Black heritage the strongest. Asian and European it is more mixed especially when looking at FSM eligibility. The ethnic make-up of neighbourhoods along with questions around employment status and benefit eligibility will influence these patterns and would need further investigation before stating any conclusions. In the three groups making up the $60 \%$ most deprived there is a wide spread in the ethnic make-up of individual school populations.

|  | Quintile | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ Schools Grouped by pupils living in areas in the 10\% most deprived |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $62 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| \% BAME | $37 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| \% White British | $23 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| \% Asian | $18 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| \% Black | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| \% Mixed | $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| \% West/East European | $7 \%$ | 5 |  |  |  |
| Schools Grouped by pupils eligible for Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% BAME | $44 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| \% White British | $55 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| \% Asian | $10 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| \% Black | $13 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| \% Mixed | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| \% West/East European | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |



FSM ever Primary Schools
FSM ever considers pupils who have been eligible for FSM in the last 6 years. As this would be another way to group schools it is not surprising that there is a strong relationship between schools grouped by IMD or current FSM eligibility. The latter being a very similar measure. The relationship with home addresses is more nuanced, for example a few schools in the middle group/quintile for children living in the $10 \%$ most deprived have over $40 \%$ of pupils eligible for FSM in the last 6 years while some schools with the greatest proportion of pupils living in area of $10 \%$ most deprived had less than 20\% eligible.

| Quintile | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools Grouped by pupils living in areas in the 10\% most deprived |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of pupils FSM 6 | $33 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Range of FSM 6 percentages | $15-52 \%$ | $6-44 \%$ | $2-42 \%$ | $1-24 \%$ | $1-22 \%$ |
| Schools Grouped by pupils eligible for Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of pupils FSM 6 | $39 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Range of FSM 6 \% | $29-52 \%$ | $18-29 \%$ | $9-21 \%$ | $5-11 \%$ | $1-6 \%$ |




## In-year moves Primary Schools

While acknowledging the provisional nature of this data there is a strong indication that schools serving communities with greater levels of deprivation are, at least on average, subject to more requests for in year moves. (Withdrawn or declined requests were not included in the numbers.) The relationship while evident in both approaches is again more overt when considering schools grouped by IMD criteria than by FSM eligibility.

| Quintile | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools Grouped by pupils living in areas in the $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ most deprived |  |  |  |  |  |
| In year moves | 2013 | 1071 | 745 | 707 | 415 |
| Schools Grouped by pupils eligible for Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |
| In year moves | 1712 | 1296 | 811 | 611 | 521 |

## 2016 Fisher Family Trust Measures Year 6

This section looks at two attainment measures for the 2016 year 6 cohorts. It is recognised that this was a year of significant change in national assessment. The percentage of children reaching the expected standard in reading, writing and maths is considered along with the average scaled score for each school for reading and maths, the later reflects all pupils who took the tests not just the proportion that reached the expected level.

Consideration is given to all pupils and then to the FSM 6 (ever) pupils, with the later only schools with 5 or more FSM 6 pupils in year 6 are included this reduces the schools involved to 177 from the 213 for schools that FFT has year 6 results for. This reduction is greatest in the least deprived quintile school groups.

When looking at the percentage of children reaching the expected standard there is an overall pattern of higher attainment that tracks with lower deprivation and FSM levels, this relationship is stronger when looking at FSM eligibility. However there is also a large spread in individual schools with all quintile groupings have a range of $59 \%$ points or higher between the highest and lowest achieving school in that group.

| 2016 Fisher Family Trust Measures |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quintile | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |  |
| Schools Grouped by pupils living in areas in the 10\% most deprived |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Range of \% achieving Expected <br> Standard Reading Writing and Maths all <br> pupils | $6-79 \%$ | $7-72 \%$ | $25-90 \%$ | $18-94 \%$ | $10-88 \%$ |  |
| Range of scaled scores (Eng \& maths) <br> all pupils 100=expected | $90-108$ | $95-107$ | $97-110$ | $98-110$ | $99-109$ |  |
| Number of schools with 5+ FSM6 pupils <br> in Y6 | 42 | 43 | 39 | 29 | 24 |  |
| Range of \% achieving Expected <br> Standard Reading Writing and Maths <br> FSM 6 (5+ pupils) | $5-68 \%$ | $4-75 \%$ | $0-89 \%$ | $14-86 \%$ | $13-$ |  |
| Range of scaled scores (Eng \& Maths) <br> FSM 6 (5+ pupils) 100=average | $89-108$ | $95-107$ | $94-108$ | $94-106$ | $91-107$ |  |
| Schools Grouped by pupils eligible for Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Range of \% achieving Expected <br> Standard Reading Writing and Maths all <br> pupils | $6-65 \%$ | $7-79 \%$ | $18-90 \%$ | $18-90 \%$ | $18-94 \%$ |  |
| Range of scaled score (Eng \& Maths) <br> all pupils 100=average | $90-108$ | $94-106$ | $98-110$ | $98-110$ | $98-110$ |  |
| Number of schools with 5+ FSM6 pupils <br> in Y6 | 43 | 43 | 40 | 33 | 18 |  |
| Range of \% achieving Expected <br> Standard Reading Writing and Maths <br> FSM 6 (5+ pupils) | $4-58 \%$ | $5-70 \%$ | $8-89 \%$ | $13-75 \%$ | $0-100 \%$ |  |
| Range of scaled scores (Eng \& Maths) <br> FSM 6 (5+ pupils) 100=average | $89-108$ | $94-104$ | $95-108$ | $94-107$ | $91-107$ |  |

When looking at FSM6 (ever) pupils there is a more mixed picture in part reflecting the smaller cohorts involved. It would be expected these cohorts would be larger in schools with more pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds, this may explain the slightly more concentrated range of results for these schools. The relationship of FSM eligibility with attainment is reflected in national studies such as the recent August 2017 the Education Policy Institute published - Closing the Gap - Trends in Educational Attainment and Disadvantage. Key conclusions arising from analysis of the period 2007 to 2016 were that disadvantaged pupils (eligible for free school meals in last 6 years) finish secondary school 19.2 months behind their peers. This increases with persistent disadvantage, pupils who were eligible for FSM for $80 \%$ or more of their time in school who have a wider gap of 24.3 months.

When looking at the range of scaled scores there is a broad spread of schools for all quintile groups both when considering all pupils and only FSM6 pupils. Accepting that the range of the all pupil group scores are more likely to have a higher top measure with the FSM6 groupings more likely to have a lower bottom measure. The ranges are largely consistent whether viewed by FSM eligibility or 10\% IMD residency.

The tables and graphs below show schools again grouped into quintiles by both IMD residency and FSM eligibility. This is then matched against quintile groupings for attainment measures. The tables shows, for example, that 6 schools where both in the highest group (20\%) of schools for attainment against the RWM measure and in the second group (20\%) for the percentage of their pupils living in areas in the $10 \%$ most deprived nationally.

On average results are stronger for schools with a lower proportion of children from deprived or disadvantaged backgrounds. At the most pronounced looking at FSM eligibility levels the 20\% of schools with the lowest FSM levels had 22 schools in the highest achieving group and one in the lowest achieving 20\% group. While the 20\% of schools with highest FSM levels had none in the highest achieving and 22 in the lowest achieving. When looking at only FSM 6 pupils the pattern remains but is weaker with more variation in which schools based on disadvantaged levels do well for these pupils. There are schools with high levels of disadvantage both FSM eligibility and IMD areas that do better that some schools with least disadvantage. Accepting that on average this is not the case. Levels of disadvantage may present challenges but in of themselves do not determine outcomes.

Schools grouped by \% of all pupils making expected standards in Reading, Writing \& Maths in 2016 and by \% living in 10\% most deprived

| Schools Grouped by Performance |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 6-33 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 33-44 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 44-53 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 53-66 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 66-94 \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools by \% of pupils living in areas 10\% most deprived |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 0-1\% | 4 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 12 |
| 4 | 1-5\% | 2 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 14 |
| 3 | 5\%-24\% | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 9 |
| 2 | 24\%-65\% | 10 | 13 | 10 | 4 | 6 |
| 1 | 68\%-95\% | 18 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 1 |

213 Schools

> \% of pupils reaching KS2 expected standard $(R, W, M)$ by $10 \%$ IMD quintile in 2016


Schools grouped by \% of all pupils making expected standards in Reading, Writing \& Maths in 2016 and by levels of FSM eligibility

| Schools Grouped <br> by Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 <br> $6-33 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 <br> $33-44 \%$ |  | 3 <br> $44-53 \%$ | 4 <br> $53-66 \%$ | 5 <br> $66-94 \%$ |  |  |
| 5 | $1-5 \%$ | 1 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 22 |
| 4 | $5-9 \%$ | 2 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 12 |
| 3 | $9-17 \%$ | 3 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 4 |
| 2 | $17-26 \%$ | 14 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 4 |
| 1 | $26-46 \%$ | 22 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 0 |

213 Schools


Schools grouped by \% of FSM6 pupils making expected standards in Reading, Writing \& Maths in 2016 and by \% living in 10\% most deprived

| Schools Grouped <br> by Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 <br> Schools by \% of pupils living in areas 10\% most deprived |  | 2 <br> $17-27 \%$ <br> $27-36 \%$ | 4 <br> $38-48 \%$ | 5 <br> $50-100 \%$ |  |  |
| 5 | $0-1 \%$ | 5 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 7 |
| 4 | $1-5 \%$ | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3 | $5 \%-24 \%$ | 9 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 7 |
| 2 | $24 \%-65 \%$ | 5 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 9 |
| 1 | $68 \%-95 \%$ | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 5 |

177 Schools - removed those with less than 5 FSM6 pupils

$$
\text { \% of FSM } 6 \text { pupils reaching KS2 expected level (R,W,M) }
$$ by 10\% IMD quintile in 2016



Schools grouped by \% of FSM6 pupils making expected standards in Reading, Writing \& Maths in 2016 and by levels of FSM eligibility

| Schools Grouped <br> by Performance |  | 1 <br> $0-17 \%$ | 2 <br> $17-27 \%$ | 3 <br> $27-36 \%$ | 4 <br> $38-48 \%$ | 5 <br> $50-100 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools by percent of children eligible for Free School Meals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | $1-5 \%$ | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | $5-9 \%$ | 3 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 3 | $9-17 \%$ | 7 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 7 |
| 2 | $17-26 \%$ | 9 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| 1 | $26-46 \%$ | 11 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 4 |

177 Schools - removed those with less than 5 FSM6 pupils


## Criteria Used in Quintile Analysis

## Groups

- Schools ordered by the proportion of children living in areas considered in the $10 \%$ most deprived nationally.
- Schools ordered by levels of free school meal eligibility.

Criteria

| School | School Name <br> School Cluster <br> School Mobility In Year Moves | Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Size | Pupils on roll <br> Pupils on roll reception to Year 6 | 2016 January School Census |
| SEND | Numbers and percentages: <br> - SEN Support <br> - Education Health and Care Plans <br> - Combined | 2016 January School Census |
| English as an Additional Language | Numbers and percentages of pupils with: <br> - English or believed to be English <br> - English as additional language <br> - Unknown/ information not obtained | 2016 January <br> School Census |
| Index of multiple deprivation | Numbers and percentages of pupils with: <br> - Living in areas $3 \%$ most deprived <br> - Living in areas $10 \%$ most deprived <br> - Living in areas $20 \%$ most deprived | 2016 January School Census matched to Index of Multiple Deprivation |
| Ethnicity | Numbers and percentages of pupils with: <br> - Asian <br> - Black <br> - Mixed <br> - Chinese <br> - Other Ethnicity <br> - White British <br> - White Eastern/Western European <br> - White Other <br> - BAME | 2016 January <br> School Census |
| Free School Meal eligibility | Numbers and percentages of pupils: <br> - Non Free School Meals <br> - In receipt of FSM <br> - Pupils FSM Ever (FSM6) | 2016 January School Census |
| Fisher Family Trust 2016 Year 6 results | Pupils Y6 <br> - \% Expected standard+ (Re, Wr, Ma) <br> - Average Scaled Score (Re, Ma) <br> Pupils FSM6 <br> - \% Expected standard+ (Re, Wr, Ma) <br> - Average Scaled Score (Re, Ma) <br> Pupils FSM <br> - \% Expected standard+ (Re, Wr, Ma) <br> - Average Scaled Score (Re, Ma) | FFT Aspire (Fisher Family Trust) |

## Appendix 3 Child Poverty and Learning Outcomes: Key Stage Analysis.

## 2016 key stage analysis

This section considers the relationship between attainment and child poverty. It is based on 2016 results and considers FSM eligibility and deprivation in relation to home address. This reinforces that there is a relationship and that Leeds pupils considered non-disadvantaged generally perform in line or close to national comparators where disadvantaged pupils do not. The analysis considers the impact of other characteristics highlighting again that there is not a single pattern or experience. The relationship between clusters, poverty and attainment again reinforces the relationship but also shows that while heavily shaping outcomes, it is not a perfect correlation and other pupil characteristics and school performance are relevant.

## KS2 2017 FFT provisional analysis

Note: 2015 data on the line charts below relates to notional outcomes as the 2015 KS2 cohort took assessment under the old National Curriculum where outcomes were expressed in NC levels. Data for 2016 and 2017 is based on assessment under the reformed National Curriculum.

Outcomes for the non-disadvantaged cohort in Leeds (here designated 'School Not FSM6' and shown in blue) are broadly in line with the national non-FSM6 cohort and for progress they are identical in both 2016 and 2017. Outcomes for the Leeds FSM6 group are considerably lower. No value is shown for national FSM6, as both schools and LAs are expected by Ofsted to use the national other (non-disadvantaged) cohort as the appropriate comparator for performance. Comparing to the FSM6 group nationally is seen by inspectors as indicative of a school not being sufficiently aspirational for their FSM6 cohort.

The progress gap chart and the data in the table shows how the FSM6 group's progress compares within each characteristic. For example among lower attainers (this means those with low prior attainment, not their KS2 outcomes), SEN support pupils and those with EHCP, both FSM6 and non-FSM6 pupils in those groups made less progress than similar pupils nationally. Among all but one other group (non white), the FSM6 pupils within each characteristic had made less progress than similar pupils nationally, where the non-FSM6 Leeds pupils had made more progress. The not white group is the only group where the FSM6 pupils had a zero progress score, meaning that their progress was in line with pupils nationally who had similar starting points.

Note: that the progress measure shown here is FFT Aspire's VA model for combined reading, writing and maths outcomes, this is not the same as the DfE's single subject KS1-2 value added model. The Aspire model shows the percentage point difference between outcomes for a given group and the mean for pupils nationally that had the same starting KS1 starting points.

## KS4 2017 FFT provisional analysis

Very similar patterns are evident at KS4 as in KS2. The data shown below is for 2016 as no KS4 data for 2017 is available at the time of writing. It should be noted that while KS4 assessment from 2016 is not comparable with 2017 , the issues about outcomes for pupil groups will in all likelihood be the same.

For Attainment 8, outcomes for Leeds non-FSM6 and national non-FSM6 are in line, and Progress 8 scores in 2016 were on average higher for Leeds non-FSM6 pupils than the national non-FSM6 mean. However the Leeds FSM6 cohort had average Progress 8 scores of -0.47 , meaning that they scored on average half a grade less across all their Attainment 8 subjects compared to similar pupils with the same KS2 prior attainment.

The bar chart and table on the following pages show that Progress 8 scores were negative for all FSM6 groups, while they were only negative for two of the non FSM6 groups: SEN support and EHCPs. The non-white FSM6 group was the closest to a zero Progress 8 score, with a mean Progress 8 result of -0.1.

The table also shows within each characteristic group proportionally how many are FSM6. Overall at the end of KS4 about a third of the cohort are FSM6, but among some groups this is very different. Almost half of the group with low prior attainment are FSM6, and more than half of the SEN support and EHCP groups are FSM6. Among the non-FSM6 group, there is a fairly even split of high, middle and low prior attainers, but more than half of the FSM6 group have low prior attainment.

## Disadvantaged pupils

LA KS2 performance for disadvantaged pupils 2017

Attainment: \% Expected standard+ $(\mathrm{Re}, \mathrm{Wr}, \mathrm{Ma})$


Progress: \% Expected standard+ (Re, Wr, Ma)


Progress gap



## Disadvantaged pupils

LA KS4 performance for disadvantaged pupils 2016

Attainment: Attainment 8 (Overall)


Progress: Progress 8 (Overall)


Progress gap

Progress 8 (Overall)



## Outcomes by home address and Index of Multiple Deprivation

There is a close inverse correlation between the area a child lives in terms of how deprived (IMD decile) and the proportion reaching the expected standard in reading, writing and maths. In 2016 30.5\% of pupils sitting KS2 in Leeds reside within the $10 \%$ most deprived areas nationally. The proportion of pupils reaching the expected standard in these localities is just over one third compared to $48 \%$ for the city overall and two-thirds of those living in the least deprived reaching the expected standard. Children living in areas in the 10-40\% most deprived shared similar results of 4045\%.

Table: 2016 KS2 -Pupils reaching the expected standard in reading, writing and maths by IMD Decile

| IMD Decile | Has KS2 pupil reached the expected standard in reading test, writing TA and maths test? |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No Yes |  |  | \% Yes | Rank |
| 1 | 1655 | 884 | 2539 | 34.8\% | 10 |
| 2 | 446 | 308 | 754 | 40.8\% | 9 |
| 3 | 358 | 299 | 657 | 45.5\% | 7 |
| 4 | 282 | 213 | 495 | 43.0\% | 8 |
| 5 | 265 | 290 | 555 | 52.3\% | 6 |
| 6 | 276 | 355 | 631 | 56.3\% | 5 |
| 7 | 341 | 440 | 781 | 56.3\% | 4 |
| 8 | 266 | 390 | 656 | 59.5\% | 3 |
| 9 | 217 | 336 | 553 | 60.8\% | 2 |
| 10 | 211 | 437 | 648 | 67.4\% | 1 |
| Missing Pcd or OOA | 30 | 15 | 45 | 33.3\% |  |
| Total | 4347 | 3967 | 8314 | 47.7\% |  |
| KS2 2016 Confirmed Data - Source: Key to Success January 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |

Again there is a clear correlation between IMD decile and the proportion of young people reaching the expected standard. $29.1 \%$ of pupils in 2016 who sat KS4 in Leeds reside within the $10 \%$ most deprived areas nationally. The proportion of pupils reaching the expected standard in English and maths in these localities is just over $40 \%$ (this is $70 \%$ of the Leeds average). In the least deprived decile there are around a quarter the number of young people as in the most deprived decile. The proportion of this least deprived group achieving the expected level was almost twice the most deprived group.

Table: KS4 2016 Pupils achieving English and Maths with grade A* to C by IMD Decile

|  | Did pupil achieve E+M A*-C? |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | No | Yes | Total | \% Yes | Rank |  |
|  | 1 | 1253 | 931 | 2184 | $42.6 \%$ | 10 |
|  | 2 | 320 | 367 | 687 | $53.4 \%$ | 9 |
|  | 3 | 269 | 354 | 623 | $56.8 \%$ | 7 |
|  | 4 | 209 | 273 | 482 | $56.6 \%$ | 8 |
|  | 5 | 172 | 313 | 485 | $64.5 \%$ | 6 |
|  | 6 | 178 | 383 | 561 | $68.3 \%$ | 5 |
|  | 7 | 168 | 485 | 653 | $74.3 \%$ | 3 |
|  | 8 | 189 | 482 | 671 | $71.8 \%$ | 4 |
|  | 9 | 122 | 401 | 523 | $76.7 \%$ | 2 |
|  | 10 | 80 | 469 | 549 | $85.4 \%$ | 1 |
| Incorrect Pcd or OOA |  | 69 | 20 | 89 | $22.5 \%$ |  |
| Total |  | 3029 | 4478 | 7507 | $59.7 \%$ |  |

KS4 2016 Confirmed Data - Source: Key to Success January 2017
The table on the following page considers pupils by the children's cluster they live in. It also takes the national Index of Multiple Deprivation, gives and average deprivation percentage for each cluster, by which the clusters are then ranked.

This shows on average the Inner East cluster can be considered around the 6.7\% most deprived area nationally while the EPOS cluster is $79.1 \%$ most deprived. This shows some correlation between deprivation ranking and the percent of children reaching national expectations. However it is far from a direct relationship. Patterns of where a child lives and where they go to school will be relevant, the figures do not necessarily apply to the schools in the cluster, especially if pupils travel from outside the cluster to the school.

The last pages show Leeds divided into Lower Super Output areas. The 40 least and most deprived LSOAs are mapped. Also mapped are the highest and lowest performing LSOAs in terms of 2016 headline results for Key Stage 2 and 4 by home address of pupils. These are small cohorts in each LSOA with the potential for year on year variation. An exact match should therefore not be expected. The maps reinforce both the relationship between deprivation / poverty and outcomes and that this as in the clusters is above is not an exact relationship.

Table 2016 Key Stage headline results by cluster and deprivation

|  |  |  | Has KS2 pupil reached the expected standard? |  |  | Did KS4 pupil achieve E+M A*C? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cluster | Average \% IMD | Av \% IMD Rank | Total | \% Yes | Rank | Total | \% Yes | Rank |
| Inner East | 6.7\% | 1 | 595 | 34.6\% | 22 | 514 | 47.9\% | 21 |
| J.E.S.S. | 9.2\% | 2 | 541 | 36.8\% | 21 | 406 | 45.1\% | 23 |
| Beeston, Cottingley and Middleton | 17.3\% | 3 | 425 | 38.8\% | 19 | 363 | 54.5\% | 16 |
| ACES | 17.9\% | 4 | 252 | 48.8\% | 13 | 234 | 50.0\% | 17 |
| Bramley | 18.0\% | 5 | 374 | 32.6\% | 23 | 339 | 45.7\% | 22 |
| 2gether | 19.7\% | 6 | 604 | 39.1\% | 18 | 544 | 49.3\% | 18 |
| Seacroft Manston | 20.5\% | 7 | 497 | 49.1\% | 11 | 485 | 49.1\% | 19 |
| OPEN XS | 22.9\% | 8 | 123 | 37.4\% | 20 | 112 | 48.2\% | 20 |
| Farnley | 24.0\% | 9 | 217 | 41.9\% | 17 | 158 | 57.6\% | 14 |
| Templenewsam Halton | 35.8\% | 10 | 326 | 52.5\% | 7 | 282 | 55.3\% | 15 |
| Inner NW Hub | 38.8\% | 11 | 284 | 54.6\% | 6 | 227 | 58.6\% | 12 |
| Morley | 48.3\% | 12 | 418 | 49.0\% | 12 | 354 | 69.5\% | 8 |
| Pudsey | 51.3\% | 13 | 514 | 52.1\% | 8 | 409 | 59.7\% | 11 |
| Rothwell | 51.7\% | 14 | 343 | 49.9\% | 10 | 271 | 67.2\% | 10 |
| Brigshaw | 53.4\% | 15 | 249 | 47.0\% | 14 | 254 | 58.3\% | 13 |
| ESNW | 57.3\% | 16 | 219 | 57.5\% | 5 | 204 | 72.1\% | 5 |
| Ardsley \& Tingley | 57.8\% | 17 | 164 | 46.3\% | 16 | 173 | 85.0\% | 1 |
| ARM | 62.5\% | 18 | 619 | 58.6\% | 3 | 514 | 78.6\% | 3 |
| Garforth | 68.2\% | 19 | 184 | 46.7\% | 15 | 209 | 74.6\% | 4 |
| Aireborough | 69.9\% | 20 | 368 | 62.8\% | 2 | 345 | 71.3\% | 6 |
| Horsforth | 72.3\% | 21 | 213 | 66.7\% | 1 | 166 | 78.9\% | 2 |
| Otley/Pool/Bramhope | 73.5\% | 22 | 212 | 50.9\% | 9 | 186 | 68.8\% | 9 |
| EPOS | 79.1\% | 23 | 324 | 58.3\% | 4 | 197 | 71.1\% | 7 |
| Out of Area |  |  | 249 | 51.0\% |  | 561 | 57.0\% |  |
| Total |  |  | 8314 | 47.7\% |  | 7507 | 59.7\% |  |

KS2 \& KS4 2016 Confirmed Data - Source: Key to Success January 2017

The 40 least deprived LSOAs in Leeds (Index of multiple deprivation 2015)
Key:

The 40 mostdeprived LSOAs in Leeds (Index of multiple deprivation 2015)


The 40 LSOAs where children achieved the highest KS2 outcomes (2015-16 academic year).


The 40 LSOAs where children achieved the lowest KS2 outcomes (2015-16 academic year).


The 40 LSOAs where children achieved the highest GCSE outcomes (2015-16 academic year).


The 40 LSOAs where children achieved the lowest GCSE outcomes (2015-16 academic year).


## Appendix 4 Demographics

This section is based on analysis of the January 2017 school census and considers the number of school age children and young people living in poverty, poverty levels and localities and the how other factors are influenced by poverty. It may update previous information presented to scrutiny based on the 2016 census. It considers:

- Free School Meal (FSM)eligibility.
- School age children by home address in relation to the index of multiple deprivation (IMD).
FSM and IMD are looked at by cluster. 10 of 23 clusters are significantly below the average level of deprivation for the city, with 9 quite a lot below the average.


## Free school meal eligibility

Free school meal (FSM) eligibility is often used as a key deprivation indicator. In Leeds, there were 18,655 pupils of statutory school age eligible for FSM at January Census 2017. By phase of education this was 11,888 for primary age pupils ( $17.7 \%$ of the primary cohort) and 6365 for secondary pupils (16.5\%). There is a higher rate of eligibility within special establishments with $39.4 \%$ of children and young people in this setting being eligible.

Table 3.1: Number and percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals,2012-2017

|  | Number of cyp FSM eligible |  |  |  |  |  | \% FSM of cyp FSM eligible |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Primary | 12574 | 13946 | 12854 | 12359 | 11763 | 11888 | 22.0 | 23.7 | 21.2 | 19.6 | 18.0 | 17.7 |
| Secondary | 7498 | 8092 | 7104 | 6681 | 6225 | 6365 | 19.5 | 21.4 | 18.9 | 17.8 | 16.5 | 16.5 |
| Special | 244 | 290 | 335 | 340 | 365 | 402 | 35.6 | 38.7 | 42.7 | 42.0 | 40.5 | 39.4 |
| Pru |  |  | 13 | 20 | 20 |  |  |  | 48.1 | 55.6 | 50.0 |  |
| Leeds Total | 20316 | 22328 | 20306 | 19400 | 18373 | 18655 | 21.1 | 25.8 | 22.5 | 18.7 | 17.7 | 17.5 |

Source: January school census 2017
The proportion of those children and young people who are FSM eligible in Leeds is following a similar trajectory to national FSM eligibility and has been steadily decreasing since 2013. The assumption is that changing eligibility not reducing need explains the decline. Leeds has a higher proportion of children and young people who are eligible for FSM compared to national.

Chart: \% of primary and secondary phase pupils eligible for free school meals


[^0]The maps on the following page reflect free school meal eligibility by cluster. The tables following these look at the relationship by cluster of free school meal eligibility and IMD ranking. Clusters have been ranked in terms of their average IMD score. This is then followed by scatter plots looking at LSOAs assessed by FSM eligibility and IMD, this relates to appendix 2 and again reflects a correlation but also that there is not one set pattern and there can be variations in high numbers of pupils from highly deprived areas and high proportions of FSM eligible.

## Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) release a national measure of deprivation by Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) called the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). This index ranks LSOAs in order of deprivation; with common measures being the $20 \%$, $10 \%$ or $3 \%$ most deprived nationally. Leeds is ranked 25 out of 152 upper tier local authorities in terms of the proportion of LSOAs ranked in the most deprived $10 \%$ nationally, with 105 neighbourhoods (22\% of all Leeds neighbourhoods). Whilst 22\% of the neighbourhoods in Leeds were in those $10 \%$ most deprived LSOA's nationally; that equated to $31 \%$ of Leeds statutory school aged pupils or 33,640 children and young people. The charts below describe the number of primary and secondary phase pupils resident in each decile. There are very similar proportions of primary and secondary pupils living in the $10 \%$ most deprived communities, though numerically there are almost twice as many primary aged pupils $(21,468)$ than secondary $(12,172)$.

Charts: Number of pupils by IMD decile of residence

> primary secondary


[^1]Percentage of primary and secondary pupils eligible for free school meals by cluster


FSM eligibility by cluster, with red highlighting those clusters with FSM eligibility over $30 \%$. Inner East and Open XS have the highest eligibility rates for primary aged children, with Bramley, ACES, JESS and Beeston, Cottingley and Middleton all having eligibility rates of between $25 \%-30 \%$. Those with least eligibility are concentrated in the North and North East of the city. For secondary provision, the greatest eligibility rates are again central clusters, with JESS, Inner East, Open XS and ACES all having eligibility rates of between $25 \%$ $30 \%$.

Average IMD percentage rank by cluster


Averaging the IMD \% Rank for all statutoryaged pupils by Cluster begins to show a picture of the deprivation across the city. There are 10 Clusters in Leeds that are significantly below the average level of deprivation for the city. The 9 highlighted stand out as quite a lot below that average. For ease of comparison, this will remain the order of Clusters throughout this analysis.

10 clusters significantly below the average level of deprivation in Leeds are:

1. Inner East
2. JESS
3. Beeston, Cottingley and Middleton
4. ACES
5. Bramley
6. 2gether
7. Seacroft Manston
8. Open XS
9. Farnley
10. Templenewsam Halton
[^2]Primary and secondary phase average IMD percentage rank and free school meal eligibility by cluster


Source: January school census 2017 and Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015

The average IMD rank and percentage FSM eligible by cluster. The charts indicate that as FSM eligibility decreases, the proportion living in the least deprived communities increases. This is true for both primary and secondary phase.

Percentage IMD rank v primary and secondary phase free school meal eligibility by LSOA


Source: January school census 2017 and Index Multiple Deprivation 2015
IMD rank by primary and secondary FSM indicate a strong correlation between FSM eligibility and IMD ranking. At the same time, it shows that there are outliers, with some LSOAs in the least $30 \%$ deprived having high eligibility rates and some in the most $30 \%$ deprived having no FSM eligibility.

Average IMD percentage rank by cluster.


This map shows the IMD average percent rank by Cluster; and highlights the 9 Clusters with an average percent rank below 30\%. Inner East and JESS stand out as having most deprived LSOAs, with both clusters averaging an IMD rank of less than 10.
The remainder of this report will continue to explore IMD in the context of each section.

Pupil density per km² - Primary and Secondary phases


These maps detail pupil density by LSOA, with the deeper shades highlighting those LSOAs with very dense populations of pupils. The picture is similar for both Primary and Secondary phases. Inner East and 2gether stand out as clusters containing localities with the greatest pupil density; with pockets also in JESS, Beeston, Cottingley and Middleton, ACES and Bramley. The clusters towards the edges of the city generally have localities with less dense pupil populations.

Comparing the IMD deprivation of the clusters with the pupil population displayed above begins to show that the most deprived Clusters typically have the most dense pupil population At a cluster level, these show a strong negative correlation.

## Special Educational Need and Disability

Plotting the percentage SEND in a cluster (on the secondary axis) against the average \% IMD by Cluster shows some relationship. The chart below shows primary phase pupils only, and statistically there is a very strong inverse correlation.

Average IMD Percent rank v percent Total SEND pupils by cluster


Source: January census 2017 \& ONS IMD 2015
In order to see whether there were any significant differences in deprivation between primary needs the relative IMD-based deprivation of Primary-phase pupils were compared by SEND Primary Need. The analysis shows that Moderate Learning Difficulty (MLD); Other difficulty/disorder (OTH); Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH); Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN); and Severe Learning Difficulty (SLD) pupils are all significantly more deprived than the city average. The remaining Primary needs are not significantly different to the city average deprivation ("NULL" is non-SEND pupils).

## City-wide summary

Bringing all the information above together provides an interesting overview. Using an index is a good way of comparing areas. In the table below an index score of a 100 means the proportion is the same as the city average; while an index of 50 is half, and an index of 200 is double. The difference between the nine most deprived Clusters and the rest of the city is quite clear. Generalising somewhat, these nine clusters have the most dense population of pupils, the highest rates of Free School Meals, the highest rates of new arrivals, and the highest proportions of BAME, EAL and SEND pupils.

Table 8.1: Cluster summary table

| Cluster | IMD <br> Av <br> Rank IMD <br> Perc Rank | No. of Pupils | Cluster <br> Area <br> $\left(\mathrm{km}^{2}\right)$ | Pupil Density per km ${ }^{2}$ | Rank <br> Density | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { FSM } \\ & \text { Pri } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% <br> FSM <br> Pri <br> Index | \% <br> FSM <br> Sec | \% <br> FSM <br> Sec <br> Index | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { NTC } & \\ \text { Pri } & \text { I } \\ \text { Phase } & \text { I } \\ \text { Exc R } & \mathrm{P} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | NTC <br> Index <br> Pri | NTC <br> Sec <br> Phase | NTC <br> Index <br> Sec | $\begin{aligned} & \% \\ & \text { BME } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% <br> BME <br> Index |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% EAL } \\ & \text { Index } \end{aligned}$ | \% <br> SEND <br> Pri | \% <br> SEND <br> Index <br> Pri | \% <br> SEND <br> Sec | \% <br> SEND <br> Index <br> Sec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inner East | 7\% 1 | 8,302 | 9 | 964 | 2 | 33\% | 184 | 30\% | 176 | 7\% | 205 | 6\% | 224 | 64\% | 194 | 43\% | 226 | 18\% | 122 | 15\% | 114 |
| J.E.S.S. | 9\% 2 | 7,072 | 16 | 441 | 7 | 30\% | 167 | 29\% | 174 | 5\% | 152 | 5\% | 191 | 53\% | 158 | 38\% | 200 | 21\% | 142 | 17\% | 132 |
| Beeston, Cottingley and Middleton | 17\% 3 | 5,405 | 12 | 454 | 6 | 25\% | 142 | 23\% | 139 | 3\% | 81 | 3\% | 102 | 37\% | 111 | 23\% | 123 | 22\% | 148 | 14\% | 107 |
| ACES | 18\% | 3,355 | 7 | 487 | 5 | 28\% | 156 | 25\% | 149 | 3\% | 97 | 3\% | 114 | 38\% | 114 | 28\% | 145 | 22\% | 146 | 13\% | 97 |
| Bramley | 18\% | 5,007 | 9 | 551 | 3 | 26\% | 148 | 24\% | 143 | 1\% | 41 | 2\% | 66 | 19\% | 58 | 10\% | 52 | 14\% | 93 | 17\% | 126 |
| 2gether | 20\% | 8,031 | 8 | 992 | 1 | 19\% | 108 | 20\% | 120 | 8\% | 243 | 7\% | 260 | 78\% | 235 | 49\% | 255 | 16\% | 109 | 19\% | 141 |
| Seacroft Manston | 20\% | 6,614 | 16 | 406 | 8 | 23\% | 131 | 23\% | 138 | 2\% | 48 | 1\% | 41 | 19\% | 56 | 7\% | 37 | 19\% | 130 | 15\% | 117 |
| OPEN XS | 23\% 8 | 2,174 | 4 | 505 | 4 | 32\% | 182 | 30\% | 178 | 7\% | 211 | 6\% | 245 | 87\% | 261 | 64\% | 336 | 16\% | 106 | 17\% | 132 |
| Farnley | 24\% $\quad 9$ | 2,274 | 10 | 222 | 15 | 25\% | 139 | 20\% | 117 | 2\% | 74 | 1\% | 48 | 15\% | 45 | 6\% | 30 | 17\% | 111 | 9\% | 72 |
| Templenewsam Halton | 36\% 10 | 3,717 | 21 | 181 | 16 | 21\% | 119 | 18\% | 108 | 1\% | 46 | 1\% | 41 | 22\% | 67 | 11\% | 59 | 17\% | 116 | 12\% | 89 |
| Inner NW Hub | 39\% 11 | 3,655 | 12 | 312 | 10 | 22\% | 121 | 20\% | 120 | 4\% | 135 | 3\% | 131 | 48\% | 145 | 28\% | 147 | 14\% | 94 | 14\% | 105 |
| Morley | 48\% 12 | 5,252 | 23 | 228 | 14 | 11\% | 62 | 10\% | 60 | 2\% | 57 | 1\% | 34 | 11\% | 34 | 4\% | 20 | 11\% | 75 | 6\% | 45 |
| Pudsey | 51\% 13 | 6,489 | 23 | 283 | 11 | 9\% | 53 | 11\% | 68 | 2\% | 54 | 1\% | 51 | 19\% | 57 | 9\% | 48 | 12\% | 78 | 11\% | 82 |
| Rothwell | 52\% 14 | 4,086 | 26 | 155 | 18 | 12\% | 70 | 12\% | 73 | 1\% | 34 | 0\% | 17 | 8\% | 25 | 3\% | 13 | 11\% | 73 | 14\% | 105 |
| Brigshaw | 53\% 15 | 3,309 | 41 | 80 | 20 | 10\% | 56 | 10\% | 61 | 2\% | 47 | 1\% | 27 | 5\% | 16 | 1\% | 8 | 12\% | 83 | 15\% | 114 |
| ESNW | 57\% 16 | 2,959 | 12 | 243 | 13 | 11\% | 61 | 13\% | 76 | 3\% | 80 | 2\% | 80 | 29\% | 88 | 15\% | 80 | 11\% | 74 | 11\% | 80 |
| Ardsley \& Tingley | 58\% 17 | 2,148 | 14 | 152 | 19 | 12\% | 67 | 9\% | 56 | 2\% | 71 | 0\% | 11 | 10\% | 29 | 3\% | 15 | 10\% | 69 | 8\% | 63 |
| ARM | 62\% 18 | 7,667 | 30 | 253 | 12 | 8\% | 44 | 9\% | 54 | 3\% | 88 | 2\% | 80 | 50\% | 152 | 22\% | 113 | 10\% | 64 | 12\% | 87 |
| Garforth | 68\% 19 | 2,307 | 38 | 61 | 21 | 7\% | 37 | 5\% | 30 | 1\% | 41 | 1\% | 21 | 7\% | 21 | 2\% | 11 | 15\% | 99 | 14\% | 106 |
| Aireborough | 70\% 20 | 4,590 | 28 | 166 | 17 | 6\% | 35 | 5\% | 32 | 2\% | 58 | 1\% | 47 | 9\% | 26 | 3\% | 16 | 11\% | 77 | 10\% | 79 |
| Horsforth | 72\% 21 | 2,575 | 7 | 350 | 9 | 6\% | 32 | 7\% | 42 | 1\% | 27 | 1\% | 52 | 16\% | 47 | 5\% | 26 | 12\% | 80 | 9\% | 70 |
| Otley/Pool/Bramhope | 74\% 22 | 2,416 | 41 | 59 | 22 | 5\% | 28 | 5\% | 31 | 2\% | 65 | 1\% | 44 | 8\% | 23 | 2\% | 9 | 12\% | 83 | 10\% | 79 |
| EPOS | 79\% 23 | 3,356 | 144 | 23 | 23 | 4\% | 20 | 7\% | 40 | 3\% | 97 | 2\% | 96 | 10\% | 29 | 3\% | 13 | 10\% | 65 | 13\% | 98 |
| Total | 38\% | 102,760 | 552 | 186 |  | 18\% | 100 | 17\% | 100 | 3\% | 100 | 3\% | 100 | 33\% | 100 | 19\% | 100 | 15\% | 100 | 13\% | 100 |
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[^0]:    Source: January school census 2017

[^1]:    Source: January school census 2017 and Index Multiple Deprivation 2015

[^2]:    Source: January school census 2017 and Index Multiple Deprivation 2015

