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## SUBJECT: Annex 1 - Overview of 2007 performance at KS3 \& KS4

## 1 KEY STAGE 3

### 1.1 Key Stage 3 Trends and Comparisons

2005-2007 Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 + at Key Stage 3

| \% pupils achieving level 5+ | 2005 |  |  | 2006 |  |  | 2007 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | Nat | Stat Neigh* | Leeds | Nat | Stat Neigh* | Leeds | Nat | Stat Neigh* |
| English | 70 | 74 | 72 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 74 | 72 |
| Mathematics | 70 | 74 | 73 | 75 | 77 | 75 | 74 | 76 | 75 |
| Science | 65 | 70 | 68 | 69 | 72 | 72 | 70 | 73 | 72 |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
1.1. The percentage of pupils achieving level 5 or above improved for English and 1 science, but dropped by $1 \%$ for maths. Performance in Leeds is $2-3 \%$ below national for each core subject in 2007, performance is in line with statistical neighbours for English.

2005-2007 Percentage of pupils achieving Level $6+$ at Key Stage 3

| \% pupils achieving level 5+ | 2005 |  |  | 2006 |  |  | 2007 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | Nat | Stat Neigh* | Leeds | Nat | Stat Neigh* | Leeds | Nat | Stat Neigh* |
| English | 31 | 34 | 31 | 32 | 34 | 31 | 30 | 32 | 29 |
| Mathematics | 49 | 53 | 50 | 56 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 56 | 53 |
| Science | 33 | 37 | 33 | 39 | 41 | 38 | 37 | 41 | 37 |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
1.1. The percentage of pupils achieving a level 6 or above dropped by 2 percentage points 2 in each core subject in 2007, drops were also seen nationally and in statistical neighbours. The gap to national performance now stands at 2\% in English, 2\% in maths and $4 \%$ in science. Performance is better than in statistical neighbours for English and maths and the same for science.

| \% Level 5+ |  | 2005 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | gender | Leeds | Nat | Leeds | Nat | Leeds | Nat |
| English | Girls | 76 | 80 | 76 | 80 | 78 | 80 |
|  | Boys | 64 | 67 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 |
| Maths | Girls | 70 | 74 | 75 | 77 | 73 | 76 |
|  | Boys | 71 | 73 | 75 | 76 | 74 | 75 |
| Science | Girls | 65 | 70 | 69 | 73 | 69 | 73 |
|  | Boys | 66 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 70 | 72 |

1.1. The gap in performance between girls and boys in minimal for maths and science, but 3 boys have a percentage achieving level 5 significantly lower than girls for English, the same as the national pattern. In 2007 the gap in attainment for English is smaller in Leeds than nationally

### 1.2 Key Stage 3 Trajectories


1.2. Performance in English is still below school expectations and FFT ' $B$ ' estimates.

1 However, the gap to FFT ' $B$ ' estimate has reduced to 0.8 percentage points in 2007.

1.2. Despite the small drop in percentage level 5 s in maths in 2007, performance is still 2 above the FFT 'B' estimate. Performance in 2007 was in line with the school
aggregated targets.

| KS3 5+ Science Actuals, Targets and Projections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 | $\square$ - $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | A… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| $\longrightarrow$ Actual | 62 | 64 | 63 | 62 | 66 | 69 | 70 |  |  |
| $\cdots$ - - - FFT Estimate Type B |  |  |  | 73 | 74 | 70.2 | 70.5 | 70.9 | 74 |
| -- FFT Estimate Type D |  |  | 76.5 | 77.3 | 75.4 | 74.7 | 74.8 | 75.4 | 77 |
| - Agreed Target |  |  |  | 70 | 76 | 71 | 72 | 74.8 |  |

1.2. Performance in science is still below school expectations and FFT ' $B$ ' estimates, 3 although the gap to FFT 'B' reduced to 0.5\% in 2007.

1.2. ICT performance is below school expectations, and it should be noted that the 4 expectations of schools have fallen by $5 \%$ for the 2007 cohort. This may well be due to more realistic target setting practices that will result in engagement by subject teachers and pupils and result in the gap continuing to close but attainment levels continuing to rise.

### 1.3 Floor targets

1.3.1 The 2008 floor targets at Key Stage 3 are described as the number of schools where less than $50 \%$ of pupils achieve a level 5 or better in all three core subjects. These pupils are deemed less likely to achieve 5+A*-C at KS4 two year later. The new floor target for Key Stage 3 is $50 \%$ or more pupils achieving a level 5 or above in English and maths.

Numbers and percentages of schools below Key Stage 3 floor targets

|  | $<50 \%$ level 5+ core subjects |  | $<50 \%$ level 5+ English and maths |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number | $\%$ | number | $\%$ |
| 2003 | 18 | 42.9 | 15 | 35.7 |
| 2004 | 17 | 40.5 | 14 | 33.3 |
| 2005 | 18 | 43.9 | 13 | 31.7 |
| 2006 | 9 | 23.7 | 10 | 25.0 |
| 2007 | 12 | 31.6 | 11 | 28.9 |

1.3.2 Performance against the 2008 Key Stage 3 floor targets has shown a significant fall since 2003. Less than one-third of Leeds' secondary schools are now below the 2008 Key Stage 3 floor target. 11 schools are currently not meeting the new Key Stage 3 floor target.

### 1.4 Attainment of Pupil Groups

Percentage of pupils attaining level 5+: Looked After Children

|  | 2005 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds |
| Cohort size | 86 |  | 96 |  | 100 |
| English | 25 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 24 |
| Maths | 24 | 28 | 32 | 33 | 27 |
| Science | 20 | 26 | 29 | 29 | 21 |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
1.4.1 Provisional data for 2007 indicates that the percentage of pupils attaining the expected level 5 in Key Stage 3 has fallen in each core subject in Leeds. Less than a quarter of Looked After Children (LAC) attained the expected level in English and science and just over a quarter in maths. In 2006 outcomes for LAC in Leeds were in line with national levels of performance.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 5+: Free School Meal Eligibility

|  |  | 2005 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds |
| English | Non eligible | 77.4 | 78 | 76.3 | 77.4 | 77.2 |
|  | Eligible | 48.7 | 51 | 44.0 | 48.7 | 45.3 |
| Maths | Non eligible | 77.6 | 78 | 80.7 | 77.6 | 78.9 |
|  | Eligible | 49.2 | 51 | 50.7 | 49.2 | 48.0 |
| Science | Non eligible | 73.1 | 74 | 76.0 | 73.1 | 75.7 |
|  | Eligible | 40.6 | 44 | 42.4 | 40.6 | 41.7 |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
1.4.2 The percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals achieving level 5 or above rose for English, but fell slightly for maths and science in 2007. The gap in attainment between eligible and non-eligible pupils is wider in Leeds than is seen nationally in 2006.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 5+: Special Education Needs

|  |  | 2005 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds |
| Maths | Action | 31 | 38 | 29 | 39 | 39 |
|  | Action + | 30 | 26 | 21 | 26 | 27 |
|  | Statement | 8 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| Science | Action | 37 | 47 | 41 | 41 | 46 |
|  | Action + | 32 | 36 | 29 | 31 | 28 |
|  | Statement | 17 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 15 |
|  | Action | 32 | 39 | 32 | 36 | 39 |
|  | Action + | 30 | 31 | 27 | 28 | 26 |

1.4.3 Analysis of the attainment of pupils with SEN indicates that the percentage of pupils achieving the expected level (level 5) at Key Stage 3 is significantly lower than the Leeds average. Provisional data for 2007 indicates that improvements have been achieved in 2007 for pupils on School Action in all core subjects. The attainment of pupils with statements has remained relatively static. For pupils on School Action plus, attainment has improved for English and remained relatively static for maths and science. National data is not yet available for 2007, but performance in 2006 in Leeds was below the national level in English and within 1-2 percentage points in maths.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 5 or above in Key Stage 3 English: Ethnicity

|  | Leeds |  |  |  | National |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort(07) | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{1}$ | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{2}$ |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 64 | 71 | 54 | 73 | 68 | 66 |  |
| Indian | 174 | 82 | 83 | 87 | 83 | 82 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 151 | 59 | 48 | 56 |  |  |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 9 | 43 | 50 | 67 | 64 | 62 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 219 | 63 | 57 | 67 |  |  |  |
| Other Asian background | 44 | 68 | 61 | 71 | 72 | 71 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 88 | 59 | 65 | 56 | 67 | 67 |  |
| Black African | 121 | 56 | 65 | 56 | 65 | 66 |  |
| Other Black Background | 38 | 63 | 73 | 50 | 67 | 66 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 31 | 54 | 55 | 77 | 73 | 72 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 114 | 60 | 59 | 70 | 68 | 69 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 53 | 83 | 73 | 77 | 81 | 80 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 66 | 63 | 67 | 65 | 77 | 75 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 37 | 79 | 90 | 78 | 82 | 80 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 60 | 63 | 60 | 54 | 64 | 63 |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 6685 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 75 | 73 |  |
| White Irish | 29 | 76 | 63 | 82 | 77 | 79 |  |
| Other White Background | 82 | 71 | 69 | 56 | 72 | 70 |  |
| Traveller Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 9 | 25 | 50 | 38 | 23 | 20 |  |
| Gypsy\Roma | 23 | 0 | 29 | 15 | 29 | 26 |  |
| All pupils | 8394 | 70 | 70 | 72 | 74 | 73 | 74 |

Source: NCER KEYPAS (Leeds), DCSF Statistical First Release (National) Notes:
${ }^{1} 2007$ Data is provisional
${ }^{2}$ National 2007 data for BME groups not available at time of writing
1.4.4 Overall standards in English at Key Stage 3 have remained broadly static, with a 2 percentage point increase in Leeds over the three year period and no change to the national level of achievement which is 2 percentage points above that of Leeds. The outcomes for individual BME groups do, however, vary considerably. Results for the Bangladeshi heritage cohort have fluctuated over the three years, but in 2007, $73 \%$ of this group achieved the "expected" level; well above the most recent national comparative figure. The relatively high attainment of the Bangladeshi cohort contrasts with that of the Kashmiri Pakistani cohort, whose outcomes have remained well below the Leeds average and also below that of the
equivalent national cohort. Improvements observed amongst the Black heritage groups in 2006 were not repeated in 2007 and performance has fallen back to 2005 levels, or below. Improvements in outcomes for the Mixed heritage groups are more sustained and outcomes are now in line with the Leeds average for these groups. This is especially true for the Mixed White and Black Caribbean cohorts have improved significantly over the period and are now in line with general levels of attainment in Leeds. Low levels of attainment for the GRT heritage cohorts and falling outcomes for the Other White heritage students are observed here, as they have been at most other key stages. Also in common with other key stages, Indian and Chinese heritage students are the only BME groups that attain consistently higher than the average.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 5 or above in Key Stage 3 maths: Ethnicity

|  | Leeds |  |  |  | National |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort(07) | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{1}$ | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{2}$ |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 64 | 55 | 57 | 59 | 64 | 69 |  |
| Indian | 174 | 76 | 83 | 85 | 82 | 85 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 151 | 57 | 61 | 61 |  |  |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 9 | 71 | 67 | 67 | 61 | 66 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 219 | 64 | 62 | 65 |  |  |  |
| Other Asian background | 44 | 78 | 79 | 84 | 75 | 78 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 88 | 60 | 73 | 61 | 60 | 64 |  |
| Black African | 121 | 54 | 71 | 62 | 61 | 66 |  |
| Other Black Background | 38 | 63 | 73 | 45 | 62 | 67 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 31 | 58 | 59 | 53 | 70 | 73 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 114 | 58 | 62 | 75 | 65 | 70 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 53 | 76 | 79 | 75 | 80 | 82 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 66 | 61 | 66 | 58 | 74 | 77 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 37 | 97 | 95 | 89 | 93 | 92 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 60 | 65 | 67 | 62 | 67 | 71 |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 6685 | 72 | 76 | 75 | 75 | 78 |  |
| White Irish | 29 | 70 | 54 | 86 | 74 | 81 |  |
| Other White Background | 82 | 70 | 77 | 69 | 73 | 76 |  |
| Traveller Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 9 | 0 | 67 | 38 | 22 | 23 |  |
| GypsylRoma | 23 | 60 | 36 | 15 | 27 | 31 |  |
| All pupils | 8394 | 71 | 75 | 73 | 74 | 77 | 76 |

Source: NCER KEYPAS (Leeds), DCSF Statistical First Release (National)
Notes:
${ }^{1} 2007$ Data is provisional
${ }^{2}$ National 2007 data for BME groups not available at time of writing
1.4.5 Overall standards for maths at key stage 3 in Leeds have seen the same net gain of 2 percentage points as observed nationally, with attainment in Leeds remaining three percentage points below the national figure of $76 \%$. Attainment has been above average and improving for the Indian heritage cohorts, and well above average for the Chinese heritage cohorts. Bangladeshi and Kashmiri / Pakistani heritage groups remain well below the Leeds average, but attainment for the pupils in Leeds is comparable to that of the national equivalent cohorts. Improvements observed amongst the Black heritage groups in 2006 were not repeated in 2007 and
performance has fallen back to 2005 levels, or below. However, the Mixed White and Black Caribbean cohorts have improved significantly over the period and are now in line with general levels of attainment in Leeds.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 5 or above in Key Stage 3 science: Ethnicity

|  | Leeds |  |  |  | National |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort(07) | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{1}$ | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{2}$ |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 64 | 39 | 45 | 44 | 53 | 57 |  |
| Indian | 174 | 71 | 78 | 81 | 74 | 78 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 151 | 42 | 45 | 54 |  |  |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 9 | 43 | 50 | 56 | 50 | 54 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 219 | 50 | 53 | 56 |  |  |  |
| Other Asian background | 44 | 68 | 64 | 66 | 65 | 57 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 88 | 52 | 63 | 48 | 54 | 58 |  |
| Black African | 121 | 50 | 55 | 51 | 52 | 56 |  |
| Other Black Background | 38 | 55 | 59 | 42 | 55 | 60 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 31 | 38 | 55 | 53 | 64 | 69 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 114 | 52 | 55 | 69 | 61 | 66 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 53 | 74 | 73 | 71 | 76 | 77 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 66 | 53 | 63 | 55 | 70 | 73 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 37 | 78 | 92 | 78 | 81 | 81 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 60 | 60 | 51 | 53 | 57 | 60 |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 6685 | 68 | 71 | 72 | 71 | 74 |  |
| White Irish | 29 | 61 | 66 | 82 | 71 | 78 |  |
| Other White Background | 82 | 69 | 67 | 61 | 66 | 67 |  |
| Traveller Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 9 | 0 | 67 | 38 | 18 | 17 |  |
| GypsylRoma | 23 | 0 | 29 | 15 | 23 | 28 |  |
| All pupils | 8394 | 65 | 69 | 70 | 70 | 72 | 73 |

Source: NCER KEYPAS (Leeds), DCSF Statistical First Release (National)
Notes:
${ }^{1} 2007$ Data is provisional
${ }^{2}$ National 2007 data for BME groups not available at time of writing
1.4.6 Standards of attainment for science in Leeds have risen by 5 percentage points over the last three years, compared to a 3 percentage point increase nationally; Leeds however remains 3 percentage points below the national level of achievement of $73 \%$. With the exception of Indian heritage students, the attainment of all Asian heritage groups is well below the overall Leeds figure. While this differential is reflected to a large extent nationally, the performance of Bangladeshi students in Leeds is also well below that of their peers nationally. The modest improvements observed amongst the Black heritage groups in 2006 were not repeated in 2007 and performance has fallen back to 2005 levels, or below. However, the Mixed White and Black Caribbean cohorts have improved significantly over the period and are now in line with general levels of attainment in Leeds. The improvements for this increasingly large group are encouraging and have been observed in all three core subjects in Leeds.

### 1.5 Key Stage 3 Contextual Value Added

1.5.1 Analysis of performance in terms of value added at secondary schools is currently limited to Fischer Family Trust (FFT) analysis as the DfES Value Added measure is not yet available. The table shows the percentile ranking of Leeds for subjects at Key Stage 3. The lower the percentile rank, the greater the progress that pupils make through the key stage. A number of 10 or smaller places an authority in the highest $10 \%$ of all authorities; a number of 75 or greater places an authority in the lower quartile.

1.5.2 FFT CVA rankings in Leeds for Key Stage 3 have shown consistent improvement since 2005 in both English and maths. Both English and maths were within the bottom quartile in 2005, however, this has been reversed in both subjects in 2006 and 2007. Both subjects are now just below the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile nationally. Maths performance in 2005 can be considered an outlier in an upward trend whilst in English, performance has made improvement since 2004.
1.5.3 Overall, progress at Key Stage 3 is well below national expectations in Leeds.

|  | Estimate-Actual <br> Difference (\%) |  |  | LA Contextual Percentile Ranking |  |  | 3 year trend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subject | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |  |
| English L5+ | -2.8 | -1.5 | -1.3 | 92 | 79 | 75 | $\uparrow$ |
| Maths L5+ | -2.8 | -1.6 | -1.0 | 96 | 87 | 81 | $\uparrow$ |
| Science L5+ | -3.3 | -1.8 | -1.3 | 95 | 88 | 74 | $\uparrow$ |
| English L6+ | -1.0 | -0.6 |  | 72 | 61 | 41 | $\uparrow$ |
| Maths L6+ | -2.1 | -0.6 |  | 86 | 67 | 62 | $\uparrow$ |
| Science L6+ | -1.7 | -0.4 |  | 76 | 56 | 71 | $\uparrow$ |
| Mean Grade | -0.07 | -0.03 |  | 94 | 76 | 70 | $\uparrow$ |


| $\uparrow$ | Significantly increase over 3 years | $\downarrow$ | Significant fall over three years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Significantly above 3 year estimate |  | Significantly below 3 year estimate |

1.5.4 However the trend for this is showing encouraging signs, with the gap to expectation closing for every indicator, resulting in an improvement in the percentile ranking. Overall performance across all three subjects is now outside the bottom quartile
having been in the bottom 10\% in 2005.

### 1.6 Contextual Value Added for groups of pupils

1.6.1 Contextual Value Added can also be used to evaluate the progress of priority pupil groups.

|  | English |  |  | Maths |  |  | Science |  |  | Trend |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Group | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | En | Ma | Sci |
| All Pupils | -2.8 | -1.5 | -1.3 | -2.8 | -1.6 | -1.0 | -3.3 | -1.8 | -1.3 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |
| Boys | -2.8 | -0.7 | -1.1 | -2.9 | -1.3 | -0.8 | -3.6 | -1.6 | -1.2 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |
| Boys - Lower | -4.1 | -1.3 | -1.5 | -5.3 | -3.1 | -0.9 | -5.4 | -3.3 | -1.6 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Boys - Middle | -4.1 | -0.4 | -1.8 | -2.9 | -0.8 | -1.3 | -5.0 | -0.8 | -1.5 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |
| Boys - Upper | 0.6 | -0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | -0.4 | -0.4 |  |  |  |
| Girls | -2.8 | -2.4 | -1.6 | -2.8 | -1.8 | -1.3 | -3.1 | -2.1 | -1.3 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Girls - Lower | -7.0 | -5.2 | -4.4 | -6.4 | -5.3 | -1.9 | -5.3 | -6.0 | -1.7 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Girls - Middle | -1.7 | -2.1 | -0.8 | -1.9 | -0.6 | -1.6 | -3.7 | -1.2 | -2.2 |  |  |  |
| Girls - Upper | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | -0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | -0.1 |  |  |  |


| $\uparrow$ | Significantly increase over 3 years | $\downarrow$ | Significant fall over three years |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Significantly above 3 year estimate |  | Significantly below 3 year estimate |

1.6.2 Overall, performance at Key Stage 3 is below FFT estimates over the past three years. However, the gap to estimate for all subjects has closed, significantly in English and science, but remains unstable for maths. Performance is particularly encouraging for boys, of all abilities. For girls, performance is mixed, with low ability girls struggling in English, whilst middle and high ability pupils are below estimate in maths and science.
1.6.3 Analysis of the performance at Key Stage 3 for the larger ethnic groups shows that several are in line with FFT estimates.

|  | English |  |  |  | Maths |  |  |  | Science |  |  | Trend |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Group | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | En | Ma | Sci |  |  |
| All Pupils | -2.8 | -1.5 | -1.3 | -2.8 | -1.6 | -1.0 | -3.3 | -1.8 | -1.3 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | -1.2 | -16.5 | 3.5 | -12.6 | -20.4 | -12.1 | -16.1 | -19.6 | -15.2 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Indian | -0.4 | 0.0 | 4.3 | -4.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | -3.8 | 0.1 | -0.5 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |
| Pakistani | -7.0 | -9.2 | -3.2 | -3.9 | -4.1 | -2.6 | -6.9 | -3.2 | -3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Asian | 0.0 | -5.7 | -0.3 | -0.9 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | -4.0 | -2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black African | -2.3 | 5.4 | 2.7 | -2.9 | 1.2 | 2.8 | -4.7 | 1.6 | 1.8 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | -6.7 | -2.7 | -3.2 | -3.5 | -1.2 | 3.2 | -3.2 | -3.5 | -3.1 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 6.2 | 9.3 | 9.6 | 2.5 | 2.1 | -2.3 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any Other heritage | 0.0 | 0.3 | -1.7 | -3.0 | -3.0 | -7.3 | 0.3 | -4.9 | -4.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | -2.7 | -1.3 | -1.4 | -2.7 | -1.5 | -1.0 | -3.2 | -1.7 | -1.0 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |  |  |
| No Information | 2.4 | 6.3 | -1.5 | -0.2 | -2.0 | 0.3 | 1.8 | -0.1 | -0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |

1.6.4 Bangladeshi and White pupils are significantly below estimates. Bangladeshi pupils have moved further below estimate since 2005 in maths. Black African and Black Caribbean pupils, in English, have shown significant improvements towards estimates.

|  | English |  |  | Maths |  |  |  | Science |  |  | Trend |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Group | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | En | Ma | Sci |  |
| All Pupils | -2.8 | -1.5 | -1.3 | -2.8 | -1.6 | -1.0 | -3.3 | -1.8 | -1.3 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |  |
| FSM - No | -2.3 | -0.8 | -0.5 | -2.3 | -0.8 | -0.4 | -2.5 | -1.1 | -0.6 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |  |
| FSM - Yes | -4.8 | -4.5 | -4.9 | -5.2 | -5.0 | -3.8 | -6.7 | -5.0 | -4.2 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |
| Looked After - No | -2.8 | -1.5 | -1.3 | -2.8 | -1.6 | -1.0 | -3.4 | -1.8 | -1.2 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |  |
| Looked After - Yes | -3.5 | -2.8 | -2.6 | -2.9 | -2.0 | -7.4 | -0.1 | -3.4 | -6.8 |  |  |  |  |
| No SEN | -7.4 | -3.0 | -1.0 | -6.1 | -4.2 | -0.6 | -6.1 | -5.1 | -0.6 | $\uparrow \uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |  |
| School Action | -2.5 | -1.5 | -4.4 | -2.4 | -1.2 | -2.8 | -3.1 | -1.5 | -4.8 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |
| School Action Plus | -3.5 | -2.0 | -1.2 | -8.3 | -4.0 | -4.8 | -6.3 | -3.7 | -6.1 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Statemented | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.8 | -0.8 | -0.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 | -0.2 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |

1.6.5 For other priority pupil groups, the picture is mixed. Pupils eligible for Free School Meals are significantly below estimates over the past three years, but have made improvements in English.
1.6.6 In English and science, LAC are in line with estimate with no change over three years. However, their performance is significantly below estimate in maths.
1.6.7 Pupils with statements of special need are in line with estimates in all three subjects, whilst School Action and School Action plus pupils are below estimates over the three year period from 2005.

| KEY STAGE 3: percentage of pupils achieving level 5+ |  | English |  |  | Maths |  |  | Science |  |  | 2006-2007 change |  |  | Difference from 2007 Leeds |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pupils | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | En | Ma | Sc | En | Ma | Sc |
| Bangladeshi | 64 | 71 | 54 | 73 | 55 | 57 | 59 | 39 | 45 | 44 | 19 | 2 | -1 | 1 | -14 | -26 |
| Indian | 174 | 82 | 83 | 87 | 76 | 83 | 85 | 71 | 78 | 81 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 85 | 81 |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 151 | 59 | 48 | 56 | 57 | 61 | 61 | 42 | 45 | 54 | 8 | 0 | 9 | -16 | 61 | 54 |
| Kashmiri Other | 9 | 43 | 50 | 67 | 71 | 67 | 67 | 43 | 50 | 56 | 17 | 0 | 6 | -5 | 67 | 56 |
| Other Pakistani | 219 | 63 | 57 | 67 | 64 | 62 | 65 | 50 | 53 | 56 | 10 | 3 | 3 | -5 | 65 | 56 |
| Other Asian background | 44 | 68 | 61 | 71 | 78 | 79 | 84 | 68 | 64 | 66 | 10 | 5 | 2 | -1 | 84 | 66 |
| Black Caribbean | 88 | 59 | 65 | 56 | 60 | 73 | 61 | 52 | 63 | 48 | -9 | -12 | -15 | -16 | 61 | 48 |
| Black African | 121 | 56 | 65 | 56 | 54 | 71 | 62 | 50 | 55 | 51 | -9 | -9 | -4 | -16 | 62 | 51 |
| Other Black Background | 38 | 63 | 73 | 50 | 63 | 73 | 45 | 55 | 59 | 42 | -23 | -28 | -17 | -22 | 45 | 42 |
| Mixed Black African and White Mixed Black Caribbean and | 31 | 54 | 55 | 77 | 58 | 59 | 53 | 38 | 55 | 53 | 22 | -6 | -2 | 5 | 53 | 53 |
| White | 114 | 60 | 59 | 70 | 58 | 62 | 75 | 52 | 55 | 69 | 11 | 13 | 14 | -2 | 75 | 69 |
| Mixed Asian and White | 53 | 83 | 73 | 77 | 76 | 79 | 75 | 74 | 73 | 71 | 4 | -4 | -2 | 5 | 75 | 71 |
| Other Mixed Background | 66 | 63 | 67 | 65 | 61 | 66 | 58 | 53 | 63 | 55 | -2 | -8 | -8 | -7 | 58 | 55 |
| Chinese | 37 | 79 | 90 | 78 | 97 | 95 | 89 | 78 | 92 | 78 | -12 | -6 | -14 | 6 | 89 | 78 |
| Other Ethnic group | 60 | 63 | 60 | 54 | 65 | 67 | 62 | 60 | 51 | 53 | -6 | -5 | 2 | -18 | 62 | 53 |
| White British | 6685 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 72 | 76 | 75 | 68 | 71 | 72 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 1 | 75 | 72 |
| White Irish | 29 | 76 | 63 | 82 | 70 | 54 | 86 | 61 | 66 | 82 | 19 | 32 | 16 | 10 | 86 | 82 |
| Other White Background | 82 | 71 | 69 | 56 | 70 | 77 | 69 | 69 | 67 | 61 | -13 | -8 | -6 | -16 | 69 | 61 |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 9 | 25 | 50 | 38 | 0 | 67 | 38 | 0 | 67 | 38 | -12 | -29 | -29 | -34 | 38 | 38 |
| Gypsy\Roma | 23 | 0 | 29 | 15 | 60 | 36 | 15 | 0 | 29 | 15 | -14 | -21 | -14 | -57 | 15 | 15 |
| All pupils | 8394 | 70 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 75 | 73 | 65 | 69 | 70 | 2 | -2 | 1 | 0 | 73 | 70 |

### 2.1 Key Stage 4 Trends and Comparisons

2.1.1 Performance at Key Stage 4 has shown improvement, particularly in the two 5+ A*-C measures

2005-2007 Percentage Benchmark indicators for GCSE

| \% pupils achieving: | 2005 |  |  | 2006 |  |  | 2007 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | Nat | Stat <br> Neigh | Leeds | Nat | Stat <br> Neigh | Leeds | Nat | Stat <br> Neigh |
| 5 or more A*- C | 49.7 | 57.1 | 50.9 | 52.2 | 59.2 | 53.5 | 56.1 | 61.5 | 57.8 |
| 5 or more A*-C <br> (inc Eng \& maths) | 38.2 | 44.9 | 38.7 | 40.4 | 45.8 | 39.9 | 42.3 | 46.5 | 43.6 |
| 5 or more A*-G | 86.6 | 90.2 | 88.5 | 86.5 | 90.6 | 89.3 | 88.1 | 91.6 | 90.9 |
| No Passes | 5.1 | 2.6 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 2.3 |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
2.1.2 The increase in $5+A^{*}-C$ in Leeds was greater than achieved nationally, therefore further narrowing the gap to $5.4 \%$. Improvements in 5 A*-C including English and $^{*}$ maths and 5 or more $\mathrm{A}^{*}$-G were also more than seen nationally and the target for $5+$ $A^{*}$-G was achieved in 2007. The percentage of pupils achieving 1+ $A^{*}$-G remained stable in 2007 and is higher than seen nationally and in statistical neighbours.

| Key Stage 4 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | gender | Leeds | Nat | Leeds | Nat | Leeds | Nat |
| 5 or more A*-C | Girls | 53.9 | 62.1 | 55.9 | 63.9 | 59.0 | 64.0 |
|  | Boys | 44.5 | 52.2 | 47.5 | 54.3 | 53.3 | 54.8 |
| 5 or more A*-C | Girls | 42.4 | 49.1 | 43.8 | 50.2 | 45.9 | 49.7 |
| (inc Eng \& maths) | Boys | 34.5 | 40.7 | 36.6 | 41.5 | 39.0 | 41.4 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ or more A*-G | Girls | 88.6 | 92.5 | 88.6 | 92.9 | 89.6 | 93.2 |
|  | Boys | 83.6 | 88.1 | 83.9 | 88.3 | 86.7 | 89.4 |
| No Passes | Girls | 4.9 | 2.0 | 4.3 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 1.9 |
|  | Boys | 6.7 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 2.5 | 5.2 | 2.8 |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
2.1.3 The gap in attainment between boys and girls has narrowed for each indicator in 2007. The gender gap is smaller in Leeds than nationally for $5+A^{*}-C, 5+A^{*}-C$ including English and maths and 5+ A*-G, but wider for no passes.

### 2.2 Key Stage 4 Trajectories


2.2.1 For the first time, performance is above FFT B estimates. Although the target has not been achieved for 2007, the gap to the school aggregated target is only $0.4 \%$.

### 2.3 Key Stage 4 Floor Targets

Numbers and percentages of schools below Key Stage 4 floor targets

|  | <25\% 5+ A*-C |  | <30\% 5+ A*-C |  | $<30 \% 5+A^{*}-$ C inc. English and maths |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | number | \% | number | \% | number | \% |
| 2003 | 12 | 27.9 | 15 | 34.9 | 19 | 45.2 |
| 2004 | 6 | 15.0 | 10 | 25.0 | 21 | 50.0 |
| 2005 | 4 | 9.8 | 7 | 17.1 | 19 | 46.3 |
| 2006 | 2 | 5.0 | 6 | 15.0 | 13 | 34.2 |
| 2007 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 5.3 | 13 | 34.2 |

2.3.1 Performance in relation to Key Stage 4 floor targets show encouraging trends, with only $5.3 \%$ (two schools) being below the 2008 floor target of $30 \%$ for $5+A^{*}$-C. 13 schools (34.2\%) are below the new floor target of $30 \%$ five or more $A^{*}-C$ including English and maths.

### 2.4 Attainment of Pupil Groups

Percentage of pupils attaining Key Stage 4 benchmarks: Looked After Children

|  | 2005 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds |
| Cohort size | 103 |  | 104 |  |  |
| not entered | 36 | 41 | 31 | 36 | 34 |
| 5+ A*-C | 14 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 8 |
| 5+ A*-G | 39 | 39 | 49 | 41 | 39 |
| 1+ A*-G | 64 | 56 | 67 | 60 | 62 |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
2.4.1 The percentage of LAC in Key Stage 4 that sat exams, fell slightly in 2007. The percentage achieving one or more $A^{*}-G$ and five or more $A^{*}-G$ also fell. The percentage achieving five or more $A^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ increased slightly to $8 \%$. In 2006 the percentage achieving one or more $A^{*}-G$ and five or more $A^{*}$-G was above national performance, but below for five or more $A^{*}$-C. In 2007, 4\% of LAC achieved the new
gold standard measure of five or more GCSEs including English and maths.
Percentage of pupils attaining Key Stage 4 benchmarks: Free School Meal Eligibility

|  |  | 2005 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| 5+ A*-C | Non eligible | 55.5 | 57.3 | 58.8 | 60.7 | 62.0 |  |
|  | Eligible | 23.1 | 30.1 | 22.3 | 32.6 | 26.9 |  |
| $5+$ A*-G | Non eligible | 90.1 |  | 90.9 |  | 91.5 |  |
|  | Eligible | 69.0 |  | 69.5 |  | 71.7 |  |
| No passes | Non eligible | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 3.1 |  |
|  | Eligible | 12.7 | 7.5 | 11.2 | 6.3 | 10.3 |  |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
2.4.2 Performance of FSM eligible pupils improved all indicators in 2007.

Percentage of pupils attaining Key Stage 4 benchmarks: Special Education Needs

|  |  | 2005 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| $5+A^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ | Action | 12.8 | 17.1 | 17.8 | 21.6 | 23.6 |  |
|  | Action + | 7.7 |  | 8.6 | 14.9 | 14.1 |  |
|  | Statement | 6.7 | 7.1 | 4.3 | 8.5 | 9.8 |  |
| 5+ A*-G | Action | 64.5 |  | 66.4 |  | 71.0 |  |
|  | Action + | 37.8 |  | 47.2 |  | 54.4 |  |
|  | Statement | 38.0 |  | 28.8 |  | 32.8 |  |
| No passes | Action | 10.9 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 4.6 | 8.4 |  |
|  | Action + | 30.2 |  | 23.4 | 12.8 | 18.4 |  |
|  | Statement | 30.1 | 19.4 | 42.8 | 18.6 | 37.3 |  |

Note: 2007 data is provisional
2.4.3 For pupils with SEN statements, attainment of $5+A^{*}$-C more than doubled in 2007 and the percentage achieving 5+ A*-G also increased. All SEN groups saw a drop in the percentage of pupils not achieving any passes. All SEN groups showed improvement on all indicators in the table above.

Percentage of pupils attaining 5 or more $A^{*}$-C: Ethnicity

|  | Leeds |  |  |  | National |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort(07) | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{1}$ | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{2}$ |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 31 | 41.9 | 59.0 | 39.6 | 52.7 | 56.6 |  |
| Indian | 165 | 59.4 | 66.9 | 67.4 | 70.1 | 71.7 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 125 | 33.6 | 36.8 | 36.4 |  |  |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 4 | 25.0 | 40.0 | 33.3 | 48.4 | 51.4 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 188 | 43.1 | 41.0 | 50.8 |  |  |  |
| Other Asian background | 34 | 47.1 | 55.6 | 63.9 | 63.8 | 64.6 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 145 | 31.7 | 28.0 | 48.4 | 41.7 | 44.9 |  |
| Black African | 68 | 45.6 | 49.6 | 50.9 | 48.3 | 51.0 |  |
| Other Black Background | 42 | 28.6 | 26.2 | 41.5 | 41.7 | 47.1 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 12 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 55.5 | 56.8 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 100 | 34.0 | 32.3 | 39.0 | 44.1 | 47.3 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 31 | 45.2 | 63.8 | 52.2 | 67.4 | 68.9 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 44 | 50.0 | 40.0 | 37.9 | 58.6 | 58.7 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 39 | 64.1 | 75.8 | 85.3 | 81.0 | 80.0 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 56 | 48.2 | 56.6 | 51.1 | 54.0 | 56.3 |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 7191 | 50.2 | 53.1 | 57.4 | 55.0 | 57.5 |  |
| White Irish | 41 | 41.5 | 51.4 | 55.9 | 62.6 | 61.3 |  |
| Other White Background | 84 | 59.5 | 60.9 | 60.2 | 58.9 | 60.1 |  |
| Traveller Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 4 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 12.5 | 22.5 | 19.0 |  |
| Gypsy\Roma | 9 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 10.4 |  |
| All pupils | 8486 | 49.1 | 52.0 | 56.1 | 54.9 | 57.3 | 59.3 |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), DCSF Statistical First Release (National)
Notes: ${ }^{1} 2007$ Data is provisional
${ }^{2}$ National 2007 data for BME groups not available at time of writing
2.4.4 Standards against this headline indicator in Leeds have improved by 7 percentage points in three years, compared to a national improvement of 4.4 percentage points. This encouraging overall improvement has been exceeded by the improvement in outcomes for the Black heritage cohorts; the percentage of Black Caribbean heritage pupils achieving this level of attainment has risen by 17 percentage points. Improvements for Asian heritage groups are more mixed; there has actually been a fall in attainment for the Bangladeshi cohorts, and a smaller than average improvement for the Kashmiri Pakistani heritage cohorts, but there has been an eight percentage point improvement observed for the Other Pakistani cohorts. General levels of attainment for Asian heritage pupils do remain well below average, with the exception of Indian pupils. As at other Key Stages, very few pupils from Gypsy/Roma and Traveller heritage backgrounds achieve the "expected" level of attainment.

### 2.5 Contextual Value Added

2.5.1 Analyses generated through the Fischer Family Trust (FFT) 'Value Added Project' model show that progress in secondary schools is still a major issue in Leeds. Students in a large proportion of the schools in Leeds do not make the progress expected compared with national expectations. However, the improvement in 5+ A*-

C progress shown last year has continued and the position for capped points, the OfSTED CVA measure, has improved in 2007.

2.5.2 Overall, the performance of Leeds as a whole measured by Value Added between key stages two and four is still low. Key judgements show that city wide performance is in the bottom $10 \%$ for most indicators once the context of the pupils and the school attended is taken into account.

|  | Difference |  |  | Rank |  |  | 3 year <br> trend |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indicator | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |  |
| 5+ A*-C | -3.4 | -2.5 | -1.5 | 84 | 75 | 63 | $\uparrow$ |
| 5+ A*-G | -2.5 | -2.9 | -2.6 | 92 | 96 | 95 |  |
| Capped Points score | -12.0 | -12.4 | -9.3 | 94 | 97 | 90 | $\uparrow$ |


| $\uparrow$ | Significantly increase over 3 years | $\downarrow$ | Significant fall over three years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Significantly above 3 year estimate |  | Significantly below 3 year estimate |

2.5.3 Performance at $5+A^{*}-C$ has improved and is just inside the bottom quartile.

### 2.5.4 Number of Schools in each Fischer Family Trust Quartile


2.5.5 For Key Stage 2-4 progress, the chart above shows that the number of schools in the fourth quartile, having increased in 2006 fell to their lowest level in 2007, while the number of schools making better than average progress increased after a significant fall last year. In 2003 six (16\%) schools were in the top $50 \%$ of schools nationally for added value measured by the average point score, in 2007 this stands at 12 (31.6\%).
2.5.6 In terms of Key Stage 3-4, almost half of schools have made expected or better than expected levels of progress, a significant improvement on one-quarter in 2006. The number of schools in the lower quartile is at its lowest level, at 13 (34\%), with six schools (16\%) in the top quartile.
2.5.7 FFT data allows a detailed analysis of the performance of the major pupils groups in Leeds to be produced. In this analysis, performance is compared to estimate, and the difference is shown below. Three year trends are also shown, with significant differences and changes over the three years highlighted.

|  | \% 5+ A*-C |  |  | \% 5+ A*-G |  | Capped s96 points |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Trend |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Group | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 5+A*-C | 5+A*-G | Points |  |  |  |  |
| All Pupils | -3.4 | -2.5 | -1.5 | -2.5 | -2.9 | -2.6 | -12.0 | -12.4 | -9.3 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |
| Boys | -3.0 | -2.3 | -0.3 | -2.4 | -3.0 | -2.0 | -11.1 | -12.9 | -7.6 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |
| Boys - Lower | -2.7 | -3.0 | -0.7 | -3.5 | -3.7 | -2.0 | -19.8 | -22.1 | -12.7 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |
| Boys - Middle | -5.6 | -3.3 | -2.1 | -2.3 | -3.8 | -3.2 | -11.4 | -13.5 | -10.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boys - Upper | -0.2 | -0.3 | 2.5 | -1.3 | -1.3 | -0.7 | 0.2 | -0.4 | 2.7 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Girls | -3.9 | -2.6 | -2.9 | -2.6 | -2.8 | -3.1 | -12.8 | -12.0 | -11.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Girls - Lower | -6.1 | -5.5 | -4.6 | -4.0 | -4.9 | -5.2 | -23.1 | -26.1 | -22.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Girls - Middle | -3.7 | -2.1 | -4.2 | -2.4 | -2.5 | -3.2 | -11.1 | -8.3 | -10.6 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |
| Girls - Upper | -1.9 | -0.2 | 0.9 | -1.4 | -1.0 | -0.6 | -4.5 | -1.4 | 0.8 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |


| $\uparrow$ | Significantly increase over 3 years | $\downarrow$ | Significant fall over three years |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Significantly above 3 year estimate |  | Significantly below 3 year estimate |

2.5.8 Overall, performance is significantly below FFT estimates for all indicators but significant improvements have been recorded for $5+A^{*}-C$ and for capped points score. Boys have performed in line with expectations in terms of 5+A*-C and high ability girls have performed well across the indicators. Performance at $5+A^{*}-G$ is below expectation for both boys and girls, with no discernable improvement toward estimate

|  | \% 5+ A*-C |  |  | \% 5+ A*-G |  |  | Capped s96 points |  |  | Trend |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Group | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 2006 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 5+A*-C | 5+A*-G | Points |
| All Pupils | -3.4 | -2.5 | -1.5 | -2.5 | -2.9 | -2.6 | -12.0 | -12.4 | -9.3 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Bangladeshi | -7.7 | 6.1 | -15.9 | 4.6 | 3.1 | -4.4 | -13.8 | -11.8 | -33.4 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Indian | -6.5 | -3.8 | -5.3 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | -8.4 | -7.6 | -5.6 |  |  |  |
| Pakistani | -10.6 | -11.8 | -7.8 | 0.0 | -2.3 | -0.7 | -25.8 | -27.0 | -18.4 |  |  |  |
| Other Asian | -3.8 | -0.4 | -8.5 | -1.8 | -2.5 | -3.5 | -3.3 | -12.6 | -28.4 |  |  |  |
| Black African | -7.1 | -8.9 | -1.6 | 3.6 | -1.8 | -2.5 | -9.2 | -20.9 | -3.5 |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | -5.7 | -9.7 | -1.4 | -1.3 | -7.9 | -10.8 | -25.2 | -30.9 | -26.2 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Chinese | -0.3 | -3.2 | 10.5 | 1.6 | -0.7 | 0.2 | -7.3 | -4.3 | 18.5 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Any Other heritage | -4.3 | -7.0 | -4.5 | -1.8 | -3.7 | -7.2 | -11.4 | -16.2 | -17.9 |  |  |  |
| White | -2.9 | -1.7 | -1.0 | -2.8 | -2.8 | -2.3 | -11.0 | -11.0 | -8.0 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |
| No Information | -11.5 | -9.3 | -4.4 | -10.8 | -17.9 | -4.8 | -21.8 | -42.2 | -7.1 |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |

2.5.9 Several ethnic groups are now performing in line with estimates in terms of $5+A^{*}-C$, notably Black African, Black Caribbean, Chinese and Other heritage pupils. Signs are more encouraging at $5+A^{*}-G$, where performance of all Asian heritage pupils is in line with estimate. White, Chinese and Other heritage pupils are significantly below estimate on this indicator. Overall performance, measured by points score is significantly below estimates for Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Other Asian, Black Caribbean, Other heritage and White pupils.

|  | \% 5+ A*-C |  |  | \% 5+ A*-G |  | Capped s96 points |  | Trend |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Group | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 5+A*-C | 5+A*-G | Points |
| All Pupils | -3.4 | -2.5 | -1.5 | -2.5 | -2.9 | -2.6 | -12.0 | -12.4 | -9.3 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |
| FSM - No | -3.4 | -1.7 | -4.2 | -1.4 | -1.5 | -8.2 | -8.2 | -7.6 | -27.4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |
| FSM - Yes | -3.8 | -6.0 | -0.9 | -7.9 | -9.0 | -1.3 | -29.5 | -33.7 | -5.4 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Looked After - No | -3.4 | -2.3 | -1.5 | -2.4 | -2.7 | -2.3 | -11.7 | -11.9 | -9.0 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Looked After - Yes | -6.4 | -13.0 | -4.2 | -20.0 | -20.6 | -20.1 | -37.8 | -61.1 | -35.0 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| No SEN | -3.0 | -2.1 | -1.2 | -0.6 | -0.8 | -0.2 | -8.2 | -8.2 | -4.5 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |
| School Action | -7.8 | -4.2 | -2.6 | -8.8 | -9.9 | -8.0 | -35.7 | -34.2 | -28.0 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| School Action Plus | -5.6 | -4.8 | -3.7 | -24.5 | -16.4 | -15.2 | -54.3 | -38.1 | -34.3 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Statemented | -1.1 | -3.2 | -1.5 | -13.6 | -16.4 | -19.9 | -11.9 | -21.4 | -23.1 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |

2.5.1 Performance for other priority groups is not encouraging, although LAC performed 0 broadly in line with $5+A^{*}-C$ estimates. In almost all other areas, performance was below estimate for Free School Meal eligible, and pupils with special needs, with virtually no significant improvements.

## 3 EXCLUSIONS

### 3.1 PERMANENT EXCLUSIONS

3.1.1 Reduction of permanent exclusions has been a key driver of the 'No Child Left Behind' agenda. Significant results have been achieved over the last years in reducing permanent exclusions as demonstrated in the table below.

Permanent exclusions

|  | Leeds |  |  | National |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Target | Number of <br> Exclusions | Percentage of pupils <br> excluded |  |
| $2003 / 04$ |  | 166 | 0.15 | 0.13 |
| $2004 / 05$ |  | 120 | 0.11 | 0.12 |
| $2005 / 06$ | 100 | 85 | 0.08 | 0.12 |
| $2006 / 07$ | 70 | 65 | 0.06 |  |

Source: Leeds data: Education Data Management System; National Data: Statistical First Release
3.1.2 The number of permanent exclusions in Leeds schools has fallen significantly, resulting in a $61 \%$ reduction since 2003/04. This pattern of reducing exclusions is not matched nationally, where the percentage of pupils permanently excluded has not reduced significantly. The percentage of pupils permanently excluded in Leeds has been below national levels since 2004/05, the percentage of pupils excluded in Leeds in 2006/07 is half the national rate for 2005/06.
3.1.3 The Leeds target for the number of permanent exclusions has been achieved for the last two academic years, however we are not complacent and recognise that to meet the Local Public Service Agreement target of 40 exclusions in the 2007/08 academic year requires the same concerted, targeted approach.
3.1.4 It should be noted that our highest excluding school was David Young Academy in 2006/2007 with 14 exclusions which is well above the Leeds average. Although these figures do not count in the figures for Leeds maintained schools, this has an impact on other schools in the area in terms of the high numbers of permanently excluded pupils that require school places
3.1.5 In the 2006/07 academic year there were no permanent exclusions from Leeds primary schools or SILCs. As demonstrated in the table below, the percentage of pupils permanently excluded from primary schools and SILCs in Leeds has been consistently below national levels over the last three years.

Comparative permanent exclusions by phase

|  | Primary |  | Secondary |  | Special |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| $2003 / 04$ | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.33 |
| $2004 / 05$ | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.31 |
| $2005 / 06$ | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.17 | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.23 |
| $2006 / 07$ | 0.00 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.00 |  |

Source: DfES statistical first release
3.1.6 One significant factor contributing to the reduction in the number of permanent exclusions has been the number of exclusions that have been successfully challenged and overturned by the Pupil Planning Team. A total of 38 permanent exclusions were avoided through partnership working between the Pupil Planning Team, schools, Area Management Boards (AMBs) and families. A further 13 permanent exclusions were withdrawn by headteachers before governors as alternatives solutions had been found through working in partnership with the exclusions team. 18 primary permanent exclusions were avoided by collaborative
working with the Pupil Support Centre at Oakwood and 2 exclusions were overturned by governors and a further 6 overturned at Independent Appeal Panel.

### 3.2 School Performance

3.2.1 As can be seen in the table below, the number of schools with five or more permanent exclusions decreased once again in 2006/07, with only four schools having this level of exclusions. These four schools accounted for $45 \%$ of all permanent exclusions. Over a quarter of schools (10) had no permanent exclusions in the 2006/07 academic year.

School analysis of permanent exclusions

| Number of <br> exclusions | Number of schools |  |  | \% of exclusions |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2004 / 05$ | $2005 / 06$ | $2006 / 07$ | $2004 / 05$ | $2005 / 06$ | $2006 / 07$ |
| $5+$ | 10 | 6 | 4 | 72 | 45 | 45 |
| $2-4$ | 10 | 12 | 10 | 21 | 41 | 40 |
| $0-1$ | 22 | 24 | 25 | 8 | 13 | 15 |

Source: Education Data Management System

### 3.3 Permanent Exclusions of Pupil Groups

3.3.1 Boys still have a higher rate of permanent exclusion than girls, although the rate for boys has fallen more than has been seen for girls. Rates of exclusion have also fallen for pupils eligible for free school meals and those living in deprived areas, although these groups are still twice as likely to be excluded than the Leeds average (three times more likely for those eligible for free school meals).
3.3.2 LAC had the highest rate of permanent exclusion in each of the last three years, although the rate has dropped in 2006/07.
3.3.3 Pupils with SEN still have rates of exclusion higher than the Leeds average (around four times higher). However, as in all groups these are beginning to fall.
3.3.4 The rate of permanent exclusion for pupils of Black and Minority Ethnic heritage is now lower than the Leeds average, although this hides variations for individual groups, the number of permanent exclusions is now too small to enable analysis by individual ethnic group, although some patterns are notable, particularly that the groups that previously had the highest rates of permanent exclusion - Traveller groups and pupils of Black Caribbean heritage - had no pupils permanently excluded in 2006/07.
Permanent Exclusions by Pupil Group


Source: Education Data Management System

### 3.4 FIXED TERM EXCLUSIONS

3.4.1 The number of fixed term exclusions reduced by $13 \%$ in the 2006/07 academic year and have decreased by $21 \%$ since 2003/04.
3.4.2 Whilst good progress has been made over 2006/2007, the challenging target of 39 was achieved in 2006/07 and a significant reduction in the number of fixed term exclusions is required to achieve the Local Public Service Agreement target of 25 exclusions per 1000 pupils in the 2007/08 academic year.

Comparative fixed term exclusion data ${ }^{1}$

|  | Leeds $^{2}$ |  |  | National $^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of <br> exclusions | Target (rate <br> of exclusion) | Rate of exclusion per 1000 <br> pupils |  |
| $2003 / 04$ | 8310 |  | 73.74 | 44.9 |
| $2004 / 05$ | 7612 |  | 68.26 | 51.2 |
| $2005 / 06$ | 7513 |  | 68.09 |  |
| $2006 / 07$ | 6527 | 39 | 60.15 |  |

Source: Leeds data: Education Data Management System; National Data: Statistical First Release Notes: 1: not including exclusions from Pupil Referral Units; 2: national data is not available for 2005/06 or 2006/07
3.4.3 Due to changes in collection methods, comparative fixed term exclusion data is only available for secondary schools for 2005/06. 2006/07 data will be published in June 2008.
3.4.4 The rate of exclusion from secondary schools in Leeds fell by $10 \%$ in 2006/07,
however the rate of exclusion in Leeds remains higher than the national rate for secondary schools in 2005/06.
3.4.5 The rate of exclusion for SILCs more than doubled in 2006/07, the majority of these exclusions were from the BESD SILC.

Comparative fixed term exclusions by school type

|  | Primary |  | Secondary |  | Special (SILCs) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| $2003 / 04$ | 12.0 | 9.7 | 153.7 | 86.6 | 164.9 | 174.5 |
| $2004 / 05$ | 9.4 | 10.4 | 145.3 | 99.4 | 43.2 | 189.1 |
| $2005 / 06$ | 6.0 |  | 144.8 | 104.0 | 79.9 |  |
| $2006 / 07$ | 5.5 |  | 129.6 |  | 162.2 |  |

Source: Leeds data: Education Data Management System; National Data: Statistical First Release
3.4.6 As can be seen in the table below, the number of pupils that have been excluded for a fixed period has also reduced, by $7 \%$ in the 2006/07 academic year, and by $17 \%$ since 2003/04.

Number of pupils with fixed term exclusions

|  | Number of pupils | \% of pupils |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2003 / 04$ | 4052 | 3.6 |
| $2004 / 05$ | 3666 | 3.3 |
| $2005 / 06$ | 3603 | 3.3 |
| $2006 / 07$ | 3336 | 3.1 |

Source: Education Data Management System
3.4.7 New regulations relating to fixed term exclusions came into effect in September 2007. From this data schools have a statutory responsibility to provide education after the fifth day of a fixed term exclusion. In the 2006/07 academic year there were 923 exclusions with a duration in excess of five days and the total number of days provision that would have been required was 5656.5 days.
3.4.8 The pupil planning team are working in partnership with schools and the Area Management Boards to monitor and track individual pupils in order to ensure this requirement is met over 2007/2008.

### 3.5 School Performance

3.5.1 The number of schools with a rate of exclusion in excess of 150 per 1000 pupils decreased in 2006/07, these 13 schools accounting for $60 \%$ of exclusions. The number of schools with less than 50 exclusions per 100 pupils dropped, for the first time in 2006/07. There were three secondary schools with no fixed term exclusions.

Secondary school analysis of fixed term exclusions

| Rate of <br> exclusion | Number of schools |  |  | \% of exclusions |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2004 / 05$ | $2005 / 06$ | $2006 / 07$ | $2004 / 05$ | $2005 / 06$ | $2006 / 07$ |
| $150+$ | 16 | 18 | 13 | 68.3 | 69.2 | 59.9 |
| $50-150$ | 16 | 13 | 18 | 25.8 | 25.7 | 37.6 |
| $<50$ | 10 | 11 | 8 | 5.9 | 5.0 | 2.5 |

Source: Education Data Management System

### 3.6 Fixed Term Exclusions of Pupil Groups

Fixed term exclusions by pupil group


Source: Education Data Management System
3.6.1 As seen in the chart above, the rate of fixed term exclusions is higher for boys than for girls. Pupils eligible for Free School Meals and those who live in deprived areas have higher levels of fixed term exclusions than the Leeds average, although the rate of exclusion has fallen for each of these groups, the rate of exclusion remains 1.5 times higher than the Leeds average (two times higher for pupils eligible for Free School Meals).
3.6.2 Pupils with SEN have relatively high rates of exclusion, pupils with statements remain 3.5 times more likely to be excluded.
3.6.3 Although the rate of fixed term exclusion for LAC has fallen slightly in 2006/07, the rate of exclusion for this group of pupils was five times higher than the Leeds average and remains a focus for targeted action through the appointment of the Headteacher of a virtual school for LAC.
3.6.4 The rate of exclusions for pupils of Black and Minority Ethnic heritage has fallen, however these pupils still have a rate of exclusion 1.2 times higher than the average for all pupils in Leeds, pupils of black heritage are twice as likely to be excluded than the Leeds average, however there are variations in rates of exclusions for ethnic groups, as shown in the table below.

Fixed term exclusions by ethnicity

| Ethnic group | Rate of exclusion per 1000pupils |  | Ratio to Leeds average rate of exclusion |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | 2005/06 | 2006/07 |
| Asian or Asian British |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 52.4 | 56.5 | 0.8 | 0.9 |
| Indian | 20.8 | 19.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Kashmiri Other | 110.1 | 44.2 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 66.5 | 74.6 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| Other Pakistani | 40.3 | 51.9 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| Other Asian | 45.3 | 42.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |
| Black African | 46.5 | 38.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Black Caribbean | 222.7 | 196.7 | 3.2 | 3.3 |
| Other Black Background | 137.9 | 115.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| Chinese | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 107.4 | 104.1 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Mixed Asian and White | 66.9 | 37.7 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| Mixed Black African and White | 107.0 | 101.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 217.2 | 179.2 | 3.2 | 3.0 |
| Other Ethnic group | 19.3 | 32.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| White |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 65.6 | 56.3 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| White Irish | 61.0 | 56.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Other White Background | 39.2 | 38.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Traveller Groups |  |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 162.2 | 228.8 | 2.4 | 3.8 |
| Gypsy Roma | 175.0 | 153.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 |

Source: Education Data Management System
3.6.5 Pupils of traveller heritage, Black Caribbean and Mixed Black Caribbean and White pupils are the ethnic groups with the highest rates of fixed term exclusion. The rate of exclusion for these groups has consistently been 2.5-3 times higher than the Leeds average over recent years.

## 4 ATTENDANCE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

4.1 Comparative Attendance and Absence Data: Secondary Schools
4.1.1 Analysis of secondary attendance and exclusion figures excludes figures from the David Young Academy as these are returned directly to the DCSF.
4.1.2 The comparative attendance and absence figures for Leeds secondary schools from 2002/03 to 2006/07 are shown in the table below.

Percentage attendance in secondary schools

|  | Leeds target | Leeds | National | Statistical <br> Neighbour <br> Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2002 / 03$ | 90.5 | 90.59 | 91.72 | 91.66 |
| $2003 / 04$ | 90.8 | 91.03 | 91.95 | 91.89 |
| $2004 / 05$ | 91.1 | 91.33 | 92.19 | 92.14 |
| $2005 / 06$ | 91.9 | 90.85 | 92.08 | 91.92 |
| $2006 / 07^{*}$ | 92.2 | 90.93 | 92.24 | 92.28 |

Source: Forvus returns; * 2006/07 data from Forvus equivalent returns provided by schools
4.1.3 After improving considerably in previous years, attendance in Leeds secondary schools fell by $0.8 \%$ in 2005/06, the equivalent to 37,000 school days. The rise was slightly less than that achieved nationally and by statistical neighbours, hence widening the gap, however the downward trend was halted and secondary attendance stable at 90.9\%.
4.1.4 The target set for $2006 / 07$ of $92.2 \%$ was not achieved. A significant step change in secondary attendance is required to meet the Local Public Service Agreement target of $92.3 \%$ attendance in the 2007/08 academic year.
4.1.5 The addition of the Parent Support Advisers is already having an impact. Further integrated work between PSA's and attendance advisers over 2007/2008 will be a key strand of the strategy. As illustrated in the table below authorised absence fell in 2006/07 and is now lower than in any of the last five years.

Percentage authorised absence in secondary schools

|  | Leeds | National | Statistical <br> Neighbour <br> Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2002 / 03$ | 7.48 | 7.21 | 7.25 |
| $2003 / 04$ | 6.94 | 6.92 | 6.96 |
| $2004 / 05$ | 6.75 | 6.58 | 6.51 |
| $2005 / 06$ | 7.29 | 6.70 | 6.72 |
| $2006 / 07$ | 6.51 | 6.30 | 6.16 |

Source: Forvus returns; * 2006/07 data for Forvus equivalent returns provided by schools
4.1.6 Attendance is everybody's concern. The Common Assessment Framework (CAF) and lead budget hold professionals are fully operational and will be used where individual attendance figures are low. Across Leeds secondary schools unauthorised absence has increased by $0.71 \%$. Some of the increase in unauthorised absence will be explained by improved data quality through the introduction of the new national attendance codes in September 2006, this is reflected in the increase in unauthorised absence seen nationally and in statistical neighbours

Percentage unauthorised absence in secondary schools

|  | Leeds | National | Statistical <br> Neighbour <br> Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2002 / 03$ | 1.92 | 1.07 | 1.09 |
| $2003 / 04$ | 2.03 | 1.13 | 1.16 |
| $2004 / 05$ | 1.91 | 1.23 | 1.35 |
| $2005 / 06$ | 1.85 | 1.22 | 1.37 |
| $2006 / 07$ | 2.56 | 1.46 | 1.56 |

Source: Forvus returns; * 2006/07 data for Forvus equivalent returns provided by schools
4.1.7 All Leeds secondary schools are now using the new codes resulting in data being more robust than that reported previously.
4.1.8 The increase in Leeds is higher than national or comparative authorities. Some of this additional increase is explained through local issues with recording attendance in three high schools. These schools each had $50 \%$ or more of their absences recorded as ' N - reason not yet provided', which counts as an unauthorised absence. Each of these three schools showed an increase in unauthorised absence of over $4 \%$ compared to 2005/06
4.1.9 Inaccurate data has been identified as a leadership and management issue as the responsibility for tracking and improving attendance and pupil outcomes lies with the headteacher and governing body. Accuracy of data collection and the use of it to track and safeguard pupils is key to a successful school. Lead responsibility for Attendance on the Senior Leadership Team and accurate use of data has been built into our school improvement policies and procedures.
4.1.1 Guidance has been widely circulated to schools on using these codes, and a 0 Registration Coding Escalation Policy produced to address emerging concerns.
4.1.1 Following a pilot in the south of the city and extensive consultation including the 1 South Area Management Board the Attendance Service was restructured over the last academic year to build in greater scrutiny and challenge through the introduction of the Attendance Adviser role. The new structure has still to embed in practice therefore results of this change will not be evident in this years figures.
4.1.1 The structure will enable Attendance Advisers to work across clusters and areas in 2 more integrated ways with other services and agencies ensuring that they target their efforts at these children and families requiring the most support with attendance.

### 4.2 Persistent Absence

4.2.1 In November 2006, the DCSF announced a new drive to tackle persistent absence (PA) in schools. Persistent absence was defined as pupils who miss $20 \%$ or more of the school year. The figure of $20 \%$ absence was chosen as it is a widely-used threshold for intervention, recognising the significant impact that such low attendance has on outcomes for young people, illustrated throughout this report.
4.2.2 Persistent absence is now the DCSF criteria for identifying target secondary schools and local authorities for attendance. The criteria are based around the number and percentage of pupils that are persistent absentees in a school.
4.2.3 In the 2005/06 academic year, 15 Leeds secondary schools were identified as target schools, this has risen to 18 in 2006/07. Two of the 2005/06 cohort of schools have made significant progress and are no longer target schools however an additional five schools have been added to the target schools list due to the change in criteria as shown below:
4.2.4 2005/06 criteria

- at least 80 or more persistent absentee pupils
- these pupils formed $10 \%$ or more of each school's population

2006/07 criteria

- at least 70 or more persistent absentee pupils
- these pupils formed $9 \%$ or more of each school's population
4.2.5 Nationally, in the autumn and spring term of the 2005/06 academic year, 7.8\% of pupils in secondary schools were persistent absentees. These pupils accounted for nearly one-third of absence and nearly two-thirds of unauthorised absence in secondary schools.
4.2.6 As can be seen in the table below $10.7 \%$ of the secondary cohort in Leeds in 2005/06 were persistent absentees. This is greater than the $7.8 \%$ of pupils nationally. This $10 \%$ of pupils accounted for $38 \%$ of all absence from Leeds secondary schools, $29 \%$ of authorised absence and $78 \%$ of unauthorised absence. The percentage of pupils that were persistent absentees in Leeds secondary schools reduced by almost $1 \%$ in 2006/07. The 4055 pupils that were persistent absentees in 2006/07 contributed to $30 \%$ of authorised absence and $72 \%$ of unauthorised absence. National data is not yet available for 2006/07.
4.2.7 It is this group of children and young people that the service will be focussing on over 2007/2008. Increased data sharing and working in a more integrated way across Children Leeds will be a key focus of future working in localities and across extended school clusters.

Number and percentage of persistent absent pupils in secondary schools ${ }^{1}$

|  | number of persistent absentee | \% of pupils that were persistent absentees |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2005 / 06$ | 4625 | 10.7 |
| $2006 / 07$ | 4055 | 9.8 |

Source: School Census
Notes: 1 - pupils with 51 or more absence sessions in the autumn and spring terms

### 4.3 School Performance

4.3.1 In the 2006/07 academic year, 20 secondary schools (53\%) improved their attendan 10 schools achieved their attendance targets.
4.3.2 At the end of September 2007 the DCSF released new target setting guidance for schools. This document contains information on the median, lower and upper quartile of absence for schools with the same percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals (as opposed to the old methodology which split schools into quintiles based on their free school meal eligibility). Schools are expected to set targets to achieve levels of absence at or below the median level of absence for the free school meal percentage.
4.3.3 The table below shows the numbers and percentages of secondary schools in each quartile when their 2006/07 absence is compared to quartile performance for each school's free school meal percentage.

Secondary school performance against schools with the same free school meal eligibility

|  | Number of schools | $\%$ of schools |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Top quartile | 6 | 15.8 |
| Second quartile | 10 | 26.3 |
| 3rd quartile | 9 | 23.7 |
| Bottom quartile | 13 | 34.2 |

4.3.4 Analysis of the table above shows that only $57.9 \%$ of secondary schools have levels of absence lower than the median for the free school meal percentage. Thirteen schools, over one third, are in the bottom quartile of performance.

Difference to the median level of absence for secondary schools

4.3.5 The chart above shows the distribution of secondary schools by free school meal eligibility and the difference to the median level of absence. This indicates that schools in Leeds with higher levels of free school meal eligibility show the worst performance on comparison to similar schools nationally, having the largest differentials to the national medians
4.3.6 The table below illustrates the target schools for persistent absence

Number and percentage of persistent absentees in target schools

|  | 2005/06 |  | 2006/07 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Numbe r of PA | \% of pupils who were PA | Numbe $r$ of PA | \% of pupils who were PA |
| Target schools in 2005/06 and 2006/07 |  |  |  |  |
| Lawnswood School | 225 | 17.0 | 209 | 15.6 |
| City of Leeds School | 120 | 22.1 | 177 | 28.8 |
| Allerton Grange School | 185 | 12.6 | 182 | 12.2 |
| Primrose High School | 170 | 25.6 | 191 | 22.8 |
| John Smeaton Community High School | 208 | 20.3 | 178 | 19.0 |
| Cockburn College of Arts | 184 | 17.7 | 118 | 10.8 |
| Intake High School Arts College | 202 | 17.8 | 201 | 18.8 |
| Wortley High School | 128 | 15.8 | 126 | 15.6 |
| West Leeds High School | 179 | 17.4 | 163 | 15.8 |
| Parklands Girls' High School | 125 | 17.5 | 143 | 20.1 |
| Rodillian School | 141 | 11.7 | 136 | 11.1 |
| Mount St Mary's Catholic High School | 141 | 11.5 | 113 | 10.0 |
| South Leeds High School | 390 | 29.2 | 251 | 19.4 |
| Target schools in 2005/06 but not in 2006/07 |  |  |  |  |
| Ralph Thoresby High School | 100 | 11.5 | 77 | 8.8 |
| Morley High School | 128 | 10.2 | 102 | 8.0 |
| New target schools for 2006/07 |  |  |  |  |
| Carr Manor High School | 83 | 12.1 | 75 | 12.0 |
| Temple Moor High School | 96 | 8.3 | 104 | 9.2 |
| Farnley Park High School | 47 | 6.3 | 98 | 12.8 |
| Royds School | 106 | 8.7 | 149 | 12.5 |
| Bruntcliffe School | 122 | 9.1 | 131 | 9.7 |

Source: DCSF and School Census
4.3.7 Of the 15 target schools in 2005/06, eight reduced the number of persistent absentees, by more than 10 and overall the target schools achieved a 10\% reduction in the number of persistent absentees. Of the five schools that have become target schools in 2006/07, 3 enter due to the change in criteria and two due to significant increases in persistent absentee pupils.
4.3.8 It is clear from all our data and analysis that to meet the step change required and raise expectations in relation to attendance greater focussed integrated work is required at an individual pupil and family level. The planned move to increased localised integrated delivery models is extended clusters by all services across children Leeds will be a key focus of our revised strategy over 2007/2008

### 4.4 Attendance and Persistent Absence of Pupil Groups



## Attendance of pupil groups.

Source: School Census
4.4.1 As the chart above illustrates, boys have slightly higher levels of attendance than girls. Pupils resident in deprived areas of the city and those eligible for free school meals have low levels of attendance when compared to the Leeds average, attendance fell for each of these groups in 2006/07. Pupils with SEN and in receipt of funding for Inclusion also have lower levels of attendance. Attendance of pupils of Black and Minority Ethnic heritage is equivalent to the Leeds average and the attendance of the priority Asian groups has improved in 2006/07 to be in line with the Leeds average.
4.4.2 As the chart below shows there remain differences in levels of attendance for individual ethnic groups.
4.4.3 Despite significant improvements in primary attendance for Looked After Children to just about 94\%, the attendance of LAC in secondary schools fell in 2006/07 to an all time low of 86\%. Attendance for this group was 4.5\% below the Leeds average.
4.4.4 The need to make a significant difference for LAC across the was recognised in 2006 and resources re-aligned to appoint a head of a virtual school for LAC. A key focus of this appointment is to raise levels of attendance and attainment for all LAC. Given the successful candidate only started in September 2007 it is too early measure the impact of this appointment on 2006/07 figures.

Percentage of Persistent Absentees by Pupil Groups.


Source: School Census
4.4.5 In the autumn and spring terms of 2006/07, more girls than boys were persistent absentees ( $10.1 \%$ compared to $9.4 \%$ ). Almost a quarter of pupils eligible for free school meals were persistent absentees (two and a half times the Leeds average. The percentage of LAC that were persistent absentees was twice as high as the Leeds average at 20\%. The percentage of pupils of Black and Minority Ethnic heritage that were persistent absentees was not significantly higher than the Leeds average, including the priority Asian and Black groups. However, this does hide variations for individual groups, as demonstrated in the table below.

Attendance and Persistent Absence by Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | \% attendance |  | \% of pupils |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | 2006/07 |
| Asian or Asian British |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 87.1 | 88.3 | 14.3 |
| Indian | 92.8 | 93.4 | 5.1 |
| Kashmiri Other | 88.0 | 88.7 | 10.7 |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 88.9 | 90.7 | 9.7 |
| Other Pakistani | 89.7 | 91.7 | 7.9 |
| Other Asian | 91.0 | 91.4 | 8.5 |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |
| Black African | 95.5 | 94.7 | 3.6 |
| Black Caribbean | 91.2 | 90.0 | 11.6 |
| Other Black Background | 90.3 | 88.9 | 13.4 |
| Chinese | 96.5 | 97.1 | 0.5 |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 90.3 | 88.9 | 14.8 |
| Mixed Asian and White | 90.3 | 90.6 | 10.4 |
| Mixed Black African and White | 91.5 | 89.7 | 11.3 |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 88.9 | 88.4 | 14.9 |
| Other Ethnic group | 90.8 | 91.6 | 8.6 |
| White |  |  |  |
| White British | 91.0 | 91.0 | 9.8 |
| White Irish | 91.1 | 92.3 | 7.6 |
| Other White Background | 89.8 | 90.6 | 9.5 |
| Traveller Groups |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 75.9 | 69.4 | 44.7 |
| Gypsy Roma | 73.3 | 71.0 | 45.3 |

Source: School Census
4.4.6 Almost half of Gypsy/Roma and pupils of White Irish Traveller heritage were persistent absentees in 2006/07, pupils of Bangladeshi, Other Mixed and Mixed Black Caribbean and White heritage also has higher proportions of pupils persistently absent than the Leeds average. Attendance increased in 2006/07 for all Asian or Asian British groups, but dropped for pupils of Black or Black British heritage.
4.4.7 Increased tracking and localised integrated working with children and families over 2007/2008 across extended school clusters will result in increased early preventative work and raised levels of attendance and attainment.

