



REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS

EXECUTIVE BOARD: 24 January 2007

SUBJECT: Annual Report on Standards in Leeds High Schools and Biannual Update on Ofsted Inspections and Schools Causing Concern

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 This paper sets out the achievement of young people in Leeds over the past five years and considers the strategies for improvement that have been employed.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 Secondary achievement in Leeds remains consistently below the national average, and was highlighted as one of the key areas for action following the Ofsted inspection of the Local Education Authority in autumn 2004.

2.2 This report provides background information on:

- Detailed analysis of levels of achievement in Leeds, including differentiation between different groups (for example ethnic groups, boys and girls), and also between different schools.
- Analysis of differing rates of change in the levels of achievement (eg 5A*-C and 5A*-G at Key Stage 4).
- The Education Leeds School Improvement Policy and how it supports improvements in school achievement.

3.0 MAIN FINDINGS

3.1 Standards at Key Stage 3 have improved notably and are at least equal to the average of statistical neighbours and within 2% of the national average in all core subjects. This is the first time in nearly fifteen years that Leeds has reached this level. The improvement results from the rigorous effort by schools and the targeted support of the national strategies team. There is still more work to do on transition from Key Stage 2, and updating the curriculum particularly in year 7.

3.2 Standards at Key Stage 4 have continued to improve at 5A*-C, a reflection of the support that is focused on students at the C/D borderline. However, standards at 5A*-G and for students at risk of not gaining any qualifications are rising more slowly and are below comparative regional or national figures. This area should be a priority for improvement. This lower achievement also reduces schools' overall value added figures

and improvement is also lacking in this area

- 3.3 The results of the first 25 Ofsted inspections under the new framework are good with only one school definitely in a category. This is in the context of a reported one in eight unsatisfactory schools nationally. However, there are a few schools about to be inspected which are vulnerable and the picture could look very different by the end of this academic year, despite extensive programmes of support.
- 3.4 A recent evaluation by an experienced HMI shows the improvements that have been made as a result of programmes of support. The 'six schools project' involving a partnership with external consultants resulted in improvements to standards and leadership, and helped the merger and reorganisation of the schools involved. Schools in the 'releasing potential' project contributed above average improvements to the Leeds picture.
- 3.5 Education Leeds has introduced a new school improvement policy and has begun to negotiate partnerships with and between schools to focus on areas of greatest need and to make best use of the existing expertise and interests of schools.

4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL POLICY AND GOVERNANCE

- 4.1 This report informs the new school improvement policy and the development of a strategy for extending and developing partnerships which increase the capacity of all schools to raise achievement. The new inspection framework places additional pressure on schools and particularly on school leaders, who need support. The continued low performance of many minority and vulnerable groups means that tackling inequalities remains a very high priority for Education Leeds and is a central feature of the Children and Young People's Plan for Leeds.

5.0 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 Central and school-based strategies, and a variety of partnerships and initiatives, have been successful in raising achievement in Leeds. However, further developments will be necessary if the momentum is to be maintained and Leeds is to keep pace with national improvements.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The Executive Board is asked to:
- i) note the contents of the report
 - ii) note the strategies for improvement that have been developed to support further increases in achievement for all pupils, groups and schools.

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF EDUCATION LEEDS

EXECUTIVE BOARD: 24 January 2007

SUBJECT: Annual Report on Standards in Leeds High Schools and Biannual Update on Ofsted Inspections and Schools Causing Concern

<p>Electoral wards Affected:</p> <p>ALL WARDS</p>	<p>Specific Implications For:</p> <p>Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Women <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Narrowing the Gap <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Eligible for Call-in <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Not Eligible for Call-in <input type="checkbox"/></p>

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 This paper sets out the achievement of young people in Leeds over the past five years and considers the strategies for improvement that have been employed. The data within this report informs the evaluation of progress related to key strands of the Children and Young People's Plan for Leeds 2006-2009

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 Secondary achievement in Leeds remains consistently below the national average, and was highlighted as one of the key areas for action following the Ofsted inspection of the Local Education Authority in autumn 2004.

2.2 This report provides background information on:

- detailed analysis of levels of achievement in Leeds, including differentiation between different groups (for example ethnic groups, boys and girls), and also between different schools;
- analysis of differing rates of change in the levels of achievement (e.g. 5A*-C and 5A*-G at Key Stage 4);

- the Education Leeds School Improvement Policy and how it supports improvements in school achievement;
- The findings of recent Ofsted inspections, and the overall findings by Ofsted since the introduction of the new framework;
- The progress of schools in extended partnerships.

3.0 MAIN ISSUES

3.1 Overview of Standards at Key Stages 3 and 4, and post-16

3.1.1 Standards at Key Stage 3 have improved notably and are at least equal to the average of statistical neighbours and within 2% of the national average in all core subjects. This is the first time in nearly 15 years that Leeds has reached this level. The improvement results from the rigorous effort by schools and the targeted support of the national strategies team. There is still more work to do on transition from Key Stage 2, and updating the curriculum particularly in Year 7. Standards at Key Stage 4 have continued to improve at 5A*-C, a reflection of the support that is focused on students at the C/D borderline. However, standards at 5A*-G and for students at risk of not gaining any qualifications are rising more slowly and are below comparative regional or national figures. This area should be a priority for improvement. This lower achievement also reduces schools' overall value added figures and improvement is also slow in this area. At post-16 the trend of gradual improvement in the points score per subject entry continues.

3.2 KEY STAGE 3

3.2.1 Key Stage 3 Trends and Comparisons


2004-2006 Percentage of pupils achieving level 5 + at Key Stage 3

% pupils achieving level 5+	2004			2005			2006		
	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*
English	66	71	65	70	74	70	70	72	69
Mathematics	70	73	70	70	74	71	75	77	75
Science	62	66	63	65	70	66	69	72	70

Note: 2006 data is provisional

Stat Neigh = statistical neighbours (comparable Local Authorities)

3.2.2 Standards are improving at Key Stage 3. In terms of level 5+ all three tested subjects have shown marked improvement since 2004, closing the gap to national performance and mirroring that seen in statistical neighbour authorities. This is the best level of performance ever seen in Leeds. The increased focus by schools on individual students and their potential, and targeted support from the national strategies consultants is producing higher results. This needs to be extended to more students and groups, as there is still scope for improvement. Overall, performance across all subjects and measured by the average point score is in the third quartile nationally



2004-2006 Percentage of pupils achieving level 6 + at Key Stage 3

% pupils achieving level 5+	2004			2005			2006		
	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*	Leeds	Nat	Stat Neigh*
English	29	34	28	31	34	31	32	34	30
Mathematics	50	52	49	49	53	50	56	57	54
Science	31	34	31	33	37	33	39	41	38

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.2.3 In terms of level 6+ performance, the gap to national levels has closed in all three subjects. The gap has now stands at 2% in English, 1% in mathematics and 2% in science. Performance against statistical neighbours has widened over the last three years, with Leeds out-performing the statistical neighbour's average in all three subjects.


% level 5+		2004		2005		2006	
	gender	Leeds	Nat	Leeds	Nat	Leeds	Nat
English	Girls	72	78	76	80	76	80
	Boys	60	64	64	67	64	65
Maths	Girls	71	74	70	74	75	77
	Boys	70	72	71	73	75	76
Science	Girls	63	67	65	70	69	73
	Boys	61	65	66	69	70	71

3.2.4 The overall pattern of performance by gender in Leeds is broadly similar to the national picture. However, the gap between Leeds and national for boys is only 1% in all subjects, while the gap for girls is larger and reaches 4% in English and science. Hence although the gender gap in Leeds is smaller, this could be seen as due to the underperformance of girls compared with national figures. On the other hand it also shows that interventions to raise boys' attainment are having some success.


3.2.5 Key Stage 3 Trajectories

3.2.6 Performance is compared with estimates generated by the Fischer Family Trust (FFT) which uses prior performance in national curriculum tests combined with characteristics about pupils and schools to estimate performance in subsequent tests. A type 'B' estimate is one based on similar pupils in similar schools. Type 'D' marks the upper quartile.


3.2.7 In 2004 performance was clearly below expectations, being 6% below the FFT 'B' estimate, but by 2006 this gap had narrowed to less than 2%. This improvement is despite the fact that both FFT and schools expected a drop in performance in 2006, but managed to maintain the standard at 2005 levels. A rise in performance is expected in 2007.



3.2.8 Key Stage 3 mathematics shows very strong improvement in 2006. Performance in mathematics is now in line with initial FFT top quartile estimates, although this is subject to amendment once new analysis is released. It should be noted that performance in 2006 exceeded the aggregation of the targets set by schools in 2004 for this cohort.



3.2.9 There has been a strong improvement in science. In 2004 performance in science was well below expectations, being 11% below the FFT 'B' estimate, but by 2006 this gap had narrowed to less than 2%.



3.2.10 Attainment in ICT continues to rise from 2004, and is more in line with achievement in other Key Stage 3 subjects. Target setting is becoming more realistic as the understanding of requirements becomes better established in schools. Expectations for 2007 are very challenging but achievable.

3.2.11 Floor targets

3.2.12 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 less likely to achieve 5+A*-C at Key Stage 4 two years later.

Numbers and percentages of schools below Key Stage 3 floor targets

	<50% level 5+ core subjects	
	number	%
2003	18	42.9
2004	17	40.5
2005	18	43.9
2006	12	30.0

3.2.13 Performance against Key Stage 3 floor targets has shown a significant fall in 2006 after static performance prior to that. Less than one-third of Leeds' secondary schools are now below the Key Stage 3 floor target.

3.2.14 Attainment of Pupil Groups

Percentage of pupils attaining level 5+: Looked After Children

	2004	2005	2006
Cohort size	95	86	96
English	15	26	27
Maths	22	24	34
Science	14	21	28

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.2.15 Performance of looked after children (LAC) continued the improvement seen in 2005, although performance is still well below the cohort as a whole. There have been significant improvements in all three subjects with almost twice as many LAC achieving level 5 or better since 2004.

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

		2004		2005		2006
		Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
English	Non eligible	74.2	76	77.4	78	76.3
	Eligible	42.1	46	48.7	51	44.0
Maths	Non eligible	77.8	77	77.6	78	80.7
	Eligible	46.7	50	49.2	51	50.7
Science	Non eligible	70.3	71	73.1	74	76.0
	Eligible	36.0	39	40.6	44	42.4

Note: 2006 data is provisional

- 3.2.16 Performance in English of pupils eligible for free school meals fell in 2006, but improvements were seen in mathematics and science, maintaining the rises of 2005. The gap is still a significant one and is wider at Key Stage 3 than seen at Key Stage 2 representing a widening of the gap between affluent and deprived families as children become older.

Percentage of pupils attaining level 5+: Special Education Needs

		2004		2005		2006
		Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
English	Action	34.7	33	36.0	39	29.2
	Action +	24.9	23	29.4	26	21.4
	Statement	10.0	11	11.4	12	11.4
Maths	Action	44.0	38	40.1	40	41.3
	Action +	35.4	30	36.9	31	29.3
	Statement	12.2	15	15.6	15	16.2
Science	Action	32.7	29	35.4	36	31.8
	Action +	27.2	23	29.1	28	27.0
	Statement	9.7	14	15.7	17	15.6


Note: 2006 data is provisional

- 3.2.17 Pupils with special educational needs make significant achievements. There is no firm criteria for defining 'action' and 'action plus' students and statements are given for a variety of circumstances. Hence comparison and trends are not particularly meaningful. However, the patterns of achievement in recent years are broadly in line with national figures.

3.2.18 Key Stage 3 Contextual Value Added

- 3.2.19 Analysis of performance in terms of value added at secondary schools is currently limited to FFT analysis as the Department for Education and Skills (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.

- 3.2.20 (FFT) contextual value added rankings in Leeds for Key Stage 3 have not shown any consistent pattern in recent years.



3.2.21 Both English and mathematics were within the bottom quartile in 2005, with the encouraging trend in mathematics seen in earlier years falling back and only a slight improvement in English. However, initial analysis suggests that this has been reversed in both subjects in 2006. Both subjects are now outside the bottom quartile nationally, for the first time. Mathematics performance in 2005 can be considered an outlier in an upward trend whilst in English, performance has made improvement in each of the last two years.

3.2.22 While, overall, progress at Key Stage 3 in Leeds is well below national expectations, there are encouraging signs of improvement 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 just inside the bottom quartile having been in the bottom 10% in 2005.

Subject	Estimate-Actual Difference (%)			LA Contextual Percentile Ranking			3 year trend
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	
English L5+	-3.6	-2.8	-1.5	93	92	79	↑
Maths L5+	-1.5	-2.8	-1.6	82	96	87	↑ ↓
Science L5+	-2.5	-3.3	-1.8	88	95	88	↑
English L6+	-2.5	-1.0	-0.6	84	72	61	↑
Maths L6+	-0.4	-2.1	-0.6	58	86	67	↑ ↓
Science L6+	-0.9	-1.7	-0.4	66	76	56	↑
Mean Grade	-0.06	-0.07	-0.03	84	94	76	↑

↑	Significantly increase over 3 years	↓	Significant fall over three years
█	Significantly above 3 year estimate	█	Significantly below 3 year estimate

3.2.23 Contextual Value Added for groups of pupils

3.2.24 Contextual value added can also be used to evaluate the progress of priority pupil groups.

Pupil Group	English			Maths			Science			3 year trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	En	Ma	Sci
All Pupils	-3.6	-2.8	-1.5	-1.5	-2.8	-1.6	-2.5	-3.3	-1.8	↑	↑ ↓	↑
Boys	-3.7	-2.8	-0.7	-1.5	-2.9	-1.3	-2.3	-3.6	-1.6	↑	↑ ↓	↑
Boys - Lower	-5.6	-4.1	-1.3	-3.5	-5.3	-3.1	-3.1	-5.4	-3.3	↑		
Boys - Middle	-4.7	-4.1	-0.4	-0.7	-2.9	-0.8	-3.3	-5.0	-0.8	↑	↑ ↓	↑
Boys - Upper	-0.3	0.6	-0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	-0.4			
Girls	-3.5	-2.8	-2.4	-1.5	-2.8	-1.8	-2.7	-3.1	-2.1		↓	↑
Girls - Lower	-9.3	-7.0	-5.2	-4.4	-6.4	-5.3	-4.1	-5.3	-5.6	↑		
Girls - Middle	-1.9	-1.7	-2.1	-0.4	-1.9	-0.6	-3.7	-3.7	-1.2			
Girls - Upper	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.0	0.3	0.6			↑

↑	Significantly increase over 3 years	↓	Significant fall over three years
	Significantly above 3 year estimate		Significantly below 3 year estimate

3.2.25 The gap to estimate for all subjects has closed, significantly in English and science. Performance is particularly encouraging for boys, of all abilities. For girls, those of high ability have out-performed the estimate, whilst low and middle ability girls remain below estimate.

3.2.26 Analysis of the performance at Key Stage 3 for the larger ethnic groups shows that several are in line with FFT estimates.

Pupil Group	English			Maths			Science			3 year trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	En	Ma	Sci
Bangladeshi	-7.6	-1.2	-16.5	-1.1	12.6	-20.4	-2.0	-16.1	-19.6	↓	↓	
Indian	0.1	-0.4	0.0	-5.2	-4.9	0.8	-2.6	-3.8	0.1		↑	
Pakistani	-7.7	-7.0	-9.2	-6.7	-3.9	-4.1	-8.4	-6.9	-3.2			
Other Asian	-4.1	-0.0	-5.7	2.6	-0.9	0.4	5.2	0.2	-4.0			
Black African	-11.2	-2.3	5.4	1.4	-2.9	1.2	0.8	-4.7	1.6	↑		↑
Black Caribbean	-11.5	-6.7	-2.7	-2.5	-3.5	-1.2	-7.2	-3.2	-3.5	↑		
Chinese	-2.9	6.2	9.3	0.5	2.5	2.1	7.7	2.4	2.5			
Any Other heritage	-2.1	0.5	0.3	-0.7	-3.1	-3.0	-4.1	0.3	-4.9			
White	-3.2	-2.7	-1.3	-1.2	-2.7	-1.4	-2.2	-3.2	-1.7	↑	↑ ↓	↑
No Information	-4.5	2.4	6.3	-1.5	-0.2	-2.0	-2.9	1.8	-0.1			

3.2.27 Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean, Pakistani, and White pupils are significantly below estimates. Bangladeshi pupils have moved further below estimate since 2004, but Pakistani pupils show no change since 2004. Black Caribbean pupils, in English, and White pupils in English and science have shown improvements towards estimates.

Pupil Group	English			Maths			Science			3 year trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	En	Ma	Sci
FSM - No	-2.8	-2.3	-0.8	-0.8	-2.3	-0.8	-2.1	-2.5	-1.1	↑	↑ ↓	↑
FSM - Yes	-7.4	-4.8	-4.5	-4.5	-5.2	-5.0	-4.3	-6.7	-5.0	↑		
Looked After - No	-3.5	-2.8	-1.5	-1.5	-2.8	-1.6	-2.4	-3.4	-1.8	↑	↑ ↓	↑
Looked After - Yes	-9.6	-3.5	-2.8	-3.2	-2.9	-2.0	-9.3	-0.1	-3.4			
No SEN	-7.0	-7.4	-3.0	-5.4	-6.1	-4.2	-6.3	-6.1	-5.2	↑		
School Action	-3.6	-2.5	-1.5	-1.1	-2.4	-1.2	-2.3	-3.1	-1.5	↑↑	↑ ↓	↑
School Action Plus	-4.0	-3.5	-2.0	-0.5	-8.3	-4.0	-0.4	-6.3	-3.7		↓	
Statemented	3.1	1.8	2.0	-1.4	-0.8	-0.8	-0.5	0.2	-0.2			

3.2.28 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.

- 3.2.29 In English and science, looked after children are significantly below estimate with no change over three years. However, their performance is in line with estimates in mathematics.
- 3.2.30 Pupils with statements of special need are significantly above estimates in English and in line with estimates in mathematics and science, whilst school action and school action plus pupils are below estimates over the three year period from 2004

Key Stage 3: percentage of pupils achieving level 5+

	Pupils	English			Maths			Science			2005 - 2006 change			Difference from total 2006		
	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	English	Maths	Science	English	Maths	Science
Bangladeshi	52	51.2	70.6	54.0	48.8	54.9	56.9	42.5	39.2	45.1	-16.6	2.0	5.9	-15.6	-17.6	-23.8
Indian	153	78.9	81.8	83.0	76.9	76.5	83.0	69.1	71.2	78.4	1.2	6.5	7.3	13.4	8.5	9.5
Kashmiri Pakistani	101	52.0	59.0	48.5	62.2	57.4	61.0	45.7	41.8	45.5	-10.5	3.6	3.7	-21.1	-13.5	-23.4
Kashmiri Other	6	66.7	42.9	50.0	100.0	71.4	66.7	66.7	42.9	50.0	7.1	-4.8	7.1	-19.6	-7.8	-18.9
Other Pakistani	235	56.4	62.6	57.3	54.3	63.5	61.7	42.3	49.8	53.3	-5.3	-1.9	3.6	-12.3	-12.8	-15.6
Other Asian	45	53.8	68.3	61.4	64.1	78.0	77.3	61.5	68.3	63.6	-6.9	-0.8	-4.7	-8.2	2.8	-5.3
Black Caribbean	87	45.7	58.9	65.9	55.8	59.7	74.1	38.0	51.6	63.5	7.0	14.4	11.9	-3.7	-0.4	-5.4
Black African	87	66.7	56.3	65.5	66.7	53.8	71.4	42.1	50.0	54.8	9.2	17.7	4.8	-4.1	-3.1	-14.1
Other Black Background	44	44.4	62.7	72.7	61.4	62.7	72.7	45.5	54.9	59.1	10.0	10.0	4.2	3.1	-1.8	-9.8
Mixed Black African & White	30	60.0	53.8	55.2	60.0	57.7	58.6	46.7	38.5	55.2	1.3	0.9	16.7	-14.4	-15.9	-13.7
Mixed Black Caribbean & White	113	59.6	60.0	59.5	61.3	58.1	62.2	51.6	52.4	55.0	-0.5	4.1	2.6	-10.1	-12.3	-13.9
Mixed Asian & White	34	79.1	83.3	72.7	85.7	75.6	78.8	73.8	73.8	72.7	-10.6	3.2	-1.1	3.1	4.3	3.8
Other Mixed	68	73.7	62.7	67.2	73.7	60.8	65.7	68.4	52.9	62.7	4.4	4.9	9.7	-2.4	-8.8	-6.2
Chinese	40	75.0	78.8	89.7	89.3	97.0	94.9	85.2	78.1	92.3	11.0	-2.1	14.2	20.1	20.4	23.4
Other Ethnic group	43	64.8	62.7	60.5	71.7	64.7	67.4	58.5	59.6	51.2	-2.3	2.7	-8.5	-9.1	-7.1	-17.7
White British	7333	66.8	70.8	71.0	71.5	71.9	76.0	63.7	67.5	71.2	0.2	4.1	3.6	1.4	1.5	2.3
White Irish	41	77.5	75.8	63.4	72.5	69.7	53.7	65.0	60.6	65.9	-12.3	-16.0	5.2	-6.2	-20.8	-3.0
Traveller Irish Heritage	3	50.0	25.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	66.7	0.0	100.0	25.0	100.0	100.0	-19.6	25.5	31.1
Gypsy/Roma	16	12.5	0.0	28.6	37.5	60.0	35.7	12.5	0.0	28.6	28.6	-24.3	28.6	-41.0	-38.8	-40.3
Other White	97	74.0	71.4	70.2	75.7	70.2	77.9	70.3	68.7	68.1	-1.2	7.7	-0.6	0.6	3.4	-0.8
Info Not Obtained / Unknown	30	42.2	59.7	53.3	46.7	49.3	40.0	37.4	44.4	30.0	-6.4	-9.3	-14.4	-16.3	-34.5	-38.9
Refused	30	75.0	88.0	79.3	90.0	96.0	82.8	85.0	84.0	82.8	-8.7	-13.2	-1.2	9.7	8.3	13.9
		66.0	69.9	69.6	70.5	70.6	74.5	62.0	65.4	68.9	-0.3	3.9	3.5			

3.2.31

Performance of Black heritage pupils has improved on 2005 levels across all three subjects. Asian heritage pupils have shown improvements in mathematics and science. Improvements have also been seen for Traveller and Gypsy/Roma pupils, although this cohort is particularly small.

3.3 KEY STAGE 4

3.3.1 Key Stage 4 Trends and Comparisons

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

2004-2006 Percentage Benchmark indicators for GCSE

% pupils achieving:	2004			2005			2006		
	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Nat</i>	<i>Stat Neigh*</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Nat</i>	<i>Stat Neigh*</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>Nat</i>	<i>Stat Neigh*</i>
5 or more A* - C	45.3	53.7	47.3	49.7	57.1	50.9	51.6	59.0	53.0
5 or more A*-C (inc Eng & maths)	36.4	42.6	36.1	38.2	44.9	38.7	40.2	45.8	39.7
5 or more A*-G	85.7	88.8	88.2	86.6	90.2	88.5	86.4	90.6	89.1
No Passes	5.6	4.1	4.7	5.1	2.6	4.3	4.4	2.0	3.4

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.3 The rise in the 5+A*-C indicator means that for the first time over half the students in Leeds achieve this benchmark standard at age 16, an increase of 10% since 2002. The increase in 5+ A*-C matched the national improvement, whilst the additional measure of 5+A*-C including English and mathematics closed the gap to national performance by 1.1%. This latter indicator is closer to the national average, and above the average for statistical neighbours.

3.3.4 An area of focus for the future needs to be on low attainers, where performance is well below the national level. The gap widened in terms of 5+ A*-G with a drop of 0.2% locally and improvement nationally of 0.4%. In terms of pupils with no qualifications, local performance improved by 0.7%, 0.1% more than the national improvement.

3.3.5 In 2004 pupils gained over 94% of their Key Stage 4 points from GCSE examinations, and under 6% from non-GCSE sources including GNVQ, Basic Skills and BTEC courses. By 2006 the proportion of points earned from these other courses had risen to 16%. Pupils taking these courses did better than might have been expected from their results at previous key stages, and this increased diversity is contributing to increased achievement. Every high school in Leeds now offers at least one non-GCSE course, but there is a wide variation in the curriculum offered. The proportion of points gained from these courses varies from as much as 40% in one school to as little as 5%. Comparisons will be useful to schools in evaluating the effectiveness of their curriculum.

3.3.6 The contribution of City Learning Centres in piloting new courses in Leeds had been an important factor in the growth of vocational courses. In particular, students who would otherwise not have achieved 5 GCSEs or equivalent at higher grades have been assisted to achieve 5 'C' grades by following one of these new courses.

3.3.7

Key Stage 4		2004		2005		2006	
		Leeds	Nat	Leeds	Nat	Leeds	Nat
5 or more A*-C	Girls	50.1	58.8	53.9	62.1	55.9	63.9
	Boys	40.7	48.8	44.5	52.2	47.5	54.3
5 or more A*-C (inc Eng & maths)	Girls	40.2	46.8	42.4	49.1	43.8	50.2
	Boys	32.5	38.7	34.5	40.7	36.6	41.5
5 or more A*-G	Girls	88.3	91.2	88.6	92.5	88.6	92.9
	Boys	83.2	86.4	83.6	88.1	83.9	88.3
No Passes	Girls	4.6	3.3	4.9	2.0	4.3	1.4
	Boys	6.6	5.0	6.7	3.1	6.1	2.5


Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.8

The performance of boys achieving higher grades at GCSE has risen faster than girls in last three years, and is closer to the national average. This is not repeated for 5+ A*-G or no passes, where the gap is wider locally than nationally. Too many boys in Leeds gain no qualifications or fewer than five GCSE passes.

3.3.9 Key Stage 4 Trajectories

Performance is compared with estimates generated by the FFT which uses prior performance in national curriculum tests combined with characteristics about pupils and schools to estimate performance in subsequent tests. A type 'B' estimate is one based on similar pupils in similar schools. Type 'D' marks the upper quartile.



3.3.10

Performance in 2006 is still 3% below FFT 'B' estimates although this is an improvement on previous years; the gap to FFT 'B' estimates is closing, year on year for 5+ A*-C. The projections for future years show small increases of well under 1% per year and schools will do well to maintain the rate of recent improvement. The lower rate of increase is a consequence of recent more modest increases in Key Stage 2 which provides the basis for these projections.

3.3.11 Key Stage 4 Floor Targets

3.3.12 Numbers and percentages of schools below Key Stage 4 floor targets

	<25% 5+ A*-C (2006)		<30% 5+ A*-C (2008)	
	number	%	number	%
2003	12	27.9	15	34.9
2004	6	15.0	10	25.0
2005	4	9.8	7	17.1
2006	3	7.5	6	15.0

3.3.13 There has been a dramatic fall in the number of schools below floor targets at Key Stage 4. Only 7.5% (3 schools) were below the 2006 floor target of 25% for 5+ A*-C. A further three schools are below the 2008 floor target of 30%, making 15% in total.

3.3.14 Attainment of Pupil Groups

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

	2004		2005		2006
	Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
Cohort size	98		103		104
not entered	33		32		29
5+ A*-C	5	9	14	11	6
5+ A*-G	44	39	38	41	43
1+ A*-G	65	56	62	60	60

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.15 Performance for LAC fell at 5+ A*-C and 1+ A*-G in 2006, although entry numbers and 5+ A*-G figures improved. Provisional data indicates that the target of 15% of looked after children to achieve 5 or more A*-Cs was not achieved in 2006.

Percentage of pupils attaining Key Stage 4 benchmarks: Free School Meal Eligibility

		2004		2005		2006
		Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
5+ A*-C	Non eligible	51.5	56.2	55.5	57.3	58.8
	Eligible	18.4	26.3	23.1	30.1	22.3
5+ A*-G	Non eligible	90.7	97	90.1		90.9
	Eligible	67.4	91.3	69.0		69.5
No passes	Non eligible	3.6		3.5	3.2	3.0
	Eligible	15.4		12.7	7.5	11.2

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.16 Performance of FSM eligible pupils at 5+ A*-C fell slightly but 5+ A*-G and pupils without qualifications improved in 2006, continuing the trend seen in 2005.

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

		2004		2005		2006
		Leeds	National	Leeds	National	Leeds
5+ A*-C	Action	8.9	15.4	12.8	17.1	17.8
	Action +	8.8	11.2	7.7		8.6
	Statement	5.3	6.2	6.7	7.1	4.3
5+ A*-G	Action	64.0	76.9	64.5		66.4
	Action +	38.4	56.9	37.8		47.2
	Statement	31.1	38.4	38.0		28.8
No passes	Action	13.4		10.9	8.5	8.6
	Action +	30.8		30.2		23.4
	Statement	41.9		30.1	19.4	16.7

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.17 There are pupils with special educational needs who make significant achievements; there were notable individual successes where pupils based in specialist inclusive learning centres achieved 5 good grades at GCSE. There is no firm criteria for defining 'action' and 'action plus' students and statements are given for a variety of circumstances. Hence comparison and trends are not always meaningful. However, while the decrease in the proportion of pupils not gaining any passes is creditable the value added figures show that pupils with special educational needs should be making more progress (see 3.3.27).

3.3.18 **Contextual Value Added**


3.3.19 Contextual value added measures the progress that pupils make from one key stage to a subsequent key stage, adjusted for characteristics of pupils and schools. An 'average' results means that pupils are making progress typical of similar pupils across the country as a whole.

3.3.20 Analyses generated through the 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.

3.3.21 Overall, the performance of Leeds as a whole measured by value added between Key Stages 2 and 4 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. However, the improvement in 5+ A*-C progress shown last year has continued, and on this indicator Leeds has risen nearly to the lower quartile. The figures for 5A*-G reinforce the assertion made earlier in this report that this needs to be a priority for Education Leeds and schools.

Indicator	Difference			Rank			3 year trend
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	
5+ A*-C	-4.7	-3.4	-2.5	92	86	77	↑
5+ A*-G	-2.8	-2.5	-2.9	94	93	95	
Capped Points score	-13.9	-12.0	-12.4	95	93	96	
↑	Significantly increase over 3 years				Significant fall over three years		
	Significantly above 3 year estimate				Significantly below 3 year estimate		

3.3.22 Number of Schools in each Fischer Family Trust Quartile



3.3.23 Despite the increase in the headline 5A*-C figure, overall progress from Key Stage 2 to 4 did not improve in 2006. The chart above shows that the number of schools in the fourth quartile, had fallen since 2003, but increased again in 2006, while the number of schools making better than average progress fell in 2006 after making small improvements in previous years. In 2003 six (15%) schools were in the top 50% of schools nationally for added value measured by the average point score, in 2006 this stands at 9 (22.5%).

3.3.24 FFT data allows a detailed analysis of the performance of the major pupil groups in Leeds. 'Ability' is measured by prior performance at Key Stage 2. In this analysis, actual performance is compared to the estimate, and the difference is shown below. Three year trends are also shown, with significant differences and changes over the three years highlighted.

Pupil Group	% 5+ A*-C			% 5+ A*-G			Capped points			Trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	5+ A*-C	5+ A*-G	Points
All Pupils	-4.7	-3.4	-2.5	-2.8	-2.5	-2.9	-13.9	-12.0	-12.4	↑		
All Boys	-4.5	-3.0	-2.3	-2.9	-2.4	-3.0	-14.3	-11.1	-12.9	↑		↑
Boys - Lower ability	-2.5	-2.7	-3.0	-4.4	-3.5	-3.7	-21.1	-19.8	-22.1	↑		
Boys - Mid-ability	-8.7	-5.6	-3.3	-2.9	-2.3	-3.8	-16.0	-11.4	-13.5	↑		
Boys - Upper ability	-2.0	-0.2	-0.3	-1.1	-1.3	-1.3	-4.2	0.2	-0.4			
All Girls	-5.0	-3.9	-2.6	-2.6	-2.6	-2.8	-13.5	-12.8	-12.0	↑		
Girls - Lower ability	-5.1	-6.1	-5.5	-3.6	-4.0	-4.9	-19.7	-23.1	-26.1			↓
Girls - Mid-ability	-8.0	-3.7	-2.1	-3.0	-2.4	-2.5	-15.0	-11.1	-8.3	↑		↑
Girls - Upper ability	-1.5	-1.9	-0.2	-1.2	-1.4	-1.0	-5.6	-4.5	-1.4			

↑	Significantly increase over 3 years	↓	Significant fall over three years
	Significantly above 3 year estimate		Significantly below 3 year estimate

3.3.25 Overall, performance is significantly below FFT estimates for all indicators for both gender groups. The main message from the figures is that pupils of upper ability are more likely to achieve their expected standard than lower ability pupils. Some good progress has been made with the middle ability group in the past three years, particularly at 5A*-C.

Pupil Group	Difference between FFT estimate and actual performance											
	% 5+ A*-C			% 5+ A*-G			Capped points			Trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	5+ A*-C	5+ A*-G	Points
Bangladeshi	-19.6	-7.7	6.1	-4.8	4.6	3.1	-40.2	-13.8	-11.8	↑		
Indian	-5.6	-6.5	-3.8	0.6	3.3	0.8	-14.2	-8.4	-7.6			
Pakistani	-10.2	-10.6	-11.8	-0.2	0.0	-2.3	-26.5	-25.8	-27.0			
Other Asian	-3.3	-3.8	-0.4	-4.2	-1.8	-2.5	-21.7	-3.3	-12.6			
Black African	-11.2	-7.1	-8.9	-4.4	3.6	-1.8	-28.5	-9.2	-20.9			
Black Caribbean	-9.0	-5.7	-9.7	-1.6	-1.3	-7.9	-19.2	-25.2	-30.9			
Chinese	-0.6	-0.3	-3.2	-1.3	1.6	-0.7	-11.1	-7.3	-4.3			
Any Other heritage	-1.3	-4.3	-7.0	1.0	-1.8	-3.7	-4.1	-11.4	-16.2			
White	-4.3	-2.9	-1.7	-2.9	-2.8	-2.8	-12.9	-11.0	-11.0	↑↑		
No Information	-4.5	-11.5	-9.3	-10.0	-10.8	-17.9	-17.5	-21.8	-42.2			

3.3.26 Only a few ethnic groups are performing in line with estimates in terms of 5+ A*-C, notably Bangladeshi and Chinese pupils. Signs are more encouraging at 5+ A*-G, where performance of Indian pupils is significantly above estimate, and only White pupils and Black Caribbean pupils are significantly below estimate on this indicator. Overall performance, measured by points score is significantly below estimates for nearly all ethnic groups.

Pupil Group	% 5+ A*-C			% 5+ A*-G			Capped points			Trend		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006	5+ A*-C	5+ A*-G	Points
FSM – Not eligible	-4.7	-3.4	-1.7	-1.5	-1.4	-1.5	-10.7	-8.2	-7.6	↑↑		↑
FSM - Eligible	-5.0	-3.8	-6.0	-8.6	-7.9	-9.0	-29.4	-29.5	-33.7			
Looked After - No	-4.7	-3.4	-2.3	-2.6	-2.4	-2.7	-13.6	-11.7	-11.9	↑		
Looked After - Yes	-7.8	-6.4	-13.0	-18.6	-20.0	-20.6	-51.0	-37.8	-61.1			
No SEN	-5.0	-3.0	-2.1	-0.7	-0.6	-0.8	-10.9	-8.2	-8.2	↑		↑
School Action	-5.2	-7.8	-4.2	-5.4	-8.8	-9.9	-28.3	-35.7	-34.2	↑	↓	
School Action Plus	-2.7	-5.6	-4.8	-25.2	-24.5	-16.4	-47.2	-54.3	-38.1		↑	
Statemented	-0.8	-1.1	-3.2	-18.7	-13.6	-16.4	-20.7	-11.9	-21.4			

3.3.27 Performance for other priority groups is still well below expectations, with looked after children, free school meal eligible, and pupils with special needs all significantly below estimates for all indicators. None of these groups have shown an improvement in terms of closing the gap to estimate in the last three years.

Key Stage 4		Pupils	5+ A*-C				5+ A*-G				05-06 Improvement		2006 against LA total		
			2006	2003	2004	2005	2006	2003	2004	2005	2006	5+ A*-C	5+ A*-G	5+ A*-C	5+ A*-G
			ASIAN or ASIAN BRITISH	Bangladeshi	39	37.5	28.8	41.9	59.0	81.3	82.7	93.5	94.9	17.0	1.3
Indian	176	56.2		67.8	59.4	66.5	94.3	97.1	98.2	96.0	7.1	-2.2	15.1	10.2	
Kashmiri Pakistani	118	33.6		28.6	33.6	36.4	81.4	88.8	91.2	83.9	2.8	-7.3	-15.0	-1.9	
Kashmiri Other	5	0.0		75.0	25.0	40.0	0.0	75.0	75.0	80.0	15.0	5.0	-11.4	-5.8	
Other Pakistani	202	34.3		38.0	43.1	40.1	87.4	83.9	88.3	86.1	-3.0	-2.2	-11.3	0.3	
Other Asian background	36	48.3		50.0	47.1	52.8	82.8	80.0	79.4	77.8	5.7	-1.6	1.4	-8.0	
BLACK OR BLACK BRITISH	Black Caribbean	125	21.0	21.2	31.7	28.0	73.9	82.9	84.1	75.2	-3.7	-8.9	-23.4	-10.6	
	Black African	117	29.4	41.5	45.6	43.6	52.9	82.9	82.4	76.1	-2.0	-6.3	-7.8	-9.7	
	Other Black Background	42	25.0	27.3	28.6	23.8	68.2	80.0	88.1	81.0	-4.8	-7.1	-27.6	-4.8	
MIXED	Mixed Black African & White	21	14.3	27.8	16.7	33.3	57.1	61.1	66.7	76.2	16.7	9.5	-18.1	-9.6	
	Mixed Black Caribbean & White	96	28.4	38.6	34.0	32.3	82.7	80.2	76.0	80.2	-1.7	4.2	-19.1	-5.6	
	Mixed Asian & White	47	59.3	48.4	45.2	63.8	92.6	83.9	83.9	87.2	18.7	3.4	12.4	1.4	
	Other Mixed Background	51	41.0	26.7	50.0	39.2	87.2	80.0	77.3	84.3	-10.8	7.0	-12.2	-1.5	
CHINESE OR OTHER ETHNIC GROUP	Chinese	35	63.2	78.1	64.1	54.3	94.7	96.9	79.5	74.3	-9.8	-5.2	2.9	-11.5	
	Other Ethnic group	55	44.4	56.9	48.2	52.7	73.3	86.3	80.4	76.4	4.5	-4.0	1.3	-9.4	
WHITE	White British	7138	44.9	45.7	50.2	52.6	85.6	85.8	86.3	86.3	2.5	0.0	1.2	0.5	
	White Irish	37	58.3	58.6	41.5	51.4	86.1	86.2	80.5	81.1	9.9	0.6	0.0	-4.7	
	Traveller Irish Heritage	5	66.7	0.0	0.0	20.0	100.0	40.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	80.0	-31.4	-5.8	
	Gypsy/Roma	9	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	50.0	37.5	22.2	44.4	0.0	22.2	-40.3	-41.4	
	Other White Background	87	51.5	47.5	59.5	59.8	88.2	82.0	81.0	90.8	0.2	9.9	8.4	5.0	
UNKNOWN	Info Not Obtained	55	35.8	26.3	12.2	23.6	70.4	59.6	53.1	58.2	11.4	5.1	-27.8	-27.6	
	Refused	19	59.3	71.4	70.8	68.4	88.9	92.9	100.0	89.5	-2.4	-10.5	17.0	3.7	
Total		8515	44.1	45.1	49.1	51.4	85.1	85.5	85.9	85.8	2.3	-0.1			

Note: 2006 data is provisional

3.3.28 In terms of 5+ A*-C, performance within Asian groups has improved in terms of 5+ A*-C, but this is not the case for Black pupil groups, where performance has fallen from 2005. Notably, Bangladeshi pupils outperformed the authority as a whole in 2006. This picture is repeated in the main for 5+ A*-G, where again the gap to LA performance widened for pupils of black heritage.

3.4 POST-16

3.4.1 A Level (A2) and equivalent exam results quoted in this section are based on a partial school level survey and should therefore be treated as highly provisional and subject to change. The Leeds figures quoted for 2006 represent an estimate of the figure for the full cohort, based on the rates of improvement observed in the 84% of the cohort for whom we have provisional results. 2006 national results and results for statistical neighbour local authorities are as yet unpublished and are therefore not included in this report.

A Level (A2) Results

% pupils achieving	2004		2005		2006*	
	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>National</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>National</i>	<i>Leeds</i>	<i>National</i>
Points per student	269.6	271.9	258.1	277.8	239.9	
Points per entry	74.0	77.5	75.2	79.9	86.0	

3.4.2 The figures for A Level show a drop of 18.2 points in terms of average points score per student in 2006. However there has been an improvement in the points score per subject entry of 6.1 points. This suggests that students are taking slightly fewer subjects on average and so cannot achieve as many points, but are benefiting from this in terms of performance in the subjects that are being taken.

3.5 ATTENDANCE

	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06
	% Attendance			
Leeds	90.59	91.03	91.33	90.85
Statistical Neighbours	91.45	91.62	91.87	91.80
National	91.72	91.95	92.19	92.08
	% Authorised Absence			
Leeds	7.48	6.94	6.75	7.29
Statistical Neighbours	7.39	7.17	6.75	6.80
National	7.21	6.92	6.58	6.70
	% Unauthorised Absence			
Leeds	1.92	2.03	1.91	1.85
Statistical Neighbours	1.16	1.21	1.38	1.41
National	1.07	1.13	1.23	1.22

3.5.1 Attendance in Leeds high schools is below national rates and the average of statistical neighbours. After a steady rise since 2000-01 when attendance was below 90%, attendance fell by about half a percent in 2005-06. In part this was due to a major flu outbreak in the Autumn term, but not entirely; schools receiving extended support managed to increase their attendance. Another contribution to the decline elsewhere is the change in regulations about study leave where students who would formerly have been marked present are now coded as absent. Despite the marked increase in authorised absences, unauthorised absence continued its overall downward trend of the past five years.

3.5.2 Attendance in Target Schools

	% attendance		% unauthorised absence	
	Target schools	Non target schools	Target schools	Non target schools
2003/04	86.50	92.83	4.49	1.05
2004/05	87.48	92.83	3.91	1.14
2005/06	87.57	91.89	3.72	1.27
change	1.07	-0.94	-0.77	0.22

3.6 EXCLUSIONS

3.6.1 2005/06 has seen a further significant drop in permanent exclusions with the number falling by a half over the last two academic years. Performance in Leeds is in line with statistical neighbours and below the national rate of exclusion. This is a record low number of exclusions over a four year period. Furthermore the interim target of a reduction to 100 exclusions (LAA, LPSA2) for 2005/06 has been exceeded already with the total number at 85. The close collaboration between schools and Education Leeds through the Area Management Boards (AMBs) has been instrumental in producing this positive outcome for children and young people.

3.6.2 The majority of permanent exclusions in Leeds continued to be from secondary schools, where the end of year total was 82. This is half the rate of previous years, and similar to national figures. The impact of the reduction is uneven with six schools accounting for 45% of the total. No exclusions were recorded from SILCs for the third year running.

3.6.3 There remain some groups who are over-represented in permanent exclusions data. The groups with the highest rates of exclusion include, for example, Looked After Children who are ten times more likely to be excluded than the Leeds average. Pupils with Special Educational Needs in the main also have slightly higher rates of permanent exclusion. Pupils of Black and Minority Ethnic heritage are less likely to be excluded by comparison to those with Special Educational Needs or Looked After Children; but are still 1.4 times higher than the Leeds average.

3.7 OVERVIEW OF OFSTED INSPECTIONS OF LEEDS HIGH SCHOOLS : AUTUMN 2006

3.7.1 Under the revised framework for inspection introduced in September 2005 inspections are shorter and more frequent. Typically schools are informed three working days ahead of an inspection, and are inspected by a team of four or five inspectors for two days. The emphasis has shifted from lesson observation to a focus on the school leadership and the effectiveness of the school's own evaluation.

3.7.2 Schools are placed in one of four categories: outstanding, good, satisfactory and inadequate. If a school is judged as inadequate it is either given a notice to improve or placed in special measures. Judgements are also made about achievement and standards, leadership and management, provision (teaching and learning, curriculum, and care guidance and support), and personal development.

3.7.3 During this academic year and since the last report to the Board of Education Leeds, nine further schools have been inspected. Of these nine, three are judged to be good, four as satisfactory and two as inadequate. Education Leeds has made a formal objection to Ofsted about one of the schools judged as inadequate, and this is subject

to an inquiry.

- 3.7.4 Overall, since the introduction of the new framework in September 2005, there have been 29 inspections of high schools, PRUs and SILCs in Leeds. Thirteen have been judged as good, thirteen as satisfactory. Three schools have been given a notice to improve, although one of these is subject to an appeal.
- 3.7.5 Nationally it is reported that one in eight schools are unsatisfactory and in Leeds currently this figure is now similar with three in 25 inspected schools given a notice to improve. There are other schools waiting for an inspection who will be at risk of being placed in an Ofsted category either because of a history of low achievement, or more complex issues of inclusion, behaviour, attendance and – in some cases – reorganisation. Education Leeds continues to work with these schools but it is possible that the local figures will continue to reflect the national profile at the end of the year. Leeds has a lower proportion of ‘good’ schools and a higher proportion judged as satisfactory. This group of schools is described below in the section on schools causing concern. For some schools facing the most challenging circumstances the satisfactory judgement is an achievement and an important milestone in their progress. However, for others it is a clear message that they need to improve. For at least one school the satisfactory judgement was harsh, taking a narrow view of progress and capacity to improve, and was demoralising for the school.
- 3.7.6 It is apparent that while the majority of inspections recognise accurately the strengths and weaknesses of schools, there is still a need for greater consistency. The more complex and challenging the circumstances of a school the more difficult it is to assess fairly the effectiveness of the school. A few experienced HMI are very well informed about the local context and very highly skilled in assessing evidence. They recognise the importance of measuring the capacity of the school to improve and are willing to use the evidence of their own observations. However, a few teams are more strongly influenced by statistical data, particularly the contextual value added scores, and show less awareness of local circumstances.
- 3.7.7 On the whole, judgements have been fair. Most ‘satisfactory’ and ‘good’ judgements are accurate and pleasing. A few have been encouraging and optimistic, although with the proviso that a short inspection is likely within the three years to check on progress. Two judgements, one ‘satisfactory’ and one ‘inadequate’ have been out of step with feedback from school improvement partners and advisers. However, for the two schools involved this has potentially serious consequences and can undermine improvement and stability built up over a number of years.
- 3.7.8 See the annex to this report for a summary of each school inspected this term.

3.8 OVERVIEW OF SCHOOLS CAUSING CONCERN: HIGH SCHOOLS

- 3.8.1 The new School Improvement Policy allocates schools to four types of partnership. Schools with a history of offering support at a whole school level are ‘leading partners’. Other schools with strong features that they are willing to share are ‘learning partners’ and will lead developments in particular areas or exchange practice around a particular focus with other schools. Schools in a ‘focused partnership’ have a limited number of areas for improvement, while schools in an extended partnership are engaged in whole school improvement with a range of support on different issues.

- 3.8.2 Including the SILCs and the PRUs there are two schools (8%) who are leading partners, fifteen who are 'learning partners' (31%), twenty-seven in a 'focused partnership' (56%) and four in an 'extended partnership' (8%) Over half of those in a 'focused partnership' have a need for improvement (usually related to a history of low value added scores) that makes them vulnerable to an Ofsted inspection. However, a number of these schools who have already been inspected were able to demonstrate sufficient capacity to improve to be judged as satisfactory.
- 3.8.3 In November 2006 there are no high schools in special measures in Leeds. There is one high school with a notice to improve and another one where a notice has been given provisionally, but is the subject of an appeal supported by Education Leeds.
- 3.8.4 While this is an excellent situation and a considerable improvement compared with previous years, it does not reflect the whole picture. In the next few months there will be inspections of up to ten schools. Several of these are vulnerable because of low value added scores within the past three years and could be give a notice to improve. At least two are likely to be placed in special measures if inspected in the next few weeks because low achievement is compounded by issues of learning, teaching, attendance and behaviour. Support continues to be given to these schools but real improvement in these cases is a longer process involving parents, organisations and communities working in partnership with the school.
- 3.8.5 **Schools in an Extended Partnership : Category 4 Schools**
- 3.8.6 Schools in an extended partnership are those facing the severest challenges. Crawshaw school has a notice to improve from Ofsted and faces a re-inspection next year. The most recent results in summer 2006 were poor at GCSE and the initiatives brought in during the second half of the year did not have the necessary impact. However, the school is now making reasonable progress under the new leadership of an executive headteacher from another Leeds school. John Smeaton made strong improvements in standards at both Key Stages 3 and 4 and has the capacity and momentum to improve further. The BESD SILC has taken on considerable changes in the nature of students referred to the school and in how it caters for their needs, but there is still much work to do in order to provide effective schooling for the most challenging students in the school system. South Leeds High has opened in a new building. Standards are improved, although they are still very low for most of the students, and considerable improvement is still needed in attendance and behaviour. Progress has been hindered by difficulties associated with the merger and the new building.
- 3.8.7 A more detailed report on these schools is in the confidential part of this agenda under Access to Information Rules 10.4 (1) (2).
- 3.8.8 **Schools in a Focused Partnership : Category 3 Schools**
- 3.8.9 This group of schools covers a range of situations. A few of these schools have had recent inspections and been judged as satisfactory even though they face very challenging circumstances. Five such schools in inner Leeds have managed to improve standards to an acceptable level and inspectors were convinced of their capacity to improve further. It is likely that inspectors will return sooner than the standard three years to check on progress. A school in north Leeds was the subject of just such an inspection, a pilot for Ofsted and the first interim inspection in Leeds. It found the school to be making good progress and the school is now on a standard three year inspection cycle.

- 3.8.10 Other schools in this partnership category have had a history of lower value added scores but are now showing evidence of marked improvement and are approaching inspections with more confidence. A central Leeds school which amalgamated with a neighbouring school, and thereby took on a school with low achievement and in special measures, has deservedly been judged as a good school in a recent inspection. Other schools also raised standards substantially in 2006.
- 3.8.11 The National Strategies Secondary team, comprising three advisers and twelve consultants, plays a significant role in raising secondary standards. They provide a lead in the training and development of English mathematics, science and ICT, whole school teaching and learning, behaviour for learning and attendance. All schools in focused or extended partnerships receive bespoke consultant support. Twelve schools have support in all the strands.
- 3.8.12 Schools working with the strategy consultants have seen improved results. Education Leeds is now a national leader in support for assessment for learning. Schools which have embraced the programme have made better than average gains in improvement. The data also shows a high correlation between the attendance of subject leaders at network meetings run by the consultants and rising standards
- 3.8.13 Many of the schools are preparing for change. Some are involved in new building programmes, mostly 'Building Schools for the Future' (BSF) and Private Finance Initiative (PFI) schemes. The short term pressure on these schools, particularly those with small leadership teams and tight budgets, is considerable. The new projects impact on every area of the school from curriculum, teaching and learning to inclusion, behaviour, welfare, and external relations. Additional adviser time is allocated to these schools where possible, but senior leaders have a very large workload to make progress with the new building projects and to continue with the core work of improvement.
- 3.8.14 Education Leeds doesn't have the capacity to support all these focused partnership schools evenly, and neither should it attempt to, as many are successful and improving in a variety of areas from their own resources. However, these schools can benefit from short term focused support. This might be mentoring and coaching support for a new or acting headteacher from a neighbouring head or school improvement partner. It could be providing advice and support at different levels of leadership, and opportunities to visit other schools and look at different practices. In some cases schools are encouraged to engage in national strategy projects aimed at developing staff or focused on particular groups of pupils. The School Intervention Strategy project (SISP) has brought cross sections of staff together to plan solutions to particular priorities identified within the schools. The Black Pupils Achievement Project has targeted particular students and involved them in tutoring and mentoring. A group of schools has worked with the Fusion programme to develop leadership skills and techniques, and apply them to issues that they face. Further evaluation of their impact is needed but there is already evidence that they are helping schools to make progress, and motivating staff.
- 3.8.15 Leeds schools have been generous and enthusiastic in offering support through partnership and in being willing to exchange or receive support and advice. However, there is still a considerable amount of work to do to make better use of the skills and knowledge within schools and to share this across a wider community.

4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL POLICY AND GOVERNANCE

4.1 This report informs the new school improvement policy and the development of a strategy for extending and developing partnerships which increase the capacity of all schools to raise achievement. The new inspection framework places additional pressure on schools and particularly on school leaders, who need support. The continued low performance of many minority and vulnerable groups means that tackling inequalities remains a very high priority for Education Leeds.

5.0 LEGAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The low achievement that is evident in secondary education and the scale of the challenge faced by a number of schools, particularly in inner Leeds means that this must remain a high priority when allocating resources. The city has benefited from additional resources from the DfES for the 'Six Schools' project and the 'Releasing Potential' project, as well as from Excellence in Cities and the Leadership Incentive Grant. However, much of this additional funding has now ended. The school improvement partner programme has also provided new capacity to support leadership. As these initiatives are completed Education Leeds will need to ensure that capacity is created locally to continue the momentum from these projects.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Central and school-based strategies, and a variety of partnerships and initiatives, have been successful in raising achievement in Leeds. However, further developments will be necessary if the momentum is to be maintained and Leeds is to keep pace with national improvements.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 The Executive Board is asked to:

- iii) note the contents of the report
- iv) note the strategies for improvement that have been developed to support further increases in achievement for all pupils, groups and schools.