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## Key Stage 4

## Overall Attainment

There has been an improvement against the headline national measure of 5 or more GCSEs at grades $\mathrm{A}^{*}$-C including English and maths, with $53.1 \%$ of pupils now reaching this level. This represents a 2.5 percentage point increase on the 2010 result of $50.6 \%$. National results improved by 4.5 percentage points; the gap to national attainment for this indicator has widened and performance in Leeds is now 5.2 percentage points lower than national. The improvement achieved in statistical neighbour authorities (3.1 percentage points) was slightly higher than the improvement in Leeds; attainment in Leeds is 3.0 percentage points lower than the statistical neighbour average.

Leeds has seen a 4.3 percentage point increase in the proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A*-C, with $80.8 \%$ of pupils in Leeds achieving this level in 2011. Nationally, the improvement for this indicator was 3.4 percentage points, meaning that Leeds is now 2.0 percentage points above the national figure of $78.8 \%$. Leeds' statistical neighbours improved by 3.7 percentage points to $80.5 \%$ on this measure; Leeds is therefore above the statistical neighbour average on this measure for the first time.

Nationally there has been a 0.8 percentage point decrease in the proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at A* - G grades; the national figure for 2011 was $92.9 \%$. Leeds saw an improvement on this measure of 0.4 percentage points, meaning Leeds is now $1.2 \%$ above the national figure, at $94.1 \%$. Leeds has narrowed the gap with statistical neighbour authorities, and is now 1.0 percentage points below the statistical neighbour average.

The reduction in the proportion of pupils with no GCSE passes in Leeds is in-line with the reduction seen nationally, at $0.1 \%$. Statistical neighbour authorities saw a similar reduction. Leeds' figure remains 0.5 percentage points above the national figure, and 0.6 percentage points above the statistical neighbour average.

Table 1: 2009-2011 Key Stage 4 performance

| $\%$ of pupils achieving | 2009 |  |  | 2010 |  |  | 2011 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Stat <br> Neigh | Leeds | National | Stat <br> Neigh | Leeds | National | Stat <br> Neigh |
| 5+A*- C | 67.5 | 70.0 | 69.7 | 76.5 | 75.4 | 76.8 | 80.8 | 78.8 | 80.5 |
|  <br> maths (NI 75) | 45.9 | 49.8 | 48.4 | 50.6 | 53.4 | 53.0 | 53.1 | 58.3 | 56.1 |
| 5+A*-G | 91.3 | 92.3 | 93.5 | 93.7 | 92.8 | 94.9 | 94.1 | 92.9 | 95.1 |
| No Passes | 1.9 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.8 |

Source: DfE statistical first release
Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all schools in England

Although there has been improvement against the headline national measure of 5 or more GCSEs at grades $A^{*}-C$ including English and maths in recent years, since 2007 the rate of
improvement in Leeds has been lower than in core cities and statistical neighbours and 1 percentage point lower than national. This improvement trend is shown in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Percentage achieving 5 or more $A^{*}-C$ including English and maths


Source: DfE statistical first release

## English Baccalaureate

The English Baccalaureate (EBacc) is not a new qualification in itself, but rather a measure that recognises students' achievements across a core of selected academic subjects. The EBacc covers achievement in English, maths, sciences, a language and a humanities subject.

Table 2: 2011 English Baccalaureate performance

|  | \% of pupils entered for all EBacc <br> components | \% of Pupils achieving EBacc |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Leeds | 18.1 | 13.0 |
| National | 22.7 | 16.5 |
| Statistical Neighbours | 17.6 | 12.3 |

[^0]In Leeds in 2011, 18.1\% of pupils were entered for all of the components of the EBacc, compared to $22.7 \%$ of pupils nationally. In Leeds' statistical neighbour authorities, 17.6\% of pupils were entered for all EBacc components. Nationally, $16.5 \%$ of pupils achieved the EBacc; Leeds was 3.5 percentage points below this figure, with $13 \%$ of pupils achieving the EBacc. Across Leeds' statistical neighbours, $12.3 \%$ of pupils achieved the EBacc.

Table 3: 2011 English Baccalaureate entry and achievement by individual component

|  | \% entered for each English Baccalaureate component |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | English | Maths | Sciences | Humanities | Languages |
| Leeds | 96.8 | 96.8 | 60.2 | 44.2 | 31.3 |
| National | 94.7 | 95.9 | 60.3 | 48.5 | 40.8 |
| Statistical Neighbours | 96.7 | 97.4 | 58.3 | 44.4 | 34.4 |
|  | \% achieving each English Baccalaureate component |  |  |  |  |
|  | English | Maths | Sciences | Humanities | Languages |
|  | 63.6 | 59.5 | 70.5 | 68.8 | 71.4 |
|  | 68.6 | 65.5 | 76.4 | 70.2 | 73.3 |
|  | 66.8 | 62.9 | 75.1 | 66.7 | 68.3 |

Source: DfE statistical first release
Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all schools in England. The figures for pupils achieving the English and mathematics subject areas are calculated as a percentage of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4. The figures for sciences, history or geography and languages achievements are calculated as a percentage of those pupils who were entered in that subject area.

A greater proportion of pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 were entered for the English and maths EBacc components in Leeds than were entered nationally. The proportion of Leeds pupils entered for the language component of the EBacc was significantly lower than nationally, and also below statistical neighbours.

The percentage of pupils in Leeds achieving the English and maths components of the EBacc were $63.6 \%$ and $59.5 \%$ for English and maths respectively, below both national and statistical neighbour comparators. Of the pupils entered for the science, humanities and languages components of the EBacc, a lower percentage achieved these components in Leeds than did nationally.

## Expected Levels of Progress

The Performance Tables for 2011 will include information on the proportion of pupils making expected levels of progress between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4, in English and maths. The expected level of progress between Key Stage 2 and 4 is three levels of progress. In 2011, the methodology for calculating expected progress changed; the figures reported here are calculated based on the new methodology, and therefore may not match figures previously reported for this indicator.

Table 4: 2009-2011 Expected Levels of Progress in English and maths

| $\%$ of pupils achieving | 2009 |  |  | 2010 |  |  | 2011 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Stat <br> Neigh | Leeds | National | Stat <br> Neigh | Leeds | National | Stat <br> Neigh |
| Expected <br> in English | 57.8 | 65.3 | 61.6 | 62.2 | 69.9 | 66.4 | 65.4 | 71.7 | 70.1 |
| Expected Progres <br> in maths | 50.9 | 58.4 | 53.3 | 56.0 | 62.5 | 59.1 | 59.1 | 64.7 | 60.8 |

Source: DfE statistical first release, includes data for maintained secondary and special schools
Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all schools in England

The percentage of pupils nationally making expected progress in English has improved by 6.4 percentage points since 2009 , to $71.7 \%$. In 2011 in Leeds, $65.4 \%$ of pupils made expected progress, below both the national and statistical neighbour average. The gap between the Leeds figure and the national figure has narrowed from 7.5 percentage points in 2009 to 6.3 percentage points in 2011; however, the gap between Leeds and statistical neighbour authorities has widened over this time.

The percentage of pupils making expected progress in maths was $64.7 \%$ nationally in 2011, up from $58.4 \%$ in 2009. The Leeds figure of $59.1 \%$ in 2011 was below both national and statistical neighbour averages. Leeds has seen an improvement of 8.3 percentage points between 2009 and 2011, narrowing the gap between Leeds and national, and between Leeds and statistical neighbour authorities.

## Contextual Value Added

Contextual value-added (CVA) analyses for Leeds, comparing actual and estimated levels of attainment and progress, are shown in the Table 5 below. The Fischer Family Trust (FFT) analysis is based on progress between Key Stages 2 and 4 and is only for maintained schools. For $5 A^{*}-C$, the contextual value-added has improved significantly over the last 3 years, and actual performance was more than 3 percentage points above estimated performance in both 2010 and 2011. Leeds has moved from the $36^{\text {th }}$ to the $31^{\text {st }}$ percentile for CVA for $5 A^{*}-C$. Actual performance for $5 A^{*}-C$ including English and maths is 1.1 percentage points below estimates in 2011. Leeds is therefore significantly below estimated performance in 2011 and over the 2009-2011 period. The percentile rank for CVA for $5 A^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ has declined from 54 to 65 in 2011 compared to 2010 . For 5 A*-G actual $^{*}$ performance in 2011 is significantly above estimates; this is an improvement from 2009, when performance was significantly below estimates for this indicator; the percentile rank for this indicator has improved year on year.

CVA for total points score has been significantly above expectations for the last three years, with a significant improvement over that time. In 2011 Leeds was broadly in-line with expectations in terms of capped points score, with the percentile rank for this indicator staying broadly static on the previous year.

Significantly fewer pupils in Leeds achieved 3 levels of progress in English than were estimated in 2009, 2010 and 2011. The gap between the actual figure and the FFT estimate has widened significantly over this period, from -2.69 percentage points in 2009 to -4 percentage points in 2011. Leeds ranked in the $93^{\text {rd }}$ percentile of authorities on this measure in 2011. In maths, significantly fewer pupils than expected made 3 levels of progress in 2009, 2010 and 2011, with the gap widening slightly in that time, from -2.21 percentage points in 2009 to -2.42 percentage points in 2011 . The percentile rank for this indicator puts Leeds in the bottom quartile in 2011.

Table 5: FFT CVA: Difference between estimate and actual attainment/progress

| Difference between estimate <br> and actual attainment/progress | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 3 yr <br> trend | 2010 <br> percentile <br> rank | 2011 <br> percentile <br> rank |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}$-C | 0.81 | 3.48 | 3.49 | $\uparrow$ | 36 | 31 |
| $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}$-C inc. E\&M | -0.66 | -0.32 | -1.07 |  | 54 | 65 |
| $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}$-G | -1.05 | 0.11 | 0.44 | $\uparrow$ | 46 | 34 |


| Total points score | 4.08 | 14.38 | 14.74 | $\uparrow$ | 25 | 28 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capped points score | -3.67 | 1.64 | 0.83 | $\uparrow$ | 46 | 45 |
| English 3 Levels Progress | -2.69 | -3.1 | -4.01 | $\downarrow$ | 87 | 93 |
| Maths 3 Levels Progress | -2.21 | -1.59 | -2.42 |  | 75 | 77 |

Source: FFT Live 3.2, FFT Database Notes: green = actual attainment/progress significantly higher than estimated; blue = actual attainment/progress significantly lower than estimated

## Key Stage 4 Trajectories

The significant increase in the percentage of pupils achieving 5 or more $A^{*}$ - $C$ at GCSE can be seen in the chart below. Leeds has moved from being below both the national average and FFT D estimates in 2006 to being above both in 2011.

Figure 2: $5+A^{*}-C$ at GCSE trajectory


Source: FFT Live 3.2, DFE Statistical First Release
The trend for $5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English and maths is shown in the chart below. Since the slight dip in results in 2009, Leeds schools have improved for two years in a row. The rate of improvement in 2011 was greater nationally than in Leeds. The gap between Leeds and national was 5.2 percentage points in 2011, the widest it has been since 2006.

Figure 3: $5+A^{*}-C$ including English and maths at GCSE trajectory


Source: FFT Live 3.2, DFE Statistical First Release

## Schools below floor standards

Provisional results indicate that there are four schools in Leeds below the current floor standard of $35 \%$ or more pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A*-C including English and maths. This is compared to seven schools in 2010. The four schools below floor standard are City of Leeds (18\%), South Leeds Academy (25\%), Primrose (29\%) and Swallow Hill (31\%). South Leeds Academy, Primrose and Swallow Hill were all below the floor target in 2010. South Leeds Academy saw a 4 percentage point fall in the proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A*-C including English and maths between 2010 and 2011, whilst Primrose saw a 5 percentage point increase, and Swallow Hill a 7 percentage point increase. City of Leeds fell significantly, by 14 percentage points between 2010 and 2011. The three schools that are no longer below the floor standard are the David Young Community Academy which increased the percentage of pupils achieving 5 or more $A^{*}$-C including English and maths by 16 percentage points in 2011 and John Smeaton and Parklands, where there were increases of 8 and 6 percentage points respectively.

The current government has set out its' intention to raise the floor standard for secondary schools year on year until it reaches $50 \%$ of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades $A^{*}-C$ including English and maths. Figure 4 shows a four year trend of the percentage of schools below past, current and future floor standards. This chart shows the success that has been achieved in reducing the numbers below floor standards and in raising the attainment in schools. However, significant challenges remain as the floor standard increases, with $40 \%$ of secondary schools currently below $50 \% 5$ A*-C including English and maths.

Figure 4: Percentage of schools below floor standards


## School Performance

School level results are shown in Tables 6 and 7 overleaf.

A number of individual schools have shown significant improvements in 2011. Seven schools improved their 5 or more A*-C performance in 2011 by 10 percentage points or more, whilst a further 19 saw an increase of less than $10 \%$. The schools with the biggest increases were Allerton Grange, which rose 20 percentage points to $90 \%$ in 2011, and Parklands Girls High, which also rose 20 percentage points to $72 \%$ in 2011. Ten schools saw a decrease in the percentage of pupils achieving five good GCSEs on the previous year, though half of the decreases were by one or two percentage points. City of Leeds saw a significant fall, of 14 percentage points, to $34 \%$; this is the only school in the city where fewer than $50 \%$ of pupils achieve five good GCSEs. The number of schools where $90 \%$ or more of pupils achieved five or more A*-C grades has increased from five in 2010 to eight in 2011.

Five schools increased the proportion of pupils achieving 5 or more $\mathrm{A}^{*}$-C including English and maths by 10 percentage points or more. The biggest increases were achieved by Pudsey Grangefield and the David Young Academy, with increases of 22 and 16 percentage points respectively. 14 schools saw a decrease in the percentage of pupils achieving this benchmark, and one school decreased by more than 10 percentage points City of Leeds fell by 14 percentage points to $18 \%$.

Over half of the schools in Leeds saw an increase in the proportion of pupils achieving the English Baccalaureate (EBacc); Lawnswood School recorded the highest increase, up 10 percentage points on the previous year, to $17 \%$. 10 schools saw the percentage of pupils achieving the EBacc fall on the previous year. Three schools in Leeds had no pupils achieve the EBacc in 2011; these were Primrose, John Smeaton, and the David Young Academy. In total 13 schools in Leeds saw 5\% or fewer of their pupils achieving the EBacc in 2011.

There are now only three schools where less than $90 \%$ of pupils achieve 5 or more A*-G; these are City of Leeds, Primrose, and Swallow Hill. Both City of Leeds and Primrose saw slight decreases in this figure, by 1 percentage point for City of Leeds and 2 percentage points for Primrose. Swallow Hill saw a 2 percentage point increase. In 2011, 14 schools in Leeds had 100\% of their pupils achieving any qualifications; all schools in Leeds had more than $95 \%$ of pupils achieving any qualifications. The lowest figure for this indicator was $96 \%$, recorded by South Leeds Academy.

Five schools in Leeds saw a significant increase in the proportion of pupils making 3 levels of progress (expected progress) in English on the previous year. Otley Prince Henry's, Parklands Girl's, Morley, Carr Manor and Bruntcliffe all recorded improvements of at least ten percentage points on the previous year. Morley (85.9\%), Garforth (85.2\%) and Horsforth ( $85.0 \%$ ) were the three highest-performing schools on this indicator in 2011. In terms of expected progress in maths, Farnley Park, Leeds West Academy, and Pudsey Grangefield all recorded percentage point improvements of 10 or more. $91.4 \%$ of pupils at St Mary's Catholic Comprehensive made expected progress in maths in 2011, the highest percentage in the city. Last year both South Leeds Academy and City of Leeds had both fewer than 40\% of pupils making expected progress in English, and fewer than 30\% making expected progress in maths.

Table 6: Key Stage 4 school-level attainment trend

| Schools | NOR11 | 5+ $\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ |  |  | 5+ A* - C Eng \& Mat |  |  | $5+A^{*}-\mathrm{G}$ |  |  | Any Qualifications |  |  | EBACC |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| Abbey Grange CE High | 202 | 77 | 81 | 92 | 63 | 72 | 68 | 98 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 24 | 24 | 26 |
| Allerton Grange | 294 | 57 | 70 | 90 | 44 | 45 | 43 | 90 | 93 | 96 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 7 | 8 | 10 |
| Allerton High | 179 | 76 | 91 | 94 | 52 | 62 | 59 | 97 | 98 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 12 | 18 | 16 |
| Benton Park | 230 | 75 | 70 | 79 | 62 | 56 | 63 | 99 | 95 | 96 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 20 | 19 | 21 |
| Boston Spa | 297 | 80 | 92 | 95 | 46 | 51 | 51 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 15 | 14 | 13 |
| Brigshaw High | 249 | 68 | 80 | 80 | 50 | 56 | 53 | 93 | 96 | 95 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 22 | 22 | 14 |
| Bruntcliffe High | 264 | 74 | 81 | 89 | 42 | 42 | 55 | 94 | 93 | 97 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Cardinal Heenan Catholic High | 183 | 80 | 89 | 87 | 51 | 64 | 66 | 96 | 100 | 99 | 99 | 100 | 99 | 31 | 42 | 34 |
| Carr Manor High | 142 | 58 | 66 | 68 | 27 | 35 | 41 | 90 | 93 | 90 | 98 | 99 | 96 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| City of Leeds | 126 | 24 | 54 | 38 | 12 | 32 | 18 | 71 | 83 | 82 | 91 | 97 | 98 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Cockburn Coll of Arts | 221 | 68 | 78 | 90 | 38 | 36 | 43 | 94 | 94 | 96 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Corpus Christi Cath College | 184 | 63 | 67 | 75 | 48 | 42 | 53 | 94 | 91 | 93 | 98 | 94 | 99 | 10 | 8 | 8 |
| Crawshaw | 208 | 69 | 84 | 78 | 59 | 62 | 53 | 93 | 98 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 16 | 20 | 8 |
| David Young Community Academy | 173 | 74 | 94 | 95 | 29 | 31 | 47 | 88 | 96 | 97 | 100 | 98 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Farnley Park High | 145 | 46 | 78 | 76 | 32 | 45 | 47 | 87 | 95 | 95 | 97 | 99 | 99 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| Garforth Community College | 301 | 94 | 99 | 98 | 75 | 74 | 78 | 98 | 100 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| Guiseley | 225 | 83 | 85 | 88 | 72 | 72 | 65 | 96 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 36 | 38 | 32 |
| Horsforth | 224 | 82 | 82 | 89 | 60 | 67 | 75 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 27 | 24 | 27 |
| John Smeaton Community High | 119 | 77 | 83 | 79 | 45 | 32 | 40 | 87 | 94 | 93 | 97 | 98 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lawnswood | 257 | 57 | 66 | 68 | 39 | 45 | 47 | 86 | 90 | 94 | 97 | 98 | 98 | 12 | 7 | 17 |
| Leeds West Academy | 139 |  | 68 | 81 |  | 37 | 44 |  | 93 | 96 |  | 99 | 99 |  | 0 | 2 |
| Morley High | 251 | 78 | 83 | 83 | 59 | 60 | 63 | 93 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 3 | 8 | 10 |
| Mount St.Mary's Catholic High | 187 | 68 | 75 | 80 | 39 | 46 | 42 | 96 | 99 | 93 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Parklands Girls' High | 123 | 43 | 52 | 72 | 33 | 32 | 38 | 86 | 91 | 93 | 96 | 99 | 98 | 4 | 8 | 4 |
| Priesthorpe | 207 | 79 | 75 | 88 | 43 | 56 | 52 | 95 | 98 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 15 | 17 | 19 |
| Primrose High | 180 | 39 | 52 | 51 | 16 | 25 | 29 | 77 | 84 | 82 | 91 | 99 | 99 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Prince Henry's Grammar | 216 | 83 | 85 | 89 | 63 | 62 | 72 | 97 | 97 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 37 | 38 | 39 |
| Pudsey Grangefield | 190 | 71 | 87 | 91 | 52 | 40 | 62 | 97 | 95 | 97 | 99 | 99 | 100 | 10 | 4 | 6 |
| Ralph Thoresby High | 150 | 66 | 72 | 79 | 40 | 49 | 55 | 87 | 92 | 97 | 99 | 98 | 99 | 8 | 14 | 15 |
| Rodillian | 205 | 45 | 76 | 85 | 33 | 48 | 46 | 89 | 95 | 92 | 98 | 97 | 98 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Roundhay | 247 | 78 | 86 | 82 | 56 | 65 | 64 | 92 | 99 | 96 | 99 | 100 | 99 | 28 | 27 | 27 |
| Royds | 210 | 65 | 75 | 81 | 46 | 51 | 52 | 93 | 95 | 96 | 99 | 100 | 99 | 7 | 4 | 8 |
| South Leeds Academy | 201 |  | 69 | 71 |  | 29 | 25 |  | 83 | 90 |  | 99 | 96 |  |  | 1 |
| St. Marys' Catholic Comprehensive | 180 | 85 | 92 | 92 | 74 | 84 | 85 | 98 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 44 | 40 | 42 |
| Swallow Hill Community College | 323 |  | 51 | 62 |  | 24 | 31 |  | 86 | 88 |  | 97 | 99 |  | 3 | 3 |
| Temple Moor High | 214 | 58 | 74 | 82 | 42 | 47 | 53 | 95 | 95 | 93 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 17 | 19 | 20 |
| Wetherby High | 157 | 69 | 78 | 75 | 62 | 64 | 61 | 97 | 99 | 99 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 17 | 19 | 12 |
| Woodkirk High | 329 | 72 | 84 | 83 | 63 | 70 | 69 | 99 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 12 | 7 | 7 |

Source: Performance Tables, EPAS for 2011

Table 7: School Key Stage 4 results, 2009-2011

|  |  | Expected Progress $\boldsymbol{-}$ English |  | Expected Progress - Maths |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools | NOR11 | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ |
| Abbey Grange CE High | 202 | 82.5 | 78.2 | 68.0 | 65.8 | 65.8 | 68.2 |
| Allerton Grange | 294 | 66.7 | 62.4 | 62.2 | 53.2 | 48.7 | 49.8 |
| Allerton High | 179 | 71.0 | 78.2 | 78.1 | 58.6 | 62.7 | 63.1 |
| Benton Park | 230 | 82.3 | 63.8 | 67.7 | 64.9 | 58.5 | 63.1 |
| Boston Spa | 297 | 60.8 | 67.8 | 69.1 | 47.1 | 47.3 | 48.1 |
| Brigshaw High | 249 | 65.7 | 71.7 | 75.2 | 53.7 | 54.0 | 56.8 |
| Bruntcliffe High | 264 | 50.6 | 52.4 | 65.2 | 49.4 | 50.4 | 56.5 |
| Cardinal Heenan Catholic High | 183 | 64.8 | 82.0 | 77.5 | 54.9 | 65.5 | 68.8 |
| Carr Manor High | 142 | 52.0 | 45.4 | 58.9 | 35.5 | 47.6 | 56.8 |
| City of Leeds | 126 | 19.2 | 37.0 | 31.1 | 24.3 | 49.4 | 26.1 |
| Cockburn Coll of Arts | 221 | 51.7 | 46.1 | 53.5 | 56.8 | 57.4 | 66.2 |
| Corpus Christi Cath College | 184 | 48.8 | 50.0 | 50.3 | 62.9 | 57.1 | 62.9 |
| Crawshaw | 208 | 68.5 | 73.0 | 58.8 | 59.9 | 68.4 | 59.4 |
| David Young Community Academy | 173 | 44.5 | 47.3 | 45.2 | 39.0 | 53.3 | 43.5 |
| Farnley Park High | 145 | 34.0 | 53.2 | 56.8 | 38.4 | 48.6 | 61.0 |
| Garforth Community College | 301 | 84.9 | 85.0 | 85.2 | 82.3 | 86.3 | 87.0 |
| Guiseley | 225 | 74.3 | 69.0 | 71.0 | 84.3 | 81.4 | 73.2 |
| Horsforth | 224 | 74.5 | 76.5 | 85.0 | 62.2 | 69.9 | 77.7 |
| John Smeaton Community High | 119 | 49.0 | 40.9 | 45.9 | 50.0 | 41.4 | 49.1 |
| Lawnswood | 257 | 59.6 | 56.8 | 52.3 | 45.9 | 52.3 | 56.6 |
| Leeds West Academy | 139 |  | 73.3 | 79.5 |  | 38.8 | 55.4 |
| Morley High | 251 | 77.4 | 73.9 | 85.9 | 61.5 | 66.8 | 65.4 |
| Mount St.Mary's Catholic High | 187 | 62.2 | 65.9 | 61.8 | 39.6 | 46.7 | 45.0 |
| Parklands Girls' High | 123 | 41.9 | 43.5 | 62.6 | 46.7 | 44.2 | 44.4 |
| Priesthorpe | 207 | 55.9 | 75.4 | 79.0 | 46.8 | 56.4 | 53.1 |
| Primrose High | 180 | 30.8 | 56.8 | 50.0 | 37.6 | 41.3 | 34.0 |
| Prince Henry's Grammar | 216 | 69.1 | 67.1 | 81.1 | 62.6 | 67.7 | 73.2 |
| Pudsey Grangefield | 190 | 66.7 | 73.4 | 71.0 | 47.7 | 46.7 | 58.0 |
| Ralph Thoresby High | 150 | 50.9 | 65.7 | 67.4 | 47.6 | 63.7 | 65.0 |
| Rodillian | 205 | 51.6 | 57.8 | 66.0 | 33.8 | 55.9 | 49.0 |
| Roundhay | 247 | 67.8 | 75.8 | 83.0 | 69.6 | 74.7 | 76.2 |
| Royds | 210 | 60.6 | 76.7 | 73.1 | 47.5 | 63.4 | 60.8 |
| South Leeds Academy | 201 |  |  | 37.8 |  |  | 28.2 |
| St. Marys' Catholic Comprehensive | 180 | 83.9 | 85.1 | 79.8 | 84.8 | 86.5 | 91.4 |
| Swallow Hill Community College | 323 |  | 36.1 | 41.9 |  | 27.4 | 35.8 |
| Temple Moor High | 214 | 59.8 | 52.6 | 59.5 | 45.5 | 53.5 | 56.6 |
| Wetherby High | 157 | 72.9 | 63.9 | 63.7 | 74.7 | 78.2 | 76.2 |
| Woodkirk High | 329 | 58.8 | 79.0 | 73.0 | 67.5 | 75.1 | 74.0 |
| Soure: Pero |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Performance Tables, EPAS for 2011

## Key Stage 4 attainment and progress for pupil groups

## Gender

Key Stage 4 attainment is higher for girls than boys on all measures, both in Leeds and nationally. In 2011, the gap between girls' attainment and boys' is narrower in Leeds than nationally for $5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}, 5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English and maths, and $5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}-\mathrm{G}$; the gap for no passes is wider in Leeds than nationally. Year-on-year, the attainment gap between girls and boys in $5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English and maths has widened in Leeds, from 6 percentage points in 2010, to 7.4 percentage points in 2011. In 2011 both boys and girls attained higher than national performance in $5 A^{*}-C$, and also in $5 A^{*}$-G. For $5 A^{*}-C$ including English and maths, in 2010 the gap to national was 1.6 percentage points for boys, and 4.2 percentage points for girls; by 2011 these have widened to 5.2 and 5.4 percentage points respectively. The EBacc gender gap is 6.6 percentage points in Leeds, compared to 5.5 nationally. Whilst girls in Leeds achieved 1.4 percentage points below girls nationally on this indicator, boys in Leeds were 2.5 percentage points lower than boys nationally.

Table 8: Key Stage 4 attainment by gender

|  | Gender | 2009 |  | 2010 |  | 2011 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| \% 5A*-C | Girls | 71.7 | 74.4 | 79.4 | 79.0 | 83.8 | 82.7 |
|  | Boys | 63.3 | 65.8 | 72.3 | 70.8 | 77.9 | 75.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \% 5 A^{*}-C \\ & \text { inc. } \mathrm{E} \& \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | Girls | 49.1 | 54.1 | 53.3 | 57.5 | 56.8 | 62.2 |
|  | Boys | 42.9 | 45.7 | 47.3 | 48.9 | 49.4 | 54.6 |
| \% 5A*-G | Girls | 92.9 | 92.2 | 94.3 | 94.4 | 95.4 | 94.6 |
|  | Boys | 89.7 | 89.0 | 92.7 | 90.8 | 92.8 | 91.6 |
| No passes | Girls | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
|  | Boys | 2.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| EBacc | Girls |  |  |  |  | 16.4 | 17.8 |
|  | Boys |  |  |  |  | 9.8 | 12.3 |

Source: DfE statistical first release
Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all schools in England

The gap in progress between boys and girls was much wider for English than maths in 2011. Whilst the proportion of boys making expected progress in English was similar to the proportion making expected progress in Maths, $10 \%$ more girls made expected progress in English than did so in Maths.

Table 9: 2011 Expected progress in English and Maths by Gender

|  | Gender | Leeds | National |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 3 levels of progress <br> in English | Boys | 58.5 |  |
|  | Girls | 70.1 |  |
| 3 levels of progress <br> in maths | Boys | 57.4 |  |
|  | Girls | 60.1 |  |

Source: EPAS

## Free School Meal Eligibility

There has historically been a wide gap in attainment in Leeds between pupils eligible for free school meals and those who are not, and the gaps in Leeds are wider than the national gaps. The gaps are wider in Leeds because performance of pupils not eligible for free school meals in Leeds is generally in line with national performance for this group, whereas attainment for pupils eligible for free school meals is below national attainment for this group. This issue was highlighted in the Local Authority Inspection in 2009 and narrowing the gap in attainment has been part of the improvement notice. In 2011 improvements in attainment for $5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}$-C have been greater for pupils eligible for free school meals than those who are not eligible. The free school meal gap has thus narrowed for this indicator to $25 \%$, compared to $27 \%$ in 2010 . However, for 5 A $^{*}$-C including English and maths those not eligible for free school meals improved at a greater rate than those eligible; therefore the gap has widened slightly from 33 percentage points in 2010 to 35 percentage points in 2011. In 2011, only 3\% of free school meal eligible pupils achieved the English Baccalaureate in Leeds, compared to 15\% of non-eligible pupils.

Table 10: Key Stage 4 attainment by free school meal eligibility

|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { FSM } \\ \text { eligibility } \end{array}$ | 2009 |  | 2010 |  | 2011* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| \% 5A*-C | Non eligible | 73 | 73 | 81 | 78 | 85 |  |
|  | Eligible | 39 | 49 | 54 | 58 | 60 |  |
| $\% 5 A^{*}-C$ <br> inc. E\&M | Non eligible | 52 | 54 | 56 | 59 | 59 |  |
|  | Eligible | 17 | 27 | 23 | 31 | 24 |  |
| \% 5A*-G | Non eligible | 95 | 95 | 96 | 96 | 96 |  |
|  | Eligible | 75 | 85 | 83 | 87 | 83 |  |
| No passes | Non eligible | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
|  | Eligible | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |  |
| \% EBacc | Non eligible |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |
|  | Eligible |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |

Source: DfE statistical first release, EPAS for 2011 data
Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all schools in England

The percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals that made expected progress in English in 2011 was 27.7 percentage points lower than for pupils not eligible. The gap for expected progress in maths was slightly wider than in English, at 33 percentage points.

Table 11: 2011 Expected progress in English and maths by FSM eligibility

|  | FSM eligibility | Leeds | National |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 3 levels of progress in <br> English | Non Eligible | 70.2 |  |
|  | Eligible | 42.5 |  |
|  | Non Eligible | 64.8 |  |
|  | Eligible | 32.0 |  |

## Special Education Needs

Pupils not on the SEN register saw an improvement in 5 A* $^{*}-\mathrm{C}, 5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English and maths, and $5 A^{*}-G$ between 2010 and 2011. Pupils in different SEN categories experienced a variety of outcomes across different indicators. Whilst a slightly greater proportion of pupils on School Action achieved 5 A $^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ in 2011 compared to 2010, there was a 7 percentage point fall for School Action pupils achieving 5 A*$^{*}$-C including English and maths, and a 3 percentage point fall for 5 A $^{*}$-G. School Action plus pupils achieved broadly similar results in 2011 as 2010. Statemented pupils saw an improvement in both 5 $A^{*}-C$ and $5 A^{*}$-C including English and maths, by 1 and 2 percentage points respectively. Although 16\% of pupils with no SEN pupils achieved the EBacc in 2011, pupils on the SEN category were much less likely to meet the threshold; school action, school action plus, and statemented pupils recorded $3 \%, 2 \%$ and $1 \%$ respectively for this indicator.

Table 12: Key Stage 4 attainment by SEN Stage

|  |  | 2009 |  | 2010 |  | 2011 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| \% 5A*-C | No SEN | 81 | 80 | 86 | 85 | 90 |  |
|  | Action | 46 | 46 | 60 | 56 | 62 |  |
|  | Action + | 26 | 30 | 42 | 40 | 42 |  |
|  | Statement | 12 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 18 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \% ~ 5 A^{*}-C \\ & \text { inc. E\&M } \end{aligned}$ | No SEN | 58 | 62 | 61 | 66 | 65 |  |
|  | Action | 20 | 21 | 27 | 26 | 20 |  |
|  | Action + | 12 | 13 | 16 | 17 | 14 |  |
|  | Statement | 6 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 6 |  |
| \% 5A*-G | No SEN | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 99 |  |
|  | Action | 88 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 90 |  |
|  | Action + | 67 | 76 | 75 | 80 | 76 |  |
|  | Statement | 43 | 47 | 40 | 49 | 37 |  |
| No passes | No SEN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Action | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
|  | Action + | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 |  |
|  | Statement | 19 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 23 |  |
| EBacc | No SEN |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |
|  | Action |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
|  | Action + |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | Statement |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |

Source: DfE statistical first release, EPAS for 2011 data
Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all schools in England

Pupils on the SEN register, and pupils without SEN, were both more likely to make expected progress in English than they were in maths in 2011. For those pupils on the SEN register, the difference in progress was smallest for pupils with a statement of SEN, and largest for School Action pupils.

Table 13: 2011 Expected progress in English and maths by SEN Stage

|  | SEN status | Leeds | National |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 3 levels of progress in <br> English | No SEN | 74.0 |  |
|  | Action | 41.3 |  |
|  | Action + | 25.5 |  |
|  | Statement | 13.1 |  |
| 3 levels of progress in <br> maths | No SEN | 68.5 |  |
|  | Action | 31.1 |  |
|  | Action + | 19.9 |  |
|  | Statement | 12.9 |  |

Source: EPAS

## Looked After Children

The national reporting structure for outcomes for Looked After Children (LAC) has changed. Previously outcomes have been reported for the OC2 cohort - those LAC who have were looked after on the $30^{\text {th }}$ September prior the Summer examination season and still in care 12 months later. This has now changed and as of last year, outcomes are now reported for the 903 cohort - those LAC who were looked after on the 31st March prior to the examination season.

Analysis has been presented in this report for the 903 cohort, as reported in the statutory 903 return. Time series analysis is not possible for some indicators before 2010 as the Department for Education (DfE) only started publishing outcomes for the 903 cohort in 2010.

Until December, national data for 2011 is unavailable and analysis for children Looked After by Leeds will only be for looked after children and young people that are educated in Leeds schools.

Of the LAC on the roll of a Leeds school, $88 \%$ were entered for at least one qualification. $11 \%$ achieved 5 or more GCSEs at grades A $^{*}$-C including English and maths, slightly lower than last year. The percentage achieving $5 A^{*}$-C fell marginally to $35 \%$, however this is compared to a continued improvement for all pupils in Leeds, therefore the gap has widened to 46 percentage points. The percentage of LAC achieving $5 A^{*}-G$ improved by 4 percentage points to $59 \%$, this is still significantly lower than attainment for all pupils in Leeds. $84 \%$ of LAC achieved any qualification, a slight improvement on 2010. No LAC achieved the English Baccalaureate in Leeds in 2011.

Table 14: Percentage of pupils attaining level 4+: Looked After Children

|  | 2010 |  | 2011 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| 5 A*$^{*}-C$ | 36 | 26 | 35 |  |
| 5 A $^{*}$-C inc. E \& M | 15 | 12 | 11 |  |
| 5 A $^{*}$-G | 55 | 51 | 59 |  |
| No passes | 18 | 22 | 16 |  |
| EBacc | - |  | 0 |  |

[^1]Whilst $65 \%$ of all pupils on the roll of Leeds schools made expected progress in English in 2011, only $34 \%$ of LAC made expected progress in this subject. Similarly, only $20 \%$ of LAC on the roll of a Leeds school made expected progress in maths, compared to a Leeds average figure of $59 \%$.

Table 15: 2011 Expected progress in English and maths for LAC

|  | Leeds | National |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 3 levels of progress in <br> English | 34 | - |
| 3 levels of progress in <br> maths | 20 | - |

Source: EPAS
Notes: 2011 data is provisional and is only for LAC in Leeds schools

## English as an Additional Language

For the $5 A^{*}-C$ and $5 A^{*}-C$ including English and maths measures, attainment is higher for pupils with English as a first language than for those with EAL. The gaps in attainment between the two groups have historically been wider in Leeds than nationally for these measures. The gaps in attainment between pupils with EAL and those with English as a first language have further increased in 2011 for these measures, as greater improvements continue to been seen for pupils with English as a first language. In Leeds, the percentage point gap between EAL and non-EAL pupils is 7 points for $5+A^{*}-C, 12$ points for $5+A^{*}-C$ including English and maths, 1 point for $5+A^{*}-\mathrm{G}, 0$ points for No passes and 4 points for the English Baccalaureate.

Table 16: Key Stage 4 attainment by first language

|  | First language | 2009 |  | 2010 |  | 2011 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| \% 5A*-C | Non EAL | 68 | 70 | 76 | 76 | 81 |  |
|  | EAL | 66 | 71 | 72 | 76 | 74 |  |
| $\% 5 A^{*}-C$inc. E\&M | Non EAL | 47 | 51 | 51 | 55 | 54 |  |
|  | EAL | 38 | 50 | 43 | 53 | 42 |  |
| \% 5A*-G | Non EAL | 91 | 94 | 93 | 94 | 94 |  |
|  | EAL | 92 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 93 |  |
| No passes | Non EAL | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 |  |
|  | EAL | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |  |
| EBacc | Non EAL |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |
|  | EAL |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |

[^2]Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all schools in England

## Ethnicity

## Achievement of 5 or more $A^{*}-C$

Sustained improvements have been achieved in Leeds against the $5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}$-C measure in 2011, as seen in Table 17 below, increasing by 5.5 percentage points. Most ethnic minority groups also saw improvements which were at least in line with the average improvement, but some saw decreases in outcomes compared to the previous cohorts in 2010. These groups were: Other Black background, Mixed Black Caribbean and White, Mixed Asian and White, Other White backgrounds, Other ethnic backgrounds, Travellers of Irish heritage, and Gypsy/Roma.

Outcomes for pupils of Bangladeshi heritage continued to improve in 2011, but at a slower rate than the average. The performance of young people from this group in Leeds in 2011 is lower than the national figure reported for 2010. Attainment for Indian pupils continues to improve and remains above the Leeds average and the comparative national figure for 2010. Faster than average improvement has been achieved by Kashmiri Pakistani and Other Pakistani pupils in 2011, and their attainment is now within 3 percentage points and 1 percentage point of the Leeds figure respectively.

Considerable improvements in the performance of Black Caribbean heritage pupils means that the gap in attainment for this group has effectively disappeared in 2011. The attainment of Black African pupils has also significantly improved in 2011 and is now slightly above the Leeds average. However, the percentage of Other Black heritage pupils achieving this benchmark has dropped to $57 \%$, close to 2009 levels. This group is fairly small in size and is therefore more likely to see fluctuations in outcomes year on year, but it is concerning that the encouraging improvements seen for the two larger Black groups have not also been reflected in this group.

The picture for Mixed heritage groups is inconsistent; whilst some improvements have been seen, outcomes for all but the "Other Mixed Background" group are below average. The attainment of White Eastern European pupils continues to slide and in 2011 was over 10 percentage points below the Leeds average. Attainment for Gypsy/Roma and White Irish Travellers remains the lowest of any ethnic group.

Table 17: The percentage achieving 5 or more $A^{*}$ - $C$ by ethnic group

|  | Leeds |  |  | National |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2011 <br> cohort <br> number | 2009 <br> $\%$ | 2010 <br> $\%$ | 2011 <br> $\%$ | 2009 <br> $\%$ | 2010 <br> $\%$ | 2011 <br> $\%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 88 | 63.6 | 69.5 | 72.7 | 69.7 | 75.9 |  |
|  | 140 | 85.4 | 87.2 | 92.9 | 82.2 | 87.3 |  |
|  | 170 | 54.0 | 69.9 | 77.6 |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | 66.7 | 100 | 66.7 | 66.4 | 74.0 |  |
|  | 198 | 64.7 | 71.8 | 79.8 |  |  |  |
|  | 89 | 61.4 | 66.3 | 77.5 | 72.1 | 77.8 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 103 | 42.7 | 63.4 | 80.6 | 63.2 | 70.3 |  |
| Black African | 215 | 67.7 | 68.6 | 81.4 | 70.0 | 76.2 |  |
| Other Black Background | 42 | 50.0 | 71.4 | 57.1 | 64.3 | 71.4 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 18 | 56.3 | 66.7 | 77.8 | 70.2 | 76 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 136 | 59.1 | 69 | 68.4 | 63.3 | 70.9 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 66 | 60.3 | 80 | 77.3 | 77.0 | 81.8 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 76 | 60.5 | 74.2 | 82.9 | 72.2 | 78.1 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 45 | 86.8 | 84.4 | 93.3 | 87.5 | 89.9 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 46 | 65.6 | 80.4 | 71.7 | 68.0 | 74.7 |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 6444 | 67.9 | 76.5 | 81.7 | 69.8 | 75.5 |  |
| White Irish | 34 | 70.0 | 77.8 | 97.1 | 73.1 | 79 |  |
| Other White Background | 16 | 63.9 | 64.7 | 62.5 |  |  |  |
| White Eastern European | 66 | 71.1 | 70.8 | 68.2 | 66.9 | 73.8 |  |
| White Western European | 11 | 90.9 | 80 | 81.8 |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 9 | 18.2 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 24.4 | 36.3 |  |
| GypsylRoma | 22 | 28.6 | 19.0 | 13.6 | 19.8 | 27.5 |  |
| All pupils | 6082 | 67 | 75.5 | 80.8 | 69.8 | 75.6 |  |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), DfE Statistical First Release (National) , 2011 data is provisional Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all public sector schools in England

## Achievement of 5 or more $A^{*}-C$ including English and maths

Attainment for all pupils improved by 2.5 percentage points for $5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English and maths. This modest overall improvement is the result of a very inconsistent pattern of change amongst the various ethnic groups.

Following significant improvements for some groups in 2010, most groups have only shown small changes this year. The only groups with improvements which were well above the Leeds average were: Chinese ( +20 percentage points), Mixed Black African and White (+15 percentage points) and Other Mixed backgrounds (+10 percentage points).

These groups have fairly small numbers and are more likely to see fluctuations in results due to specific cohort characteristics.

The performance for Indian pupils remains above the Leeds average for $5 \mathrm{~A}^{*}$ - C including English and maths, but is below the 2010 national level of attainment for Indian pupils. Outcomes for all other Asian groups were lower in 2011 compared to 2010 and are well below the Leeds average. This is especially true for Bangladeshi and Kashmiri Pakistani heritage students, for whom less than $40 \%$ of students achieve this level, considerably lower than the national average for these groups.

Outcomes for Black Caribbean and Black African heritage students have improved at a similar rate to the Leeds average, but remain well below the Leeds average and the national average for these groups. Results for the small cohort identified as coming from "Other Black backgrounds" have fluctuated considerably over recent years, but remain well below average in 2011.

Most mixed heritage groups have a percentage achieving 5+ $A^{*}-C$ including English and maths which is in line with the Leeds average. The exception to this is the Mixed Black Caribbean and White group; less than $40 \%$ of this group achieved this level of performance. This group is one of the larger cohorts (136 students in 2011), so their low outcomes are a key cause for concern. Only 3 of the 31 students identified as being from White Irish Traveller or Gypsy/Roma backgrounds achieved 5 A*-C including English and $^{*}$ maths in 2011.

Table 18: The percentage achieving 5 or more $A^{*}-C$ including English and maths by ethnic group


Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), DfE Statistical First Release (National) , 2011 data is provisional Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all public sector schools in England

## Achievement of 5 or more $A^{*}$-G

Following an above-average increase in 2010, the percentage of Bangladeshi heritage students achieving 5 A*-G grades has fallen back slightly in 2011, but still remains above the Leeds average and the national average for this group. Outcomes for all of the Asian heritage cohorts were above the Leeds average; it is worth noting that all 140 Indian heritage students achieved this benchmark.

The achievements of all Black heritage groups are above the Leeds average and in-line with or above the national averages for the same groups. There have been some fluctuations in outcomes for these groups over recent years, but the 2011 results are consistently positive for this indicator.

Outcomes for all mixed heritage groups are below the Leeds average, and most have fallen in 2011. Whilst some of these groups are quite small in size, the larger Mixed Black Caribbean and White heritage cohort is 6 percentage points below the Leeds average and a similar level below the national equivalents.

The percentage of Chinese pupils achieving 5 or more A*-G has risen back to 2009 levels, $_{2}$ following a fall in 2010, and is well above the Leeds average. Achievement for pupils of other ethnic heritage is slightly below the Leeds average. Attainment for Traveller groups remains very low.

Table 19: The percentage achieving 5 or more $A^{*}$-G by ethnic group

|  | Leeds |  |  |  | National |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2011 cohort number | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2011 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2011 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 88 | 90.9 | 98.3 | 96.6 | 94.5 | 95.8 |  |
| Indian | 140 | 98.3 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 97.6 | 98 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 170 | 94.7 | 95.4 | 97.6 | 94.5 | 95 |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 6 | 88.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| Other Pakistani | 198 | 92.4 | 93.4 | 98.0 |  |  |  |
| Other Asian background | 89 | 91.2 | 91.8 | 88.8 | 94.1 | 94.0 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 103 | 94.4 | 88.2 | 95.1 | 94.0 | 93.9 |  |
| Black African | 215 | 91.3 | 97.3 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 95.6 |  |
| Other Black Background | 42 | 85.4 | 87.8 | 97.6 | 92.7 | 93.7 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 18 | 96.9 | 91.7 | 88.9 | 93.1 | 93.3 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 136 | 84.8 | 87.6 | 88.2 | 91.5 | 92.4 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 66 | 86.2 | 93.3 | 93.9 | 94.6 | 95.9 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 76 | 80.3 | 93.3 | 92.1 | 94.0 | 94.5 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 45 | 97.4 | 90.6 | 97.8 | 96.4 | 97.4 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 46 | 88.5 | 93.5 | 91.3 | 91.7 | 92.7 |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 6444 | 91.2 | 93.6 | 94.1 | 93.4 | 94.5 |  |
| White Irish | 34 | 93.3 | 96.3 | 100.0 | 93.1 | 94.0 |  |
| Other White Background | 16 | 94.4 | 82.4 | 81.3 | 92.2 | 93.3 |  |
| White Eastern European | 66 | 94.7 | 92.3 | 90.9 |  |  |  |
| White Western European | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| Traveller Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 9 | 45.5 | 33.3 | 44.4 | 50.4 | 65.3 |  |
| GypsylRoma | 22 | 52.4 | 57.1 | 27.3 | 57.8 | 58.4 |  |


|  | All pupils |  | 91.1 | 93.4 | 94.1 | 93.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), DfE Statistical First Release (National), 2011 data is provisional Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all public sector schools in England

## Achievement of any qualifications

The percentage of pupils of Bangladeshi heritage achieving any qualifications in Key Stage 4 increased slightly in 2011 and is in line with the Leeds average. The percentage of Indian heritage students achieving any qualification has gone back up to $100 \%$, following a dip in 2010. A slightly higher proportion of Kashmiri/Pakistani heritage achieved any pass in 2011 than the Leeds average. The only below-average group is the Other Asian cohort, at 96.6\%

100\% of Black Caribbean and 99\% of Black African pupils achieved a Key Stage 4 pass in 2011. Achievement for other Black heritage is in line with the Leeds average.

The proportion achieving any pass remains below the Leeds average for Mixed heritage groups, all are within 1 percentage point of the Leeds average.

The small cohort sizes for Traveller and Gypsy/Roma pupils means that figures will fluctuate from year to year, but in 2011 all of the Traveller pupils and $86 \%$ of the Gypsy/Roma pupils achieved at least one qualification.

Table 20: The percentage achieving any qualifications by ethnic group

|  | Leeds |  |  |  | National |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2011$ <br> cohort <br> number | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2011 <br> \% | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2011 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 88 | 97.0 | 98.3 | 98.9 | 99.0 | 99.0 |  |
| Indian | 140 | 100.0 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 99.4 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 170 | 99.3 | 98 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 98.8 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 198 | 98.7 | 97.2 | 99.5 |  |  |  |
| Other Asian background | 89 | 98.2 | 99 | 96.6 | 98.3 | 98.6 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 103 | 98.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 99.0 |  |
| Black African | 215 | 98.8 | 100.0 | 99.1 | 99.0 | 99.1 |  |
| Other Black Background | 42 | 93.8 | 98.0 | 97.6 | 98.2 | 98.8 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 18 | 100.0 | 95.8 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 98.7 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 136 | 96.2 | 96.6 | 97.1 | 98.5 | 98.3 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 66 | 98.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.6 | 98.9 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 76 | 96.1 | 96.6 | 97.4 | 98.7 | 98.7 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 45 | 100.0 | 96.9 | 100.0 | 98.9 | 99.5 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 46 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 95.7 | 98.0 | 98.2 |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 6444 | 98.1 | 98.4 | 98.6 | 98.7 | 99.0 |  |
| White Irish | 34 | 96.7 | 96.3 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 98.4 |  |
| Other White Background | 16 | 97.2 | 94.1 | 93.8 |  |  |  |
| White Eastern European | 66 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.5 | 98.3 | 98.4 |  |
| White Western European | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 9 | 90.9 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 81.5 | 83.1 |  |
| GypsylRoma | 22 | 81.0 | 95.2 | 86.4 | 85.0 | 87.4 |  |
| All pupils |  | 98.1 | 98.3 | 98.6 | 98.7 | 98.9 |  |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), DfE Statistical First Release (National), 2011 data is provisional Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all public sector schools in England

## Achievement of EBacc

Table 21 shows the proportion of pupils from different ethnic groups that met the requirements of the EBacc in 2011. Overall in Leeds, 13\% of pupils achieved the EBacc in 2011; however there were wide variations across different ethnic groups. No pupils from the GypsylRoma, Traveller of Irish Heritage, or Other White Background ethnic groups achieved the EBacc in 2011; though it should be noted that the size of these groups was
comparatively small. The next lowest performing group was the Bangladeshi cohort, of whom only $3.4 \%$ achieved the EBacc in 2011. Many other ethnic groups were below the Leeds average; Kashmiri Pakistani (5.3\%), Other Pakistani (8.1\%), Other Asian (6.7\%), Black Caribbean (5.8\%), Black African (7.4\%), Other Black background (7.1\%), and White Eastern European (7.6\%) pupils were all below 10\%.

Of the most populous cohort, White British, 13.7\% achieved the EBacc. The highest performing cohorts in Leeds were the White Western European (36.4\%), Mixed Black African and White (27.8\%), and White Irish (26.5\%). Pupils in the Chinese (24.4\%), and Other Ethnic Group (21.7\%) were the only other two pupil groups above 20\% in Leeds last year.

Table 21: The percentage achieving EBacc by ethnic group

|  | Leeds |  | National |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2011 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2011 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 88 | 3.4 |  |
| Indian | 140 | 14.3 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 170 | 5.3 |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 6 | 16.7 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 198 | 8.1 |  |
| Other Asian background | 89 | 6.7 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 103 | 5.8 |  |
| Black African | 215 | 7.4 |  |
| Other Black Background | 42 | 7.1 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 18 | 27.8 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 136 | 12.5 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 66 | 13.6 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 76 | 17.1 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 45 | 24.4 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 46 | 21.7 |  |
| White |  |  |  |
| White British | 6444 | 13.7 |  |
| White Irish | 34 | 26.5 |  |
| Other White Background | 16 | 0.0 |  |
| White Eastern European | 66 | 7.6 |  |
| White Western European | 11 | 36.4 |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 9 | 0.0 |  |
| GypsylRoma | 22 | 0.0 |  |
| All pupils |  | 13.0 |  |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds). 2011 data is provisional

## Pupils making expected progress

Traveller groups recorded the lowest proportion of pupils making expected progress in English, at just $14.3 \%$ of Travellers of Irish Heritage and $6.7 \%$ of Gypsy Roma pupils; though this is based on a total cohort size of just 22 pupils. Other groups performing below the Leeds average include pupils of Other Black background (41.7\%), Other White background (45.5\%), Black Caribbean pupils (54.6\%), and Bangladeshi pupils (55.3\%).

A number of groups made better than average progress in English. Some of these groups, such as Indian (76.9\%), Chinese (94.4\%) and Other Ethnic Group (71.9\%) are groups that are generally high attainers at Key Stage 4. Other groups, such as Black African ( $74.1 \%$ ), have above-average progress with below-average attainment for many Key Stage 4 indicators. All of the White Western European pupils eligible for this indicator made expected progress in English in 2011, though the cohort represents only 8 pupils.

As with expected progress in English, the traveller groups were least likely to make expected progress in Maths. In 2011, no pupils in the Travellers of Irish Heritage group, and only 6\% of GypsylRoma pupils, made expected progress in maths. Other Black Background (38.9\%), Bangladeshi (45.9\%), Mixed Black Caribbean and White (46.3\%) and Kashmiri Pakistani (47.1\%) pupils were also well below the Leeds average.

The groups most likely to make expected progress in Maths in 2011 were Chinese ( $95.2 \%$ ), Other Ethnic Group (83.3\%), Kashmiri Other (80\%) and Indian (75.9\%). Though $100 \%$ of White Western European pupils made expected progress in English, only 66.7\% made expected progress in maths.

Table 22: 2011 Expected Levels of Progress by Ethnicity

|  | English |  |  | Maths |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort* number | Leeds \% | National \% | Cohort* number | Leeds \% | National \% |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 76 | 55.3 |  | 74 | 45.9 |  |
| Indian | 134 | 76.9 |  | 133 | 75.9 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 153 | 60.8 |  | 153 | 47.1 |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 6 | 66.7 |  | 5 | 80.0 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 178 | 67.4 |  | 182 | 58.8 |  |
| Other Asian background | 62 | 64.5 |  | 63 | 60.3 |  |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 97 | 54.6 |  | 95 | 51.6 |  |
| Black African | 143 | 74.1 |  | 147 | 68.7 |  |
| Other Black Background | 36 | 41.7 |  | 36 | 38.9 |  |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 14 | 78.6 |  | 14 | 71.4 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 121 | 57.0 |  | 123 | 46.3 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 57 | 63.2 |  | 58 | 58.6 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 71 | 66.2 |  | 69 | 60.9 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 36 | 94.4 |  | 42 | 95.2 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 32 | 71.9 |  | 30 | 83.3 |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 6144 | 65.7 |  | 6146 | 59.3 |  |
| White Irish | 33 | 69.7 |  | 34 | 67.6 |  |
| Other White Background | 11 | 45.5 |  | 12 | 50.0 |  |
| White Eastern European | 27 | 66.7 |  | 30 | 53.3 |  |
| White Western European | 8 | 100.0 |  | 9 | 66.7 |  |
| Traveller Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 7 | 14.3 |  | 9 | 0.0 |  |
| GypsylRoma | 15 | 6.7 |  | 17 | 5.9 |  |
| All pupils | 7496 | 65.5 |  | 7519 | 59.2 |  |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), 2011 data is provisional
*Cohort includes only those pupils included in the expected progress calculations

## Key Stage 5

## Overall Attainment

Following a slightly declining trend in the average point score (APS) achieved by students over recent years, there has been an encouraging improvement in this indicator in 2011. The Leeds APS per student has gone up by 15 points to 706.6 ; this equates to students achieving one half-grade better than last year. This improvement "bucks" the national trend; in the maintained sector the APS per student has fallen by a similar level compared to 2010. Despite the increase, Leeds remains well below the national maintained average (9 points per student) and significantly below the average for our statistical neighbours (18 points per student), but the narrowing of the gap by about 1 grade per student is a very encouraging improvement.

There continues to be an improvement in the average points per entry in Leeds. This figure has gone up by 3 points compared to 2010 and is now at 208.4. This improving trend is in line with the national situation, meaning Leeds remains well below the national maintained average, which rose by 2 points to 215.5 . The average for statistical neighbour LAs rose by 1.5 points to 208.7 - only slightly above the Leeds figure.

The percentage of students achieving 2 or more passes in Leeds continues to rise. In 2011, $94.6 \%$ of students achieved this benchmark, exceeding both the national maintained average ( $92.2 \%$ ) and the average for our statistical neighbours ( $92.7 \%$ ), which both fell in 2011. The percentage of students achieving 3 or more $A^{*}-A$ grades at $A$ Level has also risen in 2011. The Leeds figure has improved by half a percentage point to $8.3 \%$. The national maintained figure has dropped by a considerable 2.5 percentage points, but remains well above the Leeds average at $9.9 \%$. The average for our statistical neighbour LAs is within half a percentage point of Leeds at $8.8 \%$.

Table 23: 2009-2011 Key Stage 5 performance

|  | 2009 |  |  | 2010 |  |  | 2011 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | Nat | Stat <br> Neigh | Leeds | Nat | Stat <br> Neigh | Leeds | Nat | Stat <br> Neigh |
| Average <br> points per <br> student | 694 | 739.1 | 729 | 691.1 | 732.9 | 725.9 | 706.6 | 715.3 | 724.4 |
| Average <br> points per <br> entry* | 203.2 | 211.7 | 204.9 | 205.3 | 213.8 | 207.2 | 208.4 | 215.5 | 208.7 |
| \% <br> achieving <br> 2+ passes | 93.3 | 95 | 96.1 | 93.5 | 93.6 | 94.9 | 94.6 | 92.2 | 92.7 |
| \% <br> achieving <br> 3+ A*-A <br> grades | 8 | 12.7 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 12.4 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 9.9 | 8.8 |

Source: DfE statistical first release; Note: * = QCA points

For information, Table 24 below, shows achievements in 2011 only, for: Leeds, statistical neighbour local authorities, England (maintained sector) and England (all schools and FE colleges). It should be noted that the England (all schools and FE colleges) figures include independent schools and are considerably higher than the England (Maintained sector) figures. However, it is considered a fairer comparison to benchmark Leeds figures against the maintained sector since LA figures do not include independent schools in their respective areas.

Table 24: 2011 Key Stage 5 performance

|  | Average QCDA point score by students achieving all Level 3 qualifications |  | \% of candidates achieving 2 or more passes of A Level equivalent size | \% of candidates achieving 3 or more A*-A grades at GCE/Applied GCE A Level and Double Awards |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per candidate | Per entry |  |  |
| Stat Neigh average | 724.4 | 208.67 | 92.7 | 8.8 |
| Leeds | 706.6 | 208.4 | 94.6 | 8.3 |
| TOTAL (Maintained sector) | 715.3 | 212.4 | 92.2 | 9.9 |
| England Average | 733.1 | 215.5 | 92.7 | 12.8 |

Source: DfE statistical first release

## Key Stage 5 attainment for pupil groups

Attainment in Key Stage 5 is higher for girls than boys, both in Leeds and nationally, however the gap between boys and girls is reducing year on year. In terms of points per student, the gap between boys and girls in Leeds has narrowed from 56 points in 2008 (the equivalent of almost two A Level grades) to only 20 points (two thirds of an A Level grade) in 2011. The national gender gap in 2011 is much larger than that seen in Leeds, with boys in Leeds achieving at the same level as boys nationally, but girls in Leeds achieving at a lower level than girls nationally. For points per entry, the size of the gender gap has dropped to 5 points, compared to 7 points 2009. This year boys have closed the gap to girls in terms of the percentage achieving 2 or more passes at A Level to half a percentage point. In 2009 the gap was over 2 percentage points in favour of girls. The gap between the percentage of boys and girls achieving 3 or more A $^{*}$-A grades has widened to 0.8 percentage points; this is smaller than the gap seen in 2009. It should also be noted that outcomes for both boys and girls have improved against this indicator.

Table 25: Key Stage 5 attainment by gender

|  | Gender | 2009 |  | 2010 |  | 2011 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| Average points per <br> student* $^{*}$ | Girls | 710.3 | 755.7 | 705.6 | 749.2 | 715.9 | 732.2 |
|  | Boys | 676.7 | 720.2 | 674.2 | 714.7 | 696.1 | 696.0 |
| Average points per <br> entry* | Girls | 206.5 | 214.9 | 208.6 | 217.1 | 210.8 | 215.9 |
|  | Boys | 199.7 | 207.9 | 201.3 | 210.1 | 205.8 | 208.3 |
| $\%$ achieving 2+ passes | Girls | 94.4 | 95.9 | 94.9 | 94.6 | 94.8 | 92.5 |
|  | Boys | 92.1 | 94 | 92 | 92.4 | 94.3 | 91.8 |
| $\%$ achieving 3+ A*-A | Girls | 8.6 | 12.1 | 7.8 | 12.4 | 8.7 | 9.8 |
|  | Boys | 7.3 | 12.1 | 7.6 | 12.5 | 7.9 | 10.1 |

Source: DfE statistical first release; Note: * = QCA points, National - England Maintained Sector

The pupil group analysis below is for Key Stage 5 students in school sixth forms, as the pupil characteristic information is not available for students in FE colleges. No national pupil group data is available for Key Stage 5.

The points per student for pupils eligible for free school meals is significantly lower than for pupils who are not eligible. The gap in 2011 is equivalent to almost 5 A Level grades. The points per student for pupils eligible for free school meals did improve in 2011, as did the average points per entry, and the gap between eligible and non-eligible students did decrease slightly, but the gap remains significant. One factor impacting on the lower average points per student for pupils eligible for free school meals is that they have, on average, 0.4 fewer entries than students who are not eligible. However, the average points per entry is also lower for pupils eligible for free school meals.

Key Stage 5 attainment for pupils with SEN is lower than for pupils with no SEN. The average points per student and per entry fell for all SEN groups in 2011, following improvements in 2010. The number of pupils on School Action plus and with statements of SEN is low so care must be taken when interpreting the results for these groups; year-on-year fluctuations may be more of a reflection of each successive cohort, than an indication of changing outcomes.

The average points per student for pupils with EAL is lower than for pupils with English as a first language, however the gap has narrowed from 94 points in 2009 (3 grades lower) to 74 points in 2011 ( 2.5 grades lower). Again, there has been fluctuation over the last three years; a significant improvement in the APS per student score for EAL students in 2010 has been followed by a much more modest improvement in 2011, while for non EAL students there was no change in 2010, followed by a noticeable improvement in 2011. The APS per entry for EAL students has improved consistently over the last three years and is now within 1 point of the figure for non-EAL students. This demonstrates that students with EAL are on average doing as well as non-EAL students in the qualifications that they are studying, but they are taking, on average, fewer qualifications.

Table 26: Key Stage 5 attainment for pupil groups

|  | Cohort size | Avg. no. | Average points per student |  |  | Average points per entry |  |  | \% achieving 2+ passes |  |  | \% achieving 3+ A*A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2011 | 2011 | ‘09 | '10 | '11 | '09 | '10 | '11 | '09 | '10 | '11 | '09 | '10 | '11 |
| Free school meal eligibility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not eligible | 2094 | 3.6 | 728 | 734 | 743 | 202 | 204 | 207 | 95 | 95 | 96 | 8 | 8 | 10 |
| Eligible | 96 | 3.2 | 598 | 571 | 602 | 192 | 185 | 191 | 87 | 86 | 85 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Special Education Needs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No SEN | 2082 | 3.6 | 727 | 727 | 740 | 202 | 203 | 207 | 95 | 94 | 96 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| School Action | 73 | 3.3 | 664 | 694 | 682 | 198 | 202 | 206 | 92 | 93 | 85 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| School action + | 28 | 3.2 | 548 | 716 | 660 | 165 | 210 | 204 | 100 | 91 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| Statement | 10 | 3.0 | 493 | 619 | 584 | 168 | 214 | 195 | 74 | 82 | 100 | 0 | 18 | 10 |
| First Language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non EAL | 1989 | 3.6 | 731 | 731 | 744 | 203 | 204 | 207 | 95 | 95 | 96 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| EAL | 199 | 3.3 | 637 | 666 | 670 | 189 | 196 | 206 | 89 | 89 | 92 | 3 | 7 | 9 |

Source: University of Bath; EPAS, 2011 data is provisional

Average points per student and per entry by ethnic group are shown in Table 27 below. The numbers of some groups attending maintained school sixth forms are relatively small which could distort comparative analysis. In 2011, the outcomes for some groups were well above average; these groups tended to be small in number and their achievements could have been contributed to by high performance in language subjects. Points per student were well below average for pupils of Kashmiri, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Other Asian backgrounds and also for students of Black Caribbean and Black African heritage.

Table 27: Key Stage 5 attainment by ethnic group

|  | Cohort size: 2011 | Average number of entries: 2011 | Average points per student |  |  | Average points per entry |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| Asian Or Asian British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bangladeshi | 14 | 3.3 | 598.3 | 586.5 | 625.7 | 195.8 | 189.2 | 192.5 |
| Indian | 114 | 3.5 | 674.8 | 712.3 | 715.8 | 190.2 | 192.2 | 202.4 |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 58 | 3.4 | 557.1 | 554.1 | 677.5 | 184 | 178.3 | 200.4 |
| Kashmiri Other | <5 | 3 | 660 | 735 | 465.0 | 220 | 188.5 | 155.0 |
| Other Pakistani | 86 | 3.2 | 609.5 | 636.5 | 634.8 | 183.8 | 192.8 | 198.8 |
| Other Asian background | <5 | 3 | 658.5 | 662.2 | 604.1 | 190.9 | 187.2 | 206.6 |
| Black Or Black British |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 14 | 3.4 | 563.2 | 763.5 | 614.9 | 165.4 | 204.3 | 183.1 |
| Black African | 54 | 3.1 | 665.1 | 725.8 | 607.9 | 188.5 | 203.6 | 194.3 |
| Other Black Background | 15 |  | 721.7 | 661.7 | 697.2 | 206.2 | 172.6 | 227.1 |
| Mixed Heritage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 10 | 3.3 | 705 | 819.2 | 651.8 | 201.4 | 230.4 | 200.5 |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 21 | 3.2 | 698.6 | 691.1 | 623.2 | 198.2 | 198.5 | 193.9 |
| Mixed Asian and White | 14 | 4.1 | 888.5 | 663 | 855.0 | 220 | 213.9 | 207.8 |
| Other Mixed Background | 19 | 3.5 | 811.5 | 716 | 728.3 | 211.7 | 210.2 | 208.1 |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 22 | 3.9 | 900 | 879.8 | 880.2 | 223.4 | 226.8 | 227.8 |
| Other Ethnic group | 24 | 3.3 | 855 | 733 | 676.9 | 225.8 | 200.4 | 205.3 |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White British | 2222 | 3.6 | 733.4 | 730.8 | 749.4 | 203.9 | 204.2 | 209.2 |
| White Irish | 5 | 3.5 | 705 | 577.5 | 672 | 188 | 154 | 192 |
| Other White Background | 9 | 3.6 | 668.1 | 723.3 | 818.4 | 190.9 | 220.7 | 226.6 |
| White Eastern European | 9 | 3.9 | 961 | 549 | 887.7 | 234.4 | 203.3 | 229.6 |
| White Western European | 6 | 3.7 | 855 | 855 | 885 | 220.6 | 228 | 241.4 |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | <5 | 3.5 |  |  | 735 |  |  | 210 |
| Gypsy\Roma | 0 |  | 495 | 525 |  | 165 | 175 |  |
| All pupils |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), 2011 data is provisional

## Attendance in secondary schools

## Overall attendance and absence

Attendance in Leeds secondary schools increased by 0.76 percentage points in 2010/11 and attendance is now at its highest level since recording began. In 2009/10 secondary attendance was significantly below national and statistical neighbours and Leeds was ranked $147^{\text {th }}$ of 150 local authorities.

Table 28: Percentage attendance

|  | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leeds | 91.60 | 91.61 | 92.37 |
| National | 92.75 | 93.12 |  |
| Statistical Neighbour average |  | 93.19 |  |
| Leeds LA rank (out of 150 LAs) |  | 147 |  |

Source: 2008/09 \& 2009/10 DfE Statistical First Release; 2010/11 School Census Note: half-terms 1-5

Both authorised and unauthorised absence improved in 2010/11. Authorised absence fell by 0.61 percentage points and this was due to reductions in absence due to illness, agreed family holidays, exclusion and other authorised reason. Authorised absence due to religious observance rose in 2010/11.

Table 29: Percentage authorised absence

|  | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leeds | 5.83 | 5.72 | 5.11 |
| National | 5.76 | 5.43 |  |
| Statistical Neighbour average |  | 5.28 |  |
| Leeds LA rank (out of 150 LAs) |  | 120 |  |

Source: 2008/09 \& 2009/10 DfE Statistical First Release; 2010/11 School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5
Unauthorised absence fell by 0.15 percentage points. Unauthorised absence due to non agreed family holidays rose (indicating that schools not authorising holidays in term time has not yet lead to an overall reduction in holidays taken). Absence for other unauthorised reason and no reason yet recorded fell. In 2009/10 levels of unauthorised absence from Leeds secondary schools was significantly higher than national and statistical neighbours and Leeds was ranked $143^{\text {rd }}$ of 150 local authorities.

Table 30: Percentage unauthorised absence

|  | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leeds | 2.58 | 2.67 | 2.52 |
| National | 1.49 | 1.45 |  |
| Statistical Neighbour average |  | 1.53 |  |
| Leeds LA rank (out of 150 LAs) |  | 143 |  |

Source: 2008/09 \& 2009/10 DfE Statistical First Release; 2010/11 School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

In 2009/10 absence from secondary schools due to religious observance, exclusion, and other authorised reason were higher than the national level of absence for these reasons. Leeds had higher levels of absence for all unauthorised reasons, but absence due to other unauthorised reason was more than double the national rate of absence for this reason.

Table 31: Reasons for absence from secondary schools

| Reason for absence | Leeds |  | National |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2009 / 10$ | 2010/11 |  |
| Authorised absence | 3.81 | 3.55 | 3.84 |  |  |
| Illness | 0.42 | 0.40 | 0.42 |  |  |
| Medical/Dental appointments | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.05 |  |  |
| Religious observance | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.14 |  |  |
| Study leave | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |  |  |
| Traveller absence | 0.26 | 0.21 | 0.25 |  |  |
| Agreed family holiday | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |  |  |
| Agreed extended family holiday | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.15 |  |  |
| Excluded | 0.85 | 0.58 | 0.55 |  |  |
| Other authorised reason | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.13 |  |  |
| Unauthorised absence | 0.12 | 0.10 | 0.08 |  |  |
| Not agreed family holiday | 2.06 | 1.93 | 0.99 |  |  |
| Arrived after registers closed | 0.31 | 0.24 | 0.24 |  |  |
| Other unauthorised reason |  |  |  |  |  |
| No reason yet provided |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release, Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

## Persistent Absence

The DfE have now changed the definition of persistent absence and the threshold for a pupil to be judged as persistently absent is now $15 \%$ of absence over the school year. To enable analysis of progress over time, both measures of persistent absence are presented in this report, for the $15 \%$ and $20 \%$ thresholds.

Based on the 20\% absence threshold, levels of PA have continued to fall in Leeds secondary schools. The number of persistent absentees has fallen $17 \%$ from 2,981 to 2,486 . In 2009/10, Leeds had the second highest level of persistent absence of all local authorities.

Table 32: percentage persistent absentees - 20\% absence threshold

|  | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leeds | 7.9 | 7.4 | 6.3 |
| National | 5.0 | 4.4 |  |
| Statistical Neighbour average |  | 4.4 |  |
| Leeds LA rank (out of 150 LAs) |  | 149 |  |

[^3]Note: half-terms 1-5

There has also been a decrease in persistent absence based on the new $15 \%$ absence threshold, from $13.1 \%$ in $2009 / 10$ to $11.2 \%$ in $2010 / 11$. This is a $16 \%$ decrease from 5,284 pupils to 4,459 . In $2009 / 10$ the percentage of pupils missing more than $15 \%$ of schools in Leeds was significantly higher than national.

Table 33: Percentage persistent absentees - 15\% absence threshold

|  | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leeds |  | 13.1 | 11.2 |
| National | - | 9.2 |  |
| Statistical Neighbour average | - | - |  |
| Leeds LA rank (out of 150 LAs) | - | - |  |

Source:
Note: half-terms 1-5

## Attendance and persistent absence for pupil groups

Year group
Attendance reduces and persistent absence increases with age in secondary schools, with attendance in year 7 almost 5 percentage points higher than attendance in year 11. Attendance and persistent absence improved for all year groups in 2010/11.

The gap to national attendance and persistent absence increases with age within secondary schools, with attendance and persistent absence for year 7 pupils closer to the national than year 11. This indicates that as children get older in Leeds, an increasing cohort is disengaging from education; this impacts on attendance, attainment, numbers Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEET), youth offending, and is linked to those not making good progress in school.

Figure 5: Attendance by year group


Source: National - DfE statistical first release, Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5
Table 34: Persistent absence by year group

|  | PA - 20\% threshold |  |  | PA - 15\% threshold |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds |  | National |  | Leeds |  | National |
|  | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| year 7 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 2.0 |  | 7.4 | 6.0 |  |
| year 8 | 4.9 | 3.8 | 3.0 |  | 10.4 | 8.5 |  |
| year 9 | 6.9 | 5.9 | 4.1 |  | 12.7 | 11.1 |  |
| year 10 | 9.4 | 7.4 | 5.4 |  | 15.4 | 12.9 |  |
| year 11 | 12.6 | 11.6 | 7.4 |  | 19.4 | 17.5 |  |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release; Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

## Gender

In secondary schools, attendance is lower and persistent absence higher, for girls. This is the same pattern as seen nationally.

Table 35: Attendance and persistent absence: Gender

|  | Gender | 2009/10 |  | 2010/11 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| \% attendance | Girls | 91.4 | 93.0 | 92.2 |  |
|  | Boys | 91.8 | 93.3 | 92.5 |  |
| \% PA 20\%threshold | Girls | 7.6 | 4.6 | 6.5 |  |
|  | Boys | 7.2 | 4.2 | 6.0 |  |
| \% PA 15\%threshold | Girls | 13.4 |  | 11.5 |  |
|  | Boys | 12.9 |  | 10.9 |  |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release; Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

## Free school meal eligibility

Levels of attendance for pupils eligible for free school meals are significantly lower than for pupils who are not eligible. The improvements in attendance were greater for pupils eligible for free school meals in 2010/11, therefore the gap has narrowed. In 2009/10, the gap in attendance between those eligible and those not eligible was wider in Leeds than nationally, this is because there is a larger gap between Leeds and national for attendance of pupils eligible for free school meals than there is for those not eligible.

Pupils eligible for free school meals are more than 4 times as likely to be persistent absentees than pupils who are not eligible on the $20 \%$ threshold, and more than 3.5 times more likely on the $15 \%$ threshold measure. Over a quarter of pupils eligible for free school meals missed more than $15 \%$ of school in 2010/11.

Table 36: Attendance and persistent absence: Free school meal eligibility

|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { FSM } \\ \text { eligibility } \end{array}$ | 2009/10 |  | 2010/11 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| \% attendance | Not Eligible | 93.1 | 93.7 | 93.7 |  |
|  | Eligible | 85.3 | 89.7 | 86.6 |  |
| \% PA 20\% threshold | Not Eligible | 4.6 | 3.3 | 3.8 |  |
|  | Eligible | 18.9 | 10.1 | 16.2 |  |
| \% PA 15\% threshold | Not Eligible | 9.2 |  | 7.6 |  |
|  | Eligible | 29.3 |  | 26.3 |  |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release; Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

## Special Education Needs

Attendance is higher for pupils with no SEN and is lowest for those on School Action plus. This is the same pattern as is seen nationally. In 2009/10 the gap to national was narrowest for those pupils with no SEN and widest for those on School Action plus. Attendance improved for all levels of SEN in 2010/11. Over a quarter of pupils on School Action plus missed $20 \%$ of school and a third missed at least $15 \%$.

Table 37: Attendance and persistent absence: Special Education Needs

| \% SEN | 2009/10 |  | 2010/11 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
|  | No SEN | 93.2 | 94.0 | 93.7 |  |
|  | Action | 88.5 | 91.4 | 89.3 |  |
|  | Action + | 80.4 | 88.1 | 82.4 |  |
|  | Statement | 88.8 | 90.8 | 90.1 |  |
| \% PA 20\% <br> threshold | No SEN | 4.2 | 2.8 | 3.7 |  |
|  | Action | 13.2 | 7.0 | 11.5 |  |
|  | Action + | 29.8 | 14.1 | 26.1 |  |
|  | Statement | 12.8 | 8.9 | 9.8 |  |
| \% PA 15\% <br> threshold | No SEN | 8.8 |  | 7.6 |  |
|  | Action | 22.1 |  | 20.2 |  |
|  | Action + | 40.9 |  | 17.8 |  |
|  | Statement | 19.0 |  |  |  |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release; Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

## Looked After Children

Attendance of LAC in secondary schools is lower than the Leeds average. This is different from the national picture, where in 2009/10 attendance of LAC in secondary schools was marginally above the national attendance for all pupils. Levels of persistent absence for LAC are also significantly higher than the Leeds average and the 2009/10 figure for persistent absence of LAC in Leeds is higher than national.

Table 38: Attendance and persistent absence: Looked After Children

|  | 2009/10 |  | $2010 / 11$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| \% attendance | 90.5 | 93.3 | 90.2 |  |
| \% PA 20\% threshold | 11.0 | 6.4 | 12.7 |  |
| \% PA 15\% threshold | 17.2 | - | 17.5 |  |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release; Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

## English as an Additional Language

Pupils in secondary schools that have English as an additional language have higher levels of attendance and lower levels of persistent absence than pupils with English as a first language. The gap has reduced in Leeds in 2010/11 as attendance stayed the same for pupils with EAL, but rose for those not EAL. Persistent absence is also lower for pupils with EAL.

Table 39: Attendance and persistent absence: First language

| First <br> language | 2009/10 |  | 2010/11 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |  |
| $\%$ attendance | EAL | 92.6 | 94.0 | 92.6 |  |
|  | Non EAL | 91.5 | 93.0 | 92.3 |  |
| \% PA 20\% <br> threshold | EAL | 4.4 | 2.7 | 4.9 |  |
|  | Non EAL | 7.8 | 4.6 | 6.4 |  |
| \% PA 15\% <br> threshold | EAL | 10.4 |  | 9.8 |  |
|  | Non EAL | 13.5 |  | 11.4 |  |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release; Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

## Ethnicity

Attendance fell for some Asian groups in 2010/11, including for Bangladeshi pupils whose attendance is already significantly below the Leeds average. Attendance improved for pupils of Other Asian heritage and there was a small increase for pupils of Other Pakistani heritage. In 2009/10 all Asian heritage groups had attendance below national, with the biggest gap for Bangladeshi pupils whose attendance was over 3 percentage points lower in Leeds.

Attendance stayed the same for Black Caribbean pupils in 2010/11, but their attendance remained above the Leeds average. Attendance increased marginally for Black African pupils who also stayed significantly above the Leeds average and attendance improved by more than 1 percentage point for pupils of Other Black heritage. In 2009/10 attendance was below the national average for Black Caribbean and Other Black heritage and in-line for Black African.

Attendance fell for Mixed Black African and White pupils and rose slightly for other mixed heritage groups. All mixed groups were below the Leeds average in 2010/11 and below the national average in 2009/10.

Attendance rose for pupils of Chinese heritage and fell slightly for those of other ethnic minority heritage.

There were increases in attendance for White Irish Traveller and Gypsy/Roma pupils, but attendance for these groups remains very low. Attendance fell for White Eastern European pupils and remains well below the Leeds average.

Table 40: Attendance by ethnicity

| $\%$ attendance | Leeds |  | National |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| Asian Or Asian British | 92.5 | 92.6 | 94.1 |  |
| Bangladeshi | 90.5 | 90.1 | 93.8 |  |
| Indian | 94.8 | 94.9 | 95.2 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 92.1 | 91.7 |  |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 92.0 | 91.9 | 93.1 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 91.8 | 92.1 |  | 94.9 |
| Other Asian background | 93.1 | 93.6 | 95.0 |  |
| Black Or Black British | 94.3 | 94.6 | 93.8 |  |
| Black Caribbean | 92.6 | 92.6 | 95.8 |  |
| Black African | 95.8 | 96.0 | 94.1 |  |
| Other Black Background | 91.7 | 92.9 | 92.6 |  |
| Mixed Heritage | 90.2 | 90.8 | 93.2 |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 92.6 | 92.2 | 91.8 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 89.1 | 90.3 | 93.3 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 91.1 | 91.3 | 93.0 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 90.8 | 90.9 |  |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  | 96.7 |  |
| Chinese | 96.7 | 97.8 | 9.9 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 92.3 | 92.0 | 93.9 | 92 |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release; Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

Persistent absence on the 20\% threshold increased for most Asian heritage groups in 2010/11. There was a marginal decrease for pupils of Bangladeshi heritage. However, all Asian groups continue to have levels of PA lower than the Leeds average. In 2009/10 PA was higher in Leeds than the national average for all Asian groups, but the gap was most significant for Bangladeshi pupils, who had a rate of PA more than twice the national average. All Asian heritage groups saw reductions in PA on the 15\% threshold, however, on this indicator there are a higher proportion of Bangladeshi pupils missing $15 \%$ of school than the Leeds average.

All Black heritage groups saw a decrease in the proportion of pupils missing $20 \%$ of school in 2010/11 and all have a level of PA lower than the Leeds average on both the $20 \%$ and $5 \%$ thresholds. In 2009/10 levels of PA for Black heritage groups was higher in Leeds than nationally.

PA also reduced for all mixed groups on the 20\% threshold, except for Mixed Black African and White which increased. In 2009/10, PA at the $20 \%$ threshold was around twice the national rate for all mixed groups except Mixed Black African and White. At the 15\%
threshold there were increases in 2010/11 for Mixed Black African White and Mixed Black Caribbean and White pupils.

Levels of persistent absence remain very low for pupils of Chinese heritage.
Pupils of White Irish Traveller and Gypsy/Roma heritage have the highest levels of persistent absence. PA at both thresholds increased for pupils of White Eastern European heritage.

Table 41: Persistent absence by ethnicity

| \% Persistent absentees | PA 20\% threshold |  |  |  | PA 15\% threshold |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds |  | National |  | Leeds |  | National |
|  | 09/10 | 10/11 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 10/11 |
| Asian Or Asian British | 3.9 | 4.1 | 2.2 |  | 10.2 | 8.8 |  |
| Bangladeshi | 6.3 | 6.1 | 2.5 |  | 15.5 | 13.8 |  |
| Indian | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.4 |  | 4.7 | 4.0 |  |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 4.5 | 5.0 | 2.9 |  | 10.3 | 10.2 |  |
| Kashmiri Other | 3.2 | 2.6 |  |  | 9.7 | 7.9 |  |
| Other Pakistani | 4.1 | 4.4 |  |  | 12.1 | 10.0 |  |
| Other Asian background | 3.7 | 4.0 | 1.7 |  | 9.3 | 6.7 |  |
| Black Or Black British | 3.6 | 2.9 | 2.3 |  | 6.9 | 6.6 |  |
| Black Caribbean | 5.2 | 5.0 | 3.8 |  | 11.1 | 10.9 |  |
| Black African | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.3 |  | 3.2 | 3.9 |  |
| Other Black Background | 7.8 | 5.3 | 3.4 |  | 14.5 | 10.2 |  |
| Mixed Heritage | 10.1 | 8.6 | 5.1 |  | 16.0 | 15.6 |  |
| Mixed Black African and White | 2.7 | 6.7 | 4.4 |  | 8.8 | 10.1 |  |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 11.8 | 9.9 | 6.7 |  | 17.9 | 18.7 |  |
| Mixed Asian and White | 7.8 | 7.1 | 4.0 |  | 14.7 | 12.6 |  |
| Other Mixed Background | 11.0 | 8.4 | 4.3 |  | 16.1 | 14.4 |  |
| Chinese Or Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 |  | 3.3 | 0.5 |  |
| Other Ethnic group | 3.9 | 5.3 | 2.9 |  | 10.7 | 9.5 |  |
| White | 7.9 | 6.6 | 4.7 |  | 13.7 | 11.6 |  |
| White British | 7.7 | 6.4 | 4.6 |  | 13.4 | 11.2 |  |
| White Irish | 5.8 | 6.1 | 5.6 |  | 13.1 | 9.5 |  |
| Other White Background | 8.1 | 7.8 | 4.4 |  | 16.8 | 16.5 |  |
| White Eastern European | 10.1 | 11.1 |  |  | 19.8 | 21.3 |  |
| White Western European | 1.3 | 0.0 |  |  | 6.3 | 5.3 |  |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 65.8 | 69.0 | 36.8 |  | 76.3 | 75.9 |  |
| GypsylRoma | 46.7 | 43.2 | 28.0 |  | 63.7 | 57.6 |  |
| All pupils | 7.4 | 6.3 | 4.4 |  | 13.1 | 11.2 | 9.2 |

Source: National - DfE statistical first release; Leeds - School Census
Note: half-terms 1-5

## Exclusions from secondary schools

## Permanent exclusions

The overall number of permanent exclusions from Leeds secondary schools (including academies) decreased by $23 \%$ to 44 in 2010/11. There was an increase in permanent exclusions from academies in 2010/11. This was not due to the increased number of academies, as all of the permanent exclusions were from academies that have been in place since before 2010/11. The trend of no permanent exclusions from SILCs continued in 2010/11.

Table 42: Number of permanent exclusions from Leeds schools

|  | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maintained secondary | 44 | 47 | 28 |
| Academy | 8 | 10 | 16 |
| All State funded secondary | 52 | 57 | 44 |
| SILC | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: Synergy Education Case Management System
The percentage of pupils permanently excluded was lower than nationally in 2009/10, for both all state funded secondary schools and just for maintained secondary schools.
National data for 2010/11 will not be available until June 2012.
Table 43: Percentage of pupils permanently excluded

|  | Leeds |  |  | National |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2008 / 09$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ |
| State funded secondary | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.17 | 0.15 |  |
| LA maintained secondary | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.14 |  |
| Special | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.11 |  |

Source: DfE statistical first release

Over a third of permanent exclusions in 2010/11 were for persistent disruptive behaviour. In 2009/10 the proportion of exclusions due to this reason was in-line with national. The proportion of exclusions due to physical assault on staff was higher than national, whereas the proportion due to physical assault on pupils was lower.

Table 44: Reasons for permanent exclusion

|  | Leeds |  |  |  | National |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% of |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number of exclusions | $\%$ of exclusions |  | exclusions |  |
|  | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2009 / 10$ | $2010 / 11$ | $2009 / 10$ |
| Physical Assault - Pupil | 5 | 4 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 17.4 |
| Physical Assault - Staff | 11 | 8 | 19.3 | 18.2 | 7.4 |
| Bullying | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Dangerous Behaviour | 3 | 5 | 5.3 | 11.4 | - |
| Persistent Disruptive Behaviour | 16 | 17 | 28.1 | 38.6 | 29.0 |
| Damage to Property | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| Drug and Alcohol Related | 1 | 0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 7.3 |
| Other | 6 | 0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 16.5 |
| Racial Abuse | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Sexual Misconduct | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| Theft | 4 | 0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| Verbal Abuse - Pupil | 5 | 3 | 8.8 | 6.8 | 4.4 |
| Verbal Abuse - Staff | 6 | 6 | 10.5 | 13.6 | 11.0 |

Source: Leeds - Synergy Education Case Management System; National - DfE Statistical First Release

## Fixed term exclusions

Local analysis of fixed term exclusions from secondary schools is getting increasingly problematic as academies are not required to inform the local authority when they exclude a pupil on a fixed term basis. Some academies have continued to report exclusions. The analysis in this report is for all secondary schools that have reported exclusions to us. In 2009/10 the David Young Community Academy and South Leeds Academy are excluded from the analysis and in 2010/11 the David Young Community Academy, Morley Academy and Garforth Academy are excluded. This change in schools included in the analysis makes comparisons between years problematic.

National comparative data for 2010/11 will not be available until June 2012. The DfE changed the way it reported exclusions for the 2009/10 academic year to cover all statefunded secondary schools (including academies); before that point, data had been published for maintained schools. Therefore a time series comparison with national levels of fixed term exclusions cannot be provided for secondary schools.

Table 45 below indicates that in 2009/10 the rate of fixed term exclusion from state-funded secondary schools was higher in Leeds than nationally. However, in 2008/09 when the data published was for maintained secondary schools, the rate of exclusions was lower in Leeds (8.9) than nationally (9.3).

Table 45: Comparative fixed term exclusion data: 2009/10

|  | State-funded secondary schools |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Stat. Neighbours |
| $2009 / 10$ | 11.2 | 8.6 | 8.3 |
| $2010 / 11$ | - | - | - |

Source: DfE statistical first release

Table 46: Fixed term exclusions: 2010/11

| Number of exclusions | 3780 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Number of days lost to exclusion | 11406 |
| Rate of exclusion per 100 pupils | 9.2 |

Source: Synergy Education Case Management System

## Fixed term exclusions by pupil group

Due to the changes year on year in the schools included in the analysis, analysis of fixed term exclusions by pupil group are only provided for 2010/11.

The percentage of fixed term exclusions for each year group are shown in Figure 6 below. Exclusions increase with age to reach a peak in year 10, before dropping again in year 11.

Figure 6: Fixed term exclusion by year group


Source: Synergy Education Case Management System

Boys are much more likely to be fixed term excluded than girls, accounting for almost three quarters of all fixed term exclusions from secondary schools.

The rate of fixed term exclusion for pupils eligible for free school meals is three times higher than the rate for pupils that are not eligible. Looked After Children also have a higher rate of exclusion than the Leeds average, being over three times more likely to be excluded than the Leeds average.

Pupils on School Action Plus have very high rates of exclusion; rates of exclusion are also significantly higher for pupils with statements and pupils on School Action than for those with no SEN

Table 47: Fixed term exclusion by pupil group: 2010/11

|  | Number of exclusions | Rate per 100 pupils |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 1033 | 5.1 |  |
| Female | 2759 | 13.3 |  |
| Male | 2127 | 7.5 |  |
| Free school meal eligibility | 1672 | 24.0 |  |
| Not eligible | 91 | 34.1 |  |
| Eligible |  |  |  |
| Looked After Children | 1405 | 4.4 |  |
| Special Education Needs | 1213 | 19.9 |  |
| No SEN | 1025 | 46.7 |  |
| School Action | 156 | 28.9 |  |
| School Action plus |  |  |  |

Source: Synergy Education Case Management System
In 2010/11 all Asian heritage groups had a rate of fixed term exclusion lower than the Leeds average. All Black groups were above the Leeds average, with the exception of Black African pupils. The rate of exclusion was particularly high for pupils of Other Black heritage, who were 3 times more likely to be excluded than the average; Black Caribbean pupils were almost twice as likely to be excluded.

Pupils of Mixed Black African and White heritage, and Mixed Black Caribbean and White heritage, had rates of exclusion above the average.

The highest rate of exclusion is for pupils of White Irish Traveller heritage. Gypsy/Roma pupils also have high levels of fixed term exclusions.

Table 48: Fixed term exclusions by ethnicity: 2010/11

|  | Number of exclusions | Rate per 100 pupils |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Or Asian British | $\mathbf{2 1 4}$ | 5.0 |
| Bangladeshi | 33 | 7.7 |
| Indian | 14 | 1.5 |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 52 | 6.0 |
| Kashmiri Other | 3 | 6.5 |
| Other Pakistani | 87 | 5.8 |
| Other Asian background | 25 | 4.7 |
| Black Or Black British | $\mathbf{2 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 9}$ |
| Black Caribbean | 93 | 17.5 |
| Black African | 78 | 6.9 |
| Other Black Background | 77 | 28.5 |
| Mixed Heritage | $\mathbf{2 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 1}$ |
| Mixed Black African and White | 21 | 15.8 |
| Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 128 | 18.7 |
| Mixed Asian and White | 26 | 7.5 |
| Other Mixed Background | 54 | 11.7 |
| Chinese Or Other | 3 |  |
| Chinese | 8 | 1.5 |
| Other Ethnic group | $\mathbf{3 0 6 9}$ | 2.5 |
| White | 2961 | $\mathbf{9 . 4}$ |
| White British | 11 | 9.4 |
| White Irish | 12 | 7.1 |
| Other White Background | 23 | 6.1 |
| White Eastern European | 1 | 6.3 |
| White Western European | 31 | 1.0 |
| Traveller Irish Heritage | 30 | 110.7 |
| Gypsy\Roma |  | 23.8 |
| All pupils | $\mathbf{9 . 2}$ |  |
| Sar |  |  |

Source: Synergy Education Case Management System

## School Inspections

When looking at Ofsted inspections, it should be remembered that not every school is inspected every year. Schools judged in their last inspection as "Outstanding" or "Good" are likely to have less frequent inspections. As such, in order to give a full view of schools' Ofsted inspections, this report will consider the most recent inspection for each school in addition to looking at all of the inspections that took place in the last academic year.

## Inspections of secondary schools 2010-2011

In the 2010/11 academic year, 11 secondary schools in Leeds were inspected. Figure 7 below shows the breakdown of the overall effectiveness judgements of those inspections, compared to the breakdown of secondary schools nationally, and of secondary schools in Leeds' statistical neighbour authorities.

Figure 7: Overall Effectiveness judgements for all secondary school inspections in 2010-11 academic year


Source: Ofsted School Inspection Outcomes Analysis Tool
Leeds had a greater proportion of secondary inspections result in an "Inadequate" judgement than either nationally or in comparison to statistical neighbour authorities, though it should be made clear than $9 \%$ representations a single inspection. There were no "Outstanding" inspection judgements for Leeds secondary schools last year. Leeds had a greater proportion of "Satisfactory" judgements and a lesser proportion of "Good" judgements than both statistical neighbours or nationally.

## Most recent inspection breakdown - Secondary Schools

Figure 8 below shows the breakdown of the Overall Effectiveness judgement for the most recent inspection of each Leeds secondary school, as of the end of the 2010/11 academic year. Only a small proportion of secondary schools in Leeds are judged to be outstanding.

There is currently one secondary school in an Ofsted category with Swallow Hill having a notice to improve. The city-wide BESD SILC also has a notice to improve. During the 2010/11 academic year Lawnswood School came out of special measures and Farnley Park came out of a notice to improve.

Figure 8:



[^0]:    Source: DfE statistical first release
    Notes: Leeds figures include maintained schools and academies, National figures include all schools in England

[^1]:    Source: 2010 DfE statistical first release, 2011 locally calculated, 2011 data is provisional Notes: all children looked after for a year or more to end March, where Leeds is their care authority

[^2]:    Source: DfE statistical first release, EPAS for 2011

[^3]:    Source: DfE Statistical First Release

