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## SUBJECT: Annex 2: Overview of 2008 performance at KS3 \& KS4

## $1.0 \quad$ Key Stage 4

### 1.1. Key Stage 4 Trends and Comparisons

1.1.2 Performance at KS4 has shown improvement across all headline indicators, with the $5+A^{*}-C$ rate continuing a strong upward trend, with a rise of $4.2 \%$ in 2009 , broadly in line with that seen nationally.

2006-2008 Percentage Benchmark indicators for GCSE

| \% pupils <br> achieving: | 2007 |  |  | 2008 |  |  | 2009 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | Nat | Stat <br> Neigh* $^{*}$ | Leeds | Nat | Stat <br> Neigh* | Leeds | NatStat <br> Neigh* $^{*}$ |  |
| 5+A*- C | 55.9 | 61.4 | 57.3 | 62.5 | 63.9 | 64.7 | 66.7 | 69.2 | 69.3 |
| 5+A*-C <br> (inc Eng \& maths) | 42.1 | 46.3 | 42.6 | 46.4 | 47.6 | 46.2 | 45.6 | 50.4 | 48.1 |
| 5+A*-G | 88.1 | 90.9 | 90.8 | 90.6 | 91.5 | 92.2 | 90.9 | 93.4 | 93.4 |
| No Passes | 4.4 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 1.2 |

Note: 2009 data is provisional
National figures are for all maintained schools only
*Statistical Neighbours as defined by OfSTED Bolton, Bury, Calderdale, Darlington, Derby, Kirklees, North Tyneside, Sheffield, St Helens, Stockton-on-Tees
1.1.3 The performance of similar authorities has improved at a slightly quicker rate, widening the gap from Leeds performance. In terms of the gold standard, Leeds' performance fell back 1\% in 2009, whereas performance nationally and in similar authorities has improved by around $2 \%$, again widening the gap.
1.1.4 In terms of $5+A^{*}$-G, Leeds' improvement of $0.3 \%$ was smaller than that recorded in similar authorities (1.2\%) and nationally (1.9\%). Locally the number of pupils achieving at least one pass locally increased by $0.4 \%$ to $98.1 \%$, whilst similar authorities rose by $0.4 \%$ to $98.8 \%$ and nationally, performance rose by $1 \%$ to $99.5 \%$.

|  | 2007 |  | 2008 |  | 2009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | gender | Leeds | Nat | Leeds | Nat | Leeds | Nat |
| 5 or more A*-C | Girls | 59.0 | 64.0 | 64.8 | 68.3 | 71.0 | 73.4 |
|  | Boys | 53.3 | 54.8 | 59.9 | 59.1 | 62.7 | 65.2 |
| 5 or more A*-C | Girls | 45.9 | 49.7 | 49.9 | 51.9 | 48.9 | 54.2 |
| (inc Eng \& Maths) | Boys | 39.0 | 41.4 | 42.8 | 43.5 | 42.5 | 46.8 |
| 5 or more A*-G | Girls | 89.6 | 93.2 | 92.1 | 93.6 | 92.6 | 95.0 |
|  | Boys | 86.7 | 89.4 | 89.0 | 89.5 | 89.4 | 91.9 |
| No Passes | Girls | 3.6 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 0.2 |
|  | Boys | 5.2 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 0.8 |

1.1.5 The gap in attainment between boys and girls has widened significantly in terms of 5+ $\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ in Leeds and is now in line with the national gap. This is due in the main to a significant improvement in the performance of girls in Leeds in 2009, who rose by $6.2 \%$, whilst boys improved by $2.8 \%$. The gap in $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ (EM) maintained previous levels, with falls seen for both genders, but for $5+A^{*}$-G the gap was closed by national performance, meaning the Leeds gap is now in line with national levels having been $1 \%$ smaller previously. Finally, the gap for No passes reversed with national improvements much larger than that seen locally.

### 1.2 Key Stage 4 trajectories

1.2.1 Schools and local authorities are no longer requires to set targets for $5+A^{*}-C$, but for $5+A^{*}-C$ (including English and maths) only. There were targets set for progress from KS3, but following the abandonment of testing at KS3, these have also been removed. In their place, from this autumn term, schools are required to set targets for progress from KS2 to KS4.

1.2.2 The drop in performance in 2009 for KS4 5+ A*-C including English and maths widens the gap to the target set by schools, which was agreed in January 2008. The target set in January 2009 maintains an aspirational trajectory and is well above the estimate shown by FFT top quartile estimates.

### 1.3 Performance of individual schools

1.3.1 Within the local authority improvements, there has been a more mixed picture at school level.

Key Stage 4 Floor Targets

1.3.2 Of the original 14 schools that were part of the National Challenge, only six remained in this category at the end of the 2008/09 academic year. Three of these schools have now closed: West Leeds and Wortley have merged to become the new Swallow Hill Community College (which remains a school in the National Challenge) and South Leeds High has closed and become an academy. Leeds has a strong record of implementing the changes necessary to reach these targets and approved improvement plans are in place for all schools that remain in the National Challenge. Proposals are being presented to Executive Board for consultation to take place on structural changes for three schools that are designed to raise standards and secure rates of improvement that are above the floor target.

### 1.4 Attainment of Pupil Groups

1.4.1 Information is available to allow the monitoring of performance of several priority groups of pupils. However, this information is not currently available at a national level and so benchmarking can only be done against national data from the previous year..

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

|  | 2007 |  | 2008 |  | 2009 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds |
| Cohort size |  |  |  |  | 115 |
| $5+$ A $^{*}$-C (inc Eng \& maths) |  |  |  |  | 4.4 |
| $5+$ A $^{*}$ - | 8 | 13 | 9 |  | 16.5 |
| $5+$ A $^{*}$ G | 39 | 43 | 34 |  | 58.3 |
| 1+ A*-G | 62 | 64 | 64 |  | 84.4 |

Note: 2009 data is provisional
National data for 2009 is currently unavailable
1.4.2 The percentage of pupils in care achieving $5+A^{*}-C$ has risen significantly in 2009, with almost $17 \%$ of pupils achieving this standard, nearly double that seen in 2008. The 5+ $A^{*}$-G performance also rose significantly, as did the $1+A^{*}$-G figure with $84 \%$ of pupils achieving at least one qualification.

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

|  |  | 2007 |  | 2008 |  | 2009 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| 5+ A*-C (inc | Non eligible | 47.7 |  | 52.3 |  | 52.0 |  |
| Eng \& maths) | Eligible | 15.9 |  | 19.5 |  | 16.0 |  |
| 5+ A*-C | Non eligible | 62 | 61 | 67.4 | 67.0 | 73.0 |  |
|  | Eligible | 26.9 | 33 | 34.6 | 40.0 | 38.0 |  |
| 5+ A*-G | Non eligible | 91.5 |  | 94.3 |  | 94.0 |  |
|  | Eligible | 71.7 |  | 78.5 |  | 75.0 |  |
| No passes | Non eligible | 3.1 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.0 |  |
|  | Eligible | 10.3 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 4.2 | 5.0 |  |

Note: 2009 data is provisional
1.4.3 Performance of FSM eligible pupils improved for $5+A^{*}-C$ and for 'No passes' although the gap for $5+A^{*}$-C widened to $35 \%$ in 2009, significantly larger than the national gap in 2008.
1.4.4 Performance fell back with regards to the gold standard measure, where $16 \%$ of FSM eligible pupils now achieve the level required, down from almost $20 \%$ in 2008. The gap to non eligible pupils has widened $3 \%$ to $36 \%$. Performance of FSM eligible pupils at $5+A-{ }^{*} G$ also fell $3.5 \%$ to $75 \%$, widening the gap to $19 \%$ in 2009.

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

|  |  | 2007 |  | 2008 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| 5+ A*-C (inc | Action | 12.9 |  | 16.1 | 16.7 | 19.0 |  |
|  | Action + | 6.4 |  | 10.8 | 10.9 | 12.0 |  |
|  | Statement | 4.5 |  | 5.5 | 5.2 | 7.0 |  |
| 5+ A*-C | Action | 23.6 | 21.9 | 31.0 | 33.6 | 45.0 |  |
|  | Action + | 14.1 | 15.3 | 17.6 | 21.6 | 25.0 |  |
|  | Statement | 9.8 | 8.7 | 11.9 | 10.7 | 12.0 |  |
| 5+ A*-G | Action | 71.0 |  | 82.8 |  | 88.0 |  |
|  | Action + | 54.4 |  | 63.4 |  | 66.0 |  |
|  | Statement | 32.8 |  | 48.7 |  | 42.0 |  |
| No passes | Action | 8.4 | 4.5 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 2.0 |  |
|  | Action + | 18.4 | 12.0 | 8.8 | 7.0 | 6.0 |  |
|  | Statement | 37.3 | 18.4 | 19.9 | 17.2 | 19.0 |  |

Note: 2009 data is provisional
No National data is available for 2009
1.4.5 The performance of pupils on the SEN register improved again in 2009. The performance in terms of the gold standard improved for all groups, as it did for 5+ A*C. Performance at $5+A^{*}-G$ improved for School Action and School Action Plus pupils, but fell almost $7 \%$ for statemented pupils. Finally, the percentage of pupils leaving without any qualifications fell for all groups., although it remained high for statemented pupils at 19\%.

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

|  |  | Pupils <br> 2009 | 5+ A*-C |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National |  |  |
|  |  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| ASIAN | Bangladeshi |  | 66 | 39.6 | 40.0 | 62.1 | 58.4 | 62.3 |  |
|  | Indian |  | 175 | 67.4 | 73.5 | 61.7 | 74.7 | 78.3 |  |
|  | Kashmiri Pakistani | 149 | 36.4 | 45.3 | 53.7 | 53.0 | 58.2 |  |
|  | Other Pakistani | 222 | 50.8 | 47.3 | 63.5 | 53.0 | 58.2 |  |
|  | Kashmiri Other | 9 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 64.1 | 66.1 |  |
|  | Other Asian background | 55 | 63.9 | 58.3 | 61.8 | 64.1 | 66.1 |  |
| BLACK | Black Caribbean | 88 | 48.4 | 54.3 | 43.2 | 49.1 | 54.0 |  |
|  | Black African | 160 | 50.9 | 54.2 | 68.1 | 55.6 | 60.3 |  |
|  | Other Black Background | 48 | 41.5 | 64.0 | 52.1 | 49.7 | 56.2 |  |
| MIXED | Mixed Black African and White | 32 | 50.0 | 55.6 | 56.3 | 57.6 | 63.4 |  |
|  | Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 128 | 39.0 | 51.8 | 58.6 | 48.8 | 55.3 |  |
|  | Mixed Asian and White | 58 | 52.2 | 68.6 | 60.3 | 69.5 | 72.1 |  |
|  | Other Mixed Background | 75 | 37.9 | 50.0 | 61.3 | 61.1 | 65.8 |  |
| OTHER | Chinese | 38 | 85.3 | 87.8 | 86.8 | 83.3 | 84.3 |  |
| GROUPS | Other Ethnic group | 59 | 51.1 | 66.7 | 67.8 | 57.2 | 60.6 |  |
| WHITE | White British | 6695 | 57.4 | 62.2 | 67.6 | 59.5 | 63.8 |  |
|  | White Irish | 30 | 55.9 | 59.0 | 70.0 | 63.1 | 69.0 |  |
|  | Traveller Irish Heritage | 11 | 12.5 | 16.7 | 18.2 | 15.6 | 17.4 |  |
|  | Gypsy\Roma | 20 | 0.0 | 26.3 | 30.0 | 14 | 15.7 |  |
|  | White Eastern European | 38 |  | 33.3 | 71.1 |  |  |  |
|  | White Western European | 10 |  | 50.0 | 90.0 | 58.8 | 60.8 |  |
|  | Other White Background | 36 | 60.2 | 77.3 | 63.9 |  |  |  |
| Total | Leeds |  | 56.1 | 61.9 | 66.7 | 59.3 | 63.5 |  |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), DCSF Statistical First Release (National)
Notes: ${ }^{1} 2009$ Data is provisional
1.4.6 Standards against this headline indicator in Leeds have improved by over $10 \%$ in three years. This encouraging overall improvement has been exceeded by the improvement in outcomes for the Black heritage cohorts, despite a fall in performance for Black Caribbean pupils in 2009 of 11\%.
1.4.7 Of the Asian heritage pupils, most improved since 2007 are Bangladeshi pupils, whose performance has improved by $23 \%$ over the time period, the majority of this increase occurred in 2009. General levels of attainment for Asian heritage pupils do remain below average, including Indian pupils in 2009 having previously been well above the Leeds average.
1.4.8 The performance of Mixed heritage pupils is less encouraging, with all groups performing below the city average with falls in performance for Mixed Asian \& White pupils or modest increases, as seen for other Mixed heritage pupils.
1.4.9 As at other Key Stages, very few pupils from Gypsy/Roma and Traveller heritage backgrounds achieve the "expected" level of attainment.

Percentage of pupils attaining 5 or more $A^{*}-C$ (inc English \& maths): Ethnicity

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pupils } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ | 5+A*-C (EM) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Leeds | National |  |  |
|  |  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| ASIAN | Bangladeshi |  | 66 | 30.2 | 32.0 | 28.8 | 41.0 | 44.5 |  |
|  | Indian |  | 175 | 52.0 | 54.8 | 61.7 | 61.6 | 64.9 |  |
|  | Kashmiri Pakistani | 149 | 26.5 | 23.6 | 31.5 | 36.8 | 39.7 |  |
|  | Other Pakistani | 222 | 33.0 | 32.7 | $36.5$ | 36.8 | 39.7 |  |
|  | Kashmiri Other | 9 | 33.3 | 50.0 | $44.4$ | 50.4 | 52.1 |  |
|  | Other Asian background | 55 | 47.2 | 46.7 |  | 50.4 | 52.1 |  |
| BLACK | Black Caribbean | 88 | 30.2 | 35.9 | 27.3 | 32.7 | 35.9 |  |
|  | Black African | 160 | 40.2 | 33.1 | 38.8 | 40.2 | 43.3 |  |
|  | Other Black Background | 48 | 36.6 | 48.0 | 18.8 | 33.1 | 39.0 |  |
| MIXED | Mixed Black African and White | 32 | 42.3 | 33.3 | 31.3 | 42.2 | 46.4 |  |
|  | Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 128 | 30.5 | 30.4 | 33.6 | 33.7 | 37.8 |  |
|  | Mixed Asian and White | 58 | 47.8 | 51.4 | 48.3 | 58.4 | 58.2 |  |
|  | Other Mixed Background | 75 | 27.6 | 26.0 | 45.3 | 48.2 | 50.6 |  |
| OTHER | Chinese | 38 | 55.9 | 73.2 | 52.6 | 70.2 | 69.5 |  |
| GROUPS | Other Ethnic group | 59 | 40.0 | 47.2 | 47.5 | 42.2 | 44.3 |  |
| WHITE | White British | 6695 | 43.3 | 47.8 | 47.2 | 45.8 | 48 |  |
|  | White Irish | 30 | 47.1 | 35.9 | 53.3 | 51.9 | 56.6 |  |
|  | Traveller Irish Heritage | 11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 8.4 | 7.3 |  |
|  | Gypsy\Roma | 20 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 6.8 |  |
|  | White Eastern European | 38 |  | 25.0 | 21.1 |  |  |  |
|  | White Western European | 10 |  | 50.0 | 60.0 | 45.8 | 45.7 |  |
|  | Other White Background | 36 | 49.4 | 56.1 | 55.6 |  |  |  |
| Total | Leeds |  | 44.0 | 46.3 | 45.6 | 45.4 | 46.2 |  |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), DCSF Statistical First Release (National) Notes: $\quad{ }^{1} 2009$ data is provisional
1.4.10 Local performance has improved by $1.6 \%$ in the past two years, but with a mixed picture for different ethnic groups. Bangladeshi pupils have fallen back this year, despite the significant improvements in $5+A^{*}$-C performance. The reverse is true for Indian pupils whose performance in the gold standard has improved, despite a fall in $5+A^{*}-C$ performance. Pakistani pupils have improved in 2008, but performance is below local averages and the national level of performance in 2008.
1.4.11 The performance of Black heritage pupils has fallen back since 2007, particularly that of Black Other pupils. The majority of Mixed heritage groups have not improved significantly in the past three yeas, with only Other Mixed groups improving. Mixed Black African \& White pupils continued the fall seen in 2008, and although Black Caribbean \& White and Mixed Asian \& White groups improved in 2008, these rises were not significant ones.

Percentage of pupils attaining 1 or more $A^{*}$-G: Ethnicity

|  |  |  | $1+A^{*}-\mathrm{G}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pupils 2009 | Leeds |  |  | National |  |  |
|  |  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| ASIAN | Bangladeshi |  | 66 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 97.0 | 98.3 | 98.6 |  |
|  | Indian | 175 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 99.2 | 99.2 |  |
|  | Kashmiri Pakistani | 149 | 95.5 | 98.1 | 98.7 | 98.2 | 98.5 |  |
|  | Other Pakistani | 222 | 99.0 | 98.6 | 96.8 |  | 98.5 |  |
|  | Kashmiri Other | 9 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 97.4 | 97.7 |  |
|  | Other Asian background | 55 | 91.7 | 98.3 | 100.0 | 97.4 | 97.7 |  |
| BLACK | Black Caribbean | 88 | 98.4 | 97.8 | 97.7 | 98.0 | 98.1 |  |
|  | Black African | 160 | 97.3 | 99.2 | 98.8 | 98.1 | 98.3 |  |
|  | Other Black Background | 48 | 100.0 | 96.0 | 91.7 | 97.6 | 97.3 |  |
| MIXED | Mixed Black African and White | 32 | 100.0 | 97.2 | 100.0 | 97.0 | 97.2 |  |
|  | Mixed Black Caribbean and White | 128 | 92.4 | 93.8 | 93.8 | 96.5 | 97.6 |  |
|  | Mixed Asian and White | 58 | 93.5 | 97.1 | 96.6 | 97.7 | 98.4 |  |
|  | Other Mixed Background | 75 | 89.7 | 96.0 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 97.8 |  |
| OTHER | Chinese | 38 | 100.0 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 98.8 |  |
| GROUPS | Other Ethnic group | 59 | 95.6 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 96.9 | 97.0 |  |
| WHITE | White British | 6695 | 95.7 | 96.8 | 97.8 | 97.7 | 98.2 |  |
|  | White Irish | 30 | 97.1 | 100.0 | 96.7 | 97.1 | 97.7 |  |
|  | Traveller Irish Heritage | 11 | 62.5 | 66.7 | 90.9 | 67.5 | 71.6 |  |
|  | Gypsy\Roma | 20 | 36.4 | 89.5 | 75.0 | 79.6 | 84.8 |  |
|  | White Eastern European | 38 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
|  | White Western European | 10 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Other White Background | 36 | 95.2 | 97.0 | 97.2 | 97.2 | 97.4 |  |
| Total | Leeds |  | 95.7 | 96.9 | 97.3 | 97.6 |  |  |

Source: University of Bath EPAS (Leeds), DCSF Statistical First Release (National)
Notes: ${ }^{1} 2009$ Data is provisional
1.4.12 Most minority ethnic groups recorded increases in the numbers of pupils leaving with a qualification in the past three years. Other Pakistani heritage pupils have fallen back, as have Black Caribbean and Other Black heritage pupils.
1.4.13 Mixed heritage pupils have also recorded improvements over the past three years, although there was a drop seen for Mixed Asian and White pupils in 2009. Both traveller groups have seen improvements on this measure since 2007, although there was a slight drop for Gypsy/Roma pupils in 2009.

### 2.0 Contextual Value Added

2.1 Analyses generated through the Fischer Family Trust (FFT) 'Value Added Project' model show that progress in secondary schools is still a significant issue in Leeds. Students in a large proportion of the schools in Leeds do not make the progress expected compared with national expectations. The improvement in $5+A^{*}-C$ progress shown last year has remained approximately at the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile.

2.1.2 Overall, the performance of Leeds as a whole measured by value added between Key Stages two and four is still below expectations. Key judgements show that city wide performance, once the context of the pupils and the school attended is taken into account, is in the bottom $20 \%$ for the indicator closest to DCSF methodology, but the improvement has been consistent since 2006 when performance was within the bottom $3 \%$.

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

2.2.1 There had been a significant improvement in the performance of schools in comparison to FFT estimates based on KS2 results up to 2008, but there has been a slight fall back in performance in 2009.


Source: FFT Database v12.18
2.2.2 In 2005, nearly half of Leeds schools were in the bottom quarter of schools nationally in terms of Capped Points scores in comparison to FFT estimates. In 2009, although
better, over a 5 year trend, the proportion of schools in the bottom quarter rose to onethird. The proportion in the second and third quartiles is in line with expectations, but only one-sixth of schools are in the top quartile.
2.2.3 FFT data allows a detailed analysis of the performance of the major pupils groups in Leeds to be produced. In this analysis, performance is compared to estimate, and the difference is shown below. Three year trends are also shown, with significant differences and changes over the three years highlighted.

|  | 5+ A*-C EM |  |  | $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ |  |  | 5+ A*-G |  |  | Capped Points |  |  | 3 year trend |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Groups | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C} \\ (\mathrm{em}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ | 5+ $\mathrm{A}^{*}$-G | Points |
| All Pupils | -0.55 | 0.93 | -0.72 | -1.04 | 0.63 | 0.30 | -2.36 | -0.82 | -0.97 | -8.9 | -3.9 | -4.3 | $\uparrow \downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Boys | -0.50 | 1.17 | -0.46 | 0.13 | 2.30 | 0.20 | -2.07 | -0.54 | -0.60 | -7.5 | -2.4 | -4.5 | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Boys - Lower | -1.96 | -1.04 | -0.77 | -0.88 | 1.29 | -0.12 | -1.88 | -0.76 | 0.18 | -11.8 | -8.3 | -10.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Boys - Middle | -0.99 | 2.87 | -0.88 | -1.30 | 3.19 | -0.24 | -3.35 | -0.39 | -1.59 | -10.1 | 1.3 | -3.3 | $\uparrow \downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |
| Boys - Upper | 1.93 | 1.87 | 0.44 | 3.11 | 2.51 | 1.12 | -0.75 | -0.45 | -0.34 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.8 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Girls | -0.60 | 0.68 | -1.00 | -2.29 | -1.09 | 0.41 | -2.68 | -1.09 | -1.37 | -10.4 | -5.3 | -4.1 | $\downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Girls - Lower | -2.27 | -2.33 | -2.10 | -4.39 | -2.49 | -0.05 | -3.55 | -0.74 | -0.36 | -19.7 | -14.7 | -7.7 |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Girls - Middle | -0.65 | 2.02 | -1.34 | -3.37 | -2.42 | 0.63 | -3.47 | -1.79 | -3.12 | -10.9 | -3.7 | -5.1 | $\downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Girls - Upper | 1.37 | 2.14 | 0.47 | 1.61 | 2.20 | 0.63 | -0.60 | -0.56 | -0.45 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 0.7 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |


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

2.2.4 For most indicators by gender groups, performance for $5+A^{*}-C$ and the gold standard have varied over the past three years. The performance of lower ability girls is significantly below expectations, whilst upper ability pupils have performed significantly above expectations. However, significant improvements have been recorded by many groups for $5+A^{*}-G$ and for Capped Points score, but overall performance remains below expectation.

|  | 5+ A*-C EM |  |  | $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ |  |  | $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{G}$ |  |  | Capped Points |  |  | 3 year trend |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Groups | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C} \\ (\mathrm{em}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $5+A^{*}-C$ | $5+{ }^{*}$-G | Points |
| All Pupils | -0.55 | 0.93 | -0.72 | -1.04 | 0.63 | 0.30 | -2.36 | -0.82 | -0.97 | -8.9 | -3.9 | -4.3 | $\uparrow \downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Bangladeshi | -2.70 | -12.56 | -13.66 | -14.63 | -24.32 | -8.54 | 0.18 | -2.11 | -1.28 | -27.2 | -36.5 | -14.4 |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Indian | -8.89 | -7.93 | -4.64 | -6.75 | -3.39 | 1.72 | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.49 | -8.2 | -5.1 | -0.4 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Pakistani | -8.45 | -10.33 | -6.65 | -9.48 | -10.27 | -3.69 | -0.59 | 1.00 | 1.38 | -19.9 | -20.1 | -10.5 |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Other Asian | -6.51 | -3.37 | -1.12 | -10.47 | -1.99 | -3.76 | -3.66 | -1.72 | -4.63 | -29.8 | -6.4 | -7.0 |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Black African | 6.91 | 0.37 | -2.15 | -1.84 | 2.69 | 1.69 | -2.16 | -1.51 | -0.42 | -2.0 | -3.9 | -3.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Black Caribbean | 1.20 | -2.68 | -4.37 | 0.53 | -0.18 | -6.33 | -9.87 | -1.72 | -1.82 | -21.9 | -11.2 | -11.7 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| White | -0.03 | 1.83 | -0.04 | -0.32 | 1.33 | 0.81 | -1.91 | -0.73 | -0.85 | -7.4 | -2.7 | -3.4 | $\uparrow \downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Chinese | -14.24 | -1.03 | -13.57 | 6.29 | 4.65 | 3.21 | -1.59 | 1.51 | -2.27 | 9.0 | 7.7 | 15.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Any Other | -1.90 | -1.49 | -0.80 | -5.55 | 1.36 | -2.02 | -7.87 | -5.93 | -8.17 | -18.6 | -9.7 | -19.7 |  |  |  |  |
| No Information | -1.01 | 5.69 | 7.02 | -4.34 | 5.72 | 4.96 | -8.09 | -3.98 | -2.77 | -12.6 | -2.4 | -0.9 |  |  |  |  |


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

2.2.5 The data is not available at as detailed a level, but there has been some significant improvements in performance for several priority groups. Several groups are now in line with FFT estimates in terms of $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$, including Black African and Black Caribbean pupils. All Asian groups are now in line with estimates in terms of $5+A^{*}-G$ and despite remaining below expectations, these pupils have shown significant improvement for 5+ $A^{*}-C$.
2.2.6 Performance in terms of capped points scores for several groups is improving significantly, notably Asian heritage pupils but, significantly, Black Caribbean pupils performance is consistently below expectations in terms of Capped points.

|  | 5+ A*-C EM |  |  | $5+A^{*}-C$ |  |  | $5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{G}$ |  |  | Capped Points |  |  | 3 year trend |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil Groups | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | $\begin{gathered} 5+\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C} \\ (\mathrm{em}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $5+A^{*}-C$ | $5+A^{*}-G$ | Points |
| All Pupils | -0.55 | 0.93 | -0.72 | -1.04 | 0.63 | 0.30 | -2.36 | -0.82 | -0.97 | -8.9 | -3.9 | -4.3 | $\uparrow \downarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Looked After - Yes | -0.98 | -6.84 | -5.59 | -2.50 | -8.81 | -12.41 | -18.84 | -14.37 | -10.79 | -33.8 | -41.0 | -37.5 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| SEN Action | 0.73 | -2.66 | -3.85 | -1.79 | -3.15 | -3.30 | -6.89 | -2.48 | -0.69 | -25.5 | -17.4 | -13.4 | $\downarrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| SEN Action Plus | 0.83 | 0.40 | 0.53 | -0.95 | -5.64 | -5.47 | -13.99 | -12.29 | -11.51 | -29.6 | -25.5 | -24.9 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| SEN Statement | -0.48 | 0.11 | 0.80 | -0.93 | -0.58 | -2.44 | -16.65 | -10.06 | -7.45 | -16.3 | -9.5 | -6.1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| With FSM | -0.42 | -0.25 | -1.84 | -2.81 | -0.43 | -2.53 | -7.34 | -4.47 | -6.74 | -23.7 | -16.6 | -23.7 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow \quad \downarrow$ |


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

2.2.7 Performance for other priority groups is not encouraging, with several groups remaining significantly below expectations. Most groups show improvements at 5+ A*-G, but remain below expectations and all groups except SEN statemented pupils are below expectations for $5+A^{*}-C$ (EM). Points scores have improved for School Action pupils, but remain below expectation, and those eligible for Free School meals have been inconsistent over the three year period.

### 2.2.8 School level results

|  |  | Pupils | $5+A^{*}-C$ <br> inc E\&M | $5+$ <br> $A^{*}-C$ | $5+$ <br> $A^{*}-G$ | $1+$ <br> $A^{*}-G$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leeds | 8309 | 45.6 | 66.7 | 90.9 | 97.3 | 98.1 |
| National |  | 50.4 | 69.2 | 93.4 |  | 99.5 |
| Abbey Grange C of E High | 204 | 62.7 | 77.0 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Allerton Grange High | 298 | 44.3 | 57.0 | 89.9 | 97.3 | 98.3 |
| Allerton High | 185 | 51.4 | 75.1 | 96.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Benton Park | 235 | 62.1 | 75.3 | 98.7 | 99.1 | 99.1 |
| Boston Spa Comprehensive | 299 | 45.5 | 78.9 | 95.7 | 98.7 | 99.0 |
| Brigshaw High | 248 | 49.2 | 67.3 | 93.1 | 99.2 | 99.2 |
| Bruntcliffe High | 273 | 41.8 | 70.3 | 92.7 | 98.5 | 98.9 |
| Cardinal Heenan Catholic High | 182 | 50.5 | 78.6 | 96.2 | 97.8 | 99.5 |
| Carr Manor High | 133 | 25.6 | 54.9 | 90.2 | 97.7 | 97.7 |
| City of Leeds | 139 | 11.5 | 23.0 | 72.7 | 93.5 | 93.5 |
| Cockburn High | 191 | 37.7 | 68.1 | 93.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Corpus Christi Catholic College | 186 | 47.3 | 60.2 | 93.0 | 97.8 | 97.8 |
| Crawshaw | 212 | 59.0 | 69.3 | 93.9 | 100.5 | 100.5 |
| Farnley Park High | 151 | 32.5 | 45.7 | 86.8 | 96.7 | 96.7 |
| Garforth Community College | 298 | 75.2 | 94.3 | 98.3 | 99.3 | 99.3 |
| Guiseley | 207 | 71.5 | 82.6 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Horsforth | 217 | 59.4 | 81.1 | 99.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Intake High Arts College | 204 | 29.9 | 52.9 | 83.3 | 95.6 | 96.6 |
| John Smeaton Community High | 171 | 45.0 | 77.2 | 87.1 | 97.1 | 97.1 |
| Lawnswood | 266 | 38.3 | 56.4 | 86.5 | 97.0 | 97.4 |
| Morley High | 252 | 59.5 | 75.8 | 93.3 | 97.6 | 98.4 |
| Mount St Mary's Catholic High | 223 | 39.5 | 67.7 | 96.4 | 99.1 | 99.6 |
| Otley Prince Henry's Grammar | 228 | 62.3 | 82.9 | 96.9 | 99.6 | 99.6 |
| Parklands Girls' High | 138 | 32.6 | 42.0 | 86.2 | 94.9 | 95.7 |
| Priesthorpe | 209 | 42.6 | 78.9 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Primrose High | 144 | 15.3 | 38.2 | 75.7 | 88.9 | 91.0 |
| Pudsey Grangefield High | 199 | 51.8 | 71.4 | 97.0 | 99.0 | 99.5 |
| Ralph Thoresby High | 173 | 39.9 | 66.5 | 87.9 | 98.3 | 99.4 |
| Rodillian Performing Arts College | 232 | 33.2 | 44.8 | 89.7 | 97.4 | 98.7 |
| Roundhay | 238 | 55.5 | 78.6 | 92.0 | 97.5 | 99.2 |
| Royds | 225 | 45.3 | 64.4 | 91.6 | 98.7 | 99.1 |
| South Leeds High | 232 | 15.5 | 57.3 | 78.4 | 97.8 | 98.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| St Mary's Catholic Comprehensive | 176 | 74.4 | 84.7 | 98.3 | 98.9 | 99.4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Temple Moor High | 219 | 42.0 | 58.4 | 95.0 | 97.3 | 98.2 |
| West Leeds High | 197 | 24.4 | 46.2 | 88.3 | 96.4 | 97.0 |
| Wetherby High | 181 | 62.4 | 69.6 | 96.7 | 98.9 | 99.4 |
| Woodkirk High | 299 | 62.9 | 69.2 | 98.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wortley High | 182 | 15.4 | 73.1 | 86.3 | 98.9 | 98.9 |
| David Young Community Academy | 149 | 28.2 | 72.5 | 86.6 | 98.0 | 98.0 |
| BESD SILC - Elmete Central | 37 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 21.6 | 62.2 | 81.1 |
| East SILC - John Jamieson | 21 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 42.9 |
| North East SILC - West Oaks | 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| North West SILC | 14 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 35.7 |
| South SILC - Broomfield | 13 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| West SILC | 23 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 87.0 |

Source:EPASonline 11/11/09

### 3.0 Key Stage 5

3.1 There has been a significant increase in the data available at KS5. Data has been made available for colleges in Leeds, as well as for schools, allowing a more accurate picture of performance across the city, post-16. However, this does not extend to information regarding the performance of groups of priority pupils as this data has not previously been available and remains so for students in the college sector as colleges are not required to submit a termly census to the authority in the same way that schools are.
3.1.2 Data is still provisional at this stage and subject to amendments as further qualifications are included.

Table 8: 2007-2009 KS5 performance

|  | 2007 |  | 2008 |  | 2009 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leeds | National | Leeds | National | Leeds | National |
| Points per student | 281.6 | 284.5 | 273.4 | 287.4 | 271.8 |  |
| Points per entry | 75.2 | 78.3 | 74.9 | 79.0 | 76.5 |  |

3.1.3 In comparison to the performance of the same schools last year, the average points scores per pupil has dropped this year, whilst points per entry has improved on 2008 levels. This would suggest that students are studying fewer subjects, but are benefiting by getting better results in these fewer subjects. Initial figures suggest that the average number of entries per student has dropped below three entries in 2009.

### 3.2 Attainment of Pupil Groups

3.2.1 Performance of priority pupil groups can only be measured for pupils in Leeds schools, and colleges are not required to complete a termly census.

|  | Pupils | Points per <br> pupil | Points <br> per entry |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Leeds school pupils | 2421 | 273.9 | 76.6 |
| FSM Non eligible | 2306 | 276.3 | 76.8 |
| FSM Eligible | 115 | 221.4 | 71.9 |
| No SEN | 2325 | 275.7 | 76.9 |
| School Action | 65 | 250.5 | 74.1 |


| School Action + | 8 | 183.8 | 57.6 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statemented | 23 | 162.2 | 55.4 |
| Looked After Pupils | $<5$ | 223.3 | 67.0 |

Data Source: EPASonline, DCSF Statistical First Release Leeds figures are for maintained schools only and still provisional
3.2.2 Pupils eligible for Free School Meals obtain significantly fewer points per pupil, but their points per entry is closer to the Leeds school average, indicating fewer subjects studied, while those on the SEN register to perform significantly below the local average. The Looked After Children cohort is very small but performance is below that of the cohort as a whole.

## 2009 KS5 Performance for ethnic groups

|  | Pupils | Points <br> per pupil | Points <br> per entry |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Leeds school pupils | 2421 | 273.9 | 76.6 |
| Bangladeshi | 9 | 222.2 | 70.2 |
| Indian | 97 | 254.6 | 71.4 |
| Kashmiri Pakistani | 35 | 201.4 | 69.8 |
| Other Pakistani | 84 | 225.5 | 68.0 |
| Other Asian | 20 | 240.0 | 71.1 |
| Black African | 35 | 246.3 | 67.1 |
| Black Caribbean | 21 | 192.4 | 58.6 |
| Black Other | 9 | 271.1 | 77.5 |
| Mixed Asian \& White | 13 | 357.7 | 87.7 |
| Mixed Black African \& White | $<5$ | 282.5 | 80.7 |
| Mixed Black Caribbean \& White | 21 | 259.0 | 75.6 |
| Mixed Other | 15 | 314.7 | 82.1 |
| Chinese | 18 | 365.6 | 89.5 |
| Other heritage | 7 | 382.9 | 94.0 |
| White British | 1992 | 278.4 | 77.5 |
| White East European | $<5$ | 386.7 | 94.3 |
| White Irish | $<5$ | 272.5 | 72.7 |
| White Other | 13 | 244.6 | 69.9 |
| Gypsy Roma | $<5$ | 120.0 | 40.0 |
| White West European | $<5$ | 345.0 | 92.0 |
| Not Obtained | 8 | 177.5 | 50.7 |
| Refused | 8 | 226.3 | 67.0 |

Data Source: EPASonline, DCSF Statistical First Release Leeds figures are for maintained schools only and still provisional
3.2.3 Performance of all Asian groups is below Leeds school averages in terms of both points per pupil and points per entry and this is repeated for Black African and Black Caribbean pupils. Mixed Asian \& White and Mixed other heritage pupils perform well above the Leeds average, as do Chinese pupils.

