

**REPORT TO:** Cabinet Member – Children’s Services  
**DATE:** 18<sup>th</sup> January 2011  
**SUBJECT:** Performance of Schools KS4 and KS5  
**WARDS AFFECTED:** All  
**REPORT OF:** Peter Morgan, Strategic Director, Children, Schools and Families  
**CONTACT OFFICER:** John Parry, School Improvement Partner and Data Adviser  
0151 934 3437  
**EXEMPT/  
CONFIDENTIAL:** No

**PURPOSE/SUMMARY:**  
Report on school standards at GCSE and A-Level.

**REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:**

N.A

**RECOMMENDATION(S):**

Members note the contents of the attached Performance of Schools Report and the relative performance of Sefton against the national local and statistical neighbours where this data is available. It should be noted that some of the 2010 data is unvalidated.

**KEY DECISION:** No

**FORWARD PLAN:** Not Appropriate

**IMPLEMENTATION DATE:** Following the expiry of the “call-in” period for the Minutes of the meeting

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:** N/A

**IMPLICATIONS:** No financial implications

**Budget/Policy Framework:**

**Financial:** N/A

<b><u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u></b>	<b>2006/ 2007 £</b>	<b>2007/ 2008 £</b>	<b>2008/ 2009 £</b>	<b>2009/ 2010 £</b>
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				

Specific Capital Resources				
<b><u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u></b>				
Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				
Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N	When?			
How will the service be funded post expiry?				

**Legal:** N/A

**Risk Assessment:** N/A

**Asset Management:** N/A

**CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS**  
N/A

**CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:**

<u>Corporate Objective</u>		<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community	Yes		
2	Creating Safe Communities		Yes	
3	Jobs and Prosperity	Yes		
4	Improving Health and Well-Being		Yes	
5	Environmental Sustainability		Yes	
6	Creating Inclusive Communities		Yes	
7	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy		Yes	
8	Children and Young People	<b>Yes</b>		

**LINKS TO ENSURING INTEGRATION:**

N/A

**IMPACT UPON CHILDREN'S SERVICES TARGETS AND PRIORITIES:**

GCSE results slightly below LA target (55.5% cf 57.0%). No target for A-Level results.

The priorities as indicated in the main body of the report.

**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT**  
N/A

**BACKGROUND: N/A**



# The Performance of Schools 2010 Pupil Attainment KS4, KS5

Compiled by:	John Parry
Report by:	Advisory Service
Date:	December 2010
Version:	Final

## **2010 - The Performance of Schools**

### **Introduction**

This report is an initial analysis of all of the available data that informs the Local Authority's ongoing evaluation of the performance of Sefton schools. The evaluations within this document are based on the 2010 performance data currently available, much of which is provisional and therefore unvalidated.

The report is based on overall percentages and does not take into account actual pupil numbers and therefore statistical differences. Where data is available, Sefton's results are compared against the national average, the Merseyside average and our statistical neighbours.

Raising standards for all pupils continues to be a focus for the Local Authority. Our Key Stage 4 (KS4) priorities for 2010/2011 are to improve outcomes for pupils receiving free school meals (FSM), and looked after children and to improve the proportion of pupils gaining 5+ A\*-C including English and mathematics through overall improvement of standards in mathematics and the standards reached by boys in English. A reduction in persistent absence will also be a priority across all phases of education.

It should be noted that averages calculated in the tables in the appendices are raw averages and do not take account of pupil numbers.

**John Parry**  
**Data Adviser and School Improvement Partner**

## Key Stage 4

Year	5+ A*-C (inc. E & M)	5+ A*-C	5 A*-G
2010	55.5	82.9	96.2
2009	53.2	77.4	94.3
2008	51.4	71.2	93.4
2007	45.9	64.1	91.0
2006	44.0	61.9	92.0

Results at Key Stage 4 have improved since 2009 for both key indicators. No school was below the 30% floor target for 5 A\*-C including English and mathematics.

### Trends over time

For 5+ A\*-C, results continue to improve with an overall increase of 21.0 ppts since 2006. Achievement for 5+ A\*-C including English and mathematics has improved by 11.5 ppts since 2006. The figure for 5 A\*-G has increased 4.2 ppts since 2006. Again, the figures for 2010 are based on unvalidated data.

### Comparison with National, Statistical Neighbours and Merseyside Averages (See appendix 1)

#### 5+ A\*-C

The 5+ A\*-C results are above the national average, the Merseyside average and the average of our statistical neighbours. For 5+ A\*-C including English and mathematics, results are also above the national and Merseyside averages but 1.1 ppts below the average for statistical neighbours.

#### 5+ A\*-G

For 5+ A\*-G, attainment in Sefton is above the national average, the Merseyside average and the average of our statistical neighbours.

### LA rankings against national data.

	2010	2009	2008
5+A*-C (inc Eng & ma)	59	47	45
5+A*-C	14	14	13
5+A*-G	25	47	47

According to unvalidated data, results continue to improve overall at Key Stage 4 although in terms of national rankings the picture is mixed. The ranking of fourteenth for 5+ A\*-C has sustained the position from the previous year while the ranking of 25th for 5+ A\*-G is a significant improvement. However, the LA ranking for the target figure of 5+ A\*-C including English and mathematics has declined and this benchmark figure continues to be an issue for the LA – specifically in terms of the performance in mathematics. The ranking of 59th for this figure is disappointing.

### Conclusion

While the increases in unvalidated headline figures are pleasing, improving attainment of 5+ A\* - C (inc. En & ma) is one of the top priorities for the Local Authority in relation to standards and schools, particularly in the area of teaching and learning in mathematics. For those pupils receiving free school meals (FSM), there is still a significant gap between their performance and that of their peers: this will also be a focus of support for the future.

### Areas for further developments

- Schools with a significant differential in GCSE grades A\*-C between mathematics and English.
- Schools near the floor target of 30% 5+ A\* - C (inc. En & ma).
- Schools with significant numbers of FSM pupils where there is a significant gap between the performance of this cohort and their peers in terms of 5+ A\*-C including English and mathematics..

(See "Issues and Solutions" document)

## **Post 16 (Key Stage 5)**

	Year			
	2010	2009	2008	2007
<b>Average point score (APS) per candidate</b>	710	704.8	732.7	734.9
<b>Average point score per entry</b>	206.3	203.5	199	194.7

Results of Post-16 examinations have fluctuated in respect of one of the above measures and risen in the other. The APS per entry has been the chosen measure for the published performance tables, and this is the one that has risen over time, while the total average points score per candidate has risen slightly year on year but fallen over a four year period

To put these figures into perspective, one grade is worth 30 points at this level; and so the average grade per individual entry has risen by one third over this period of time while the total achievement for each pupil has declined by about two thirds of a single subject grade.

### Trends over time

This steady upward movement has brought Sefton nearer national averages in the APS per entry. The average total points score per candidate remains erratic but should be seen as dropping slightly over time. However, as will be seen, the comparative picture is less positive.

### Comparison with National, Statistical Neighbours and Merseyside Averages (See appendix 2)

The average points score (APS) per candidate has fallen in aggregate in Sefton over the past four years though with a small rise in the most recent year. Before this the method of calculating the points was different; and so this historical data only takes in this four year period.

APS per candidate has fallen in relation to statistical neighbours over this time – so it is now ranked 8 against the 10 statistical neighbours for whom data was available (as opposed to 7 of 11 last year) and as last year, third against Merseyside LAs as against first four years ago.

Although the APS per entry figure has risen, the comparative placing against statistical and Merseyside neighbours is the same as for the APS per candidate. Sefton is not making gains against other comparative local authorities.

On the other hand, one other figure not recorded as part of the table below is very positive. The percentage of candidates achieving 2 or more passes of A level equivalent value is, at 97.2, the highest in both groups. This is an indicator that a greater proportion of pupils in Sefton are gaining a strong basic post 16 qualification.



## ALPS Data

Year	Value Added	T Score
2010	6	5
2009	5	4
2008	5	5
2007	4	4
2006	5	5

The comparators are an overall value added score and a 'T' score which compares a number of variables and aggregates them. The variables include overall value added and teaching quality as measured by progress in individual subjects. The scale is 1-9, with 1 being the highest. The figures are very much provisional and may change.

The interpretation of post 16 data is a more complex process than other national comparators as there is significantly more pupil movement at this point; with some pupils moving to further study at other schools, or to colleges not maintained by the LA. There may also be demographic factors in play affecting pupil choice of education after compulsory schooling; and the impact of the recession is difficult to quantify. The figures above from the Local Authority ALPS report are therefore a valuable tool in judging pupil progress in comparative terms.

It should be noted that 'A' level results for post-16 colleges are included within the ALPS figures given above and may, therefore, also include pupils entering these institutions from secondary schools outside Sefton.

The comparisons given above are from ALPS data which is a partial picture of the national dataset. It does not offer comparisons with statistical neighbours but does allow comparisons between schools and against national norms (that is, against the aggregated data from all schools who take part in this exercise)

## Trends over time

The ALPS figures for Sefton have been consolidating over the past few years as can be seen and the fall to 6 in the 'value added' figure is the first fall to below the median '5' for the whole of this time. However, the other variables such as 'teaching quality' keep the 'T' score within this median.

## Conclusion

It remains the case that both raw and comparative value-added figures do not make comfortable reading for Sefton when comparisons with key stages 1 to 4 are considered. There has been a great deal of development over the past three years, not the least the opening of a new 6<sup>th</sup> form college, where the year 12 AS results in both raw and comparative terms have been extremely encouraging this year and may affect figures for A level equivalents next year and even more in years to come. The performance of individual schools is as variable as the figures for Sefton as a whole and some usually very consistent 6<sup>th</sup> forms have been less effective this year.

Nevertheless, as some data shows, there is success in ensuring that pupils leave sixth forms having received a strong basic entitlement.

However, the concern must remain that standards at this level are not moving in the right direction, and that a focus on this phase of education should be strong and challenging.

#### Areas for further developments

- Further identification of schools and subject areas which are falling short of reasonable expectations
- Challenge for schools where there are small numbers of pupils not achieving well

(See “Issues and Solutions” document)



**PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF SEFTON L.A. RESULTS  
AGAINST STATISTICAL NEIGHBOUR, MERSEYSIDE AND  
NATIONAL FIGURES (2010 data unvalidated)**



**GCSE Results** *(Comparison with statistical neighbours)*

	5+ A* - C (%)	5+ A*-C (inc. E&M) (%)	5+ A* - G (%)	5+ A*-G (inc. E&M) (%)
<b>Sefton</b>	<b>82.9</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>95.4</b>
NORTH WEST				
<b>Bury</b>	79.7	61.1	96.8	96.5
<b>Lancashire</b>	76.9	56.5	94.8	93.9
<b>Stockport</b>	77.8	61.6	95.3	94.2
<b>Wirral</b>	79.8	58.6	95.4	94.5
NORTH EAST				
<b>Darlington</b>	79.8	54.6	96.9	94.0
<b>Stockton-on-Tees</b>	74.8	52.8	94.4	92.3
EAST MIDLANDS				
<b>Nottinghamshire</b>	77.2	51.1	94.4	92.5
EAST OF ENGLAND				
<b>Southend-on-Sea</b>	78.4	61.5	93.9	93.1
SOUTH WEST				
<b>Swindon</b>	70.1	49.4	95.2	94.7
SOUTH EAST				
<b>Kent</b>	78.6	60.2	94.4	93.0
<b>Average</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>56.6</b>	<b>95.2</b>	<b>93.5</b>

**GCSE Results** *(Comparison with other Merseyside L.A.s)*

	5+ A* - C (%)	5+ A*-C (inc. E&M) (%)	5+ A* - G (%)	5+ A*-G (inc. E&M) (%)
<b>Sefton</b>	<b>82.9</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>95.4</b>
<b>Halton</b>	81.0	49.8	95.0	93.4
<b>Knowsley</b>	67.5	37.8	87.4	85.5
<b>Liverpool</b>	81.3	52.7	92.2	90.7
<b>St. Helens</b>	80.5	52.7	94.1	91.7
<b>Wirral</b>	79.8	58.6	95.4	94.5
<b>Merseyside (Average)</b>	<b>78.9</b>	<b>51.2</b>	<b>93.4</b>	<b>91.9</b>

**GCSE Results** *(Comparison with England)*

	5+ A* - C (%)	5+ A*-C (inc. E&M) (%)	5+ A* - G (%)	5+ A*-G (inc. E&M) (%)
<b>Sefton</b>	<b>82.9</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>95.4</b>
<b>England (Maintained sector)</b>	75.7	54.9	94.6	93.2
<b>England (Average)</b>	74.8	53.1	92.6	88.4



**PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF SEFTON L.A. RESULTS  
AGAINST STATISTICAL NEIGHBOUR, MERSEYSIDE AND  
NATIONAL FIGURES (2010 data unvalidated)**



**GCE/VCE A/AS and Key Skills UCAS point scores of 16 – 18 year old candidates**  
*(Comparison with statistical neighbours)*

	Per candidate	Per entry
<b>Sefton</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>206.3</b>
NORTH WEST		
<b>Bury</b>	758.5	209
<b>Lancashire</b>	817.1	222.8
<b>Stockport</b>	Missing data	Missing data
<b>Wirral</b>	740.5	206.6
NORTH EAST		
<b>Darlington</b>	773.3	207.8
<b>Stockton-on-Tees</b>	726	209.9
EAST MIDLANDS		
<b>Nottinghamshire</b>	686.1	203.2
EAST OF ENGLAND		
<b>Southend-on-Sea</b>	725.7	218.5
SOUTH WEST		
<b>Swindon</b>	619.3	201.9
SOUTH EAST		
<b>Kent</b>	731.6	211.4
<b>Average</b>		

**GCE/VCE A/AS and Key Skills UCAS point scores of 16 – 18 year old candidates**  
*(Comparison with other Merseyside L.A.s)*

	Per candidate	Per entry
<b>Sefton</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>206.3</b>
<b>Halton</b>	676.9	214
<b>Knowsley</b>	564.6	200
<b>Liverpool</b>	690.5	205.7
<b>St. Helens</b>	715.2	205.1
<b>Wirral</b>	740.5	206.6
<b>Merseyside (Average)</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>206</b>

**GCE/VCE A/AS and Key Skills UCAS point scores of 16 – 18 year old candidates**  
*(Comparison with England)*

	Per candidate	Per entry
<b>Sefton</b>		
<b>England (Maintained sector)</b>	714.4	210.5
<b>England (Average)</b>	732.9	213.8