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## Summary

The report provides the Committee with a summary of the 2016 provisional outcomes of statutory assessment at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1, Key Stage 2, Key Stage 4 and Key Stage 5. The report also provides an update on the provisional school attendance figures for 2015/16.

## Recommendations

Members are asked to note the contents of the report

Wards Affected: All
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E-mail: j.edwards@manchester.gov.uk
Name: Karen Jarmany
Position: Head of Schools' Quality Assurance and Early Years
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## Background documents (available for public inspection):

None

## 1. Introduction

1.1 Schools and the Council are committed to developing and sustaining a high quality education system for Manchester where no school is less than good, many schools are outstanding and where overall outcomes reach and exceed national benchmarks.

Manchester has had success in increasing the proportion of good and outstanding schools across the City. By the end of the academic year $2015 / 16,88.1 \%$ schools were judged Good or better by Ofsted which is a $3.1 \%$ improvement on 2014/15. This means that $86.6 \%$ children and young people are attending a Manchester school that is judged Good or better; an improvement of $2.6 \%$ on 2015. (Watchsted July 2016). This compares with national averages of $87.4 \%$ and $85.1 \%$ respectively.

The overall attainment outcomes for Manchester in 2016 indicate sustained improvements at every Key Stage.
1.2 This report presents the headline data based on provisional performance data for 2016. Comparisons are made with national averages where these are available. Final and validated data is expected between October and December 2016 for each Key Stage. A further report will be presented early in 2017 with a detailed analysis of the progress and performance of specific groups of children and young people including for example by ethnicity, gender, those entitled to free school meals, children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and children who are looked after (LAC). The further report will include analysis of performance compared with other local authorities across Greater Manchester as well as cities that are Manchester's statistical neighbours.
1.3 Based on the provisional data the outcomes for key aspects of school attainment, attendance and exclusions are as follows:
i. Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS): outcomes have improved to 63.7 \% of children achieving a Good Level of Development (GLD) at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS). This is an increase of 2.8 percentage points (ppts) from the 2015 result of $60.9 \%$. The provisional national average for the Early Years GLD has also improved by 3 ppts to $69 \%$.
ii. Year 1 Phonics Test: There has been a further improvement in the outcomes for the phonics test. $78.5 \%$ children met the required standard for phonics decoding in 2016 compared with $73.3 \%$ in 2015; an increase of 5.2 percentage points. Early indications suggest that the 2016 national result has improved by 3.7 percentage points to $80.5 \%$. The difference between Manchester and England therefore has diminished from 3.5 to 2 percentage points.
iii. Key Stage 1: This was the first year of the new Key Stage 1 tests in maths and reading. The difference between Manchester's outcomes
and those nationally has continued to diminish in all subjects except science. The difference in reading is now 3.9 percentage points, in writing it is 2.1 and in maths it is 2.0 . The gap to the national averages has been reduced in these subjects. In science the difference has increased by 0.3 percentage points.
iv. Key Stage 2: The significant changes that have taken place in Key Stage 2 assessment mean that comparison with previous years is not applicable. In $201653 \%$ of learners nationally met or exceeded the expected standard. Provisional data indicates $49 \%$ of children in Manchester LA achieved national expectation compared to the National Average of $53 \%$. However in both 2014 and 2015, Manchester LA's KS2 data increased by $3 \%$ following the discounting of International New Arrivals who arrived from non English speaking countries in Yr5 and Yr 6 . It is expected that following the discounting process and the correction of schools' reporting errors that Manchester LA will be broadly in line with national average for KS2 expected outcomes for the third year.
v. Key Stage 4: The changes to the Key Stage 4 performance measures make it difficult to make direct comparisons with results from previous years. However 2016 Manchester LA provisional results show a very positive increase in the percentage of pupils achieving an $A^{*}-C$ in English and Mathematics compared with the previous year. Provisional outcomes in Manchester have increased by from $49.1 \%$ of pupils in 2015 to $55.8 \%$ of pupils in 2016, achieving an $\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ in English and Maths.
vi. Attendance: Overall absence in Manchester primary and secondary schools has decreased in 2015/16. In primary schools it was $3.34 \%$ in $2015 / 16$ and $3.56 \%$ in 2014/15. In secondary schools absence was $4.53 \%$ in 2015/16 compared with $4.83 \%$ in 2014/15. Overall absence in special schools has increased from $7.70 \%$ in $2014 / 15$ to $8.11 \%$ in 2015/16.

## 2. Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS)

### 2.1 Context

The revised Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) was introduced in September 2012. As a result direct year on year comparisons for the end of year attainment can only be made with the outcomes since 2013.

The 17 Early Learning Goals within the EYFS are organised across 7 areas of learning. The 7 areas of learning include the three prime areas of

- personal, social and emotional development;
- physical development and
- communication and language.
and the 4 specific areas of
- literacy
- mathematics
- understanding the world
- expressive arts and design

Each area of learning is made up of two or three Early Learning Goals (ELGs). These are set out in the table below:

| Area of learning (prime in bold) | Early Learning Goal (ELG) |
| :--- | :--- |
| personal, social and emotional <br> development | Self confidence and self awareness; <br> Managing feelings and behaviour; <br> Making relationships |
| physical development | Moving and handling; Health and self <br> care |
| communication and language | Listening and attention; Understanding; <br> Speaking |
| literacy | Reading;Writing |
| mathematics | Numbers; Shape, space and measures |
| understanding the world | People and communities; The World; <br> Technology |
| expressive arts and design | Exploring and using media and <br> materials; Being imaginative |

Children are assessed against the ELGs and judged to be at one of three levels- either an emerging, expected or exceeding level of development. Each level is given a points score. Emerging $=1$ point, expected $=2$ points and exceeding $=3$ points. These point scores are referred to as average point scores (APS).

To achieve the national Good Level of Development (GLD) measure children must achieve at least the expected level in the 8 ELGs within the prime areas of learning and literacy and mathematics.

Results for the other local authorities and the validated England average will be available in October.

### 2.2 EYFS outcomes

- Outcomes at the end of the EYFS have improved by $2.8 \%$ to $63.7 \%$ of children achieving the expected Good Level of Development.
- Early indications suggest that attainment nationally also increased leaving a gap to national of $5.6 \%$. Nationally $69.3 \%$ children achieved a GLD.
- There has been an improvement in all areas of learning.
- Across the 7 broad areas attainment is lowest in Literacy and highest in Physical Development.
- Results for the expected level of achievement in the individual learning
goals were lowest in Writing at 66.4\% and highest in Technology at 88 \%.
- Overall, more children achieve the expected level or above in the Prime learning goals, than the specific learning goals.

Comparisons with national averages will be available in October.
2.3 The outcomes for each area are outlined in the table below:

## EYFSP LA Summary

End of EYFSP / 2016
Scores

Total cohort: 7162, Total eligible: 7133, Total excluded¹: 29

| Early Learning Goals | Eme | Exp | Exc | Exp or <br> Exc | Avge <br> Points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Good Level of Development ${ }^{\text {² }}$ |  |  |  |  | 63.7\% | 2.21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRIME LEARNING GOALS | Communication and Language |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Listening and attention | 19.5\% | 62.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 17.6 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 80.5\% | 1.98 |
|  | Understanding | 20.3\% | 61.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 17.8 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 79.7\% | 1.97 |
|  | Speaking | 21.3\% | 64.3\% | $\begin{gathered} 14.4 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 78.7\% | 1.93 |
|  | Physical Development |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Moving and handling | 14.7\% | 72.8\% | $\begin{gathered} 12.5 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 85.3\% | 1.98 |
|  | Health and self-care | 14.5\% | 72.7\% | $\begin{gathered} 12.8 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 85.5\% | 1.98 |
|  | Personal, Social and Emotional Development |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Self-confidence and selfawareness | 16.0\% | 69.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 14.5 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 84.0\% | 1.99 |
|  | Managing feelings and behaviour | 16.6\% | 71.4\% | $\begin{gathered} 12.0 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 83.4\% | 1.95 |
|  | Making relationships | 15.3\% | 72.8\% | $\begin{gathered} 11.9 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 84.7\% | 1.97 |


| Literacy | $30.5 \%$ | $53.7 \%$ | 15.9 <br> $\%$ | $69.5 \%$ | 1.85 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reading | $33.6 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | 10.3 <br> $\%$ | $66.4 \%$ | 1.77 |  |
|  | Writing | $27.6 \%$ | $60.6 \%$ | 11.8 <br> $\%$ | $72.4 \%$ | 1.84 |


| SPECIFIC <br> LEARNING GOALS | Shape, space and measures | 25.6\% | 64.2\% | $\begin{gathered} 10.2 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 74.4\% | 1.85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Understanding the world |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | People and communities | 20.7\% | 70.5\% | 8.7\% | 79.3\% | 1.88 |
|  | The world | 21.3\% | 69.7\% | 9.0\% | 78.7\% | 1.88 |
|  | Technology | 11.7\% | 79.4\% | 8.9\% | 88.3\% | 1.97 |
|  | Expressive arts and design |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Exploring media and materials | 18.2\% | 72.1\% | 9.8\% | 81.8\% | 1.92 |
|  | Being imaginative | 19.3\% | 72.3\% | 8.4\% | 80.7\% | 1.89 |
| AREAS OF LEARNING | Communication and language |  |  |  | 75.0\% | 1.96 |
|  | Physical development |  |  |  | 81.5\% | 1.98 |
|  | Personal, social and emotional development |  |  |  | 79.2\% | 1.97 |
|  | Literacy |  |  |  | 66.0\% | 1.81 |
|  | Mathematics |  |  |  | 70.7\% | 1.84 |
|  | Understanding the world |  |  |  | 75.6\% | 1.91 |
|  | Expressive arts and design |  |  |  | 77.9\% | 1.90 |
| OVERALL | Prime learning goals |  |  |  | 71.7\% | 1.97 |
|  | Specific learning goals |  |  |  | 61.0\% | 1.87 |
|  | All learning goals |  |  |  | 60.2\% | 1.92 |
|  | Average Total Points for Cohort |  |  |  |  | 32.6 |

### 2.4 Next steps:

- Detailed analysis of outcomes to identify those schools where specific action can be targeted through brokered school to school improvement
- Share data analysis across Early Years Childcare sector and Sure Start Children's Centres to enable all settings and SSCC to focus their efforts on the areas of learning and groups of children according to locality data.
- Continue to develop the Early Years Delivery Model and monitor the impact of speech and language therapy in the Early Years.
- Through ReadManchester, focus on reading in the Early Years including the development of Bookstart corners in every Sure Start Children's Centre; support the initial roll out of Early Words Together to increase the focus on reading in the home environment; engage settings in supporting boys' reading.
- Evaluation of impact of Bookstart Corner in every SSCC.


## 3. Key Stage One

## Phonics Test and Year 1 and 2

### 3.1 Context

This is the fifth year that the phonics check has been completed in schools and the fourth school year that the phonics re-check for Year 2 pupils has
been implemented. Meeting the required standard requires a pass mark of 32.

### 3.2 Headlines

- The percentage of pupils meeting the required standard in the phonics check in Y1 and the re-check in Year 2 has improved in Manchester.
- In Year 1, the difference between national outcomes (80.5\%) and those in Manchester ( $78.5 \%$ ) is 2 percentage points.
- Whilst Manchester outcomes improved at a faster rate than national from 2015 to 2016, the gap of 2 percentage points is the same as it was in 2014.
- From 2014 to 2016, Manchester outcomes have therefore improved at the same rate as those nationally.
- In Year 2 the percentage of pupils that met the required standard in the phonics re-check improved by 0.5 percentage points.


### 3.3 Outcome Summary

The percentage of Year 1 pupils meeting the required standard in the phonics check in Manchester increased by 5.2 percentage points in 2016. Early indications show that the national average has increased by 3.7 percentage points. *This is provisional data from NCER (National Consortium for Examination Results). The difference between the outcomes in Manchester and England has diminished from 2015 to 2016. Currently there is a difference of 2.0 percentage points, compared with 3.5 percentage points in 2015.

|  |  | Year 1 Phonics |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pupils | A/D | $\mathbf{0 - 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 +}$ |
| Manchester | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 6605 | $1.9 \%$ | $25.7 \%$ | $72.2 \%$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 6936 | $2.5 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $73.3 \%$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 7105 | $2.5 \%$ | $20.9 \%$ | $78.5 \%$ |
| England | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |  | $1 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $74.2 \%$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |  | $2 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $76.8 \%$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ |  |  | $80.5 \%{ }^{*}$ |  |

2097 Year 2 pupils took the phonics re-check in Year 2. The number that did not meet the requirement in Year 1 equates to $22.08 \%$ of the 2015 cohort. A higher percentage of pupils met the required standard following the re-check in 2016 than in 2015.

|  | Year 2 Phonics |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pupils | A/D | $\mathbf{0 - 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 +}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 2097 | $5.0 \%$ | $32.7 \%$ | $62.3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 2124 | $4.5 \%$ | $33.6 \%$ | $61.8 \%$ |

### 3.4 Next steps:

- Work in partnership with the Manchester teaching schools to create a bespoke training programme focusing on a play based approach to the teaching of phonics.
- Signpost identified schools to access the training programme.
- Continue to share good practice through targeted school to school support, the Manchester School Improvement Partnership and the Manchester Schools' Alliance.


## 4. Key Stage One

### 4.1 Context

The key stage 1 assessments changed in 2016 so the results for this year are not comparable with previous years. The system of assessments using national curriculum levels is no longer being used. Instead pupils are marked depending on whether they are meeting the expected standard (EXS) or working at higher standard (HS) in the four assessment subjects; Reading, Writing, Maths and Science.

The DfE will release provisional national figures in the early autumn. Any comparative national figures used in this report are based on emerging figures available on the data collection website. The figures are calculated using all Local Authorities' (LA) data that has been entered on the site. These comparisons have been used to give an early indication of Manchester's position.

### 4.2 Headline summary

The table below shows that the percentage of pupils meeting at least the expected standard in reading is $70.1 \%$, in writing it is $63.4 \%$, in maths it is $70.6 \%$ and in science it is $76.6 \%$. The difference between outcomes in Manchester and those nationally is greatest in science and least in reading, writing and maths combined.

The percentage of pupils in Manchester working at higher standard is lower than the emerging national averages for all subjects. There is no measure of working at higher standard in Science. The difference between outcomes in Manchester and those nationally at HS is greatest in reading and least in reading, writing and maths combined

|  | Manchester |  | National |  | Difference |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | \% EXS | \% HS | \% EXS | \% HS | \% EXS | \% HS |
| Readin <br> g | $70.1 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $23.60 \%$ | $-3.9 \%$ | $-5.9 \%$ |
| Writing | $63.4 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $65.50 \%$ | $13.30 \%$ | $-2.1 \%$ | $-3.3 \%$ |
| Maths | $70.6 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $72.60 \%$ | $17.80 \%$ | $-2.0 \%$ | $-3.2 \%$ |
| Science | $76.6 \%$ |  | $81.80 \%$ |  | $-5.2 \%$ |  |
| RWM | $58.5 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $60.30 \%$ | $8.90 \%$ | $-1.8 \%$ | $-2.2 \%$ |

### 4.3 Outcomes in Manchester compared with national: pupils meeting at least the expected standard

|  | \% Level 2+ |  |  |  |  |  | \% achievingexpected standard |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 |  |  | 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | MCR | ENG | DIFF | MCR | ENG | DIFF | MCR | ENG | DIFF |
| Reading | 84.7\% | 90\% | 5.3 | 85.7\% | 91\% | 5.3 | 70.1\% | 74\% | 3.9 |
| Writing | 81.6\% | 86\% | 4.4 | 82.7\% | 88\% | 5.3 | 63.4\% | 65.5\% | 2.1 |
| Maths | 89.0\% | 92\% | 3.0 | 89.9\% | 93\% | 3.1 | 70.6\% | 72.6\% | 2.0 |

This year's assessments are the first to reflect the new primary curriculum, which was introduced in 2014 and has set higher standards in England. Because this is the first year of the new assessments, the results look very different from those of previous years and therefore no direct comparisons can be made between \% achieving L2+ in 2014 and 2015 and \% achieving the expected standard in 2016. However, the difference between Manchester and national results can be compared. 2016 outcomes reflect a clear improvement in pupil performance at Key Stage 1.

## The gap to National in the percentage of children achieving the expected standard in provisional data



The graph above shows that the difference in performance between pupils in Manchester and those nationally has diminished in 2016 in all subjects except science. The difference in performance has diminished in reading by 1.4 percentage points, by 3.2 percentage points in writing and by 1.1 percentage points in maths. There has been a slight increase of 0.3 percentage points in science.

## Next steps:

- More detailed analysis of outcomes by pupil groups to enable targeting of specific groups of pupils
- Share effective practise on the moderation of assessment through the Manchester Schools Alliance
- Engage with national developments in Science as this subject becomes more of a focus for national outcomes.


## 5. Key Stage Two (KS2) Provisional Results

### 5.1 Context

There have been significant changes to assessment at Key Stage 2 in 2016 therefore the results for this year cannot be compared with previous years. National curriculum levels are no longer being used in assessment and new accountability measures have been adopted. Key stage 2 national curriculum test outcomes are not reported using levels but are now reported for the first time as scaled scores.

The headline measures in 2016 are

- the percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard (EXS) in reading, writing and mathematics
- the percentage of pupils achieving the higher standard in reading, writing and mathematics
- the school's progress score in each of reading, writing and maths
- the pupil's average scaled score in each of reading and mathematics

Schools are required, as a minimum, to exceed the national floor standard. The floor standard consists of two main elements: combined attainment, and progress from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2. A school will be above the floor standard if:

- $65 \%$ of pupils meet the expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics (i.e. achieve that standard in all three subjects) or
- the school achieves sufficient progress scores in all of reading, writing and mathematics

Provisional progress measures have been released in September 2016 with DfE likely to publish a confirmed list of schools below floor in December 2016. The calculation for each school takes into account the progress of all pupils and compares them with the progress made by pupils from a similar starting point nationally.

All Key Stage 2 pupils also complete a Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling test (GPS).

### 5.2 Headline summary.

The significant changes that have taken place in Key Stage 2 assessment mean that comparison with previous years is not applicable.

Expectations for attainment at the end of Key Stage 2 have been raised. The outcomes in 2016 are not therefore directly comparable with those of previous years.

- Provisional data indicates $49 \%$ of children in Manchester LA achieved national expectation in combined Reading, Writing and Mathematics
compared to the national average of 53\%. However in both 2014 and 2015, Manchester LA's KS2 data increased by $3 \%$ following the discounting of International New Arrivals who arrived from non English speaking countries in Yr5 and Yr6. It is expected that following the discounting process and the correction of schools' reporting errors that Manchester LA will be broadly in line with national average for KS2 expected outcomes for the third year.
- Provisional results for 2016 outcomes in reading and writing are currently below national by $5.6 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively; mathematics is $0.5 \%$ below national at 69.5\%; results for Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling are currently $1.9 \%$ below national outcomes. As results are checked and validated it is anticipated that the differences with national outcomes will diminish. Provisional outcomes in mathematics are currently in line with national average.
- The percentage of pupils in Manchester achieving the higher standard is provisionally lower in all subjects. Outcomes for combined Reading Writing and Maths are closest to the national average.
- The average scaled score for Maths in Manchester of 103.13 is slightly above the national average of 103. However, the average scaled scores in Reading and GPS are below the national scores, the biggest gap being 1.49 points in Reading.
- Provisional data indicates that the average progress in Manchester is above national expectations in reading, writing and mathematics.
- Provisional data indicates that fewer than five schools will be below the Department for Education's (DfE) floor standards.

Provisional figures for Manchester are summarised in the following table

|  | Manchester |  | National |  | Diff |  | Manchester | National | Diff |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% EXS | \% <br> High er Stan dard | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { EX } \\ & \text { S } \end{aligned}$ | \% <br> High er Stan dard | \% EXS | \% <br> High er Stan dard | Average Scaled Score |  |  |
| Read ing | $\begin{array}{r} 60.4 \\ \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.1 \\ \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | 19\% | -5.6\% | -4.9\% | 101.51 | 103.00 | 1.49 |
| Writi ng | $\begin{array}{r} 68.5 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.8 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74 \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 15\% | -5.5\% | -4.2\% |  |  |  |
| Math $\mathbf{s}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69.5 \\ \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.5 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 70 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 17\% | -0.5\% | -1.5\% | 103.13 | 103.00 | 0.13 |
| RWM | $\begin{array}{r} 49.0 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 3.9\% | $\begin{aligned} & 53 \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 5\% | -4.0\% | -1.1\% |  |  |  |
| GPS | $\begin{array}{r} 71.4 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21.1 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72 \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 23\% | -0.6\% | -1.9\% | 103.93 | 104.00 | 0.07 |
| Scie nce | $\begin{array}{r} 72.7 \\ \% \end{array}$ |  | 81 $\%$ |  | -8.3\% |  |  |  |  |

NB. Although the provisional outcome for RWM is 49\%, once revisions take place in October this is likely to rise to $50.1 \%$.

### 5.3 Outcomes in Manchester compared with national: pupils meeting at least the expected standard

This year's assessments are the first to reflect the new primary curriculum, which was introduced in 2014 and has set higher standards in England. Because this is the first year of the new assessments, the results look very different from those of previous years and therefore no direct comparisons can be made between \% achieving L4+ in 2014 and 2015 and \% achieving the expected standard in 2016. The difference between Manchester and national results can be compared. In both 2014 and 2015, Manchester LA's KS2 data increased by 3\% following the discounting of International New Arrivals who arrived from non English speaking countries in Yr5 and yr6. It is expected that following the discounting process and the correction of schools' reporting errors that Manchester LA will be at National Average for KS2 expected outcomes for the third year.

Table 2a, below and figure 2 b highlights KS2 headline provisional outcomes 2014-2016 which does allow a comparison to be made to the differences identified between national outcomes and Manchester outcomes at this stage. Table 2c and figure 2d provide the validated data for 2014 and 2015 demonstrating the diminished difference between percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Manchester and National following the discounting process

## Comparison of provisional Manchester outcomes with provisional National outcomes

|  | \% Level 4+ Provisional |  |  |  |  |  | \% achieving expected standard Provisional |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 |  |  | 2015 |  |  | 2016 |  |  |
|  | MCR | ENG | DIFF | MCR | ENG | DIFF | MCR | ENG | DIFF |
| GPS | 75\% | 76\% | -1 | 79\% | 80\% | -1 | 71 | 72 | -1 |
| Reading | 85\% | 89\% | -4 | 85\% | 89\% | -4 | 60 | 66 | -6 |
| Writing | 83\% | 85\% | -2 | 83\% | 87\% | -4 | 69 | 74 | -5 |
| Maths | 84\% | 86\% | -2 | 86\% | 87\% | -1 | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| Science | 84\% | 88\% | -4 | 84\% | 89\% | -5 | 73 | 81 | -8 |
| RWM | 76\% | 79\% | -3 | 77\% | 80\% | -3 | 49 | 53 | -4 |

The difference to National in the percentage of children achieving the expected standard in provisional data

## Gap to National L4+\& EXS 2016 provisional



### 5.4 Interim Progress outcomes in Manchester compared with national

The national curriculum changes introduced in 2014 and assessed using new approaches for the first time in 2016 have placed progress at the centre as the key accountability measure. The table below highlights that the average progress in Manchester is above national expectations in reading, writing and mathematics. If all pupils in a school make expected progress the school score would be 0 . Therefore when pupils make more progress than expected a positive score is recorded.

Interim progress measures show better than expected progress in all three subjects.

The table below shows interim progress measures for Manchester and the National Floor Standard measure for progress 2016

|  | 2016 Progress Score |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Reading | Writing | Maths |
| National Floor Standard | -5 | -7 | -5 |
| Expected National Average | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Progress for learners in Manchester | +0.23 | +0.64 | +1.02 |

### 5.5 Floor Standard

The 2016 floor standards for pupil progress were released in September 2016. These are calculated from the provisional outcomes in 2016. The progress floor standards for the three subjects are

- -5 Reading,
- -5 mathematics,
- -7 writing.

If schools outcomes are equal to or less than this in any one of these three
areas and also below $65 \%$ for expected outcomes in reading, writing and mathematics they are then deemed to below the floor standard for 2016.

Schools have received an initial indication of their scores but until the verification and checking exercise is complete these will not be confirmed. Early indications suggest fewer than five schools will be below the floor standard.

### 5.6 Next steps

- Continue to work with schools through the QA process to support improved outcomes
- Continue to broker support and intervention for schools through the MSIP and Teaching Schools in the City and region to improve outcomes in the identified schools, including the small number of schools identified as being below floor targets.
- Respond to the differences identified in reading through the Read Manchester programme in 2016/17
- Improve the accuracy of teacher assessment across the city by working with the Manchester Schools Alliance to share good practice.


## 6. Key Stage 4 GCSE (see Appendix 1)

### 6.1 Context

Over the past three years there have been significant changes in the calculations of Key Stage 4 performance measures which have had significant impact on GCSE results nationally. This year sees further change with a move away from the headline measure of $5+A^{*}-C$ including English and Maths to the adoption of new secondary accountability measures of Attainment 8 and Progress 8. Schools will also continue to report the percentage of pupils achieving $A^{*}-C$ in English and Maths; the proportion of pupils entered for, and achieving the EBacc, and the proportion of pupils achieving at least one qualification.

Attainment 8 and Progress 8 scores are based on all of their pupils' results across eight subjects with a double weighting for English and Mathematics. Attainment 8, using points as grade equivalents, measures a student's average grade across eight subjects. The school's progress 8 score measures the progress of pupils from the end of primary school to the end of secondary school. The score is calculated by comparing the achievement of all of its pupils against the Attainment 8 score of all pupils nationally with similar prior attainment at the end of primary school. A Progress 8 score will be published as a numerical figure where each GCSE grade is equal to one. For example, 0.5 means pupils made half a grade more progress across their subjects than expected. A score of 0 would mean pupils made expected progress. (See Appendix 1 for a more detailed explanation) A school will be considered below floor standard if the school's Progress 8 score is below -0.5.
The changes make it difficult to make direct comparisons with results from previous years with historic data for some of the indicators, but not all. There is also further evidence of the raising of grade boundaries across GCSE
subjects.

### 6.2 Headlines

- 2016 Manchester LA provisional results show a very positive increase in \% of pupils achieving an $\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ in English and Mathematics compared with the nearest equivalent measure in 2015 and 2014. The headlines show that the provisional outcomes in Manchester have increased by 6.7 percentage points from $49.1 \%$ to $55.8 \%$. Neither the North West or national Average for 2016 has yet been released, however the national average for pupils achieving an $\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ in English and Maths, the nearest equivalent measure was $55.8 \%$ in 2015.
- Attainment 8 measure also shows improvement rising from 44.2 in 2015 to 47.9 (National average 2015 attainment 8 was 47.4). This is also an improvement for Manchester LA schools compared to the 2014 Attainment 8 outcome of 44.8.
- 2016 Ebacc outcomes show a slight decline of 1.9 percentage points with $18.6 \%$ of pupils achieving the Ebacc.
- Figures for progress 8 will be confirmed in October.

Table showing provisional GCSE outcomes 2016

|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Attainment 8 | 44.8 | 44.2 | 47.93 |
| Manchester |  | 47.4 |  |
| National |  |  |  |
| \% A*-C in Eng and |  |  |  |
| Maths |  |  |  |
| * nearest equivalent |  |  |  |
| measure |  |  |  |$\quad$| Manchester | $53.5 \%$ | $49.1 \%$ | $55.8 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| National | $55.5 \%$ | $55.8 \%$ |  |

### 6.3 Next Steps

- Detailed data analysis of pupil groups and progress data against national and regional comparators (once available) to better understand the impact of changes to the GCSE across a range of pupil groups and identify strategies to address these.
- Work with targeted schools to improve reading outcomes by sharing best practice to improve the teaching of reading.
- Continue to work with schools through the MSA and the Manchester Collaborative to focus on the further improvement of outcomes in light of further changes to GCSEs in 2017.
- Continue to work with schools through the QA process to support improved outcomes


## 7. Key Stage 5 A level

### 7.1 Context

2016 saw an increase in the number of school providers offering A level.

The two lead indicators of success that are reported nationally are achievement at $A^{*}$ and grade $A$ and the overall $A$ level pass rate.

### 7.2 Headlines

Achievement at $A^{*}$ in Manchester schools increased slightly by 0.2 ppts from $7 \%$ in 2015 to $7.2 \%$ this year. Nationally the percentage awarded an A* grade remained in line with previous years at $8.1 \%$ of entries.

There has also been an increase in the percentage of entries awarded $A^{*}-A$ grades in Manchester schools from 21.8\% in 2015 to $23.1 \%$ this year. Nationally, $25.8 \%$ entries were awarded A* -A grades.

The other lead indicator used nationally is the overall pass rate:
The A*-E pass rate in Manchester has risen from $97.5 \%$ in 2015 to $98.3 \%$ this year, which is slightly above the national pass rate of $98.1 \%$.

### 7.3 Next Steps

- Work with the partnership of post 16 providers to ensure Quality Assurance in post 16 is further developed.


## 8. Attendance

The absence data below is Manchester's provisional data for 2015/16.

## Overall Absence - Primary

The table below shows that overall absence in Manchester primary schools has decreased from $3.56 \%$ in $2014 / 15$ to $3.34 \%$ in 2015/16. It is lower than the national average for the same period in 2014/15, which was $4 \%$.

## Overall Absence - Secondary

For secondary schools the table indicates that that absence has continued to fall from $4.83 \%$ in $2014 / 15$ to $4.53 \%$ to $2015 / 16$. This again is lower than the national average for the same period in 2014/15 which was $5.30 \%$.

## Overall Absence - Specialist Schools

Overall absence in special schools has increased from 7.70\% in 2014/15 to 8.11\% in 2015/16 and continues to be a priority.

## Persistent Absence Thresholds

The persistent absence (PA) thresholds for the academic year changed in 2015/16. In previous years the PA threshold was $15 \%$ absence and this changed to a PA threshold of $10 \%$ for 2015/16. National attendance figures for 2015/16 have not yet been released. Provisional data for half terms 1 and 2 in 2015/16 indicate that PA in Manchester has fallen when compared to national average. Primary is currently in line with national average and PA in the secondary sector is below the national average.

The DfE released the national data for the autumn term 2015/16 in March 2016. The data for the full academic year will be released in October 2016. The table below shows a positive trend in overall and PA absence.

|  |  | Overall Absence |  |  |  |  | PA 10\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | $\begin{gathered} 2014 / 15 \\ \text { HT1-2 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015/16 } \\ \text { HT1-2 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2014 / 1 \\ 5 \text { HT1- } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2015 / 1 \\ 6 \text { HT1- } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |
| Prim ary | Manch ester | 4.50\% | 3.80\% | 4.00\% | 4.00\% | 3.70\% | $\begin{gathered} 11.40 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9.30\% |
|  | Englan d | 4.70\% | 3.80\% | 4.00\% | 3.90\% | 3.60\% | $\begin{gathered} 10.90 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 9.00\% |
|  | Gap | -0.20\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.10\% | 0.10\% | 0.50\% | 0.30\% |
| Seco ndar y | Manch ester | 6.00\% | 5.10\% | 5.20\% | 5.00\% | 4.30\% | $\begin{gathered} 15.20 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.80 \\ \% \end{array}$ |
|  | Englan d | 5.80\% | 5.10\% | 5.30\% | 5.10\% | 4.60\% | $\begin{gathered} 15.00 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12.10 \\ \% \end{array}$ |
|  | Gap | 0.20\% | 0.00\% | -0.10\% | 0.10\% | -0.30\% | 0.20\% | -1.30\% |

## Next steps

- Work with targeted schools to reduce Persistent Absence across the city
- Continue to develop the links with the Early Help Hubs through the attendance officer roles
- Work with special schools to reduce absence


## 9. Conclusion and Next Steps

This year's provisional results demonstrate consolidation and progress in all key indicators, with improvements at all key stages.

The challenge remains to diminish the difference to national at all Key Stages and to decrease the variability in outcomes across the city. Support and intervention has been planned for schools based on these provisional outcomes, Ofsted outcomes and intelligence from the LA Quality Assurance (QA) reports and interventions. This support and intervention has been brokered through the Manchester School Improvement Partnership with representation from all the Manchester Teaching Schools and the NLEs in the city. The LA will continue to fund a QA report for each school in the city in the Autumn term and further intervention and support will be planned for the year.

A more detailed analysis of outcomes by pupil groups will be presented in February 2016 following the publication of all validated data.

## Appendix 1

## Progress 8 and Attainment 8 definitions

## Progress 8

- Progress 8 is a new secondary accountability measure aimed at measuring the progress of pupils across a selected set of 8 subjects.
- It is a type of value added measure, meaning that pupils' results are compared to the actual achievements of other pupils with the same prior attainment.
- A pupil's Progress 8 score will be published in performance tables, replacing the current system of pupils being expected to make three levels of progress from KS2 to KS4.
- It is defined as a pupil's actual Attainment 8 score, minus their estimated Attainment 8 score.


## Attainment 8

- The estimated Attainment 8 score is the average Attainment 8 score of all pupils nationally with the same prior attainment at key stage 2.
- Attainment 8 measures a student's average grade across eight subjects with double weighting for Maths and English.
- The eight subjects fit into three groups:

English and Maths: Maths is double weighted and therefore counts twice. English is double weighted if the candidate takes both English Language and English Literature with the highest grade being double counted. .

EBacc (subjects making up the English Baccalaureate) is a subset of the attainment 8 subjects. EBacc is a measure of the highest scores from the sciences, computer science, geography, history and languages.

Open group subjects which includes any remaining GCSEs and other approved academic, arts or vocational qualifications.

## Calculating Attainment 8

For a student, you add up their points for their eight subjects with double weighting for Maths and English and divide by 10 (English and Maths count twice) to get their Attainment 8 score. The school's Attainment 8 score is the average of all students' scores. Students don't have to take eight subjects, but a zero is recorded in the calculation for those students with less than 8 subjects.

