## Appendices to Attainment Scrutiny Report February 2019

The following appendices provide analyses of outcomes across all key stages for 2018 and, separately, by ethnicity.
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## Appendix 2: Data comparisons:

Tables and charts included in this report compare Manchester's outcomes with national comparator groups as defined by Ofsted (see table below). Manchester's outcomes are also compared with national outcomes for the 'same' groups of pupils where this data is available. For example the national comparator group for Free School Meals Pupils (FSM) is other non-FSM pupils nationally. The 'same' comparator group would be Manchester FSM pupils compared with FSM pupils nationally.

| Manchester pupil group | National comparator group |
| :--- | :--- |
| All pupils | All pupils |
| Boys | Boys |
| Girls | Girls |
| FSM | Other (non- FSM) |
| Non FSM | Other (non- FSM) |
| Disadvantaged | Other (Non- Disadvantaged) |
| Non Disadvantaged | Other (Non- Disadvantaged) |
| SEN Support | All pupils |
| EHC Plan | All pupils |
| No SEN | No SEN |
| EAL | All pupils |
| Non EAL | All pupils |

## Disadvantaged Pupils:

In Key Stages 1, 2 and 4 the term 'disadvantaged pupils' is used to refer to those pupils for whom the pupil premium provides support. This includes pupils who:

- were registered as eligible for free school meals at any point in the last 6 years (FSM)
- have been looked after for 1 day or more (CLA)
- were adopted from care on or after 30 December 2005 or left care under either a special guardianship order or a child arrangements order


## Appendix 3: Early Years Foundation Stage

### 3.0 Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) Profile

### 3.1 Context

The 17 Early Learning Goals (ELGs) 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) |
| :--- | :--- |
| communication and language | Listening and attention; Understanding; <br> Speaking |
| physical development | Moving and handling; Health and self- <br> care |
| personal, social and emotional <br> development | Self-confidence and self-awareness; <br> Managing feelings and behaviour; <br> Making relationships |
| 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 materials; <br> Being imaginative |

Children are assessed against the ELGs and judged to be at one of three levels; emerging, expected or exceeding level of development. Each level is given a point 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 also in literacy and mathematics.

### 3.2 Headline Summary

From 2014 to 2018, the percentage of pupils achieving a GLD in Manchester has improved by $14 \%$ compared with $12 \%$ nationally.

- Outcomes at the end of the EYFS improved from 2016 by $3 \%$. In 2017/18 $67 \%$ of children achieved the expected Good Level of Development.
- Attainment nationally also increased by $1 \%$ last year. The difference between Manchester and national outcomes has therefore remained at $5 \%$ as nationally $72 \%$ of children achieved a GLD. This remains a key priority for the city.


### 3.3 Outcome summary

- The outcomes for each area of learning are outlined in the table and block graph below:
- Results for the expected level of achievement in the individual learning goals were lowest in reading, writing and number; although improvements of $1 \%$, $2 \%$ and $2 \%$ have been made respectively.
- Outcomes were highest in technology at $88 \%$ and exploring media and materials at $83 \%$.

|  |  | Results for 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Manchester |  |  |  | National <br> Expected or Exceeding |
|  |  | Emerging | Expected | Exceeding | Expected or Exceeding |  |
| Good Level of Development |  |  |  |  | 67\% | 72\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PRIME } \\ & \text { LEARNING } \\ & \text { GOALS } \end{aligned}$ | Communication and Language |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Listening and attention | 19\% | 63\% | 17\% | 81\% | 86\% |
|  | Understanding | 20\% | 62\% | 18\% | 80\% | 86\% |
|  | Speaking | 20\% | 65\% | 15\% | 80\% | 86\% |
|  | Physical Development |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Moving and handling | 15\% | 71\% | 14\% | 85\% | 90\% |
|  | Health and self-care | 14\% | 72\% | 13\% | 86\% | 91\% |
|  | Personal, Social and Emotional Development |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Self-confidence and selfawareness | 16\% | 70\% | 14\% | 84\% | 89\% |
|  | Managing feelings and behaviour | 16\% | 72\% | 12\% | 84\% | 88\% |
|  | Making relationships | 14\% | 74\% | 12\% | 86\% | 90\% |


| SPECIFIC LEARNING GOALS | Literacy |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reading | 29\% | 55\% | 16\% | 71\% | 77\% |
|  | Writing | 31\% | 59\% | 10\% | 69\% | 74\% |
|  | Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Numbers | 26\% | 61\% | 13\% | 74\% | 80\% |
|  | Shape, Space and measures | 25\% | 63\% | 12\% | 75\% | 82\% |
|  | Understanding the World |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | People and communities | 21\% | 68\% | 11\% | 79\% | 86\% |
|  | The World | 22\% | 66\% | 12\% | 78\% | 86\% |
|  | Technology | 12\% | 75\% | 13\% | 88\% | 93\% |
|  | Expressive arts and design |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Exploring media and materials | 17\% | 72\% | 11\% | 83\% | 89\% |
|  | Being imaginative | 18\% | 72\% | 10\% | 82\% | 89\% |

## Notes:

- The blue and red sections of the block graph below show the \% of Manchester pupils that achieved the expected GLD or exceeded it.
- The empty space at the top of each block shows the difference between Manchester's outcomes and outcomes nationally.

EYFS - \% expected or exceeding each learning goal


- Across the 7 broad areas of learning, attainment is lower in literacy and mathematics, although both improved in 2018.
- Overall, more children achieved the expected level or above in the prime learning goals, than the specific learning goals.

| Summary | Manchester | National |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Communication and Language | $76.5 \%$ | $82.4 \%$ |
| Physical Development | $82.0 \%$ | $87.4 \%$ |
| Personal, social and Emotional <br> Development | $80.2 \%$ | $85.2 \%$ |
| Literacy | $68.6 \%$ | $73.3 \%$ |
| Mathematics | $73.2 \%$ | $78.3 \%$ |
| Understanding the world | $76.4 \%$ | $84.0 \%$ |
| Expressive arts and design | $80.4 \%$ | $87.2 \%$ |
| Prime Learning goals | $73.9 \%$ | $79.4 \%$ |
| Specific learning goals | $65.6 \%$ | $70.9 \%$ |
| All learning goals | $64.9 \%$ | $70.2 \%$ |

### 3.4 Results by Pupil Groups

|  | \% GLD compared with National Comparator Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2018 <br> GLD Nat <br> SAME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Manchester | National | Diff | Manchester | National | Diff | Manchester | National | Diff |  |
| All | 64\% | 69\% | -5\% | 66\% | 71\% | -4\% | 67\% | 72\% | -5\% | 72\% |
| Boys | 56\% | 62\% | -6\% | 59\% | 64\% | -5\% | 60\% | 65\% | -5\% | 65\% |
| Girls | 72\% | 77\% | -5\% | 74\% | 78\% | -4\% | 74\% | 78\% | -4\% | 78\% |
| FSM | 56\% | 72\% | -16\% | 59\% | 71\% | -12\% | 61\% | 74\% | -13\% | 57\% |
| Non FSM | 67\% | 72\% | -5\% | 69\% | 71\% | -2\% | 69\% | 74\% | -5\% | 74\% |
| SEN Support | 19\% | 69\% | -50\% | 24\% | 71\% | -46\% | 23\% | 72\% | -49\% | 28\% |
| EHC Plan | 5\% | 69\% | -64\% | 0\% | 71\% | -71\% | 2\% | 72\% | -70\% | 5\% |
| No SEN | 70\% | 75\% | -5\% | 71\% | 74\% | -3\% | 73\% | 77\% | -4\% | 77\% |
| EAL | 59\% | 69\% | -10\% | 60\% | 71\% | -11\% | 64\% | 72\% | -8\% | 66\% |
| Non EAL | 68\% | 69\% | -1\% | 70\% | 71\% | 0\% | 70\% | 72\% | -2\% | 73\% |

## Notes:

- The block graph below shows the data for pupil groups; as in the table above (3.4). The blue block relates to outcomes in 2016, red relates to outcomes in 2017 and green relates to outcomes in 2018.
- The empty space at the top of the block shows the difference between Manchester's outcomes and the national comparator group.
- The solid black line crossing each block shows the outcomes for the same group of pupils nationally.

EYFS - \% achieving Good Level of Development


### 3.4.1 Gender

- The proportion of boys achieving a GLD in 2018 improved by $1 \%$. The difference between outcomes for boys in Manchester and outcomes for boys nationally has reduced by $1 \%$ since 2016.
- Outcomes for girls in Manchester and nationally have stayed the same as 2017.
- As in previous years a higher proportion of girls than boys have achieved a GLD. The challenge remains to improve attainment for both groups.


### 3.4.2 Pupils Eligible for Free School Meals

- There has been an improvement of $2 \%$ in the attainment of pupils who are eligible for Free School Meals (FSM).
- In 2017 the difference between outcomes for FSM and non FSM pupils was $10 \%$ in Manchester; in 2018 FSM learners outcomes improved by $2 \%$, closing the gap to $8 \%$.
- A higher proportion of pupils eligible for FSM in Manchester achieved a GLD than the same group of pupils nationally. There remains a gap of $13 \%$ when comparing the FSM cohort of Manchester with all other non FSM pupils nationally but this has gap has narrowed since 2016.


### 3.4.3 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- There has been a decrease of $1 \%$ in the attainment of pupils receiving SEN support, with $2 \%$ of those children on an EHC plan achieving GLD, an improvement of $2 \%$.
- The difference in attainment between pupils receiving SEN support and those without SEN increased by $3 \%$ in 2018.
- Reducing the difference in outcomes for pupils with SEN support and those without continues to be a focus.


### 3.4.4 Pupils speaking English as an Additional Language

- In 2018 the attainment of Manchester pupils speaking English as an additional language (EAL) improved by 4\% to 64\%.
- The difference in attainment between this group and all pupils nationally is $9 \%$ whereas outcomes for non EAL pupils in Manchester and all pupils nationally has a $2 \%$ gap.


## Appendix 4: Key Stage 1 Phonics

## 4. KEY STAGE ONE: Phonics Test Year One

### 4.1 Context

This is the seventh year that the phonics check has been completed in schools. National expectation is that pupils should achieve the pass mark of 32 .

### 4.2 Headline summary

- In 2018 the percentage of pupils meeting the required standard in the phonics check improved by $1 \%$ in Manchester. Likewise, there was a $1 \%$ increase nationally.
-The difference between Manchester and national outcomes remains at $2 \%$.


### 4.3 Outcome Summary

- Outcomes in Manchester have improved by 2\% since 2016, nationally they have improved by $1 \%$. The difference between Manchester and national outcomes is diminishing.

|  | Year 1 Phonics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  |
| Score | Manchester | National | Diff | Manchester | National | Diff | Manchester | National | Diff |
| 32+ | 78\% | 81\% | -3\% | 79\% | 81\% | -2\% | 80\% | 82\% | -2\% |
| 0-31 | 21\% | 18\% | 3\% | 20\% | 17\% | 3\% | 18\% | 16\% | 2\% |
| A/D | 3\% | 2\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% |

### 4.3.1 Results by Pupil Groups

|  | \% Working Above |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Manchester | National | Diff | Same | Manchester | National | Diff | Same | Manchester | National | Diff | Same |
| All | 78\% | 81\% | -3\% | 81\% | 79\% | 81\% | -3\% | 81\% | 80\% | 82\% | -2\% | 82\% |
| Boys | 74\% | 77\% | -3\% | 77\% | 75\% | 78\% | -3\% | 78\% | 76\% | 79\% | -3\% | 79\% |
| Girls | 83\% | 84\% | -1\% | 84\% | 83\% | 85\% | -2\% | 85\% | 84\% | 86\% | -2\% | 86\% |
| FSM | 74\% | 83\% | -9\% | 69\% | 71\% | 84\% | -13\% | 68\% | 74\% | 84\% | -10\% | 70\% |
| Non FSM | 80\% | 83\% | -3\% | 83\% | 81\% | 84\% | -3\% | 84\% | 82\% | 84\% | -2\% | 84\% |
| Disadvantaged | 75\% | 83\% | -8\% | 70\% | 74\% | 84\% | -11\% | 70\% | 75\% | 85\% | -10\% | 72\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 81\% | 83\% | -2\% | 83\% | 81\% | 84\% | -3\% | 84\% | 82\% | 85\% | -3\% | 85\% |
| SEN Support | 44\% | 81\% | -37\% | 46\% | 42\% | 81\% | -39\% | 47\% | 47\% | 82\% | -35\% | 48\% |


| EHC Plan | 16\% | 81\% | -65\% | 18\% | 15\% | 81\% | -66\% | 18\% | 12\% | 82\% | -70\% | 19\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No SEN | 85\% | 86\% | -1\% | 86\% | 85\% | 87\% | -2\% | 87\% | 88\% | 89\% | -1\% | 89\% |
| EAL | 79\% | 81\% | -2\% | 80\% | 77\% | 81\% | -4\% | 81\% | 79\% | 82\% | -3\% | 82\% |
| Non EAL | 80\% | 81\% | -1\% | 81\% | 80\% | 81\% | -1\% | 82\% | 82\% | 82\% | 0\% | 83\% |

Phonics - \% working at Expected Standard


### 4.3.2 Gender

- In 2018, girls in Manchester achieved better than boys in the phonics check. The gender attainment gap is the same as it was with 2017 outcomes.
- Girls' attainment is $2 \%$ lower than girls nationally whereas boys' attainment is $3 \%$ lower.
- Increasing the percentage of both boys and girls meeting the required standard in phonics is a priority.


### 4.3.3 Pupils Eligible for Free School Meals

- There has been an increase of $3 \%$ in the attainment of pupils who are eligible for Free School Meals (FSM).
- The gap between outcomes for FSM and non FSM pupils continues to diminish. In 2017 this was $10 \%$ in Manchester; in 2018 this decreased to $8 \%$.
- A higher proportion of pupils eligible for FSM in Manchester met the required standard in the phonics check than the same group of pupils nationally. Manchester outcomes for FSM pupils are 4\% better than national.
- There is a $10 \%$ gap in attainment for FSM pupils in Manchester when compared with all other non FSM pupils nationally.
- The emphasis remains on improving attainment for both groups and closing the gap between these groups.


### 4.3.4 Disadvantaged Pupils

- In 2018 the proportion of disadvantaged pupils in Manchester meeting the required standard in phonics increased by $1 \%$ whilst outcomes for nondisadvantaged pupils also increased by $1 \%$.
- Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in Manchester are $3 \%$ better than outcomes for the same group of pupils nationally.
- When comparing outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in Manchester, with other non-disadvantaged pupils nationally, the difference remains at $10 \%$ as it was in 2017.
- Although improvements are being made, reducing the difference between outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in Manchester and other nondisadvantaged pupils nationally remains a priority.


### 4.3.5 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- In 2018, there was a $5 \%$ increase in Manchester pupils receiving SEN support achieving the expected standard in phonics.
- The difference between those pupils with SEN and those without SEN in Manchester achieving the expected standard in phonics has diminished by $2 \%$ since 2017.
- The difference between SEN pupils in Manchester achieving the expected standard in phonics and national other pupils has also diminished by $3 \%$.
- The difference between SEN pupils in Manchester achieving the expected standard in phonics and SEN pupils nationally has diminished to $1 \%$.
- There has been a decrease of $3 \%$ in pupils with an EHC plan achieving the expected standard in phonics. This is $7 \%$ below the same group of pupils nationally.
- Reducing the difference between outcomes for all pupils and those pupils with special educational needs remains a priority.


### 4.3.6 Pupils speaking English as an Additional Language

- In 2018 the difference between Manchester EAL learners and the national EAL group diminished by $1 \%$.


## Appendix 5: Key Stage 1

### 5.0 KEY STAGE ONE

### 5.1 Context

- Pupils should be working at the national expected or higher standard by the end of KS1. This report includes data for pupils achieving at the expected standard and higher standard.


### 5.2 Headline summary

- Outcomes at KS1 have improved in all areas of reading, writing, maths and science.
- The difference between outcomes for pupils in Manchester and pupils nationally has, overall, diminished.


### 5.3 Outcome summary

- In 2018, $72 \%$ of pupils achieved the expected standard in reading, $67 \%$ in writing, $74 \%$ in maths and $78 \%$ in science.
- There is a $3 \%$ difference between Manchester outcomes and national outcomes in reading, $3 \%$ in writing, $2 \%$ in maths and $5 \%$ in science.


### 5.4 Results by Pupil Groups: \% Achieving the expected standard

|  | KS1 \% Achieving Expected Standard in Reading Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 70\% | 74\% | -4\% | 74\% | 71\% | 76\% | -5\% | 76\% | 72\% | 75\% | -3\% | 75\% |
| Boys | 66\% | 70\% | -4\% | 70\% | 66\% | 71\% | -5\% | 71\% | 67\% | 71\% | -4\% | 71\% |
| Girls | 74\% | 78\% | -4\% | 78\% | 76\% | 80\% | -4\% | 80\% | 77\% | 80\% | -3\% | 80\% |
| FSM | 63\% | 77\% | -14\% | 60\% | 63\% | 78\% | -15\% | 60\% | 64\% | 78\% | -14\% | 60\% |
| Non FSM | 73\% | 77\% | -4\% | 77\% | 73\% | 78\% | -5\% | 78\% | 74\% | 78\% | -4\% | 78\% |
| Disadvantaged | 66\% | 78\% | -12\% | 62\% | 66\% | 79\% | -13\% | 63\% | 67\% | 79\% | -12\% | 62\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 73\% | 78\% | -5\% | 78\% | 74\% | 79\% | -5\% | 79\% | 75\% | 79\% | -4\% | 79\% |
| SEN Support | 32\% | 74\% | -42\% | 32\% | 29\% | 76\% | -47\% | 32\% | 30\% | 75\% | -45\% | 33\% |
| EHC Plan | 6\% | 74\% | -68\% | 14\% | 12\% | 76\% | -64\% | 15\% | 8\% | 75\% | -67\% | 13\% |
| No SEN | 80\% | 82\% | -2\% | 82\% | 80\% | 84\% | -3\% | 84\% | 82\% | 84\% | -2\% | 84\% |
| EAL | 66\% | 74\% | -8\% | 70\% | 66\% | 76\% | -10\% | 51\% | 69\% | 75\% | -6\% | 73\% |
| Non EAL | 74\% | 74\% | 0\% | 75\% | 75\% | 76\% | -1\% | 77\% | 75\% | 75\% | 0\% | 76\% |


|  | KS1 \% Achieving Expected Standard in Writing Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 63\% | 65\% | -2\% | 65\% | 65\% | 68\% | -3\% | 68\% | 67\% | 70\% | -3\% | 70\% |
| Boys | 57\% | 59\% | -2\% | 59\% | 58\% | 62\% | -4\% | 62\% | 61\% | 63\% | -2\% | 63\% |
| Girls | 70\% | 73\% | -3\% | 73\% | 73\% | 75\% | -2\% | 75\% | 73\% | 77\% | -4\% | 77\% |
| FSM | 55\% | 68\% | -13\% | 50\% | 56\% | 71\% | -15\% | 51\% | 57\% | 73\% | -16\% | 53\% |
| Non FSM | 66\% | 68\% | -2\% | 68\% | 68\% | 71\% | -3\% | 71\% | 69\% | 73\% | -4\% | 73\% |
| Disadvantaged | 58\% | 70\% | -12\% | 53\% | 59\% | 72\% | -13\% | 54\% | 60\% | 74\% | -14\% | 55\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 67\% | 70\% | -3\% | 70\% | 69\% | 72\% | -3\% | 72\% | 71\% | 74\% | -3\% | 74\% |
| SEN Support | 24\% | 65\% | -41\% | 22\% | 20\% | 68\% | -48\% | 22\% | 22\% | 70\% | -48\% | 25\% |
| EHC Plan | 6\% | 65\% | -59\% | 9\% | 9\% | 68\% | -59\% | 10\% | 7\% | 70\% | -63\% | 9\% |
| No SEN | 73\% | 74\% | -1\% | 74\% | 75\% | 77\% | -2\% | 77\% | 77\% | 79\% | -2\% | 79\% |
| EAL | 61\% | 65\% | -4\% | 64\% | 62\% | 68\% | -6\% | 52\% | 65\% | 70\% | -5\% | 69\% |
| Non EAL | 66\% | 65\% | 1\% | 66\% | 68\% | 68\% | 0\% | 69\% | 69\% | 70\% | -1\% | 70\% |


|  | KS1 \% Achieving Expected Standard in Maths Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 71\% | 73\% | -2\% | 73\% | 72\% | 75\% | -3\% | 75\% | 74\% | 76\% | -2\% | 76\% |
| Boys | 69\% | 72\% | -3\% | 72\% | 69\% | 74\% | -5\% | 74\% | 72\% | 75\% | -3\% | 75\% |
| Girls | 72\% | 74\% | -2\% | 74\% | 74\% | 76\% | -2\% | 76\% | 75\% | 77\% | -2\% | 77\% |
| FSM | 62\% | 75\% | -13\% | 58\% | 64\% | 78\% | -14\% | 60\% | 66\% | 79\% | -13\% | 61\% |
| Non FSM | 74\% | 75\% | -1\% | 75\% | 74\% | 78\% | -4\% | 78\% | 76\% | 79\% | -3\% | 79\% |
| Disadvantaged | 65\% | 77\% | -12\% | 60\% | 66\% | 79\% | -13\% | 62\% | 68\% | 80\% | -12\% | 63\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 75\% | 77\% | -3\% | 77\% | 75\% | 79\% | -4\% | 79\% | 77\% | 80\% | -3\% | 80\% |
| SEN Support | 34\% | 73\% | -39\% | 33\% | 30\% | 75\% | -45\% | 33\% | 35\% | 76\% | -41\% | 36\% |
| EHC Plan | 9\% | 73\% | -64\% | 14\% | 12\% | 75\% | -63\% | 15\% | 12\% | 76\% | -64\% | 13\% |
| No SEN | 80\% | 80\% | 0\% | 80\% | 81\% | 83\% | -2\% | 83\% | 83\% | 84\% | -1\% | 84\% |


| EAL | $70 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non EAL | $72 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $76 \%$ |


|  | KS1 \% Achieving Expected Standard in Science Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 77\% | 82\% | -5\% | 82\% | 77\% | 83\% | -6\% | 83\% | 78\% | 83\% | -5\% | 83\% |
| Boys | 73\% | 79\% | -6\% | 79\% | 73\% | 58\% | 15\% | 58\% | 75\% | 80\% | -5\% | 80\% |
| Girls | 80\% | 84\% | -4\% | 84\% | 81\% | 85\% | -4\% | 85\% | 81\% | 85\% | -4\% | 85\% |
| FSM | 70\% | 84\% | -14\% | 69\% | 71\% | 85\% | -14\% | 69\% | 71\% | 85\% | -14\% | 69\% |
| Non FSM | 79\% | 84\% | -5\% | 84\% | 79\% | 85\% | -6\% | 85\% | 80\% | 85\% | -5\% | 85\% |
| Disadvantaged | 73\% | 85\% | -12\% | 71\% | 73\% | 86\% | -13\% | 71\% | 74\% | 86\% | -12\% | 71\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 79\% | 85\% | -6\% | 85\% | 80\% | 86\% | -6\% | 86\% | 81\% | 86\% | -5\% | 86\% |
| SEN Support | 42\% | 82\% | -40\% | 46\% | 38\% | 83\% | -45\% | 44\% | 42\% | 83\% | -41\% | 46\% |
| EHC Plan | 7\% | 82\% | -75\% | 17\% | 12\% | 83\% | -71\% | 18\% | 11\% | 83\% | -72\% | 15\% |
| No SEN | 86\% | 89\% | -3\% | 89\% | 86\% | 90\% | -4\% | 90\% | 87\% | 90\% | -3\% | 90\% |
| EAL | 73\% | 82\% | -9\% | 77\% | 73\% | 83\% | -10\% | 80\% | 75\% | 83\% | -8\% | 79\% |
| Non EAL | 80\% | 82\% | -2\% | 83\% | 80\% | 83\% | -3\% | 84\% | 81\% | 83\% | -2\% | 84\% |

## Notes:

- The block graph below shows the data from the table above (5.4). The dark blue block relates to the percentage of KS1 pupils achieving the expected standard in 2016, red relates to outcomes in 2017 and green relates to outcomes in 2018.
- The empty space at the top of the block shows the difference between Manchester's outcomes and the national comparator group.
- The solid black line crossing each block shows the outcomes for the same group of pupils nationally.

KS1 - \% achieving Expected Standard in Reading


KS1 - \% achieving Expected Standard in Maths


Source: DfE
Produced by Children's PRI

KS1 - \% achieving Expected Standard in Writing


KS1 - \% achieving Expected Standard in Science


### 5.4.1 Gender

- In 2018, KS1 girls in Manchester outperformed boys in all subjects; mirroring the national picture.
- The difference between boys and girls achieving the expected standard in KS1 reading is $9 \%$ nationally it is $10 \%$ in Manchester. In writing, the difference in Manchester is $12 \%$, (a narrowing of $3 \%$ from 2017), whereas nationally it is $14 \%$. In maths the difference in Manchester is $3 \%$ (a narrowing of $2 \%$ since 2017) and remains at $2 \%$ nationally. The difference in science in Manchester is $6 \%$ and nationally it is $5 \%$.
- Increasing the percentage of both boys and girls achieving the expected standards in all subjects at KS1 remains a priority.


### 5.4.2 Pupils eligible for free school meals

- In 2018 the difference in outcomes for reading between FSM and non FSM pupils was $10 \%$ in Manchester, by contrast this was $18 \%$ for the same group of pupils nationally. In writing the difference was $12 \%$ in Manchester and $20 \%$ nationally. In maths it was $10 \%$ in Manchester and $18 \%$ nationally and in science $9 \%$ in Manchester and $16 \%$ nationally.
- FSM pupils in Manchester outperform FSM pupils nationally in all subjects at KS1. There still remains a difference however between FSM pupils and other non FSM pupils nationally and reducing this difference is a focus.


### 5.4.3 Disadvantaged Pupils

- The proportion of disadvantaged pupils in Manchester achieving the expected standard at KS1 in all subjects is higher than the same group nationally. However, there is a difference ( $12 \%$ in reading, maths and science and $14 \%$ in writing) between Manchester outcomes for disadvantaged pupils compared with the outcomes for all other non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.
- In 2018 the difference in outcomes for reading between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils was $8 \%$ in Manchester whereas it was $17 \%$ for the same group of pupils nationally. In writing it was $11 \%$ in Manchester and $19 \%$ nationally. In maths it was $9 \%$ in Manchester and 17\% nationally and in science $7 \%$ in Manchester and $15 \%$ nationally. Manchester outcomes for disadvantaged are significantly better than outcomes for the same group of pupils nationally.


### 5.4.4 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- In all subjects a smaller proportion of Manchester pupils receiving SEN support achieved the expected standard than SEN support pupils nationally. In reading the difference was $3 \%$, in writing $3 \%$ in maths $1 \%$ and in science $4 \%$.
- The difference in reading, writing and science outcomes for SEN support pupils in Manchester and those without any SEN is $1 \%$ greater than the difference nationally. In maths the difference is the same as that nationally.
- More pupils with an EHC plan nationally achieved the expected standard at KS1 in all subjects, than did Manchester pupils. The difference was $5 \%$ in reading, $2 \%$ in writing, $1 \%$ in maths and 45 in science. Increasing the proportion of pupils with an EHC plan, achieving the expected standard at KS1 in all subjects, is a focus area.


### 5.4.5 Pupils speaking English as an Additional Language

- The proportion of EAL learners in Manchester achieving the expected standard at KS1 is $4 \%$ lower than the same group nationally in reading and writing, $2 \%$ lower in maths and 4\% lower in science.
- The difference in outcomes for EAL learners in Manchester compared with all EAL pupils nationally is $4 \%$ lower in reading, writing and science and $2 \%$ lower in maths. The gap between outcomes for EAL and non EAL learners in Manchester is wider than the same gap nationally by $1 \%$ in reading, by $3 \%$ in writing and by $1 \%$ in maths. In science the gap is the same as that nationally.


### 5.5 Results by Pupil Groups: \% Achieving the higher standard

|  | KS1 - \% achieving Higher Standard in Reading compared with National Comparator Groups and National Same Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 18\% | 24\% | -6\% | 24\% | 20\% | 25\% | -5\% | 25\% | 22\% | 26\% | -4\% | 26\% |
| Boys | 15\% | 20\% | -5\% | 20\% | 17\% | 22\% | -5\% | 22\% | 18\% | 22\% | -4\% | 22\% |
| Girls | 20\% | 27\% | -7\% | 27\% | 23\% | 29\% | -6\% | 29\% | 26\% | 29\% | -3\% | 29\% |
| FSM | 13\% | 26\% | -13\% | 12\% | 13\% | 27\% | -14\% | 13\% | 14\% | 28\% | -14\% | 13\% |
| Non FSM | 19\% | 26\% | -7\% | 26\% | 22\% | 27\% | -5\% | 27\% | 24\% | 28\% | -4\% | 28\% |
| Disadvantaged | 14\% | 27\% | -13\% | 13\% | 15\% | 28\% | -13\% | 14\% | 17\% | 29\% | -13\% | 14\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 21\% | 27\% | -6\% | 27\% | 23\% | 28\% | -5\% | 28\% | 25\% | 29\% | -4\% | 29\% |
| SEN Support | 4\% | 24\% | -20\% | 4\% | 4\% | 25\% | -21\% | 5\% | 4\% | 26\% | -22\% | 5\% |
| EHC Plan | 1\% | 24\% | -23\% | 2\% | 1\% | 25\% | -24\% | 3\% | 4\% | 26\% | -23\% | 2\% |
| No SEN | 21\% | 27\% | -6\% | 27\% | 24\% | 29\% | -5\% | 29\% | 26\% | 29\% | -4\% | 29\% |
| EAL | 16\% | 24\% | -9\% | 20\% | 17\% | 25\% | -8\% | 23\% | 19\% | 26\% | -7\% | 22\% |
| Non EAL | 20\% | 24\% | -4\% | 25\% | 23\% | 25\% | -2\% | 27\% | 24\% | 26\% | -2\% | 27\% |


|  | KS1 - \% achieving Higher Standard in Writing compared with National Comparator Groups and National Same Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 10\% | 13\% | -3\% | 13\% | 14\% | 16\% | -2\% | 16\% | 14\% | 16\% | -2\% | 16\% |
| Boys | 7\% | 10\% | -3\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | -1\% | 11\% | 10\% | 12\% | -2\% | 12\% |
| Girls | 13\% | 17\% | -4\% | 17\% | 18\% | 20\% | -2\% | 20\% | 18\% | 20\% | -2\% | 20\% |
| FSM | 7\% | 15\% | -8\% | 6\% | 8\% | 17\% | -9\% | 7\% | 8\% | 17\% | -9\% | 7\% |
| Non FSM | 11\% | 15\% | -4\% | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | -1\% | 17\% | 16\% | 17\% | -1\% | 17\% |
| Disadvantaged | 7\% | 16\% | -9\% | 7\% | 9\% | 18\% | -9\% | 8\% | 9\% | 18\% | -9\% | 8\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 12\% | 16\% | -4\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | -1\% | 18\% | 17\% | 18\% | -1\% | 18\% |


| SEN Support | $1 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $-12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-14 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-14 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EHC Plan | $1 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $-12 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-16 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-14 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| No SEN | $12 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| EAL | $10 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Non EAL | $11 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $16 \%$ |


|  | KS1 - \% achieving Higher Standard in Maths compared with National Comparator Groups and National Same Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 15\% | 18\% | -3\% | 18\% | 18\% | 20\% | -2\% | 20\% | 20\% | 22\% | -2\% | 22\% |
| Boys | 16\% | 19\% | -3\% | 19\% | 19\% | 22\% | -3\% | 22\% | 21\% | 24\% | -3\% | 24\% |
| Girls | 13\% | 16\% | -3\% | 16\% | 16\% | 19\% | -3\% | 19\% | 19\% | 20\% | -1\% | 20\% |
| FSM | 10\% | 19\% | -9\% | 9\% | 11\% | 22\% | -11\% | 10\% | 13\% | 24\% | -11\% | 11\% |
| Non FSM | 11\% | 19\% | -8\% | 19\% | 16\% | 22\% | -6\% | 22\% | 16\% | 24\% | -8\% | 24\% |
| Disadvantaged | 10\% | 20\% | -10\% | 10\% | 13\% | 23\% | -10\% | 11\% | 14\% | 25\% | -11\% | 12\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 18\% | 20\% | -2\% | 20\% | 21\% | 23\% | -2\% | 23\% | 24\% | 25\% | -2\% | 25\% |
| SEN Support | 3\% | 18\% | -15\% | 4\% | 4\% | 20\% | -16\% | 4\% | 4\% | 22\% | -18\% | 5\% |
| EHC Plan | 2\% | 18\% | -16\% | 2\% | 1\% | 20\% | -19\% | 2\% | 3\% | 22\% | -19\% | 2\% |
| No SEN | 17\% | 20\% | -3\% | 20\% | 20\% | 23\% | -3\% | 23\% | 23\% | 25\% | -2\% | 25\% |
| EAL | 15\% | 18\% | -3\% | 18\% | 17\% | 20\% | -3\% | 20\% | 20\% | 22\% | -2\% | 21\% |
| Non EAL | 15\% | 18\% | -3\% | 18\% | 18\% | 20\% | -2\% | 21\% | 20\% | 22\% | -2\% | 22\% |

## Notes:

- The block graphs on page 22 shows the data from the table above (5.5). The dark blue block relates to the percentage of KS1 pupils achieving a higher standard in reading in 2016, red relates to outcomes in writing and green relates to maths.
- The empty space at the top of the block shows the difference between Manchester's outcomes and the national comparator group.
- The solid black line crossing each block shows the outcomes for the same group of pupils nationally.




### 5.5.1 Gender

- In 2018, the proportion of girls achieving a higher standard at KS1 in reading and writing was higher than boys, in addition, the difference increased from 2017. In maths more boys achieved at the higher standard.
- A lower proportion boys and girls in Manchester achieved the higher standard in all subjects than in the same groups nationally. The difference between Manchester outcomes at the higher standard and outcomes at the higher standard nationally in reading was $4 \%$ for boys and $3 \%$ for girls. In writing it was $2 \%$ for boys and $2 \%$ for girls. In maths it was $3 \%$ for boys and $1 \%$ for girls.
- Girls in Manchester outperformed boys at the higher standard in reading and maths by $8 \%$, conversely, in maths, boys outperformed girls by $2 \%$.
- Increasing the percentage of both boys and girls achieving the higher standard in all subjects at KS1 remains a priority, as does reducing the difference in outcomes for boys and girls.


### 5.5.2 Pupils eligible for free school meals

- In 2018 the difference in outcomes at the higher standard for reading between FSM and non FSM pupils was 10\% in Manchester. By comparison, the difference was $15 \%$ for the same groups of pupils nationally. In writing the difference was $8 \%$ in Manchester, but $10 \%$ nationally and in maths it was $3 \%$ in Manchester and 13\% nationally.
- Outcomes at the higher standard for FSM pupils in Manchester were slightly higher than outcomes for FSM pupils nationally. There still remains a difference however between FSM pupils and other non FSM pupils nationally and reducing this difference is a focus.


### 5.5.3 Disadvantaged Pupils

- The proportion of disadvantaged pupils in Manchester achieving the higher standard at KS1 in all subjects was slightly higher than the same group of pupils nationally. However, there was a $12 \%$ difference in reading, $9 \%$ difference in writing and $111 \%$ difference in maths between Manchester outcomes for disadvantaged pupils and all other non-disadvantaged pupils nationally.
- In 2018 the difference in outcomes at the higher standard for reading between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged pupils was $8 \%$ in Manchester whereas it was $15 \%$ for the same group of pupils nationally. In writing it was $8 \%$ in Manchester and $10 \%$ nationally. In maths it was $10 \%$ in Manchester and $13 \%$ nationally.


### 5.5.4 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- A similar proportion of Manchester pupils receiving SEN support achieved the higher standard in reading, writing and maths when compared with the same group of pupils nationally. However, a slightly higher proportion of Manchester pupils on an EHC plan achieved the higher standard in all subjects than the same group of pupils nationally.


### 5.5.5 Pupils speaking English as an Additional Language

- The proportion of EAL learners in Manchester achieving the higher standard at KS1 was $3 \%$ lower than the same group nationally in reading, $1 \%$ lower in writing and $1 \%$ lower in maths.


## Appendix 6: Key Stage 2

## 6. KEY STAGE TWO (KS2) Results

### 6.1 Context

In 2016 the measures for KS2 performance changed. Where previously results were recorded as the percentage of pupils gaining a particular national curriculum level, the key measure since 2016 is the percentage of pupils reaching an expected standard. This measure has been assessed by tests (and teacher assessment) in reading, maths, grammar, punctuation and spelling (GPS) and through teacher assessment alone in writing and science.

The headline measures are:

- the percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics (RWM) (the assessing for measuring writing changed in 2018 so RWM outcomes are not comparable to 2016 \& 2017)
- the percentage of pupils achieving the higher standard in reading, writing and mathematics (Changes to the assessment regime in 2018 mean writing comparisons are not directly comparable to recent years.)
- the school's progress score in each of reading, writing and maths
- the pupil's average scaled* score in each of reading and mathematics
*The scaled score takes pupils actual scores and using a statistical model, supported by a panel of teachers, adjusts scores to fall in a range from $80-120$. A score of 99 or below means a pupil has not reached the expected standard. 100 or more signifies a pupil has met the expected standard and above 110 has exceeded the expected standard.


## Interpreting progress scores

By definition, the average progress score, for all mainstream pupils nationally, is zero.
A school's progress scores, for each of English reading, English writing and mathematics are the average of each of its pupils' progress score in that subject.
School level progress scores will be presented as positive and negative numbers either side of zero.

- a score of 0 means pupils in this school, on average, do about as well as those with similar prior attainment nationally
- a positive score means pupils in this school, on average, do better than those with similar prior attainment nationally
- a negative score means pupils in this school, on average, do worse than those with similar prior attainment nationally.
(A negative score does not mean that pupils did not make any progress; rather it means they made less progress than other pupils nationally with similar starting points. In 2018 research from recent years was applied to ensure that highly negative scores are not included in the calculation for progress scores so that this does not impact disproportionately on the overall outcome)


## Notes: Using the new national comparators to compare local performance with national outcomes for progress and attainment of pupil groups; raising the bar.

In order to be able to interpret the data at KS2 please refer to the table at the start of this document which clearly sets out the national comparator groups which changed in 2016.

To assist in understanding how outcomes for particular groups are changing, a measure described as NAT (SAME) has been added to some of the tables where the data is available. This provides the outcomes for the same group nationally, so that a comparison can be made to national outcomes with similar groups of Manchester learners.

### 6.2 Headlines

## Attainment at KS2

- $62.2 \%$ of pupils in Manchester have met the expected standard in reading, writing and maths combined. This is $3 \%$ above the results for 2017 but widens the gap with the national average of $64 \%$ to $1.8 \%$. This year the KS2 results for a number of pupils have been annulled for Reading, Writing and Maths due to maladministration of the assessments; this is currently being investigated. The outcomes for Manchester increases to $63.8 \%$ when these results, currently recorded as zero, are removed from the calculation.
- In Maths, the Manchester average was $1 \%$ below the national average for pupils achieving the expected standard. The percentage of pupils in Manchester achieving the expected standard in reading and writing were both below the national average, by 3 percentage points. Manchester is in line with the percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard nationally in Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling (GPS). The average scaled score for Maths and GPS was the same as the national average. The average scaled score for reading was lower than the national average.
- Science outcomes for pupils achieving the expected standard were $4 \%$ below the national average.
- Manchester had $7 \%$ of pupils achieving the higher standard in combined reading, writing and maths. This is $2 \%$ below the national average. Pupil outcomes at the higher standard were $4 \%$ below the national average in reading, $3 \%$ below in writing and Manchester pupils' outcomes were the same as national outcomes in maths.
- Of the components making up the RWM measure for all pupil groups in Manchester, reading was the lowest performing element.


## Progress in 2018 at KS2

All progress scores (reading, writing and mathematics) for the 2017 cohort of Manchester pupils were above the national average and statistically significantly better; showing that children in Manchester made more progress in all areas of their learning. This maintains the positive progress outcomes in 2017.

### 6.3 Percentage of pupil groups achieving Expected Standard at KS2 in Manchester LA compared with national comparator groups

## Summary

- Of the three elements making up the KS2 reading, writing, maths (RWM) expected measure, reading and writing were the areas where all learners were the furthest away from national outcomes, at $-3 \%$. This placed the outcomes for Manchester pupils in terms of RWM $110^{\text {th }}$ out of 152 Local Authorities. The progress made by Manchester pupils in reading is in the top quartile of local authorities and places Manchester $24^{\text {th }}$ out of all Local Authorities.
- In maths, expected outcomes in Manchester are slightly below national but progress in maths is in the top quartile of Local Authorities.


## Comparison with national averages

|  | KS2 \% Achieving Expected Standard in Reading Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 63\% | 66\% | -3\% | 66\% | 69\% | 72\% | -3\% | 72\% | 72\% | 75\% | -3\% | 75\% |
| Boys | 59\% | 62\% | -3\% | 62\% | 66\% | 68\% | -2\% | 68\% | 69\% | 72\% | -3\% | 72\% |
| Girls | 66\% | 70\% | -4\% | 70\% | 72\% | 75\% | -3\% | 75\% | 76\% | 79\% | -3\% | 79\% |
| FSM | 54\% | 69\% | -15\% | 49\% | 60\% | 74\% | -14\% | 55\% | 63\% | 78\% | -15\% | 60\% |
| Non FSM | 66\% | 69\% | -3\% | 69\% | 72\% | 74\% | -2\% | 74\% | 76\% | 78\% | -2\% | 78\% |
| Disadvantaged | 56\% | 72\% | -16\% | 53\% | 63\% | 77\% | -14\% | 60\% | 67\% | 80\% | -13\% | 64\% |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | 70\% | 72\% | -2\% | 72\% | 75\% | 77\% | -2\% | 77\% | 78\% | 80\% | -2\% | 80\% |
| SEN Support | 34\% | 66\% | -32\% | 32\% | 36\% | 72\% | -36\% | 37\% | 44\% | 75\% | -31\% | 43\% |
| EHC Plan | 10\% | 66\% | -56\% | 14\% | 8\% | 72\% | -64\% | 15\% | 16\% | 75\% | -60\% | 16\% |
| No SEN | 71\% | 74\% | -3\% | 74\% | 78\% | 80\% | -2\% | 80\% | 81\% | 83\% | -2\% | 83\% |
| EAL | 57\% | 66\% | -9\% | 58\% | 63\% | 72\% | -9\% | 65\% | 68\% | 75\% | -8\% | 71\% |
| Non EAL | 66\% | 66\% | 0\% | 68\% | 73\% | 72\% | 1\% | 73\% | 76\% | 75\% | 1\% | 77\% |


|  | KS2 \% Achieving Expected Standard in Writing Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 73\% | 74\% | -1\% | 74\% | 75\% | 76\% | -1\% | 76\% | 75\% | 78\% | -3\% | 78\% |
| Boys | 66\% | 68\% | -2\% | 68\% | 69\% | 70\% | -1\% | 70\% | 70\% | 72\% | -2\% | 72\% |
| Girls | 80\% | 81\% | -1\% | 81\% | 81\% | 82\% | -1\% | 82\% | 81\% | 84\% | -3\% | 84\% |
| FSM | 42\% | 77\% | -35\% | 59\% | 66\% | 79\% | -13\% | 61\% | 65\% | 81\% | -16\% | 63\% |
| Non FSM | 77\% | 77\% | 0\% | 77\% | 78\% | 79\% | -1\% | 79\% | 79\% | 81\% | -2\% | 81\% |
| Disadvantaged | 68\% | 79\% | -11\% | 64\% | 70\% | 81\% | -12\% | 66\% | 70\% | 83\% | -13\% | 67\% |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | 79\% | 79\% | 0\% | 79\% | 80\% | 81\% | -1\% | 81\% | 81\% | 83\% | -2\% | 83\% |
| SEN Support | 34\% | 74\% | -40\% | 32\% | 33\% | 76\% | -43\% | 34\% | 38\% | 78\% | -40\% | 38\% |
| EHC Plan | 9\% | 74\% | -65\% | 13\% | 5\% | 76\% | -71\% | 13\% | 12\% | 78\% | -66\% | 13\% |
| No SEN | 84\% | 84\% | 0\% | 84\% | 86\% | 86\% | 0\% | 86\% | 86\% | 88\% | -2\% | 88\% |


| EAL | $70 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $-6 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non EAL | $75 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $79 \%$ |


|  | KS2 \% Achieving Expected Standard in Maths Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 71\% | 70\% | 1\% | 70\% | 75\% | 75\% | 0\% | 75\% | 75\% | 76\% | -1\% | 76\% |
| Boys | 70\% | 70\% | 0\% | 70\% | 74\% | 75\% | -1\% | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% | 0\% | 75\% |
| Girls | 72\% | 70\% | 2\% | 70\% | 77\% | 75\% | 2\% | 75\% | 76\% | 76\% | 0\% | 76\% |
| FSM | 62\% | 73\% | -11\% | 54\% | 65\% | 78\% | -14\% | 59\% | 65\% | 78\% | -13\% | 59\% |
| Non FSM | 75\% | 73\% | 2\% | 73\% | 79\% | 78\% | 1\% | 78\% | 79\% | 78\% | 1\% | 78\% |
| Disadvantaged | 65\% | 76\% | -11\% | 58\% | 69\% | 80\% | -12\% | 63\% | 69\% | 81\% | -12\% | 64\% |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | 79\% | 76\% | 3\% | 76\% | 83\% | 80\% | 3\% | 80\% | 82\% | 81\% | 1\% | 81\% |
| SEN Support | 39\% | 70\% | -31\% | 36\% | 42\% | 75\% | -33\% | 41\% | 46\% | 76\% | -31\% | 42\% |
| EHC Plan | 14\% | 70\% | -56\% | 15\% | 10\% | 75\% | -65\% | 15\% | 13\% | 76\% | -63\% | 15\% |
| No SEN | 80\% | 78\% | 2\% | 78\% | 85\% | 83\% | 2\% | 83\% | 84\% | 84\% | 0\% | 84\% |
| EAL | 71\% | 70\% | 1\% | 72\% | 76\% | 75\% | 1\% | 76\% | 75\% | 76\% | -1\% | 77\% |
| Non EAL | 71\% | 70\% | 1\% | 69\% | 76\% | 75\% | 1\% | 75\% | 76\% | 76\% | 0\% | 75\% |


|  | KS2 \% Achieving Expected Standard in RWM Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 52\% | 53\% | -1\% | 53\% | 60\% | 61\% | -1\% | 61\% | 62\% | 64\% | -2\% | 64\% |
| Boys | 48\% | 50\% | -2\% | 50\% | 56\% | 57\% | -1\% | 57\% | 58\% | 61\% | -3\% | 61\% |
| Girls | 56\% | 57\% | -1\% | 57\% | 64\% | 65\% | -1\% | 65\% | 66\% | 68\% | -2\% | 68\% |
| FSM | 42\% | 57\% | -15\% | 35\% | 49\% | 64\% | -15\% | 43\% | 51\% | 68\% | -17\% | 46\% |
| Non FSM | 56\% | 57\% | -1\% | 57\% | 64\% | 64\% | 0\% | 64\% | 66\% | 68\% | -2\% | 68\% |
| Disadvantaged | 45\% | 60\% | -15\% | 39\% | 53\% | 67\% | -14\% | 48\% | 56\% | 70\% | -14\% | 51\% |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | 61\% | 60\% | 1\% | 60\% | 68\% | 67\% | 1\% | 67\% | 69\% | 70\% | -1\% | 70\% |


| SEN Support | $18 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $-35 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $-39 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $-37 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EHC Plan | $5 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $-48 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $-59 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $-56 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| No SEN | $61 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| EAL | $48 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
| Non EAL | $55 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $65 \%$ |


|  | KS2 \% Achieving Expected Standard in Science Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Manchester | National | Diff | Same | Manchester | National | Diff | Same | Manchester | National | Diff | Same |
| All | 77\% | 81\% | -4\% | 81\% | 78\% | 82\% | -4\% | 82\% | 79\% | 82\% | -3\% | 82\% |
| Boys | 74\% | 79\% | -5\% | 79\% | 75\% | 79\% | -4\% | 79\% | 77\% | 80\% | -3\% | 80\% |
| Girls | 80\% | 83\% | -3\% | 83\% | 82\% | 84\% | -2\% | 84\% | 82\% | 85\% | -3\% | 85\% |
| FSM | 68\% |  |  |  | 68\% |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |
| Non FSM | 81\% |  |  |  | 82\% |  |  |  | 82\% |  |  |  |
| Disadvantaged | 71\% |  |  |  | 73\% |  |  |  | 74\% |  |  |  |
| Non Disadvantaged | 83\% |  |  |  | 85\% |  |  |  | 84\% |  |  |  |
| SEN Support | 44\% | 81\% | -37\% |  | 42\% | 82\% | -40\% |  | 46\% | 82\% | $36 \%$ |  |
| EHC Plan | 12\% | 81\% | -69\% |  | 6\% | 82\% | -76\% |  | 15\% | 82\% | $67 \%$ |  |
| No SEN | 86\% |  |  |  | 89\% |  |  |  | 89\% |  |  |  |
| EAL | 73\% | 81\% | -8\% |  | 77\% | 82\% | -5\% |  | 76\% | 82\% | -6\% |  |
| Non EAL | 79\% | 81\% | -2\% |  | 79\% | 82\% | -3\% |  | 0\% | 82\% | 82\% |  |

National comparators for science are only available for all pupils, boys and girls.

### 6.3.1 Gender

- In 2018, at KS2 girls continued to out-perform boys in all areas with the greatest difference in writing (11\%) and least in maths (1\%). Girls' and boys' performance in maths is in line with national. In writing the gender gap has closed by 3\% since 2016 and at $11 \%$ is $1 \%$ below that seen nationally. The smallest gap, at $1 \%$ in line with national, is seen in maths outcomes.


### 6.3.2 Pupils eligible for free school meals

- In 2018 at KS2 the difference between outcomes for writing and maths outcomes for FSM and non FSM in Manchester was the largest at $14 \%$ (nationally 18/19\% respectively). In reading the gap was $13 \%$ in Manchester against $18 \%$ nationally. Outcomes at KS2 in RWM for FSM pupils placed Manchester $38^{\text {th }}$ out of all local authorities. FSM learners in Manchester did better in writing ( $2 \%$ ) in reading ( $+3 \%$ ) and in maths ( $+6 \%$ ) when compared with other FSM pupils nationally. They also did better than the similar group in the RWM ( $+5 \%$ ) combined measure.


### 6.3.3 Disadvantaged Pupils

- The new national comparators in 2017 highlight maths as a focus for disadvantaged pupils. This measure has the largest difference for outcomes when compared with non-disadvantaged Manchester learners. However outcomes in RWM at KS2 for disadvantaged pupils placed Manchester $34^{\text {th }}$ out of all local authorities. When compared with the national disadvantaged cohort, disadvantaged learners in Manchester exceed national outcomes in all measures: reading $(+3 \%)$, writing $(+3 \%)$, maths $(+5 \%)$, combined RWM $(+5 \%)$. The difference between the non-disadvantaged cohort and the disadvantaged cohort was between $11 \%$ (reading and writing) and $13 \%$ (maths) with all outcomes at least $4 \%$ less than the national difference.


### 6.3.4 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- In comparing the outcomes for Manchester pupils in receipt of SEN support with the similar group nationally their outcomes are in line in writing, $+1 \%$ in reading, $+4 \%$ in maths and $+3 \%$ overall for RWM.
- However, KS2 outcomes in 2018 for learners with SEN support showed that there continue to be significant gaps to national comparators in all areas.
- Outcomes for pupils with an EHC plan are in line to national in reading outcomes but below the national cohort of pupils with EHC plans in writing and maths.


### 6.3.5 Pupils speaking English as an Additional Language

- EAL learners in Manchester are below the national outcomes in each area compared with those learners in the EAL national cohort; reading (-3\%), writing $(-5 \%)$ and maths (-2\%) in 2018. In Manchester the largest difference in outcomes is in reading where the difference between EAL and non EAL learners is $8 \%$. (nationally this is $6 \%$ ) The smallest difference is in maths ( $1 \%$ ) (nationally $2 \%$ ). Non EAL learners are at least in line with national outcomes.
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### 6.4 Percentage of pupil groups achieving Higher Standard at KS2 in Manchester LA compared with national comparator groups

## Comparison with national averages

For pupils to achieve the higher standard they must have gained a scaled score in the relevant subject at 110 or above. In writing a moderated teacher assessment indicating they were working at the higher standard must be achieved.

|  | KS2 \% Achieving Higher Standard in Reading Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 15\% | 19\% | -4\% | 19\% | 21\% | 25\% | -4\% | 25\% | 26\% | 28\% | -2\% | 28\% |
| Boys | 12\% | 16\% | -4\% | 16\% | 19\% | 22\% | -3\% | 22\% | 22\% | 24\% | -2\% | 24\% |
| Girls | 17\% | 22\% | -5\% | 22\% | 24\% | 21\% | 3\% | 21\% | 30\% | 33\% | -3\% | 33\% |
| FSM | 9\% | 21\% | -13\% | 8\% | 13\% | 27\% | -14\% | 12\% | 18\% | 30\% | -12\% | 16\% |
| Non FSM | 17\% | 21\% | -4\% | 21\% | 24\% | 27\% | -3\% | 27\% | 29\% | 30\% | -1\% | 30\% |


| Disadvantaged | $10 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $-14 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $-13 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $-12 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | $21 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| SEN Support | $5 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $-14 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $-22 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $-17 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| EHC Plan | $2 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $-17 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $-24 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $-23 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| No SEN | $17 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| EAL | $11 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $-8 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $-9 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $-7 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| Non EAL | $17 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $29 \%$ |


|  | KS2 \% Achieving Higher Standard in Writing Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 12\% | 15\% | -3\% | 15\% | 15\% | 18\% | -3\% | 18\% | 16\% | 20\% | -4\% | 20\% |
| Boys | 9\% | 11\% | -2\% | 11\% | 11\% | 13\% | -2\% | 13\% | 13\% | 15\% | -2\% | 15\% |
| Girls | 15\% | 19\% | -4\% | 19\% | 18\% | 23\% | -5\% | 23\% | 20\% | 25\% | -5\% | 25\% |
| FSM | 7\% | 16\% | -9\% | 7\% | 9\% | 19\% | -10\% | 8\% | 11\% | 22\% | -11\% | 10\% |
| Non FSM | 14\% | 16\% | -2\% | 16\% | 17\% | 19\% | -2\% | 19\% | 18\% | 22\% | -4\% | 22\% |
| Disadvantaged | 8\% | 18\% | -10\% | 8\% | 11\% | 21\% | -10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 24\% | -12\% | 11\% |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | 16\% | 18\% | -2\% | 18\% | 19\% | 21\% | -2\% | 21\% | 21\% | 24\% | -4\% | 24\% |
| SEN Support | 3\% | 15\% | -12\% | 2\% | 3\% | 18\% | -15\% | 3\% | 3\% | 20\% | -17\% | 3\% |
| EHC Plan | 0\% | 15\% | -15\% | 1\% | 0\% | 18\% | -18\% | 1\% | 1\% | 20\% | -19\% | 2\% |
| No SEN | 14\% | 17\% | -3\% | 17\% | 18\% | 21\% | -3\% | 21\% | 20\% | 24\% | -4\% | 24\% |
| EAL | 11\% | 15\% | -4\% | 14\% | 13\% | 18\% | -5\% | 16\% | 14\% | 20\% | -7\% | 19\% |
| Non EAL | 13\% | 15\% | -2\% | 15\% | 16\% | 18\% | -3\% | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | -2\% | 20\% |

KS2 \% Achieving Higher Standard in Maths Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same

|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 16\% | 17\% | -1\% | 17\% | 23\% | 23\% | 0\% | 23\% | 23\% | 24\% | -1\% | 24\% |
| Boys | 18\% | 18\% | 0\% | 18\% | 24\% | 24\% | 0\% | 24\% | 24\% | 26\% | -2\% | 26\% |
| Girls | 14\% | 15\% | -1\% | 15\% | 22\% | 21\% | 1\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% | -1\% | 22\% |
| FSM | 9\% | 18\% | -9\% | 8\% | 12\% | 25\% | -13\% | 11\% | 14\% | 26\% | -12\% | 12\% |
| Non FSM | 19\% | 18\% | 1\% | 18\% | 27\% | 25\% | 2\% | 25\% | 26\% | 26\% | 0\% | 26\% |
| Disadvantaged | 10\% | 20\% | -10\% | 9\% | 16\% | 27\% | -11\% | 13\% | 17\% | 28\% | -11\% | 14\% |
| Non Disadvantaged | 23\% | 20\% | 3\% | 20\% | 32\% | 27\% | 5\% | 27\% | 29\% | 28\% | 0\% | 28\% |
| SEN Support | 4\% | 17\% | -13\% | 4\% | 6\% | 23\% | -17\% | 5\% | 6\% | 24\% | -18\% | 6\% |
| EHC Plan | 2\% | 17\% | -15\% | 2\% | 1\% | 23\% | -23\% | 3\% | 4\% | 24\% | -20\% | 3\% |
| No SEN | 19\% | 19\% | 0\% | 19\% | 28\% | 26\% | 2\% | 26\% | 27\% | 27\% | 0\% | 27\% |
| EAL | 17\% | 17\% | -1\% | 20\% | 24\% | 23\% | 1\% | 26\% | 23\% | 24\% | -1\% | 27\% |
| Non EAL | 16\% | 17\% | -1\% | 16\% | 23\% | 23\% | 0\% | 22\% | 22\% | 24\% | -2\% | 23\% |


|  | KS2 \% Achieving Higher Standard in RWM Compared with National Comparator Groups and Same Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same | Man | Nat | Diff | Same |
| All | 4\% | 5\% | -1\% | 5\% | 7\% | 9\% | -2\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | -1\% | 10\% |
| Boys | 4\% | 5\% | -1\% | 5\% | 5\% | 7\% | -2\% | 7\% | 8\% | 8\% | 0\% | 8\% |
| Girls | 5\% | 6\% | -1\% | 6\% | 9\% | 10\% | -1\% | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | -2\% | 12\% |
| FSM | 2\% | 6\% | -5\% | 2\% | 3\% | 10\% | -7\% | 0\% | 4\% | 11\% | -7\% | 4\% |
| Non FSM | 5\% | 6\% | -1\% | 6\% | 9\% | 10\% | -1\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 0\% | 11\% |
| Disadvantaged | 2\% | 7\% | -5\% | 2\% | 5\% | 11\% | -6\% | 4\% | 6\% | 12\% | -6\% | 4\% |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | 7\% | 7\% | 0\% | 7\% | 10\% | 11\% | -1\% | 11\% | 12\% | 12\% | 0\% | 12\% |
| SEN Support | 1\% | 5\% | -5\% | 0\% | 1\% | 9\% | -8\% | 1\% | 1\% | 10\% | -9\% | 1\% |
| EHC Plan | 0\% | 5\% | -5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 9\% | -9\% | 1\% | 1\% | 10\% | -9\% | 1\% |
| No SEN | 5\% | 6\% | -1\% | 6\% | 9\% | 10\% | -1\% | 10\% | 11\% | 12\% | -1\% | 12\% |
| EAL | 4\% | 5\% | -1\% | 5\% | 6\% | 9\% | -3\% | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% | -2\% | 10\% |
| Non EAL | 5\% | 5\% | -1\% | 5\% | 8\% | 9\% | -1\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 0\% | 10\% |

### 6.4.1 Gender

- In 2018, $2 \%$ more girls than boys achieved the Higher Standard in RWM. Nationally this measure was $4 \%$. In Manchester $8 \%$ more girls than boys achieved the Higher Standard in reading. 7\% more girls than boys achieved the Higher Standard in writing. 3\% more boys than girls achieved the Higher Standard in maths. Boys' outcomes in 2018 moved from being in line with national boys outcomes for maths in 2017 to $2 \%$ below in 2018. Girls have moved from $1 \%$ above to $1 \%$ below other girls nationally in maths. Boys' outcomes in writing are below other boys nationally ( $2 \%$ ) but girls' outcomes are further below ( $5 \%$ ).


### 6.4.2 Pupils eligible for free school meals

- In 2018 FSM pupils achieved above the national averages for similar pupils at the Higher Standard in reading (+2\%), writing (+1\%) and maths (+2\%). In Manchester the percentage of the FSM cohort achieving the Higher Standard in RWM is in line with national.


### 6.4.3 Disadvantaged Pupils

- In 2018 2\% more Manchester disadvantaged pupils achieved the Higher Standard in RWM than the national disadvantaged comparator group; this is an increase of $1 \%$. When compared with the national cohort of disadvantaged learners, Manchester learners were above national comparator outcomes by $3 \%$ in reading, $1 \%$ in writing and $3 \%$ in maths.


### 6.4.4 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- KS2 outcomes in 2018 for pupils with SEN support is now above or in line with the same cohort nationally. In 2018 reading outcomes were $2 \%$ above. In maths and writing outcomes were in line with the national similar group and overall Manchester pupils achieved in line with national at outcomes for Higher Standard in RWM.
- Manchester pupils with an EHC plan attaining the Higher Standard in RWM overall improved to be in line with national figures (1\%).


### 6.4.5 Pupils speaking English as an Additional Language

- In 2018 outcomes for Manchester pupils with EAL were slightly below that seen by the national EAL cohort. In RWM the gap to national in 2018 was $2 \%$ for reading and $1 \%$ for writing and maths.
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New progress measures were calculated for the first time in 2016 identifying each pupil's starting point in KS1 and plotting expected progress and measuring against the number of learners making this progress. If all pupils make the progress, a score of zero is recorded. A score greater than zero highlights pupils making more progress than would be expected. A score below zero suggests progress is below what would be expected.
Progress for All pupils in Manchester is above what would be expected in:

- reading (+0.9)
- writing (+0.3)
- and maths (+1.1)

|  | Progress Scores in Reading with National comparator groups and National Same groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same |
| All | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 |
| Boys | 0.1 | -0.3 | 0.4 | -0.3 | 0.48 | -0.3 | 0.78 | -0.3 | 0.5 | -0.4 | 0.9 | -0.4 |
| Girls | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.64 | 0.3 | 0.34 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.4 |
| FSM | -0.1 | 0.2 | -0.3 | -0.9 | 0.09 | 0.2 | -0.11 | -0.9 | 0.1 | 0.2 | -0.1 | -0.8 |
| Non FSM | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.74 | 0.2 | 0.54 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 |
| Disadvantaged | -0.2 | 0.3 | -0.5 | -0.7 | 0.28 | 0.3 | -0.02 | -0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | -0.6 |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | 1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.87 | 0.3 | 0.57 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
| SEN Support | -0.2 | 0 | -0.2 | -1.3 | -0.18 | 0 | -0.18 | -1.2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.4 | -1 |
| EHC Plan | -3.3 | 0 | -3.3 | -3.1 | -5.36 | 0 | -5.36 | -3.7 | -3 | 0 | -3 | -3.8 |
| No SEN | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.84 | 0.3 | 0.54 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| EAL | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.32 | 0 | 0.32 | 0.3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Non EAL | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 | -0.1 | 0.69 | 0 | 0.69 | -0.1 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.9 | -0.1 |


|  | Progress Scores in Writing with National comparator groups and National Same groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same |
| All | 0.8 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.52 | 0 | 0.52 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 |
| Boys | 0 | -0.8 | 0.8 | -0.8 | -0.18 | -0.8 | 0.62 | -0.8 | -0.5 | -0.8 | 0.3 | -0.8 |
| Girls | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.22 | 0.8 | 0.42 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| FSM | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 | -0.7 | -0.6 | 0.1 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| Non FSM | 1 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.69 | 0.1 | 0.59 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 |


| Disadvantaged | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | -0.3 | 0.29 | 0.2 | 0.09 | -0.4 | -0.2 | 0.2 | -0.4 | -0.4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non <br> Disadvantaged | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0.78 | 0.2 | 0.58 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| SEN Support | -1 | 0 | -1 | -2.4 | -1.88 | 0 | -1.88 | -2.2 | -1.7 | 0 | -1.7 | -1.8 |
| EHC Plan | -2.8 | 0 | -2.8 | -4 | -6.41 | 0 | -6.41 | -4.3 | -3.2 | 0 | -3.2 | -4.1 |
| No SEN | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| EAL | 1.3 | 0 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.48 | 0 | 1.48 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.6 | -0.2 |
| Non EAL | 0.6 | 0 | 0.6 | -0.3 | -0.07 | 0 | -0.07 | -0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -0.2 |


|  | Progress Scores in Maths with National Comparator group and National Same group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  |  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same |
| All | 1.1 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 1.35 | 0 | 1.35 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 |
| Boys | 1.7 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.94 | 0.6 | 1.34 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Girls | 0.6 | -0.6 | 1.2 | -0.6 | 0.76 | -0.7 | 1.46 | -0.7 | 0.6 | -0.7 | 1.3 | -0.7 |
| FSM | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | -0.7 | 0.41 | 0.2 | 0.21 | -0.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 | -0.1 | -0.8 |
| Non FSM | 1.3 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 1.71 | 0.2 | 1.51 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 |
| Disadvantaged | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | -0.5 | 0.78 | 0.3 | 0.48 | -0.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | -0.6 |
| Non Disadvantaged | 1.7 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 0.3 |
| SEN Support | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1.1 | 0.14 | 0 | 0.14 | -1.1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.2 | -1 |
| EHC Plan | -2.4 | 0 | -2.4 | -3.5 | -4.72 | 0 | -4.72 | -4.1 | -3.2 | 0 | -3.2 | -3.8 |
| No SEN | 1.5 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 1.74 | 0.3 | 1.44 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.3 |
| EAL | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2.24 | 0 | 2.24 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 0 | 2.2 | -0.4 |
| Non Eal | 0.6 | 0 | 0.6 | -0.4 | 0.81 | 0 | 0.81 | -0.4 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | -0.4 |

### 6.5.1 Gender

- Gender performance in 2018 mirrors that of 2017. In reading girls' progress is slightly better than boys; in writing girls' progress remains better than boys; in maths boys' progress is better than girls'. Manchester boys and girls made more progress than pupils nationally in reading, writing and maths.


### 6.5.2 Pupils eligible for free school meals

- FSM pupils made more progress in reading, writing and maths; when compared with the national FSM cohort. Progress was better for Manchester pupils with FSM in all subjects. An improving trend is seen in reading. In maths and writing a narrowing of the difference with the national cohort is seen in 2018.


### 6.5.3 Disadvantaged Pupils

- Disadvantaged pupils from Manchester made more progress when compared with the national disadvantaged cohort. An improving trend is seen in reading across 2016-2018. In maths and writing a slight narrowing of the difference with the national cohort is seen in 2018.


### 6.5.4 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- Pupils in the group SEN support made better than expected progress in reading, writing and maths when compared with the national SEN cohort.
- Those pupils with an EHC plan made improved progress in reading, writing and maths. Progress was better than the progress made by the national cohort in all areas. This is an improvement on 2017.


### 6.5.5 Pupils speaking English as an Additional Language

- EAL learners made better than expected progress in all areas. When compared to the national cohort of EAL pupils, outcomes were better in all areas.

The 3 graphs below highlight expected progress in reading, writing and maths. The horizontal axis marks expected progress.



## 7. KEY STAGE 4 Final Results

The Department of Education \& Skills listened to feedback and has refined the methodology for 2018 in order to reduce the disproportionate impact of extreme pupil-level progress scores only. There is now a limit as to how negative a pupil's progress score can be when calculating the school average.

The significant changes to the Key Stage 4 performance measures in 2018 mean that direct comparisons with results from previous years are not possible. The range of new more demanding GCSEs reporting for the first time in 2018 has increased. This introduces more variables which then impacts on the calculation of the overall measures.

### 7.1 Context

- In recent years there have been significant changes to Key Stage 4 performance measures which have had impact on GCSE results nationally. In 2016 there was a move away from the headline measure of $5+A^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ including English and Maths to new secondary accountability measures of Attainment 8 and Progress 8. Schools report the percentage of pupils achieving grades 5-9 in English and Maths; the proportion of pupils entered for, and achieving the EBacc, and the proportion of pupils achieving at least one qualification.
- In 2018 the more challenging GCSEs in English Language, English Literature and mathematics have been examined for the second time. More GCSEs have been graded on a 1-9 numerical grade, including Science, Humanities and Languages.
- Attainment 8 and Progress 8 scores are based on pupils' results across eight subjects with a double weighting for English and Mathematics. In 2017 the methodology for calculating Attainment 8 moved to a new system. This system has continued in 2018. Attainment 8 provides a point score for the school that is essentially the student average point score across eight subjects.
- The school's progress 8 score measures the progress of pupils from the end of primary school. It is based on a calculation that uses each students' average point score from Key Stage 2 and compares this to their outcomes at the end of Key Stage 4. Feedback from schools has identified the disproportionate impact of extreme pupils' scores on the progress measure. This has been responded to in the methodology for calculating progress in 2018.


### 7.2 Headlines

- 2018 Manchester LA results for attainment 8 shows a negative diminishing the difference to national ( 1.3 pts). However the difference to national has slightly increased for outcomes in progress 8 . However in both 9-5 in English and Maths and 9-4 in English and Maths the gap to national has reduced by -0.1 and -0.9 respectively.
- The Manchester overall progress 8 score was -0.13 which was below the national progress 8 score of 0 . Manchester's progress 8 score for disadvantaged pupils was above the national progress 8 score for disadvantaged pupils. Similarly the progress 8 score for non-disadvantaged pupils in Manchester was above the national progress 8 score for non-disadvantaged pupils.
- The Manchester Attainment 8 score was 43.2 compared with a national attainment 8 score of 44.5 ; the difference to national has increased to -1.3 .
- $55.5 \%$ of Manchester pupils achieved grade $9-4$ in English \& Maths with $59.4 \%$ pupils achieving this measure nationally. $35.6 \%$ of Manchester pupils achieved grade 9-5 in English \& Maths with 40.2 \% pupils achieving this measure nationally. The difference between Manchester and national results for both measures has reduced to $-3.9 \%$ and $-4.6 \%$ respectively.
- The average point score for students entered for the English Baccalaureate grade was 3.69 in 2018, this is a new measure this year to judge the English Baccalaureate. The average point score nationally was 3.85 , this shows a gap of -0.16 .


### 7.3 Comparison between Manchester and England Key Stage 4 Results Trend

|  |  |  |  | Gap to National |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Manchester |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ |
|  | Attainment 8 | 43.4 | 43.2 | -1.4 | -1.2 | -1.3 |
|  | Progress 8 | -0.05 | -0.13 | -0.03 | -0.05 | -0.13 |
|  | $9-5$ in English \& Maths | $34.9 \%$ | $35.6 \%$ | $-4.0 \%$ | $-4.7 \%$ | $-4.6 \%$ |
|  | $9-4$ in English \& Maths | $54.3 \%$ | $55.5 \%$ | $-4.0 \%$ | $-4.8 \%$ | $-3.9 \%$ |
|  | \% entered English Bacc | $32.9 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ | $-1.3 \%$ | $-2.1 \%$ | $-1.7 \%$ |
|  | EBacc APS |  | 3.69 |  |  | -0.16 |
|  | \% achieved English Bacc (9-5) | $16.7 \%$ |  | $-3.9 \%$ | $-3.0 \%$ |  |
|  | \% achieved English Bacc (9-4) | $19.6 \%$ |  | $-3.9 \%$ | $-2.3 \%$ |  |
| England | Attainment 8 | 44.6 | 44.5 |  |  |  |
|  | $9-5$ in English \& Maths | $39.6 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ |  |  |  |
|  | $9-4$ in English \& Maths | $59.1 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ |  |  |  |
|  | \% entered English Bacc | $35.0 \%$ | $35.2 \%$ |  |  |  |
|  | EBacc APS |  | 3.85 |  |  |  |
|  | \% achieved English Bacc (9-5) | $19.7 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | \% achieved English Bacc (9-4) | $21.9 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

- Due to the changes in how Key Stage 4 performance measures have been calculated in 2018 and the changes to the grading system it is impossible to compare directly with previous year results.
- In 2018, Manchester LA results saw an increase to the difference to national in Attainment 8 and progress 8 , however in all other measures Manchester improved compared to National.

2018 Progress 8 scores by Pupils Group with National Comparators


| 2018 - Progress 8 <br> Compared With National Comparator Group |  |  |  | 2018 <br> Nat Same |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MCR | NAT | Diff |  |
| All | -0.13 | 0 | -0.13 | 0 |
| Boys | -0.37 | -0.25 | -0.12 | -0.25 |
| Girls | 0.11 | 0.22 | -0.11 | 0.22 |
| FSM | -0.53 | 0.05 | -0.58 | -0.53 |
| Non FSM | -0.1 | 0.05 | -0.15 | 0.05 |
| Disadvantaged | -0.32 | 0.13 | -0.45 | -0.44 |
| Non Disadvantaged | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.13 |
| SEN Support | -0.84 | 0 | -0.84 | -0.43 |
| EHC Plan | -1.37 | 0 | -1.37 | -1.09 |
| No SEN | 0.01 | 0.08 | -0.07 | 0.08 |
| EAL | 0.44 | 0 | 0.44 | 0.49 |
| Non EAL | -0.43 | 0 | -0.43 | -0.1 |

Children's PRI

- Progress 8 was introduced as a new accountability measure for KS4 outcomes in 2016. The 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 the schools pupils against the Attainment 8 score of all pupils nationally with similar prior attainment at the end of primary school. A Progress 8 score is 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 pupils nationally with similar prior attainment. A score of 0 would mean pupils made expected progress in line with pupils nationally with similar prior attainment.
- In 2018 Manchester's progress 8 score for all pupils was below national with a progress 8 score of -0.13 compared to national progress 8 of 0 ; this is a decline from 2016 when progress 8 was -0.03 and therefore classed as in line with national outcomes.


### 7.4.1 Gender

- The Manchester progress 8 score for boys of -0.37 was below the Manchester progress 8 for girls of 0.11 .
- When compared to national progress 8 scores, the Manchester girls' progress 8 score was below national with a progress 8 score of 0.11 compared to the national girls' progress 8 score of 0.22 . Similarly, the Manchester boys' progress 8 score was below boys nationally with a score of -0.37 compared with -0.25 nationally.


### 7.4.2 Pupils Eligible for Free School Meals

- The Manchester progress 8 score for pupils' eligible for FSM was below expected but was the same as the progress 8 score of those pupils eligible for FSM nationally. Manchester FSM's progress 8 score was -0.53 compared to a national same progress 8 score of -0.53 .
- In addition, the Manchester progress 8 score for pupils not eligible for FSM of -0.1 was also below the progress 8 score for Non FSM nationally, 0.05 .


### 7.4.3 Disadvantaged Pupils

- The progress 8 score for Manchester disadvantaged pupils was -0.32 , which was below expected progress but was above the progress 8 score of -0.44 for disadvantaged pupils nationally.
- The progress 8 score for non-disadvantaged pupils in Manchester was 0.14 which was above the national progress 8 score for non-disadvantaged pupils of 0.13 .


### 7.4.4 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- Manchester SEN support pupils performance was below expected progress and lower than the group of SEN support pupils nationally. Manchester SEN support pupils progress 8 score was -0.84 compared to the national progress 8 of -0.43 .
- There was also a gap in the performance in progress 8 for children with an EHC plan compared to both the national comparator and national same group.


### 7.4.5 Pupils with English as an Additional Language

- In Manchester the progress score for children with English as an Additional Language (EAL) was similar to the national same group. Manchester EAL progress 8 score was 0.44 compared to the National EAL progress 8 score of 0.49.
- However, Manchester's Non EAL children performed significantly below the national same group with a Manchester Non EAL progress 8 score of -0.43 compared to the national Progress 8 score of -0.1 .


### 7.5 Attainment 8

| 2018 - Attainment 8Compared With National Comparator Group |  |  |  | $2018$ <br> NAT <br> same |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MCR | NAT | Diff |  |
| All | 43.2 | 44.5 | -1.3 | 44.5 |
| Boys | 40.3 | 41.5 | -1.2 | 41.5 |
| Girls | 46.2 | 49.4 | -3.2 | 49.4 |
| FSM | 34.7 | 48.3 | -13.6 | 34.4 |
| Non FSM | 46 | 48.3 | -2.3 | 48.3 |
| Disadvantaged | 39.3 | 50.1 | -10.8 | 36.7 |
| Non Disadvantaged | 48.5 | 50.1 | -1.6 | 50.1 |
| SEN Support | 25.5 | 44.5 | -19 | 32.2 |
| EHC Plan | 12.1 | 44.5 | -32.4 | 13.5 |
| No SEN | 46.5 | 49.8 | -3.3 | 49.8 |
| EAL | 46.2 | 44.5 | 1.7 | 47.2 |
| Non EAL | 41.2 | 44.5 | -3.3 | 46.5 |

Children's PRI

2018 Attainment 8 by Pupil Group with National Comparators


- Attainment 8 was also a new accountability measure for KS4 outcomes for 2016. Attainment 8 is based on all 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. In 2018 Attainment 8 has been calculated using a new system. Attainment 8 provides a point score for the school that is essentially the student average point score across eight subjects.
- In 2018 Manchester's attainment 8 score for all pupils is below national with a score of 43.2 compared to a national attainment 8 score of 44.5 . The difference to national has increased slightly from 2016 outcomes to 1.3.


### 7.5.1 Gender

- The Manchester attainment 8 score for boys of 40.3 was significantly below the Manchester attainment 8 for girls of 46.2 .
- When compared to national outcomes the attainment 8 scores for both Manchester boys and girls were below the national score with a wider difference to national for Manchester girls of -3.2 compared to the -1.2 difference to national for Manchester boys.


### 7.5.2 Pupils Eligible for Free School Meals

- The Manchester attainment 8 score for pupils' eligible for FSM although significantly below the national comparator was slightly above the attainment 8 score of those pupils eligible for FSM nationally. Manchester FSM's attainment 8 score was 34.7 compared to an attainment 8 score of 34.4 for pupils eligible for FSM nationally.
- The Manchester attainment 8 score for pupils not eligible for FSM was below those pupils not eligible for FSM nationally. Manchester non FSM pupils' attainment 8 score was 46 compared to a national attainment 8 score of 48.3.


### 7.5.3 Disadvantaged Pupils

- The attainment 8 score for Manchester disadvantaged pupils was significantly below the national comparator of non-disadvantaged pupils, however when compared to the same cohort Manchester disadvantaged pupils performed better than disadvantaged pupils nationally and Manchester ranked 39 for disadvantaged attainment 8 . The attainment 8 score for Manchester disadvantaged pupils was 39.3 , which was -10.8 below non-disadvantaged nationally but was above the attainment 8 score of 36.7 for disadvantaged pupils nationally.
- The attainment 8 score for Manchester non-disadvantaged pupils was -1.6 below non-disadvantaged pupils nationally with Manchester nondisadvantaged children achieving an attainment 8 score of 48.5 compared to Manchester disadvantaged pupils attainment 8 of 39.3 and national nondisadvantaged of 50.1 .


### 7.5.4 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- Manchester SEN support pupils' attainment 8 score was significantly below SEN support pupils nationally. Manchester SEN support pupils' attainment 8 score was 25.5 compared to the national SEN support attainment 8 of 32.2.
- There is also a difference in the performance in Attainment 8 for children with an EHC plan compared to the same cohort nationally. The Manchester attainment 8 score for pupils with an EHC plan was 12.1 compared to a national score of 13.5 .


### 7.5.5 Pupils with English as an Additional Language

- Manchester EAL children's attainment 8 score was above the national attainment 8 score for all pupils and it was below EAL pupils nationally whereas Manchester Non EAL children performed significantly below the Non EAL pupils nationally.
- Manchester EAL attainment 8 score was 46.2 compared to the National EAL attainment 8 score of 47.2 . Manchester Non EAL pupils' attainment progress 8 score was 41.2 compared to the national attainment 8 score of 46.5 .


## 7.6 \% Achieved grade 9-4 and grade 9-5 in English and Maths

|  | \% achieved English \& Maths (9-5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Manchester | National | Diff | Same | Manchester | National | Diff | Same |
| All | 34.9\% | 39.6\% | -4.7\% | 39.6\% | 35.6\% | 40.2\% | -4.6\% | 40.2\% |
| Boys | 30.6\% | 36.4\% | -5.8\% | 36.4\% | 32.6\% | 36.8\% | -4.2\% | 36.8\% |
| Girls | 39.1\% | 42.9\% | -3.8\% | 42.9\% | 38.6\% | 43.9\% | -5.3\% | 43.9\% |
| FSM | 21.7\% | 45.8\% | -24.1\% | 21.7\% | 21.3\% | 46.4\% | -25.1\% | 21.6\% |
| Non FSM | 39.4\% | 45.8\% | -6.4\% | 45.8\% | 40.3\% | 46.4\% | -6.1\% | 46.4\% |


| Disadvantaged | $24.6 \%$ | $49.4 \%$ | $-24.8 \%$ | $24.5 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ | $-21.8 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non Disadvantaged | $46.0 \%$ | $49.4 \%$ | $-3.4 \%$ | $49.4 \%$ | $45.5 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ | $-4.6 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ |
| SEN Support | $9.6 \%$ | $39.6 \%$ | $-30.0 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ | $-29.4 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ |
| EHC Plan | $3.3 \%$ | $39.6 \%$ | $-36.3 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ | $-34.3 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
| No SEN | $39.5 \%$ | $47.6 \%$ | $-8.1 \%$ | $47.6 \%$ | $39.6 \%$ | $48.3 \%$ | $-8.7 \%$ | $48.3 \%$ |
| EAL | $40.4 \%$ | $39.6 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $42.8 \%$ | $39.0 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ | $43.3 \%$ |
| Non EAL | $31.7 \%$ | $39.6 \%$ | $-7.9 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ | $-6.9 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ |

Children's PRI

2018 - \% achieving English \& Maths (9-5) by Pupil Group with National Comparators


|  | \% achieved English \& Maths (9-4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2017 |  |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | Manchester | National | Diff | Same | Manchester | National | Diff | Same |
| All | 54.3\% | 59.1\% | -4.8\% | 59.1\% | 55.5\% | 59.4\% | -3.9\% | 59.4\% |


| Boys | $50.0 \%$ | $55.2 \%$ | $-5.2 \%$ | $55.2 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ | $55.5 \%$ | $-4.8 \%$ | $55.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Girls | $58.7 \%$ | $63.1 \%$ | $-4.4 \%$ | $63.1 \%$ | $60.4 \%$ | $63.7 \%$ | $-3.3 \%$ | $63.7 \%$ |
| FSM | $39.4 \%$ | $67.4 \%$ | $-28.0 \%$ | $40.3 \%$ | $39.7 \%$ | $67.7 \%$ | $-28.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ |
| Non FSM | $59.5 \%$ | $67.4 \%$ | $-7.9 \%$ | $67.4 \%$ | $60.7 \%$ | $67.7 \%$ | $-7.0 \%$ | $67.7 \%$ |
| Disadvantaged | $44.1 \%$ | $71.2 \%$ | $-27.1 \%$ | $44.3 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ | $71.5 \%$ | $-23.8 \%$ | $44.5 \%$ |
| Non Disadvantaged | $65.4 \%$ | $71.2 \%$ | $-5.8 \%$ | $71.2 \%$ | $66.2 \%$ | $71.5 \%$ | $-5.3 \%$ | $71.5 \%$ |
| SEN Support | $19.2 \%$ | $59.1 \%$ | $-39.9 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | $-40.4 \%$ | $31.3 \%$ |
| EHC Plan | $7.9 \%$ | $59.1 \%$ | $-51.2 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | $-50.2 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ |
| No SEN | $60.8 \%$ | $70.4 \%$ | $-9.6 \%$ | $70.4 \%$ | $61.5 \%$ | $70.6 \%$ | $-9.1 \%$ | $70.6 \%$ |
| EAL | $60.4 \%$ | $59.1 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ | $59.7 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $63.0 \%$ |
| Non EAL | $50.9 \%$ | $59.1 \%$ | $-8.2 \%$ | $64.2 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | $-6.7 \%$ | $64.6 \%$ |

Children's PRI


### 7.6.1 9-4 and 9-5 English and Maths

- In $201855.5 \%$ of Manchester pupils achieved grade 9-4 in English \& Maths compared to $59.4 \%$ pupils achieving this measure nationally whilst $35.6 \%$ of Manchester pupils achieved grade $9-5$ in English \& Maths compared to $40.2 \%$ pupils achieving this measure nationally. The difference between Manchester and national results has decreased to -3.9\% at grade 9-4 and -4.6\% for those children achieving grade 9-5 at English and Maths.
- The percentage for both FSM pupils and disadvantaged pupils in Manchester achieving grade 9-4 in English and Maths is in line with both FSM pupils and disadvantaged pupils nationally. Similarly the percentage for both FSM pupils and disadvantaged pupils in Manchester achieving grade 9-5 in English and Maths is the same as both FSM pupils and disadvantaged pupils nationally.
- All other pupil groups in Manchester have achieved below national percentages when compared to the same cohort.
7.6.2 Gender
- In 2018, the proportion of Manchester girls achieving both grade 9-4 and grade 9-5 in English and Maths was significantly higher than the proportion of Manchester boys; this was the same picture nationally.
- Manchester girls achieved above Manchester boys with $60.4 \%$ gaining 9-4 and $38.6 \%$ gaining $9-5$ in English and Maths; with a difference of $-3.3 \%$ at grade 9-4 and a difference of $-5.3 \%$ at grade 9-5.
- $50.7 \%$ of Manchester boys achieved grade 9-4 in English and Maths compared to $55.5 \%$ of boys nationally; $32.6 \%$ of Manchester boys achieved grade 9 5 in English and Maths compared to $36.8 \%$ of boys nationally.


### 7.6.3 Pupils Eligible for Free School Meals

- As stated above pupils eligible for FSM achieved in line with FSM pupils nationally, although they performed significantly below those not eligible for free school meals.
- Manchester FSM achieved 39.7\% 9-4 in English \& Maths which was 0.9\% below the same cohort nationally the national same group who achieved $40 \%$. $21.3 \%$ of Manchester pupils eligible for FSM achieved grade 9-5 in English and Maths which was similar to national with $21.6 \%$
- In Manchester those pupils not eligible for FSM achieved significantly below non FSM pupils nationally with $60.7 \%$ of non FSM children gaining grade 9-4 compared to $67.7 \%$ nationally. There was a similar pattern at grade $9-5$ with and $40.3 \%$ of Manchester pupils not eligible for FSM achieving grade $9-5$ in English and Maths compared to 46.4 \% nationally.


### 7.6.4 Disadvantaged Pupils

- The proportion of Manchester disadvantaged pupils achieving grade 9-4 and grade 9-5 in English and Maths followed a similar pattern to those children eligible for FSM with a similar proportion of disadvantaged pupils achieving 9-4 grades and 9-5 grades in English and Maths than disadvantaged pupils nationally but with a significantly lower proportion of non-disadvantaged pupils in Manchester achieving the qualifications.
- Manchester disadvantaged pupils achieved $47.7 \%$ grade 9-4 in English \& Maths compared to $44.5 \%$ for the same cohort nationally; Manchester disadvantaged pupils achieved $28.3 \%$ grade $9-5$ in English \& Maths compared to $24.9 \%$ for the same cohort nationally.
- Manchester non-disadvantaged pupils achieved below the same cohort nationally at both grade 9-4 and grade 9-5 in English and Maths. Manchester nondisadvantaged pupils achieved $66.1 \%$ at grade 9-4 in English and Maths compared to $71.5 \%$ nationally and $45.5 \%$ of Manchester non disadvantaged pupils achieved grade 9-5 in English and Maths compared to $50.1 \%$ nationally.


### 7.6.5 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- Manchester pupils with SEN support perform significantly below the same cohort nationally for this accountability measure, as well as for progress 8 and attainment 8.
- Manchester pupils with SEN support achieved 19\% grade 9-4 in English \& Maths which is $12.3 \%$ below the same cohort nationally, and a greater difference to national than last year. Similarly, Manchester pupils at SEN support achieved $10.8 \%$ grade $9-5$ in English \& Maths which is $5.7 \%$ below the same cohort nationally.
- There is also a difference in the performance in $\mathrm{A}^{*}-\mathrm{C}$ in English \& Maths for children with an EHC plan compared to the same cohort nationally. Manchester children with an EHC plan achieved $9.2 \%$ 9-4 in English \& Maths compared to $10.5 \%$ of children with an EHC plan nationally. At the higher level Manchester children with an EHC plan achieved 5.9\% 9-5 in English \& Maths compared to $5.3 \%$ of children with an EHC plan nationally.
- Non SEN achievement at both grade 9-4 and grade 9-5 in English and Maths was significantly below national with Manchester non SEN achieving 9.6\% below the same cohort nationally at grade 9-4 and 8.1\% below the same cohort nationally at grade 9-5. Manchester non SEN achieved 61.5\% grade 9-4 and 39.6\% grade 9-5 in English \& Maths compared to the national non SEN achievement of $70.6 \%$ at grade 9-4 and 48.3\% at grade 9-5 in English and Maths.


### 7.6.6 Pupils with English as an Additional Language

- When using this accountability measure, both Manchester EAL children and Manchester non EAL children achieve below EAL and non EAL nationally. The difference in performance is much smaller for EAL children than for the non EAL children.
- Manchester EAL children achieved 59.7\% 9-4 in English \& Maths and 39\% 9-5 in English and Maths above Manchester non EAL children and above all children nationally but below the same cohort nationally. Manchester EAL children performed $3.3 \%$ below EAL children nationally at grade 9-4 and $4.3 \%$ below EAL children nationally at grade 9-5.
- Manchester non EAL children achieved significantly below both Manchester EAL and non EAL children nationally. Manchester non EAL children gained $52.7 \%$ 9-4 in English \& Maths which was 11.9\% below national non EAL children who achieved 64.6\% and Manchester non EAL children gained 33.3\% 95 in English \& Maths which was 10.1\% below national non EAL children who achieved 43.4\%


### 7.7. English Baccalaureate

|  | \% Entered EBacc Compared With National Comparator Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2018 NAT same |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | MCR | NAT | Diff | MCR | NAT | Diff | MCR | NAT | Diff |  |
| All | 35.5\% | 36.8\% | -1.3\% | 32.9\% | 35.0\% | -2.1\% | 33.5\% | 35.2\% | -1.7\% | 35.2\% |
| Boys | 27.9\% | 31.6\% | -3.7\% | 25.0\% | 29.8\% | -4.8\% | 25.2\% | 29.8\% | -4.6\% | 29.8\% |
| Girls | 43.5\% | 42.3\% | 1.2\% | 40.7\% | 40.5\% | 0.2\% | 41.9\% | 40.9\% | 1.0\% | 40.9\% |


| FSM | $24.4 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ | $-18.1 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $-18.6 \%$ | $23.1 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $-17.4 \%$ | $23.6 \%$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non FSM | $39.6 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ | $-2.9 \%$ | $36.7 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $-3.8 \%$ | $36.9 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $-3.6 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ |
| Disadvantaged | $27.0 \%$ | $45.5 \%$ | $-18.5 \%$ | $25.4 \%$ | $43.0 \%$ | $-17.6 \%$ | $28.1 \%$ | $42.8 \%$ | $-14.7 \%$ | $26.4 \%$ |
| Non Disadvantaged | $45.6 \%$ | $45.5 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $41.0 \%$ | $43.0 \%$ | $-2.0 \%$ | $40.9 \%$ | $42.8 \%$ | $-1.9 \%$ | $42.8 \%$ |
| SEN Support | $10.0 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $-26.8 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ | $-26.1 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $35.2 \%$ | $-26.4 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ |
| EHC Plan | $3.7 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $-33.1 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ | $-31.7 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $35.2 \%$ | $-33.0 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| No SEN | $40.1 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ | $-4.6 \%$ | $37.3 \%$ | $42.6 \%$ | $-5.3 \%$ | $37.6 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ | $-5.1 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ |
| EAL | $38.8 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ | $35.2 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ |
| Non EAL | $34.0 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $-2.8 \%$ | $28.8 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ | $-6.2 \%$ | $27.5 \%$ | $35.2 \%$ | $-7.7 \%$ | $36.6 \%$ |

Children's PRI

- The percentage of pupils in Manchester entered for a group of qualifications that meet the criteria for the English Baccalaureate has increased from 32.9 $\%$ entered in 2017 to $33.5 \%$ in 2018; national entries stayed the same.

|  | \% achieving EBacc APS with <br> National Comparator group and <br> National Same group |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2018 |  |  |  |
|  | MCR | NAT | Diff | Same |
| All | 3.69 | 3.85 | -0.16 | 3.85 |
| Boys | 3.40 | 3.58 | -0.18 | 3.58 |
| Girls | 3.99 | 4.12 | -0.13 | 4.12 |
| FSM | 2.86 | 4.22 | -1.36 | 2.85 |
| Non FSM | 3.97 | 4.22 | -0.25 | 4.22 |
| Disadvantaged | 3.28 | 4.40 | -1.12 | 3.07 |
| Non Disadvantaged | 4.25 | 4.40 | -0.15 | 4.40 |
| SEN Support | 1.93 | 3.85 | -1.92 | 1.04 |
| EHC Plan | 0.86 | 3.85 | -2.99 | 2.61 |
| No SEN | 4.01 | 4.35 | -0.34 | 4.35 |
| EAL | 4.08 | 3.85 | 0.23 | 4.22 |
| Non EAL | 3.44 | 3.85 | -0.41 | 4.01 |

Children's PRI

2018 - Ebacc APS by pupil group with National comparator

7.7.1

- The measure for Ebacc changed in 2018 from percentage achieving Ebacc $9-4 / 9-5$ to percentage achieving Ebacc Average points score (APS), therefore no comparison can be made to previous years. The percentage of students achieving Ebacc APS in Manchester is 3.69 compared with a national score of 3.85, a gap of -0.16
- Manchester FSM pupils and Manchester disadvantaged pupils achieved in line or above the same cohort nationally whereas all other pupil groups performed below national averages.


### 7.7.2 Gender

- Manchester boys achieve significantly below Manchester girls in the Ebacc. In 2018 Manchester boys achieved the Ebacc APS of 3.40 compared with 3.99 of Manchester girls.
- The APS of Manchester boys achieving the Ebacc was 3.40 compared with a national figure of 3.58 , a gap of -0.18 .
- Manchester girls achieving the Ebacc APS was 3.99, this compared with a national figure of 4.12, a gap of -0.13.


### 7.7.3 Pupils Eligible for Free School Meals

- In 2018 the percentage of Manchester FSM student achieving Ebacc APS was 2.86 compared with a national figure of 2.85 , showing a positive picture and a gap of +0.01 .
- For Non FSM students in Manchester achieving Ebacc the APS was 3.97, compared with a national figure of 4.25 . This shows a negative gap of -0.25 .


### 7.7.4 Disadvantaged Pupils

- In 2018, disadvantaged children in Manchester achieved the Ebacc achieved an APS 3.28, compared with a national score of 3.07. This again shows a positive picture with a gap of +0.21 .
- Manchester non-disadvantaged children achieving the Ebacc with an APS of 4.25 compared to a national figure of 4.40, a gap of -0.15 .


### 7.7.5 Pupils with Special Educational Needs

- In Manchester children with SEN support achieved the Ebacc with an APS of 1.94 compared with a national figure of 1.04 , showing a significantly positive picture with a gap of +0.9
- Manchester children with an EHC plan achieving the Ebacc with an APS of 0.86 compared with the national figure of 2.61, a gap of -1.75


### 7.7.6 Pupils with English as an Additional Language

- In Manchester, EAL children achieved the Ebacc with an APS of 4.08 compared with a national figure of 4.22 , showing a gap of -0.14 .
- In Manchester, non EAL children achieving the Ebacc with an APS of 3.44 compared to the national APS figure of 4.01, giving a gap -0.57.


### 7.8 KS4 school results

- The numbers of schools below the Government's floor standard has decreased from seven schools in 2017 to six schools in 2018. (The government's floor standard is a progress 8 score of -0.5
- Twelve out of twenty-six schools had positive progress 8 scores with children making better than national progress.
- Levenshulme High School achieved the highest progress 8 score of 0.94 and Whalley Range High School achieved the second highest with a progress score of 0.52 whilst Abraham Moss Community School achieved the third highest with a progress score of 0.45
- The King David High School had the highest Attainment 8 score of 61.1


### 7.8.1 Results by Schools

|  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DfE No | School Name | A8 | P8 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { \% E\&M } \\ & 9-5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { \% E\&M } \\ & 9-4 \end{aligned}$ | EBacc APS |
| 4271 | Abraham Moss Community School | 39.3 | -0.05 | 26\% | 47\% | 3.24 |
| 4256 | Burnage Academy for Boys | 42.7 | 0.26 | 37\% | 60\% | 3.7 |
| 4002 | Cedar Mount Academy | 38.6 | -0.38 | 21\% | 40\% | 3.24 |
| 4281 | Chorlton High School | 47.5 | 0 | 41\% | 63\% | 4.08 |
| 4005 | Levenshulme High School | 48.9 | 0.94 | 44\% | 67\% | 4.64 |
| 4753 | Loreto High School Chorlton | 45 | -0.11 | 39\% | 54\% | 3.78 |
| 6905 | Manchester Academy | 39 | -0.26 | 35\% | 52\% | 3.17 |
| 6913 | Manchester Communication Academy | 45.1 | 0.24 | 31\% | 52\% | 3.68 |
| 4008 | Manchester Creative and Media Academy | 38.7 | -0.51 | 25\% | 48\% | 3.29 |
| 4004 | Manchester Creative Studio | 37.3 | -1.08 | 24\% | 45\% | 2.6 |
| 6908 | Manchester Enterprise Academy | 33.9 | -0.65 | 13\% | 30\% | 2.83 |
| 6909 | Manchester Health Academy | 37.2 | -0.72 | 19\% | 45\% | 2.76 |
| 4006 | Newall Green High School | 32 | -1.18 | 15\% | 32\% | 2.66 |
| 4761 | Our Lady's RC High School | 44.8 | -0.29 | 40\% | 64\% | 3.88 |
| 4248 | Parrs Wood High School | 49.9 | 0.18 | 47\% | 68\% | 4.28 |
| 4766 | Saint Paul's Catholic High School | 39.6 | -0.53 | 36\% | 57\% | 3.23 |
| 4762 | St Matthew's RC High School | 37.7 | -1.1 | 30\% | 46\% | 3.43 |
| 4770 | St Peter's RC High School | 46.1 | 0.13 | 37\% | 52\% | 3.84 |
| 4768 | The Barlow RC High School | 46.7 | 0.12 | 43\% | 63\% | 3.8 |
| 6914 | The Co-operative Academy of Manchester | 41.3 | -0.14 | 24\% | 50\% | 3.42 |
| 4010 | The East Manchester Academy | 37.9 | -0.75 | 26\% | 43\% | 3.12 |
| 4810 | The King David High School | 61.1 | 0.45 | 76\% | 91\% | 5.45 |
| 4765 | Trinity Cofe High School | 49.8 | 0.06 | 48\% | 66\% | 4.06 |
| 4257 | Whalley Range 11-18 High School | 48.7 | 0.52 | 40\% | 66\% | 4.6 |
| 6907 | William Hulme's Grammar School | 53.3 | 0.31 | 57\% | 75\% | 4.55 |
| 4276 | Wright Robinson College | 45.9 | 0.23 | 40\% | 63\% | 4.1 |


|  | Manchester | 43.2 | -0.13 | $35.6 \%$ | $55.5 \%$ | 3.69 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | National | 44.5 | 0 | $40.2 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ | 3.85 |

### 7.9 Comparison with other Local Authorities



## Progress 8

- Manchester LA has the fourth highest progress 8 score of -0.13 when compared to other Greater Manchester Authorities. Trafford's progress score was 0.21 , Stockport's progress 8 was -0.03 and Bolton's was -0.12 .
- Manchester's outcomes for progress 8 also compared favourably with the majority of statistical neighbours. Manchester achieved the fourth highest progress 8 score when compared to its statistical neighbours.


Attainment 8

- Manchester LA has not performed well against the attainment 8 accountability measure when compared with other Greater Manchester Authorities with the third lowest attainment 8 score of 43.2




GM Authorities - \% achieving 9-4 in English \& Maths


## English \& Maths (9-4):

- When compared to statistical neighbours, Manchester ranked seventh out of the statistical neighbours in the percentage of pupils achieving English and Maths at grade 9-4 and ranked sixth when comparing achievement at grade 9-5.
- Manchester has not performed well by comparison in the English \& Maths measure for either grade 4-9 or 5-9 when compared with the other Greater Manchester authorities, ranking eighth for grades 9-5 and 9-4
- Disadvantaged pupils in Manchester have performed relatively well in terms of achieving English \& Maths, in Greater Manchester, ranking fourth for grades 4-9 and third for 5-9. Non disadvantaged pupils have not performed as well, ranking ninth for grades 4-9 and fifth for grades 5-9, in Greater Manchester.


## Appendix 8: Key Stage 5

### 8.0 Key Stage 5 Results

### 8.1 Context

Legislation enacted in 2014 requires all young people to enter into employment, education or training at age 16+. A majority of learners at 16 progress to college for their level 3 education either studying A levels or vocational/ technical qualifications. 2016 student outcomes were the first to be fully impacted on by Professor Wolf's review of post 16 qualifications. When making comparisons it is important to remember that 2018 outcomes are the first for all of the new reformed A levels (except Maths) although it will take until 2020 before all A levels in the curriculum have been reformed. Essentially course content has been revised and the assessment approach has moved to linear exams assessed at the end of the two year A level study rather than by AS modules at the end of the first year of study followed by A2 modules at the end of the second year.

Five new accountability headline measures for schools, colleges and other institutions providing education for 16-19 year olds were introduced by DfE in 2016. These are designed to place a greater emphasis on progress and progression alongside attainment, ensuring students make progress from their starting points and that every young person leaves education capable of getting a place at university, an apprenticeship or a good job.

The measures are:

- Progress - a value added progress measure to show how well students have progressed when compared with students with the same prior attainment for students taking Level 3 academic and Applied General qualifications. A completion and attainment measure which compares the attainment of students with the national average attainment for each qualification and treats non-completion as a fail for students taking Tech Levels (and Technical Certificates from 2017);
- Attainment - continuing the average point score per entry measure and removing the average point score per student measure;
- Retention - a measure showing the proportion of students being retained in their core aim and aligned as far as possible with the retention element of the funding formula;
- English and maths - an average change in grade measure for students who did not get a good pass (currently a grade C) in these subjects at GCSE;
- Destinations -the measure shows the percentage of students going to or remaining in a sustained education or employment destination in the academic year after taking A levels or other Level 3 qualifications.

A number of these measures were first published by DfE in March 2018 providing details of the 2017 outcomes. There will be a similar delay in reporting 2019 outcomes for some of these measures. This report includes those key headlines that can currently be drawn from the data that has been made available from national statistical releases.

From 2017 there are plans to expand the performance tables to include level 2 outcomes and to introduce disadvantage measures showing how students who were eligible for the pupil premium in year 11 compare to their peers in each of the five headline measures.

From 2018 there are plans to include apprenticeships and work based learning in performance tables.

### 8.2 Comparison with Core Cities performance 2018

## A Level

| Core Cities | *A Level cohort APS/entry | *3 best A levels APS | *A levels AAB | A levels AAB 2 fac subj | $3+A$ grades | *A Level cohort APS/entry | *3 best A levels APS | *A levels AAB | A levels AAB 2 fac subj | $\begin{gathered} 3+A \\ \text { grades } \end{gathered}$ | *A Level cohort APS/entry | *3 best A levels APS | *A levels AAB | A levels AAB 2 fac subj | $3+A$ grades |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2017 | 2017 | 2017 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2018 | 2018 | 2018 | 2018 | 2017-18 Diff |  |  |  |  |
| Birmingham | 30.4 | 33.7 | 19.4 | 16 | 11.5 | 31.62 | 32.36 | 19.3 | 16.2 | 11.3 | 1.22 | -1.34 | -0.1 | 0.2 | -0.2 |
| Bristol | 30.93 | 33.24 | 17.9 | 12.5 | 10.2 | 31.57 | 30.46 | 13.7 | 10.8 | 7.4 | 0.64 | -2.78 | -4.2 | -1.7 | -2.8 |
| Leeds | 29.92 | 32.87 | 16 | 12 | 8.7 | 31.16 | 31.15 | 16.1 | 12 | 9.5 | 1.24 | -1.72 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.8 |
| Liverpool | 29.48 | 33.01 | 17.1 | 14.1 | 10.1 | 30.12 | 30.73 | 16.4 | 13.9 | 9.9 | 0.64 | -2.28 | -0.7 | -0.2 | -0.2 |
| Manchester | 31.45 | 34.75 | 19.3 | 12 | 10.1 | 31.81 | 33.49 | 16.7 | 11.7 | 9.5 | 0.36 | -1.26 | -2.6 | -0.3 | -0.6 |
| Newcastle | 29.2 | 33.18 | 15.5 | 10.5 | 8.5 | 30.55 | 32.39 | 16.3 | 11.6 | 9.2 | 1.35 | -0.79 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.7 |
| Nottingham | 29.17 | 32.28 | 16.6 | 11.3 | 10.1 | 30.37 | 31.95 | 17.7 | 12.1 | 9.6 | 1.2 | -0.33 | 1.1 | 0.8 | -0.5 |
| Sheffield | 30.69 | 33.59 | 21.2 | 17.3 | 12.7 | 32.52 | 33.07 | 21.8 | 17.3 | 13.5 | 1.83 | -0.52 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.8 |
| North West | 31.31 | 34.78 | 19.5 | 13.2 | 10.9 | 32.36 | 32.68 | 17.7 | 12.5 | 10.1 | 1.05 | -2.1 | -1.8 | -0.7 | -0.8 |
| SN | 28.7 | 31.93 | 14.17 | 10.36 | 7.93 | 29.34 | 29.44 | 12.71 | 9.24 | 6.9 | 0.6 | -2.5 | -1.5 | -1.1 | -1.0 |
| England | 32.39 | 35.12 | 22.4 | 17 | 13.4 | 33.33 | 33.59 | 21.1 | 16.2 | 12.9 | 0.94 | -1.53 | -1.3 | -0.8 | -0.5 |
| LA ranking | 49 | 45 | 57 | 86 | 72 | 68 | 35 | 68 | 85 | 72 |  |  |  |  |  |

### 8.3 A level outcomes 2018

- In 2018 A level average points scores (APS) outcomes / A level entry (academic) place Manchester $1 / 8$ in terms of Core Cities outcomes, above the North West average and slightly below the England average for 2018. The APS in Manchester at 31.81 compares favourably with statistical neighbours at 28.7. This places Manchester $1 \times$ in their statistical neighbour group and $1^{s i}$ in the Core City group of LAs. In 2017 outcomes In Manchester were 45th and in 2018 there has been a rise to $35^{\text {m }}$ out of 152 LAs is recorded.
- In 2018 the APS for 3 best A levels outcomes places Manchester $1 / 8$ in relation to Core Cities outcomes and in line with the NW average and in line with England APS
- In 2017 the percentage of learners gaining AAB with 2 subjects being facilitating subjects places Manchester $5 / 8$ when compared with Core Cities and below the NW average and England outcomes. In $201712.0 \%$ of learners achieved grades AAB or better for A levels where 2 are facilitating subjects which compares favourably with statistical neighbours outcomes at $10.36 \%$, in $201811.7 \%$ of learners achieved grades AAB or better for A levels where 2 are facilitating subjects. Manchester ranked $86^{w}$ in 2017 and in 2018 85th out of 152 LAs for this indicator.
- In 2018 the percentage of learners gaining 3+ A grades in A level places Manchester 4/8 for Core Cities and below the average for learners in the NW and for the total England cohort. In $201810.1 \%$ of learners achieved this measure which compares favourably with statistical neighbour outcomes at $6.9 \%$. In 2017 outcomes ranked Manchester post 16 learners $72^{\text {nd }}$ for this outcome and in $201872^{\text {no }}$ out of 152 LAs.
8.4 Table summarising national rankings relating to A level Attainment in 2017 (Source: LAIT from DfE Feb 2018)

| Indicator | Manchester ranking of all LAs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ |
| APS per entry best 3 A levels | 45 | 35 |
| APS per entry A level cohort | 49 | 68 |
| \% of learners with 3+ A grades/double awards | 72 | 72 |
| \% of learners achieving grades AAB or better (+2 Fac subj) | 57 <br> $(86)$ | 68 <br> $(85)$ |

### 8.5 Table of Core Cities outcomes in Applied General Qualifications, Tech level performance and Progression in L2 Maths and English

| Core Cities | *Applied general quals | **Tech level perform.mance | Prog English | Prog Maths | *Applied general quals | **Tech level perform.mance | Prog English | Prog Maths | *Applied general quals | **Tech level perform.mance | Prog English | Prog Maths |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2017 | 2017 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2018 | 2018 | 2018 | 2017-18 Diff |  |  |  |
| Birmingham | 35.59 | 34.32 | 0.02 | 0 | 33.9 | 28.03 | 0.1 | -0.02 | -1.69 | -6.29 | 0.08 | -0.02 |
| Bristol | 33.8 | 28.15 | -0.32 | -0.26 | 25.49 | 24.5 | -0.16 | -0.18 | -8.31 | -3.65 | 0.16 | 0.08 |
| Leeds | 35.78 | 31.88 | -0.16 | -0.2 | 27.9 | 31.46 | -0.06 | -0.07 | -7.88 | -0.42 | 0.1 | 0.13 |
| Liverpool | 35.94 | 30.62 | -0.01 | -0.05 | 29.87 | 27.58 | 0.23 | 0.1 | -6.07 | -3.04 | 0.24 | 0.15 |
| Manchester | 34.27 | 32.69 | -0.11 | 0.05 | 28.69 | 23.97 | 0.05 | 0.08 | -5.58 | -8.72 | 0.16 | 0.03 |
| Newcastle | 35.1 | 29.52 | -0.14 | -0.21 | 30.67 | 24.57 | -0.15 | -0.19 | -4.43 | -4.95 | -0.01 | 0.02 |
| Nottingham | 32.88 | 30.44 | -0.3 | -0.19 | 28.05 | 31.41 | -0.25 | -0.24 | -4.83 | 0.97 | 0.05 | -0.05 |
| Sheffield | 33.45 | 30.65 | -0.17 | -0.1 | 28.23 | 28 | 0 | -0.14 | -5.22 | -2.65 | 0.17 | -0.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North West | 36.79 | 33.66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SN | 35.92 | 31.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 35.72 | 32.26 | -0.02 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LA ranking | 109 | 61 | 91 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(Source: DfE School and College performance tables Feb 2018)
 business and health and social care.
**Tech levels are qualifications for students wishing to develop the specialist skills and knowledge for a technical occupation or industry. They lead to recognised occupations, for example in engineering, IT, accounting or professional cookery.

- Average point score (APS) outcomes for Applied General qualifications place Manchester $4 / 8$ in relation to Core Cities.
- APS outcomes/ entry (technical) places Manchester 8/8 in terms of Core Cities outcomes.
- Progress outcomes for those post 16 learners not achieving a level 2 English qualification at the start of level 3 studies places Manchester $4 / 8$ when compared to Core Cities and progress is slightly below that seen nationally.
- Progress outcomes for those post 16 learners not achieving a level 2 maths qualification at the start of level 3 studies places Manchester $2 / 8$ when compared to Core Cities and progress is above that seen nationally.


## Appendix 9: Ethnicity

## 9. Analysis of Attainment 2018 by Ethnicity

### 9.1 Context

Manchester is an international city that continues to attract people from across the world. Some communities have been part of the city for 3 or 4 generations. Others are more recent, including professionals, students, refugees and migrants seeing work. Each year schools admit an average of 1200 children who are International New Arrivals, many of whom are new to English. There are over 190 languages spoken in the city and over a third of Manchester's children and young people are bi-lingual or multi-lingual.

During the 2016/17 academic year schools were asked, for the first time, to provide additional information on the nationality, country of birth and English language proficiency of pupils. Proficiency in English is collected for all children at key stage 1 and above, who have been recorded on the census with English as an additional language (EAL). Schools are required to assess their EAL pupils against a five-point scale of reading, writing and spoken language proficiency and make a 'best fit' judgement as to the overall proficiency stage to which the pupil most closely corresponds.

In January 2017, there were 1.5 million pupils ( 18.0 per cent of the school population) recorded on the national school census at key stage 1 and above with English as an additional language (EAL). Of these, 5.3 per cent of the EAL population had been assessed with an English proficiency level of 'new to English' and 33.4 per cent had been assessed as 'fluent'. In Manchester, there is a higher percentage of pupils with EAL, 38.4\%. The percentage of Manchester pupils assessed as 'new to English' or 'early acquisition' was $6.37 \%$. The percentage of Manchester assessed as 'fluent' was $5.29 \%$. It should be noted than on average it takes between 5 and 7 years for a pupil to progress from 'new to English' to 'fluent'.

To monitor progress and to meet obligations under the Race Relations (Amendment Act) and the Equalities Act we have adopted 20 ethnic categories, within 6 broad categories, with the agreement of communities and the Department for Education and these are used in the schools annual census. The numbers on roll by ethnicity are detailed in the table below. The data is taken from the schools' annual census January 2017. The end column is the comparative figure from the schools' annual census January 2016.

It should be noted that there is under-ascription of some communities and the number where the information was refused or not collected is higher than that of some of the groups. Caution is needed when interpreting the data, especially of smaller groups, some of which comprise less than 10 pupils, which may not be statistically significant. Some of the groups are very broad, including pupils from a wide range of backgrounds and educational experiences, some new to English, some fluent in both their home language and in English, some with gaps in education, some with parents not confident to engage with schools, some who have suffered prejudice and discrimination.

Comments should not be taken as applying to every individual in each group. Individual pupils may also be at risk because of other factors eg disadvantage, exclusion or poor attendance. However, there are trends to be noted over the three years data in this report and schools should be aware of all relevant factors that may indicate pupils at risk of under-achievement.

| Numbers on Roll by Ethnicity 2017/18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broad Category | Ethnic Group | Nursery | Primary | Secondary | All Through | Sixth Form | Special | PRU | Total | $\begin{array}{r}\text { NOR Total } \\ 2016 / 17 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| White | British | 56 | 20109 | 9484 | 193 | 159 | 562 | 210 | 30773 | 31081 |
|  | European | 9 | 2261 | 782 | 80 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 3161 | 3146 |
|  | Irish | 0 | 207 | 102 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 328 | 351 |
|  | Traveller Of Irish Heritage | 0 | 52 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 82 | 82 |
|  | Gypsy/Roma | 0 | 123 | 48 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 189 | 238 |
|  | Other White | 1 | 516 | 375 | 15 | 7 | 11 | 13 | 938 | 825 |
| Black or Black British | Caribbean | 2 | 832 | 585 | 49 | 10 | 49 | 12 | 1539 | 1583 |
|  | Nigerian | 2 | 1835 | 669 | 32 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 2569 | 2483 |
|  | Somali | 4 | 1463 | 760 | 151 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 2414 | 2505 |
|  | Other Black African | 21 | 3130 | 1424 | 94 | 52 | 94 | 16 | 4831 | 4399 |
|  | Any Other Black Background | 4 | 2119 | 931 | 10 | 4 | 29 | 16 | 3113 | 3073 |
| Chinese | Chinese | 3 | 694 | 162 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 882 | 922 |
| Mixed/ Dual Background | White And Asian | 1 | 834 | 285 | 46 | 3 | 16 | 1 | 1186 | 1144 |
|  | White And Black African | 3 | 885 | 311 | 23 | 8 | 18 | 2 | 1250 | 1165 |
|  | White And Black Caribbean | 7 | 1460 | 680 | 53 | 10 | 47 | 31 | 2288 | 2208 |
|  | Any Other Mixed Background | 11 | 1682 | 727 | 42 | 23 | 50 | 15 | 2550 | 2613 |
| Asian or Asian British | Bangladeshi | 0 | 1262 | 732 | 43 | 6 | 31 | 1 | 2075 | 2071 |
|  | Indian | 2 | 1053 | 337 | 127 | 3 | 23 | 1 | 1546 | 1525 |
|  | Mirpuri Pakistani | 2 | 554 | 118 | 117 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 808 | 855 |
|  | Other Pakistani | 3 | 7671 | 3384 | 1539 | 49 | 185 | 13 | 12844 | 12415 |
|  | African Asian | 0 | 177 | 27 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 224 | 255 |
|  | Other Asian | 3 | 1125 | 468 | 63 | 7 | 32 | 3 | 1701 | 1617 |
| Any Other Ethnic Group | Afghanistani | 1 | 536 | 115 | 53 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 709 | 668 |
|  | Arab | 21 | 2358 | 696 | 246 | 4 | 30 | 1 | 3356 | 3273 |
|  | Iranian | 0 | 143 | 48 | 20 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 215 | 217 |
|  | Vietnamese | 1 | 82 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 114 | 125 |
|  | Other Ethnic Group | 3 | 1103 | 422 | 83 | 11 | 27 | 11 | 1660 | 1476 |
| No Data | Information Not Obtained | 1 | 172 | 260 | 20 | 28 | 49 | 44 | 574 | 539 |
|  | Refused | 1 | 243 | 229 | 6 | 5 | 36 | 3 | 523 | 445 |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 109 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 120 | 90 |
|  | Total | 162 | 54790 | 24217 | 3140 | 404 | 1438 | 411 | 84562 | 83389 |
|  | Non-White British | 64.2\% | 62.3\% | 58.8\% | 93.0\% | 52.5\% | 54.8\% | 37.5\% | 62.2\% | 61.4\% |
|  | Non White | 58.0\% | 56.6\% | 53.3\% | 89.6\% | 50.0\% | 50.9\% | 30.4\% | 56.6\% | 55.9\% |

Note: Unlike the national comparisons within the rest of the document, the comparisons for ethnic groups are with the same groupings nationally, for example, Chinese pupils in Manchester are compared with Chinese pupils nationally.

### 9.2 Early Years Foundation Stage

EYFS - \% acheiving a Good Level of Development by Ethnic Groups with National Comparators


- The ethnic groups with the highest percentage of pupils achieving a good level of development (GLD) in Manchester in 2018 are Irish with 94.1\%, and Chinese with $77.1 \%$. The best performing ethnic groups nationally are Chinese, Indian and White and Asian.
- The Pakistani group is the largest ethnic group after White British in Manchester and performed slightly above the national group with $66.6 \%$ of children achieving GLD.
- Caribbean learner's outcomes in 2018 exceeded the national group by $3 \%(72 \%)$, white and black African learners and those from any other black background in Manchester performed at the same level as those nationally.
- All other groups performed below their national groups and below the national level of $71 \%$.
- The Manchester White British Group performed 1.4\% above the Manchester average of $66.9 \%$, but remains $6 \%$ behind the national group.


### 9.3 Phonics:



- The ethnic group with the highest percentage of pupils meeting the required standard at phonics is Indian with $97.2 \%$. This is an increase of $7 \%$ from 2017
- The following ethnic groups in Manchester - Irish, Traveller of Irish heritage, Gypsy Roma, Caribbean, White and Black Caribbean, Other Black African, and any other Mixed Background outperformed the equivalent national group.
- Nationally, the best performing groups at phonics are Indian with $90 \%$, followed by Chinese, $91 \%$. There was no change in the top performing ethnic groups nationally between 2016 and 2018
- The ethnic group with the lowest percentage of pupils meeting the required standard in phonics in Manchester in 2018 is Gypsy/Roma with $44.4 \%$ ( $2 \%$ above the equivalent national group.). The next lowest performing groups in Manchester are Traveller of Irish Heritage at $66.7 \%$ which is $24 \%$ above the national cohort for this group.
- Nationally, the lowest performing group is Gypsy/Roma, 42\% Followed by Traveller of Irish heritage $43 \%$.
- The groups that have improved by more than $10 \%$ in Manchester from 2016 are White and Asian (10.8\%) and Indian (13.9\%).


### 9.4 Key Stage 1:



### 9.4.1 Key Stage 1 Reading

- The ethnic groups with the highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard at KS1 in Reading is Chinese with $90.5 \%$. The next highest ethnic groups are White and Black African with 79.5\%\% Bangladeshi 78.4\%, and Any other Black Background 78.1\%.
- Nationally, the ethnic group with the highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Reading is Indian, Chinese with $84 \%$.
- The ethnic groups which achieved above the national average of $75.0 \%$ were Chinese $90.5 \%$, White and Black African $79.5 \%$, Bangladeshi $78.4 \%$, Any other Black background $77.1 \%$, Any other Asian background 77.9\%, White and Asian 77.8\%, Indian 77.8\%, Other Black African 77.2\%, Any Other Mixed Background 75.8\%,
- The majority of groups improved on their 2017 performance. Some groups had a decline on 2017 outcomes.
- The ethnic groups that have the lowest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Reading in Manchester are Gypsy/Roma with $40 \%$ and Traveller of Irish Heritage with $41.4 \%$. This mirrors the lowest performing ethnic groups nationally - Gypsy/Roma, $41 \%$ and Traveller of Irish Heritage, $41 \%$.


### 9.4.2 Key Stage 1 Writing

- The ethnic group with the highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard at KS1 in Writing in Manchester is Chinese with $85.7 \%$. The next highest ethnic groups are Any Other Asian background, $74.8 \%$ and White \& Bangladeshi, 74.7\%.
- In addition to the above, the following groups achieved above both the national average of $70.0 \%$ and the Manchester average of $67 \%$ - Other Black African, $73.5 \%$, White and Asian 72.6\%, Any Other Black background 72.6\%, Indian 72.2\%, White and Black African 70.9\%
- The White British Group performed below the Manchester average.
- Nationally, the ethnic group with the highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Writing is Chinese with $83 \%$, followed by Indian with 81\%.
- Nationally, the lowest performing groups were Gypsy Roma with $25.0 \%$ and Traveller of Irish Heritage with $24.0 \%$.
- The ethnic group that has the lowest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Writing in Manchester is Traveller of Irish Heritage, 33.3\% The next lowest performing group in Manchester is Gypsy/Roma with 40\%.


### 9.4.3 Key Stage 1 Maths

- The ethnic group with the highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard at KS1 in Maths is Chinese, followed by Irish, Bangladeshi, Any Other Asian Background and White and Asian.
- Nationally, the ethnic groups with the highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Maths usually are Chinese, followed by Indian, White \& Asian and Any Other Asian.
- The ethnic group that has the lowest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Maths in Manchester is Gypsy/Roma. The next lowest performing group in Manchester is Traveller of Irish Heritage. Again, this reflects national performance as the lowest performing ethnic groups were also Gypsy/Roma and Traveller of Irish Heritage.


### 9.5 Key Stage 2:



- The Manchester ethnic groups with the highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard at KS2 in combined Reading, Writing and Maths are White and Asian with 78.9\% (up from 2017), followed by Any Other Asian background, $73 \%$ (also up on 2017) and Other Black African $70 \%$.
- Each ethnic group improved their performance at expected standard in 2018, with the exception of Irish.
- A number of groups performed above the national average of $64 \%$ - Irish, $64.7 \%$, Pakistani $65 \%$, White and Asian, $77.1 \%$, Any Other mixed $69.7 \%$, whilst Any other Black at $74 \%$ and Indian at $67 \%$ made improvements of $2.5 \%$ and $5 \%$ respectively on their 2017 performance.
- The national groups who performed best are Any other Asian (81\%) and White and Asian (76\%).
- The groups with the lowest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in combined Reading, Writing and Maths in Manchester are Gypsy/Roma with 0\% and Traveller of Irish Heritage, 0\%. The national performance of these groups is also well below that of other ethnic groups at 18 and $22 \%$ respectively.


### 9.5.2 Key Stage 2 Reading

- The ethnic groups with highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Reading at KS2 in Manchester are White and Asian, $85.9 \%$ (from $77.8 \%$ in 2017), Black and African $85 \%$ ( $73 \%$ in 2017) and Irish $82 \%$ ( $79 \%$ in 2017).
- Nationally, the highest performing groups are Any other Asian, with $83 \%$ and Irish, with $82 \%$.
- The ethnic group with the lowest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Reading is Gypsy/Roma, with 0\% in Manchester, and $28 \%$ nationally.


### 9.5.3 Key Stage 2 Writing

- The ethnic group with highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Writing at KS2 in Manchester was White and Asian, $87.5 \%$, followed by Black African, with $83 \%$. These groups both achieved above the national average with Any Other Asian, $83 \%$, Mixed, $80 \%$, Indian, $80 \%$, also performing well.
- The Indian and Other White groups performed above their national groups,
- The ethnic groups with the lowest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Writing were Gypsy/Roma, 4\% and Traveller of Irish Heritage, $16 \%$, reflecting the lower achievement nationally for these groups, although Manchester are considerably below the 30 and $33 \%$ national figures.


### 9.5.4 Key Stage 2 Maths

- The ethnic groups with highest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Maths in Manchester are Any Other Asian Background, $92 \%$ followed by White and Asian, 85.9\%
- The ethnic group with the lowest percentage of pupils achieving the expected standard in Maths for Manchester is Gypsy/Roma, with $4.3 \%$ and Traveller of Irish Heritage with $16.7 \%$. Both groups are achieving lower than their national groups of 18 and $22 \%$.


### 9.6 Key Stage 2 Progress Scores by Ethnic Groups

2018 - KS1-2 Progress Score for Reading by Ethnic Group with National


2018 - KS1-2 Progress Score for Writing by Ethnic Group with National comparisons


2018 - KS1-2 Progress Score for Maths by Ethnic Group with National


### 9.6.1 Key Stage 2 Progress Reading:

- In terms of progress, all ethnic groups in Manchester have a positive progress score in Reading except Traveller of Irish Heritage, Gypsy/Roma, and Bangladeshi. The groups with the highest progress score are White and Black, and Indian, with 2\%.
- Nationally, the groups with a negative progress score in Reading are White British, Gypsy/Roma, Traveller of Irish Heritage, Caribbean, White \& Black Caribbean and Pakistani. The group with the highest progress score in Reading nationally is Irish with $1.4 \%$.


### 9.6.2 Key Stage 2 Progress Writing

- In terms of progress, all ethnic groups in Manchester have a positive progress score in Writing except British, Irish, Traveller of Irish Heritage, Gypsy/Roma, White \& Asian, Caribbean and White and Black Caribbean. The group with the highest progress score is Irish with 2.22.
- Nationally, the groups with a negative progress score in Writing are White British, Traveller of Irish Heritage, Gypsy/Roma and White \& Black Caribbean, Any mixed and Pakistani. The group with the highest progress score in Writing nationally is Chinese with $2.5 \%$.


### 9.6.3 Key Stage 2 Progress Maths

- In terms of progress, all ethnic groups in Manchester have a positive progress score in Maths except Traveller of Irish Heritage White and Black Caribbean and Caribbean. The group with the highest progress score in Manchester is Chinese with $4.7 \%$. This mirrors the highest progress score in maths nationally which is also Chinese with $4.7 \%$.
- Nationally, the groups with a negative progress score in Maths are Traveller of Irish Heritage, Gypsy/Roma, Caribbean, White \& Black Caribbean and Any other mixed.


### 9.7 Key Stage 4:



### 9.7.1 Key Stage 4:

- The ethnic group with the highest Attainment 8 score in Manchester in 2018 is unchanged from 2017 with Chinese pupils the best performing followed again by Indian and Bangladeshi as the next best performing group in Manchester. This mirrors the pattern nationally for highest and next performing ethnic group.
- In 2018 the ethnic group with the lowest Attainment 8 score in Manchester, as in 2017, is the Gypsy/Roma group. The groups with the second and third lowest Attainment 8 score are Traveller of Irish Heritage and Caribbean. Again, Manchester attainment reflects the performance of groups nationally, with Traveller of Irish Heritage, Gypsy/Roma and Caribbean being the lowest attaining groups.
- The ethnic groups in Manchester to have a positive progress 8 scores are Other White, White and Asian, White and Black African, Any other Asian, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, Caribbean, Black African, Any other Black Background and Any other ethnic group.
- The ethnic group with the highest Progress 8 score in Manchester is Chinese.
- There are 14 ethnic groups nationally with positive Progress 8 scores and 10 in Manchester.
- The ethnic groups in Manchester in 2018 with negative progress 8 scores, similarly to 2017 are White British, Traveller of Irish Heritage, Gypsy/Roma, Caribbean and White \& Black Caribbean.
- The Manchester ethnic groups with a better Progress 8 than their national comparators are Traveller of Irish Heritage, White and Black African, Caribbean, Any other Black background, White and Asian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi.

KS4 - \% Achieving English \& Maths (9-5) by Ethnic group with National Comparators


KS4 - \% achieving English \& Maths (9-4) by Ethnic Group with National Comparators


KS4 - \% entered eBacc by Ethnic Group with National Comparators


2018 - EBacc APS by Ethnic Group with National Comparators


