

# This document has been archived

Department for Education

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

## 14-16 Qualifications and Performance Tables and the reform of equivalences

### Description of the policy

The current qualification system is failing pupils – many are taking qualifications that do not provide routes to higher levels of education or the prospect of employment. Our aim is to raise standards by focusing schools on the highest quality qualifications, improving all pupils' opportunities for progression and ensuring that vocational education is held in high esteem. This will be achieved by reforming performance tables for 14-16 year olds from 2014 (for courses undertaken from September 2012), so that they only recognise qualifications which are high quality, rigorous and provide access to a range of study and employment opportunities. All qualifications will count in performance tables as equivalent to no more than one GCSE.

The current system has provided perverse incentives for schools' choice of qualifications to be influenced more heavily by their weighting in performance tables than their intrinsic value to pupils. This was highlighted by Professor Wolf in her Review of Vocational Education, published in March 2011. It is important that all pupils aged 14-16 receive a broad and balanced education – specialising too soon narrows their choices and limits their future opportunities. Performance table reforms will encourage schools to teach such a curriculum at Key Stage 4. The reforms will also raise the status of non-GCSE/iGCSE qualifications, by clearly identifying those which are high quality.

### Background

The Government has announced that for courses taught from September 2012 and reported in 2014, Key Stage 4 performance tables will be restricted to:

- i) GCSEs, established iGCSEs or AS levels;
- ii) qualifications that are high quality, rigorous and could lead to a range of study and employment opportunities;
- iii) qualifications that are the same size as a GCSE or larger, with each qualification counting as equivalent to one GCSE;
- iv) a maximum of two qualifications per pupil that are not GCSEs, established iGCSEs or AS levels.

A full public consultation was undertaken to determine the characteristics that non-GCSE/iGCSE qualifications (both vocational and academic) would have to demonstrate to be included in Key Stage 4 performance tables from 2014. The technical guidance [Qualifications for 14-16 Year Olds and Performance Tables](#), published in October 2011, set out these characteristics in detail. It stated that in order to be approved for inclusion in performance tables, a qualification would need to have:

- i) at least 120 Guided Learning Hours (the size of a full course GCSE);
- ii) grading (more than pass/fail);
- iii) at least 20% of the final grade derived from external assessment;
- iv) synoptic assessment;
- v) a track record of pupils progressing to further study within the same area and more broadly;
- vi) take up by at least 100 young people across 5 schools and colleges in a single cohort;
- vii) appropriate content for 14-16 year olds that covers a particular curriculum area or vocational sector.

Awarding organisations were asked to submit qualifications at Level 1, Level 2 and Level 1/2 for assessment against these requirements by 30 November 2011. 311 qualifications submissions were received and assessed by DfE officials with support from qualification experts. In taking decisions on which qualifications would be included in the Key Stage 4 performance tables in 2014, due regard was given to the analysis set out below.

The list of approved qualifications was published on 31 January 2012. An updated version of the list will be published in March 2012. This will include any newly-accredited versions of qualifications that are already on the approved list.

### **Who will be affected?**

Providers of education at Key Stage 4 (maintained schools, academies, Pupil Referral Units, University Technical Colleges) have their performance results published annually, and will therefore be affected by these reforms.

Awarding organisations, who develop and market qualifications, will also be affected. They may be required to redevelop their qualifications to demonstrate the characteristics set out above, in order for them to be included in future performance tables.

These reforms should drive significant changes in school behaviour. They will lead to improvements in the quality of vocational education for pupils aged 14-16 and remove perverse incentives for schools to focus on non-academic qualifications in Key Stage 4. Pupils beginning Key Stage 4 courses in September 2012 may take more challenging qualifications, but these qualifications will be of greater value to their future prospects in education and employment. Schools will still be able to teach qualifications which are not included in performance tables, but which are accredited by Ofqual and have section 96 approval for pre-16 teaching, where they consider them to meet the needs or interests of their pupils. This means that a range of qualifications will continue to be available to meet the needs of all pupils.

## Implementation

All non-GCSE/established iGCSE Level 1 and 2 qualifications submitted by awarding organisations were assessed under the same process and by the same characteristics, as set out in the guidance [Qualifications for 14-16 Year Olds and Performance Tables](#).

Existing qualifications which are too new to have evidence of pupils' progression or take up, but which demonstrate the other characteristics, will be included subject to further review once the first cohort has completed the qualification. This will give awarding organisations the opportunity to gather the necessary evidence. Qualifications which do not include sufficient assessment and/or grading, but which demonstrate the other characteristics, will also be included for one year, to give awarding organisations time to develop new versions which demonstrate all characteristics.

The list of qualifications to be included in the 2014 Key Stage 4 Performance Tables was published on 31 January 2012, following consideration of the analysis set out below. Awarding organisations then had the opportunity to request a review of the Department's decisions, based on the original evidence they submitted. An update to the list will be published in March 2012 to include any newly accredited qualifications which demonstrate the characteristics, and any qualifications included as a result of further review.

The list will be updated on an annual basis. New qualifications will be considered for inclusion in performance tables from 2016.

## The Evidence Base

We have modelled the potential impact of implementing these reforms as detailed below. We have used the Ofqual list of vocational qualifications currently with section 96 approval as the source of data for qualifications that currently count in Key Stage 4 performance tables. We have used Key Stage 4 attainment data to analyse take-up by different groups of particular subjects and qualifications, and to analyse the impact these reforms would have if applied retrospectively to attainment in 2011. This gives a hypothetical picture only and needs to be considered with caution, as it does not account for the fact that, had the reforms been in place, schools' and pupils' behaviour would have been different, in terms of the qualifications chosen. **It cannot, therefore, be considered a prediction of likely attainment in 2014, as the reforms are likely to drive a significant change in school behaviour.**

Data are for pupils in the maintained sector in England only, and information is held on their characteristics (gender, Special Educational Needs (SEN), ethnicity and Free School Meals (FSM) eligibility). There are no data available for religion or belief, Lesbian Gay and Bisexual (LGB) and transgender groups.

### What the evidence shows – key facts

An analysis modelled on Key Stage 4 attainment data for 2011 assumes that schools continue to enter students for the same qualifications, irrespective of whether or not these are included within Key Stage 4 performance tables. In practice this is a very unlikely scenario; we expect that schools will stop offering many of the qualifications that will be excluded from the performance tables and start providing others that are included. Further attainment or progression data will therefore need to be collected once the reforms are in effect, to assess their impact on school behaviour. This will be obtained from the first cohort of pupils affected by these reforms when they finish their Key Stage 4 studies in 2014. The data will become available in 2015.

Based on analysis of 2011 Key Stage 4 results, reforms to equivalences and the recommended reduction of qualifications included in performance tables in 2014 would result in an estimated decrease in national attainment (by the 5+A\*-C GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths measure) of 5 percentage points, if schools made no changes to the qualifications they offered. The decline in apparent attainment is greater if English and Maths are not included in the measure and would disproportionately affect those groups that are over-represented amongst underachievers.

This analysis is set out in detail in the table at Annex A. The rates using the existing measures are consistent with the figures published in SFR03/2012 (DfE: GCSE and Equivalent Attainment by Pupil Characteristics in England) on 9 February. These data are supplemented by Tables 1 and 2 in Annex C, which provide the national average and school-level data respectively. The rates are all based on the numbers of pupils in the 2011 KS4 amended results file who were in the spring 2011 pupil level census and are not directly comparable with results published elsewhere.

If, as we intend and expect, schools adapt their provision to deliver more qualifications that are included in performance tables and fewer that are not included, the analysis in Annex A is unlikely to materialise and should be seen as a hypothetical 'no change, worst case scenario'. Annex B gives a breakdown for each group, by subject sector, of the Level 2 qualification passes counted in KS4 2011 which would not be counted if these reforms were applied retrospectively to the data. This enables us to see if the impact on a particular group is due to their opting for specific sectors or subjects. The evidence shows that this is not the case: in general, there is not a great deal of variation in the sector breakdown between groups.

For some pupils, particularly those with SEN, qualifications not included in performance tables may be the most suited to their needs. Schools will still be able to offer such qualifications where it is in the interests of their pupils to do so. However, for the most part, the evidence highlighted in Professor Wolf's Review of Vocational Education shows that the current system provides perverse incentives for schools to channel lower-attaining pupils, including a disproportionate number with SEN, into qualification routes that do not provide prospects for progression into employment or further education but do maximise the chances of the school reaching its threshold for attainment. These reforms will therefore bring significant benefits; in future we expect these pupils will take more challenging qualifications, but that these qualifications are more likely to be of value to their future education and employment. The resulting decline in (apparent) attainment – and the

concomitant rise in real qualification quality – will have a disproportionate impact and potential longer term benefits for disadvantaged groups where results are generally weaker. The likely positive impact on progression will be disproportionately high for pupils with SEN, and could therefore help to overcome the current disparity between their rates of progression and those of their peers.

The following information has been taken from a variety of reports which are all referenced.

## Disability

### Context

There are currently 3 levels of intervention for pupils with SEN in England (*Dept for Education Green Paper. Support and aspiration: a new approach to special educational needs and disability: A consultation, Dept for Education, March 2011*):

**School Action (SA)** – where the teacher or the school SEN Coordinator (SENCO) decides to provide something for the child additional to or different from schools' usual differentiated approach to help children learn.

**School Action Plus (SAP)** – where the school consults specialists and requests help from external services.

**Statement (St)** – where the child requires support beyond that which the school can provide and the local authority arranges appropriate provision.

76% of the overall cohort in state schools age 15 had no SEN status in 2011. 13.3% had School Action status, 6.9% had School Action Plus status, and 3.7% were statemented.

In 2011, 22% of pupils with SEN achieved 5+ GCSEs or equivalent at A\*-C including English and Maths at Key Stage 4, compared to 70% of those without SEN.

Based on the Level 2 non-GCSE/IGCSE qualifications achieved in 2011, the subject areas with the highest proportions of SEN pupils were:

**Home Economics** (22.1% SA, 13.2% SAP, 4.4% St, compared to 60.3% non SEN)

**Security/Armed Forces** (27.8% SA, 20% SAP, 8.1% St, compared to 44.1% non SEN)

**Environment** (21.2% SA, 13.8% SAP, 4.6% St, compared to 60.4% non SEN)

### Impact

If schools did not respond to the reforms by delivering different qualifications, according to the analysis set out in Annex A, the absolute

percentage point fall in the rate attaining 5+A\*-C GCSE or equivalents including English and Maths would be less for SEN groups (-4 percentage points) than for those with no SEN (-5 percentage points). However, this could be due to the fact that attainment for SEN groups by that measure is significantly lower to begin with. If the measure of 5+A\*-C without English and Maths is used, the percentage point fall is much greater for those with SEN (-32 percentage points), and particularly those with School Action and School Action Plus, than for those without SEN (-20 percentage points).

Annex B shows, by subject sector, how Level 2 qualification passes for pupils with SEN that counted in KS4 2011 would not be counted if the reforms were applied retrospectively to the data. In some subjects, there is a greater impact on pupils with SEN than those without: for example, the qualifications in Other Science make up a higher percentage of those not counted for SEN pupils (12.7% for SA, 13.8% for SAP, 15.6% for St) than of those not counted for non SEN pupils (6.7%). This could be due to the fact that Other Science is disproportionately popular with SEN pupils, compared to their predominance within the Key Stage 4 cohort (34.6% SEN pupils compared to 65.4% non SEN). Similarly, there is a slightly greater impact on SEN pupils from the change in the representation of Home Economics in the performance tables (accounting for 1.1% of the qualifications excluded for SA pupils, 1.4% for SAP pupils, and 1.7% for St pupils, compared to 0.5% of those excluded for non SEN pupils). However, the reduction in the number of qualifications in other subjects has an equal impact on those with SEN to those without, even where a high number of SEN students opt for them, such as Environment.

For SEN pupils, the impact of qualifications being excluded from performance tables is distributed across a range of subjects, not linked to the small number of qualifications which are disproportionately taken by pupils with SEN. The impact is also generally proportional to the impact on non SEN pupils.

## Gender

### Context

In 2011, 62% of females achieved 5+ GCSEs or equivalent at A\*-C including English and Maths at Key Stage 4, compared to 55% of males.

Based on the Level 2 non-GCSE/IGCSE qualifications achieved in 2011, the subject areas with the most disproportionate take-up by either males or females were:

### **Males:**

**Humanities** (97.1% male)

**Construction, engineering and manufacturing** (95.1% male)

**Security/Armed Forces** (82.3% male)

**Environment** (67.3% male)

## **Females:**

**Dance** (98.5% female)

**Hairdressing** (98.4% female)

**Health and social care** (86.4% female)

**Health and beauty** (81% female)

### Impact

If schools did not respond to the reforms by delivering different qualifications, according to provisional analysis of KS4 2011 data in Annex A, the rate of males achieving 5+A\*-C GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths would fall by 6 percentage points (to 49%), compared with a smaller fall of 4 percentage points for females (to 58%). This increases the gap in apparent attainment between males and females by 2 percentage points. The decline in apparent attainment is greater if the requirement for English and Maths is removed: a decrease by 25 percentage points for males (from 77% to 52%), compared with a fall of 21 percentage points for females (from 84% to 63%), increasing the gap in apparent attainment between the genders by 4 percentage points.

Annex B shows, by subject sector, how Level 2 qualification passes for male and female pupils that counted in KS4 2011 would not be counted if the reforms were applied retrospectively to the data. In a small number of subjects, there is a greater impact on one gender than the other: for example, the popularity of Physical Education amongst males (61.3% male take-up in 2011) means that 8.7% of the qualifications not counted for males are in Physical Education, compared to only 5.5% of the qualifications not counted for females. Similarly, 2.4% of the qualifications not counted for males are in construction, engineering and manufacturing, compared to only 0.1% of females' qualifications. Health and Social Care accounts for 4.3% of the qualifications not counted for females, compared to 0.7% of the qualifications not counted for males.

For both genders, the impact of qualifications being excluded from performance tables is distributed across a range of subjects, not linked to the small number of qualifications which are disproportionately taken by either males or females. Overall, for most subjects there is a roughly equal impact on males and females, for example for ICT, Religious Studies, and Personal Development.

## **Ethnicity**

### Context

Rates of achievement vary between different ethnic groups. 58% of Key Stage 4 pupils nationally achieved 5+ A\*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths in 2011. The rate of achievement by children of white British ethnicity was in line with the national average (58%). Chinese pupils showed a considerably higher rate of achievement (79%), as did Indian pupils (74%). Attainment was particularly low for pupils from the following ethnicities: Gypsy/Roma (11%), Travellers of Irish heritage (18%), Black Caribbean (49%), White and Black Caribbean (49%), and Pakistani (53%).

Based on the Level 2 non-GCSE/iGCSE qualifications achieved in 2011, subject areas with notably disproportionate take-up by particular ethnic groups were:

**Agriculture, Horticulture and Farming** (95.6% **White British**, who made up 78.2% of the overall KS4 cohort)

**Office Studies** (4.2% **White and Black Caribbean**, who made up 1.1% of the overall KS4 cohort)

**Other Languages** (20.9% **African** (2.5% of KS4 cohort), 20% **Pakistani** (2.9% of KS4 cohort), 10.9% **Indian** (2.3% of KS4 cohort))

### Impact

If schools did not respond to the reforms by delivering different qualifications, according to provisional analysis of KS4 2011 data in Annex A, the rate of pupils attaining 5+ A\*-C GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths would fall by 5 percentage points. There is a slightly higher than average decrease in the achievement of those ethnic groups already displaying lower levels of achievement, including Pakistani and Black pupils, and smaller than average decreases for the higher-attaining Chinese and Indian groups. This is also the case for the measure without English and Maths. The decrease in attainment for Gypsy/Roma/Traveller children is lower than average, but this is due to the fact that the current rate of attainment of those groups is considerably lower to begin with.

Annex B shows, by subject sector, how Level 2 qualification passes for pupils from different ethnic groups that counted in KS4 2011 would not be counted if the reforms were applied retrospectively to the data. In a small number of subjects, there is a greater impact on certain ethnic groups: for example, qualifications in Other Science account for 8.1% of the qualifications not counted on average across all groups. This is higher for Travellers of Irish heritage (11.3%) or Gypsy/Roma pupils (14.4%), and considerably lower for Chinese or Indian pupils (4.9% and 5.4% respectively).

Conversely, not counting certain qualifications within the performance tables, such as in Religious Studies (which will be excluded as a short-course GCSE on the basis of size) has a disproportionate impact on certain groups, such as Chinese (12.2%) or Indian (11.5%) pupils, compared to the average 8.2% of qualifications excluded across all ethnic groups. Overall, there is a roughly equal impact across different ethnic groups for most subjects, for example for ICT and Personal Development, and also for subjects which have a disproportionate take-up by particular ethnic groups, for example Agriculture, Horticulture and Farming.

### **Socio-economic Groups**

#### Context

The gap between students from different socio-economic backgrounds remains wide, with students eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) far less likely to achieve 5 GCSEs or equivalents at A\*-C including English and Maths (35% in 2011, compared to 62% of those not eligible for FSM). The combination of being eligible for FSM and being part of another group with lower probability of obtaining good qualifications (for example

males, those with an identified SEN and certain ethnic minority groups) leads to extremely low results (*How Fair is Britain?: Chapter 10*). Pupils in receipt of FSM made up 14.1% of the Key Stage 4 cohort in 2011.

Pupils resident in the least deprived areas, as defined by the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI), continue to outperform pupils in the most deprived areas. However, since 2007/08 the gap has narrowed for the percentage achieving 5 or more A\*-C grades at GCSE or equivalent including English and Maths (*SFR GCSE and Equivalent Attainment by Pupil Characteristics in England 2009/10*).

### Impact

If schools did not respond to the reforms by delivering different qualifications, according to provisional analysis of KS4 2011 data in Annex A, the difference in the rate of attainment between FSM pupils and non-FSM pupils would increase. The proportion of FSM pupils achieving 5+ GCSE or equivalents at A\*-C grades including English and Maths would decrease by 6 percentage points, compared with 5 percentage points for the non-FSM group. Without the English and Maths requirement, the rate of attainment would decrease by 33 percentage points for FSM pupils and 21 percentage points for non-FSM pupils.

## **Engagement and involvement**

Key stakeholders were identified and consulted with as part of a full, public consultation.

### **Key Stakeholders involved in the process:**

- Schools Network (formerly known as SSAT)
- Association of Colleges
- Federation of Awarding Bodies
- Teaching unions and professional associations
- Awarding organisations
- Royal Academy of Engineering (FE STEM data project group)
- Higher education institutions
- OGDs (Other Government Departments) and ALBs (Arms Length Bodies)

### **Consultation responses received from:**

- Teachers and headteachers
- Schools and colleges
- School governors
- Representative bodies
- Awarding organisations

### **Equalities stakeholders:**

National Bureau for Students With Disabilities  
Association of National Specialist Colleges  
Religious Education Council of England and Wales  
Greek Orthodox  
Guru Nanak Nishkam Education Trust  
Hindu Council UK & Hindu Academy  
Association of Muslim Schools UK  
Board of Deputies of British Jews  
Catholic Education Service for England and Wales (CESEW)

### **Challenges and opportunities**

These reforms present an opportunity for schools to raise standards, and for the Government to create a more transparent system in which high-quality qualifications are clearly indicated to schools and pupils. The reduction in the number of qualifications which count in performance tables will incentivise awarding organisations to develop more rigorous and high quality qualifications for consideration in future years and ensure that qualifications are available which deliver to a broad range of needs and interests.

Qualifications related to certain sectors and subjects have differentiated take-up by pupils with SEN; who are eligible for FSM; certain ethnic minorities; and according to gender. However, the evidence shows that there is not a great deal of variation in the impact on different groups when the reforms are applied retrospectively to the 2011 KS4 data. These reforms present an opportunity to guide pupils towards high quality qualifications in those sectors, rather than the lower quality courses which they have disproportionately been guided into and which do not provide them with a path into further study and employment. In addition, this is also an opportunity for schools to counter conventional stereotypes associated with gender and ethnicity, SEN or socio-economic circumstances, by using the reforms to influence pupil choices in a positive way.

These reforms are intended to indicate which qualifications have most value for the majority at Key Stage 4. There may be qualifications not included in performance tables which are the most appropriate for individual pupils. Schools should offer their pupils qualifications that provide them with the very best foundation to progress. They can still offer qualifications with section 96 approval which do not count in performance tables, where they believe that is in the best interests of the individual pupil. We will ensure that schools are aware that this is the case.

We will continue to have performance measures that recognise the achievements of disadvantaged/lower attaining pupils (for example, measures relating to how the performance of deprived pupils compares against other pupils in the school).

## Equality analysis

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 puts a duty on public authorities (including the Secretary of State) to have due regard to the need:

- a) To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- b) To advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;
- c) To foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

The duty applies in relation to the following protected characteristics: age (except in the case of schools and children's homes), disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation.

Decisions on the reform of school performance tables, and the qualifications that they will include, have been taken after having had due regard to these matters, including consideration of a draft of this Equality Impact Assessment.

We anticipate this policy will have a positive impact on the outcomes for all young people, including those with SEN, eligible for FSM, and ethnic minorities, by promoting certain suitably challenging qualifications that are best suited to enabling them to fulfil their individual potential and provide them with the skills needed to access further study and employment. These reforms will remove perverse incentives to guide pupils into lower-quality qualifications which are not valued by further education institutions or employers. Pupils from disadvantaged groups currently make up a disproportionate number of those guided into such courses; these reforms will therefore enhance their prospects for progression, and could help to overcome the inequalities that exist at present.

It is not possible to quantify the benefits of these reforms in terms of the real impact on rates of progression or increased quality in education standards. The only possible quantitative analysis which can be conducted presents a hypothetical picture, in the form of a worst-case scenario of no change. If the list is retrofitted to provisional Key Stage 4 data for last year, we can analyse the impact in the unlikely event that schools continue to deliver their current choice of qualifications, and pupils continue to study them. This would mean that fewer pupils would reach the standard of 5 A\*-C grades, including English and Maths, with an estimated decrease in national attainment of 5 percentage points. The impact would be higher for pupils with SEN, eligible for FSM, males, and for certain ethnic groups.

The more likely scenario, as borne out by emerging evidence of the impact on school and pupil choices from the recent English Baccalaureate reform, is that the proposed changes will drive greater take-up by schools and pupils of those qualifications on the list. In this case, results can still be expected to fall to some extent, as the qualifications taken will generally be more rigorous. This can be expected to have a disproportionate impact on groups with SEN, on FSM, males, or certain ethnic minorities, where results are generally weaker.

However, any short-term fall in attainment will be accompanied by a concomitant rise in real qualification quality and, accordingly, in rates of progression in the longer term. This means that, overall, these reforms will have a disproportionate positive impact on disadvantaged groups, by ensuring that they have greater access to high quality qualifications more frequently taken by less disadvantaged peers, enhancing their rates of progression accordingly.

There is a clear benefit for all pupils in improving transparency as to which qualifications are high-quality and will enhance their prospects in employment or further education, and removing incentives for schools to promote qualifications which will not enhance progression in this way. It will still be possible for schools to choose to deliver other qualifications not included in performance tables, if these best suit the needs of their pupils. This will ensure that the needs of protected groups are met.

## **Next steps**

We will review the list of qualifications included in performance tables annually to decide whether any need to be removed or additional qualifications need to be added. As part of this process, we will also review and update this Equality Impact Assessment, using registration, attainment and progression data to analyse the impact of the reforms on disadvantaged groups. This will ensure that future decision-making on how to reshape the list of qualifications included in performance tables is informed by consideration of the impact on equalities.

Until the first cohort of pupils affected by these reforms finishes their Key Stage 4 studies in 2014, there will be a lack of attainment or progression data for us to consider in this way. Instead we will look to use registration data from the beginning of 2012 and qualitative evidence to update our Equality Impact Assessment.

All new qualifications and new versions of existing qualifications will be reviewed after their first inclusion in performance tables – once the first cohort of students has completed Year 11 and evidence is available on whether they have progressed to further education or Apprenticeships (or potentially to a job with training).

**Annex A Illustrative impact of the restriction of qualifications counted in performance tables and reform of equivalences on KS4 L2 measures by characteristics, applied retrospectively to 2011 KS4 results.**

(2011 KS4 amended data, state funded schools)

	% 5+A*-C inc E & M			% 5+A-C			Denominator
	Current Rate (%)	Applying reforms Rate (%)	Difference <sup>1</sup> in rate compared with current measure (percentage points)	Current Rate (%)	Applying reforms Rate (%)	Difference <sup>1</sup> in rate compared with current measure (percentage points)	
<b>Gender</b>							
Female	62	58	-4	84	63	-21	278,045
Male	55	49	-6	77	52	-25	288,887
<b>FSM status</b>							
Non-FSM	62	57	-5	83	62	-21	487,107
FSM	35	28	-6	65	32	-33	79,169
<b>SEN status</b>							
Not SEN	70	64	-5	89	69	-20	430,382
<b>All SEN pupils</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>135,894</b>
School Action	28	22	-5	65	27	-38	75,289
School Action Plus	19	15	-4	49	18	-31	39,399
Statemented	8	7	-1	25	9	-16	21,206
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
<b>White Summary Ethnic Group</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>-23</b>	<b>464,056</b>
White British	58	53	-5	80	58	-23	443,555
Irish	66	63	-3	81	68	-14	1,944
Traveller of Irish heritage	18	15	-2	35	18	-17	137
Gypsy/Roma	11	8	-3	31	9	-22	595
Any Other White Background	54	50	-4	79	55	-24	17,825
<b>Mixed summary ethnic group</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>-22</b>	<b>18,775</b>
White & Black Caribbean	49	44	-5	76	48	-27	6,444
White & Black African	58	54	-4	81	59	-21	1,811
White & Asian	68	64	-4	86	68	-18	3,759
Other Mixed	62	58	-5	83	63	-20	6,761
<b>Asian summary ethnic group</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>-23</b>	<b>43,207</b>
Indian	74	71	-4	90	75	-15	12,948
Pakistani	53	46	-6	81	51	-29	16,423
Bangladeshi	60	54	-6	83	58	-25	6,950
Other Asian	62	58	-5	84	63	-21	6,886
<b>Black summary ethnic group</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>-27</b>	<b>25,389</b>
Caribbean	49	43	-6	77	48	-30	8,058
African	58	52	-6	82	57	-25	14,431
Other Black	53	47	-6	79	52	-27	2,900
<b>Chinese</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>-12</b>	<b>2,303</b>
Any other Ethnic Group	54	50	-4	80	55	-24	6,807
Refused/not obtained	56	52	-4	77	56	-21	5,750
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>-23</b>	<b>566,932</b>

<sup>1</sup> The differences are calculated from unrounded percentages and therefore may be 1 percentage point different from the difference in the rounded percentages.



