

ISLE OF ANGLESEY COUNTY COUNCIL Scrutiny Report Template

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Partnership and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee |
| Date: | 21 January, 2020 |
| Subject: | School Standards Summer 2019 |
| Purpose of Report: | |
| Scrutiny Chair: | Cllr. Gwilym Owen Jones |
| Portfolio Holder(s): | Cllr. R Meirion Jones |
| Head of Service: | Rhys Hughes, Director of Education, Skills and Young People |
| Report Author: | Rhys Hughes, Director of Education, Skills and Young People |
| Tel: | 01248 752916 |
| Email: | Rhyshughes2@ynysmon.gov.uk |
| Local Members: | N/A |

1 – Recommendation(s)

The Partnership and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee are asked to:

- A1:** Approve the contents of the Report on Anglesey's Outcomes 2019 in respect of:
- Report on Teacher Assessment (Foundation Phase / Key Stage 2 / Key Stage 3)
 - Report on KS4 results
 - Report on KS5 results
 - Anglesey LA's Estyn Profile
- A2:**
- Agree on / and approve Anglesey LA's main areas for improvement.
- A3:**
- Approve the developments in respect of the engagement work with partners in Anglesey.
- A4:**
- Approve the liability process between the Anglesey Learning Service and GwE.

2 – Link to Council Plan / Other Corporate Priorities

Direct link to the Council's Plan / transformation priorities.

Aim: working towards an Anglesey that is healthy and prosperous where families can thrive.

Objective 1

Ensure that the people of Anglesey can thrive and realise their long-term potential.

We will continue to raise standards in education and ensure that our young people have the correct skills for employment and training.

3 – Guiding Principles for Scrutiny Members

To aid Members in scrutinizing the subject:-

3.1 The impact the item has on individuals and **communities [focus on the customer/citizen]**

3.2 Observe the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed change – financially and in terms of quality **[focus on value]**

3.3 Observe any risks **[focus on risk]**

3.4 Scrutiny to take the role of performance management or quality guarantee **[focus on performance and quality]**

3.5 Observe plans and proposals from the perspective of:

- long term
- prevention
- integration
- collaboration
- content

[focus on welfare]

4 – Key Scrutiny Questions

General

1. What impact have you seen since the change in requirements so that Foundation Phase, KS2 and KS3 teacher assessments aren't published?
 - General impact on National data?
 - General impact on the data of Anglesey schools?
 - The impact seen when visiting schools – on children, staff and headteachers?
2. Since there are no longer benchmark comparisons in the Foundation Phase, KS2 and KS2, how do schools and GwE (on behalf of the Anglesey Learning Service) measure whether the pupils achieve?
3. You mentioned at the start that collaboration and engagement with partners receives national attention. Can you provide us with an overview of any relevant

developments in Anglesey, and how GwE (on behalf of Anglesey's Learning Service) contributes or promotes this agenda?

4. Do you believe that the liability arrangement between the Anglesey Learning Service and GwE is effective? Why?

Primary

1. Since the Welsh Government no longer prepares a 'Core Data' package for Primary schools, does GwE (on behalf of Anglesey's Learning Service) prepare anything to aid schools to internally analyse their data?
2. Why have Foundation Phase outcomes been generally lower on the expected outcome in the past two years?
3. Why have Welsh assessments in KS2 fallen over the past two years?
4. Why do the assessments of pupils entitled to free school meals appear to be generally lower this year in both Key Stages compared to other years?

Secondary

1. Why is performance in the higher levels lower than the Anglesey average and why does GwE (on behalf of the Anglesey Learning Service) support schools to improve their performance on the higher levels and higher grades in KS4 and KS5?
2. In KS4, the new Capio 9 indicator addresses a wider range of subjects and qualifications than the previous Level 2+ Threshold/ How does GwE (on behalf of the Anglesey Learning Service) ensure support for subjects besides the core subjects?
3. Why is the performance of Anglesey's FSM pupils lower than the national average, and how are improvements ensured in the performance of this cohort of pupils?

5 – Background / Context

1. CONTEXT

See "Report on Anglesey's Outcomes 2019."

6 – Equality Impact Assessment [including impacts on the Welsh Language]

N/A

7 – Financial Implications

N/A

8 – Appendices

Report on Anglesey's Outcomes 2019.

9 – Background papers (please contact the author of the Report for any further information):

REPORT ON OUTCOMES 2019

Anglesey



CONTENT

- 1. Background and context**
 - 2. Standards**
 - **Overview of performance in each Local Authority (Individual LA's to be inserted in Appendix 1)**
 - **Estyn School Inspection Profile**
 - **National Categorisation**
 - 3. Emerging Questions To Help The Joint Committee, LA Officers And Scrutiny Committees To Evaluate Pupil Progress, Standards And Performance**
 - 4. 2019-20 Business Plan Priorities**
 - 5. Appendix 1 - Report on standards for each individual LA**
-

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Welsh Government alongside several partners and experts has undertaken a fundamental review of the accountability system for schools in Wales.

Findings highlighted that the existing system and its use of performance measures has many negative unintended consequences, such as:

- narrowing curriculum choice;
- disproportionate focus on particular groups of learners;
- the way in which benchmarking is used driving competition between schools rather than encouraging collaboration;
- an increased and unnecessary workload for teachers and others in the system, without the necessary impact or benefit for learners; and
- an aggregation of data for *accountability* purposes where it was designed for *improvement* purposes.

As a result, schools have heard conflicting messages from the various parts of the system about what matters. This has often diverted effort from learning and teaching and moved us towards a culture of compliance and bureaucracy.

A joint communication from **Welsh Government, the WLGA and Estyn** to Chairs of Scrutiny, Cabinet Members, Directors of Education, Chief Executive Officers, and Managing Directors of Regional Education Consortia, published on **16 July 2019** stated that:

“It is counter-productive for schools to be placed under disproportionate pressure on the basis of individual measures. It is not in the interest of school improvement and risks undermining the ongoing change in culture that we are working together to achieve. We expect local authorities and regional consortia to support schools to make appropriate decisions about their curriculum to avoid narrowing choice for learners.

Collectively, we have agreed that this is the right approach to take and strongly advise you to use a broad range of un-aggregated data and information to enable you to discharge your duties when reporting on school performance. Evaluating the performance of individual schools rather than generating aggregated data at local authority level will be more helpful to supporting and challenging individual schools with their improvement.”

This report on performance across North Wales will adhere to this guidance.

Reporting on Teacher Assessments (Foundation Phase to Key Stage 3)

National changes in the reporting of teacher assessments has been introduced over the past two years. It supports the key objectives of the Welsh Government document: ‘Our National Mission,’ in delivering robust assessment, evaluation and accountability arrangements to support a self-improving system.

International evidence suggests that for all learners to achieve their full potential, there should be a coherent assessment and accountability system. The primary purpose of assessment is to provide information that guides decisions about how best to progress pupils’ learning.

There is now a greater focus on the use of data in school self-evaluation. In the reformed system, schools are evaluated according to the difference they make to the progress of every child.

Data and information that is available to schools to measure this progress includes: end of key stage data, baseline entry data, pupil progress data over time, value added data between baseline and key stages, reading and numeracy diagnostic test data, action research and specific testing data as well as ESTYN inspection outcomes.

Data that has traditionally been aggregated upwards for comparison has been removed. All benchmarking, comparisons with other establishments, reading and numeracy test data, placing schools and Local Authorities in rank order is no longer acceptable or possible. As of last year, the only comparative data available to Local Authorities in these key stages are the National averages for end of these key stages.

In addition, the Minister for Education published a statement on school performance targets in June 2019. She stated:

‘ , I want to be absolutely clear that school targets should only be used to support self-evaluation and should not be aggregated up to a local authority measure of performance to hold schools to account.’

These recent changes in assessment reporting requirements will strengthen the accuracy of assessment. It will reduce inflated levels and gaming and will ensure that every school looks closely at every learner and not just borderline learners who influence whether a school achieves a narrow measure or not.

National arrangements will have a renewed emphasis on Assessment for Learning as an essential and integral feature of learning and teaching; it is a significant move away from gathering information about young people’s performance on a school-by-school basis for accountability purposes.

Teacher assessment data and National Reading and Numeracy Test data at a school, local authority and consortia level will no longer be published. This applies to the Foundation Phase, Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3 in all maintained primary and secondary schools.

Arrangements that will remain:

- National Reading and Numeracy Tests and Teacher Assessments for individual learners, however no national school level benchmark information will be published.
- Headteachers are required to report school performance to parents and adult learners each school year.
- Governing bodies are required to produce annual reports to parents, school prospectuses, school development plans, and set performance and absence targets.
- Schools, governing bodies and local authorities still have access to their own data (alongside national level data) for self-evaluation purposes.
- The Welsh Government continue to collect individual learner level data to ensure transparency at a national performance level and to inform policy.

Arrangements that will change:

- No comparative information about teacher assessments and tests, in relation to other schools within a local authority or ‘family of schools’, will be published.
- The Welsh Government no longer produce or publish School Comparative Reports and All Wales Core Data Sets for schools and local authorities in respect of teacher assessment data.
- The My Local School website no longer includes teacher assessment data below the national level (from 2018).

Changes to Areas of Learning in the Foundation Phase

In October 2014 the Foundation Phase Areas of Learning (AoL) for Language, Literacy and Communication Skills and Mathematical Development were revised to align them with the National Literacy and Numeracy Framework (LNF) as well as make them more demanding. In line with this the Foundation Phase outcomes were recalibrated to align with the increased expectations of the revised Areas of Learning.

The revised AoL were introduced on a statutory basis from September 2015. This means that the cohort of children that started Reception in September 2015 were the first children to be formally assessed against the revised outcomes at the end of the Foundation Phase in the summer of 2018. Comparisons of Foundation Phase outcomes with previous years at school level should, therefore, be avoided as they are not measured on a comparable basis.

Reporting on KS4 results

New interim KS4 measures have been introduced for 2019 as part of the significant education reform programme in Wales.

National data capture for individual schools will be based on first entry results. The data provided regionally for individual school and LAs will also be based on first entry results. JCQ/WJEC have published their data and press release based on the 'best outcome' obtained by 16 year olds across both the November and summer series. There will be differences between first entry and best outcome data.

As a result, across several indicators, it will not be possible to compare 2019 figures with previous performance.

The table below shows the new interim measures and the methodology used for calculating. It also demonstrates the key differences with previous years.

| Interim Measure | How it is calculated | Differences from previous years, and why comparisons cannot be made |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Capped 9 | <p>The Capped 9 Points Score is a performance measure calculating the average of the scores for the best awards for all individual pupils in the cohort, capped at a specified volume of GCSEs or equivalent qualifications.</p> <p>Three of the nine slots require the awards of specific subjects and qualifications in order to contribute any points towards the measure. These slots are each one GCSE in size, specifying requirements in literacy, numeracy and science GCSEs only.</p> <p>The best grade from any of the literature or first language Welsh or English GCSEs can contribute towards the literacy slot.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Only a pupil's first entry will count✓ WJEC Science GCSE only |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>The best grade from either of the mathematics or mathematics – numeracy GCSEs can contribute towards the numeracy slot.</p> <p>The best grade from a science GCSE can contribute towards the science slot (currently this is limited to awards in the WJEC suite of science GCSE qualifications currently available to learners: biology, chemistry, physics, science (double award) applied science (double award) and applied science (single award).</p> <p>The remaining six qualifications will include the pupil's best performance in either GCSE and/or vocational equivalent.</p> | |
| Literacy measure | Calculating the average of the scores for all individual pupils in the cohort, taking the best grade from any of the literature or first language Welsh or English GCSEs awarded to a pupil. | New 2019 measure, first entry only will count, with Literature also accepted within this measure |
| Numeracy measure | Calculating the average of the scores for all individual pupils in the cohort, taking the best grade from either of the mathematics or mathematics – numeracy GCSEs awarded to a pupil | New 2019 measure, first entry only will count |
| Science measure | Calculating the average of the scores for all individual pupils in the cohort, taking the best grade from a science GCSE awarded to a learner (currently this is limited to awards in the WJEC suite of science GCSE qualifications available to learners: biology, chemistry, physics, science (double award) applied science (double award) and applied science (single award) - these are identified as being able to contribute towards science measures. | New 2019 measure, first entry only will count |
| The Welsh Baccalaureate Skills Challenge Certificate measure | Calculates the average of the scores for the Welsh Baccalaureate Skills Challenge Certificate awards for all individual learners in the cohort, whether it is the Foundation (Level 1) or the National (Level 2) award. | Reported separately as a main indicator for the first time in 2019 |

In this context, the data should be analysed on a local level and as a starting point to question local priorities.

Although 2019 data is currently available on historical performance measures (L1, L2, L2+ and 5A*-A), comparison with previous years is not valid because of the first entry counting rather than best outcome.

Scrutinising Individual School Performance

Regular fortnightly Local Quality Board meetings are held between the GwE Core Lead and each LA. Any schools causing concern are discussed and any strengths and areas for improvement are noted. This links to the regular meetings held by the core lead with Supporting Improvement Advisers to discuss school progress. The regular communication between LA and GwE officers ensures shared intelligence about the capacity to improve of schools, and where concerns are identified that all parties work in partnership to review the standards and provision in the school and to set and monitor clear targets for improvement.

Each LA has its own monitoring processes to scrutinise the performance of individual schools. This includes the use of 'Accelerated Improvement Boards' for school's causing concern.

Each LA's monitoring arrangements is described within their individual standards report.

Schools Causing Concern

All schools are on an improvement journey and thus require differentiated and appropriate support and challenge to varying degrees. A few schools will require more intense targeted intervention.

The label 'schools causing concern' is very wide ranging and in its broader term has not been clearly defined in national guidance. For our own purpose within GwE, we have come up with the following definitions:

- Schools that need support to maintain or improve upon standards [i.e. moving from 'good' to 'excellent' or 'coasting schools'];
- Schools that are improving but need further support to sustain their improvement trajectory and/or further reduce within school variability;
- Schools that need more specific targeted support and intervention to prevent them being a cause of significant concern;
- Schools that have been identified as causing significant concerns and/or are in a statutory category.

GwE and the local authorities have an overall good track record in effectively supporting schools and specifically those causing concern. All secondary schools have a bespoke 'Support Plan' which ensures that GwE support is closely aligned with their SDP priorities. This allows for more effective deployment of resource, regional expertise and best practice.

High challenge and support is targeted in a timely and effective approach leading, in most instances, to an acceleration of the improvement journey in the identified schools, and, where relevant, their removal from Estyn follow-up category.

Local Quality Standards Board meetings are held on a regular basis between LA and GwE senior officer and used to share information around school performance and progress and to agree on any required adaptations to support plans. Interim Accelerated Improvement Boards provide challenge and intervention to those schools in serious categories of concern. Where concerns remain, escalated action is taken which could include the use of powers of intervention as defined by national guidance.

Current regional situation

The primary and special school inspection profile has been continuously strong and compares well with the Estyn profile for schools across Wales. All primary schools placed in a category over the past three years have been removed promptly as a result of the targeted high challenge and support.

Standards in the secondary sector remains a cause for concern. Over the past 18 months, GwE has:

- re-profiled its service to ensure that additional resource is targeted towards the secondary sector;
- strengthened its team of link secondary SIAs to ensure relevant experience and expertise;
- ensured all secondary schools have access to a generic and bespoke programme of support;
- facilitated access to curriculum, MAT, post 16 and subject networks to disseminate good practice;
- adopted a targeted 'wave' support for ensuring continued improvements in core subjects;
- enhanced the GwE offer of professional development opportunities [and especially for experienced, new and potential leaders of the future];
- led the *Assessment for Learning* regional initiative to improve teaching and learning with Shirley Clarke;
- ensured further support for head teachers via strategic forum meetings and for participating schools through the *Excellence and Innovation* forum;
- supported 12 regional schools to research and address in-school variance by improving data tracking and intervention. Lessons extracted from the pilot will be transferable to all schools across the LA;
- provided financial support for a more diagnostic approach to securing improvements at KS4 English and Mathematics via PIXL;
- provided specific training at behest of schools for curriculum middle leaders and pastoral leaders;
- supported bespoke training for targeted schools and departments to improve aspects of the teaching and learning, e.g., with Tom Sherrington, Olevi ITP and OTP.

In addition to the bespoke support delivered for secondary schools in the core subjects, generic regional and local guidance has also been available via subject networks and forums. Some of the key areas addressed include:

- English: A Level study support, Accelerated Reader training, developing literacy across the curriculum, improving oracy to support writing, improving tracking and intervention at KS4, improving standards of writing at KS4, guidance on MAT provision in English, development of resources e.g. *'Fix-it' resource to support the repair work required to address identified weak skills, Mastery Packs for KS4, Gothic SOW with grammar focus for Y7*
- Mathematics: leadership guidance and up-dates for new curriculum, sharing of best practice from Whiterose Maths Academies on the development of pedagogy within their cluster of schools, developing departmental pedagogy by 'deepening thinking', developing pedagogy at A level, supporting collaboration between numeracy co-ordinators to identify best practice in developing skills across the curriculum, develop leadership of numeracy co-ordinators who are within the first two years of being in post, developing understanding of the changes to the Numeracy Procedural tests.
- Science: excelling at GCSE Science – sharing best practice, sharing successful intervention strategies at KS4, developing scientific literacy – evidence based Research from Bangor University, developing strategies to engage learners in Science, working with schools to build scientific knowledge and supporting pupils in learning scientific concepts,


developing reading skills in Science, sharing 'how to learn strategies' and retrieval practice, developing reading skills and the understanding of command and tier two words, developing deeper understanding of the GCSE specifications.

Moving Forward

We recognise that all schools are on a continuum of improvement. Some are emerging and developing, others developing and strengthening whilst our strongest schools are more autonomous and empowered.

As a service we are often asked to synthesise a myriad of school improvement metrics into a single definition. However, it is just as important to capture the journey and not just the 'snapshot' of a school's position on that journey.

The following diagram, developed by the DfE in England, looks to define the stages of a school's journey and begins to define the trajectory of school improvement:



We feel that this type of diagrammatic trajectory representation is a more useful tool when discussing with schools the required level and nature of support required. Its application can also be an effective strategy to capture schools at the beginning of any 'downward' trajectory thus mitigating any need for them to be identified as *'causing concern'*.

We also believe that peer engagement and support should be an integral part of school improvement. Welsh Government's vision for an evaluation, improvement and accountability system is one that is fair, coherent, proportionate, transparent, and based on shared values for Welsh education. The National Mission commits us to work with Welsh Government and other key stakeholders to establish new evaluation and improvement arrangements at all levels. These arrangements will need to be robust and strong enough to bring about the required improvements and especially so within the secondary sector. There is a clear

expectation that within these arrangements schools develop not only the required capacity and skills to effectively challenge themselves, but also the ability to work collaboratively and systemically in a school improvement model founded on professional peer review.

GwE and the six regional local authorities has undertaken a consultation process with head teacher representation around the various aspects of the *National Reform Journey*. In terms of developing a regional framework for peer-to-peer engagement and support, head teachers suggested the following principles:

- a peer review approach should be adopted regionally to further drive progress towards a self-improving system;
- the peer-review model should not be developed to deliver a *pseudo-inspection* system;
- all stakeholders should work effectively together to ensure that we create the right conditions for effective peer review;
- we should agree and adopt a regional set of principles and technical language for our model;
- we should agree framework parameters which will allow flexibility for schools to operate a range of models;
- schools should have the freedom and flexibility to choose their peers;
- the model should involve peer engagement at all levels within a school;
- the model should promote trust, honesty, transparency and professional confidence;
- engagement should be a supportive and sustainable process and not a one-off imposition event;
- the model should support a cultural shift towards collegiate responsibility

Steve Munby and Michael Fullen (2016) in their paper '*Inside-out and downside-up*' outline the critical success factors for an effective system-wide school collaboration as follows:

- the purpose of collaboration must be to improve outcomes;
- the partnership must be founded on a clearly articulated shared moral purpose;
- transparency, trust and honesty are crucial;
- a commitment to and capacity for effective peer review form the engine that drives improvement;
- peer review needs to be carried out within a long-term relationship and a commitment to continuously improving practice and systems through cycles of collaborative enquiry;
- the partnership must have a plan to move from collaboration to co-responsibility to a position of shared professional accountability;
- the partnership should go beyond school leaders and engage with students, teachers, families and communities;
- partnerships welcome scrutiny and support from other partnerships as their contribution to a connected local, regional and national system.

We firmly believe that peer engagement should underpin a rigorous cycle of continuous improvement and include:

- **Self-review:** effective peer review should start with how well the school knows itself and be led by the school being reviewed. The national self-evaluation toolkit developed by Estyn/OECD and the profession should play a key role in this aspect. Self-evaluation should focus on the learner, their achievements, progress and experiences in school and focus on learning and teaching, leadership, the development of a learning organisation culture, well-being of pupils and staff, equity and inclusion. In moving forward, the self-evaluation should also focus on the four purposes of the new curriculum and evaluate the progress the school is making towards realising the new curriculum. The self-evaluation processes should allow the school to identify areas of strengths and priorities for

improvement. It should also identify aspects of their improvement journey that require peer support to aid improvement.

- **Peer-review:** the most effective peer reviews have an agreed focus. The purpose of the collaboration must be to improve outcomes and any agreed focus should be based on strong evidence of what's needed to improve and what outcomes would be most benefit to the school. Peer reviewers working as a team or trio work best where they can triangulate evidence and jointly analyse their findings. They are not there to pass judgement but to seek evidence and agree findings to be shared with the school. It is imperative that the peer review process does not become a *pseudo-inspection* system. The partnership must be founded on a clearly articulated shared moral purpose with transparency, trust and honesty crucial and integral to the process. The peer review should also provide professional development opportunities and include leaders at all levels.
- **School-to-school support:** if peer review is going to be a vehicle for ongoing improvement in school systems, then it must go further than the review itself and involve school to school or cluster support. Where the outcomes are owned by the staff, the long-term and sustainable impact will be greater. This helps to further build capacity and increased resilience within a self-improving system. The partnerships built should therefore go beyond school leaders and engage with students, teachers, families and communities.

GwE and the six regional local authorities are currently working with schools to establish a regional peer engagement model which fully reflects the principles and values that have been identified by head teachers and which also harvests from best practice nationally and beyond. Supporting Improvement Advisers are central to the facilitation and the development of this model.

This articulates our approach within the 'accountability' aspect of the reform journey. It details how peer engagement can be used to underpin a rigorous cycle of continuous development and improvement. We believe that peer engagement and support should be an integral part of school improvement in moving to a self-improving system whilst also supporting those schools that are causing concern.

2. STANDARDS

OVERVIEW OF PERFORMANCE IN EACH LOCAL AUTHORITY

Narrative report for each LA to be inserted that includes the following:

Evaluation of performance and emerging questions:

- Foundation Phase
- Key Stage 2
- Key Stage 3
- Key Stage 4
- Key Stage 5

LA's Estyn Profile

LA's Categorisation Profile

LA's monitoring arrangements for scrutinising individual school's performance

LA's Main areas for improvement to be included in Level 2 Business Plans

See Appendix 1 for individual LA report

ESTYN SCHOOL INSPECTION PROFILE

The overall inspection profile across the region is strong.

Combined School inspections Sept 2017- July 2019.

| Year | Region | No Inspected | No Follow Up | | Estyn Review | | Significant Improvement | | Special Measures | |
|-------|--------|--------------|--------------|-----|--------------|----|-------------------------|----|------------------|---|
| | | | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 17/18 | GwE | 69 | 82.6 | 57 | 14.5 | 10 | 1.4 | 1 | 1.4 | 1 |
| 17/18 | Wales | 237 | 75.1 | 178 | 17.3 | 41 | 4.6 | 11 | 3.0 | 7 |
| 18/19 | GwE | 64 | 79.7 | 51 | 17.2 | 11 | 1.6 | 1 | 1.6 | 1 |
| 18/19 | Wales | 227 | 75.8 | 172 | 19.8 | 45 | 1.8 | 4 | 2.6 | 6 |

Judgements all schools 2018-19

| | Standards | | Wellbeing | | Teaching | | Support | | Leadership | |
|----------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|------------|-------|
| | GwE | Wales | GwE | Wales | GwE | Wales | GwE | Wales | GwE | Wales |
| Excellent | 18.8 | 11.5 | 25.0 | 19.8 | 17.2 | 11.9 | 23.4 | 18.9 | 28.1 | 17.2 |
| Good | 62.5 | 65.2 | 67.2 | 67.4 | 62.5 | 62.1 | 71.9 | 70.9 | 51.6 | 58.6 |
| Adequate | 15.6 | 21.1 | 7.8 | 12.3 | 20.3 | 24.2 | 4.7 | 8.4 | 18.8 | 20.7 |
| Unsatisfactory | 3.1 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 3.6 |

Primary School inspections Sept 2017- July 2019

| Year | Region | No Inspected | No Follow Up | | Estyn Review | | Significant Improvement | | Special Measures | |
|-------|--------|--------------|--------------|-----|--------------|----|-------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 17/18 | GwE | 59 | 86.4 | 51 | 11.9 | 7 | 1.7 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 17/18 | Wales | 200 | 80.5 | 161 | 14.5 | 29 | 3.5 | 7 | 1.5 | 3 |
| 18/19 | GwE | 54 | 88.9 | 48 | 11.1 | 6 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 18/19 | Wales | 188 | 80.9 | 152 | 16.5 | 31 | 0.5 | 1 | 2.1 | 4 |

Secondary / All Age School inspections Sept 2017- July 2019

| Year | Region | No Inspected | No Follow Up | | Estyn Review | | Significant Improvement | | Special Measures | |
|-------|--------|--------------|--------------|----|--------------|----|-------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 17/18 | GwE | 7 | 57.1 | 4 | 28.6 | 2 | 0.0 | 0 | 14.3 | 1 |
| 17/18 | Wales | 30 | 50.0 | 15 | 33.3 | 10 | 10.0 | 3 | 6.7 | 2 |
| 18/19 | GwE | 8 | 12.5 | 1 | 62.5 | 5 | 12.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 |
| 18/19 | Wales | 32 | 43.8 | 14 | 40.6 | 13 | 9.4 | 3 | 6.3 | 2 |

Special School / PRU inspections Sept 2017- July 2019

| Year | Region | No Inspected | No Follow Up | | Estyn Review | | Significant Improvement | | Special Measures | |
|-------|--------|--------------|--------------|---|--------------|---|-------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 17/18 | GwE | 3 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 17/18 | Wales | 7 | 28.6 | 2 | 28.6 | 2 | 14.3 | 1 | 28.6 | 2 |
| 18/19 | GwE | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 18/19 | Wales | 7 | 85.7 | 6 | 14.3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |

Primary Judgements 2018-19

| | Standards | | Wellbeing | | Teaching | | Support | | Leadership | |
|----------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|------------|-------|
| | GwE | Wales | GwE | Wales | GwE | Wales | GwE | Wales | GwE | Wales |
| Excellent | 20.4 | 10.1 | 27.8 | 19.1 | 18.5 | 11.2 | 25.9 | 17.6 | 31.5 | 17.6 |
| Good | 70.4 | 71.3 | 68.5 | 72.3 | 72.2 | 66.5 | 72.2 | 76.1 | 57.4 | 63.3 |
| Adequate | 9.3 | 18.1 | 3.7 | 8.5 | 9.3 | 21.3 | 1.9 | 4.8 | 11.1 | 16.5 |
| Unsatisfactory | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 2.7 |

Primary – Out of the 54 primary schools inspected in 2018/19 48 (88.9%) were adjudged that no follow-up action was needed compared to 86.4% in 2017/18 and is significantly higher than the national average of 80.9%. 6 schools (11.1%) required follow up action compared to 13.6% in 2017-18 and all were awarded the least intensive follow-up category of Estyn Review. There are currently 8 schools in a follow-up category with only 1 schools currently in a Statutory Category (significant improvement). The percentage of schools receiving excellent judgements increase significantly from 13.2% in 2017/18 to 24.8% in 2018/19.

Secondary - of the 8 schools inspected no-follow-up was required in one, five were judged to require the least intensive follow-up [estyn review], whilst two were placed in special measures [one SI and one SM]. Both of these schools had already been identified within our profile as 'high risk'. Five schools were awarded a 'good' judgement for inspection area 2 [wellbeing and attitudes to learning] whilst 6 schools were judged 'good' for inspection area 4 [care, support and guidance]. One school received an 'inadequate' judgement for inspection area 5 [leadership]. No school was awarded an 'excellent' judgement for any of the inspection areas.

The current regional profile sees 6 secondary schools in statutory category. Each school has a comprehensive PIAP and the LA support plan have been ratified by Estyn. All schools are currently demonstrating steady progress against most of their recommendations. All schools are also receiving regular monitoring visits and the respective local authority officers are kept informed of progress and made fully aware of any concerns that arise. There are a further 7 in a follow up category of Estyn Review with a clear expectation that 3 of the schools will be taken out of category by the end of November.



Special – Strong profile across the inspection areas with the one school inspected in 2018/19 adjudged 'good' in all areas and not placed in a follow up category. One school remains in an Estyn review follow up category.

NATIONAL CATEGORISATION

All schools

The percentage of schools categorised as Grade C and D for Step 2 has continued to decrease from 14.6% in 16/17, 11.6% in 17/18 to 8.0% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as a D fell from 2.4% in 17/18 to 1.5% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as Grade A has increased from 27.5% in 16/17, 34.0% in 17/18 to 41.7% in 18/19.



The percentage of schools categorised as red and amber for Step 3 has again decreased from 18.8% in 16/17, 14.9% in 17/18 to 9.2% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as a red fell from 3.1% in 17/18 to 1.9% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as green has continued to increase from 19.7% in 16/17 to 36.4% in 18/19.



Primary

The percentage of schools categorised as Grade C and D for Step 2 has continued to decrease from 11.0% in 16/17, 8.0% in 17/18 to 5.4% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as a D has fallen from 1.4% in 16/17 to 0% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as Grade A has increased significantly from 28.2% in 16/17, 35.5% in 17/18 to 44.1% in 18/19.



The percentage of schools categorised as red and amber for Step 3 has again decreased from 15.2% in 16/17, 11.6% in 17/18 to 6.6% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as a red decreased from 1.7% in 17/18 to 0.0% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as green has increased significantly from 20.2% in 16/17, 30.7% in 17/18 to 38.1% in 18/19.



Secondary

The percentage of schools categorised as Grade C and D for Step 2 has decreased from 36.4% in 16/17, 35.2% in 17/18 to 24.1% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as a D has remained fairly constant 9.1% in 16/17 (5 schools), 11.1% (6 schools) in 17/18 and 11.1% (6 schools) in 18/19. The percentage categorised as Grade A has increased from 21.8% in 16/17 to 24.1% in 18/19.



The percentage of schools categorised as red and amber for Step 3 has decreased from 37.0% in 17/18 to 25.9% in 18/19. The percentage categorised as red increased slightly from 13.0% in 17/18 (7 schools) to 14.8% in 18/19 (8 schools). The percentage categorised as green increased significantly from 13.0% (7 schools) in 17/18 to 24.1% (13 schools) in 18/19.



Special

The percentage of schools categorised as Grade C and D for Step 2 remains at 11.1% (1 school) having decreased from 22.2% (2 schools) in 2016-17. No special school was categorised as a D in 17/18 and in 18/19. The percentage categorised as Grade A has continued to increase from 33.3% (3 schools) in 16/17 to 44.4% (4 schools) in 17/18 to 55.6% (5 schools) in 18/19.

The percentage of schools categorised as red and amber for Step 3 remains at 11.1% having decreased from 22.2% (2 schools) in 16/17. No special school was categorised red in 18/19 and in 17/18. The percentage categorised as green remains at 44.4% (4 schools) having increased from 33.3% (3 schools) in 16/17.



3. EMERGING QUESTIONS TO HELP THE JOINT COMMITTEE, LA OFFICERS AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES TO EVALUATE PUPIL PROGRESS, STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE

Teacher assessments

- Why do Foundation Phase, KS2 and KS3 outcomes appear to be lower over the past two years?
- Why does the regional ESTYN profile and GwE intelligence gathering contradict falling outcomes at Foundation Phase?
- How effectively is progress and value added data analysed and reported so as to strengthen performance and improve standards?
- To what extent are schools adopting rigorous assessment tracking for all learners of all ages?
- How do schools use baseline assessment data to target and plan intervention needs?
- Are individual learners and groups of learners correctly identified and effectively supported?
- Have schools developed effective self-evaluation arrangements which go beyond end of key stage performance data to identify what they are doing well and what needs to change?
- What actions are leaders undertaking with classes that consistently underperform?
- How robust are in-school standardisation and cluster moderation procedures in schools?
- What monitoring processes are in place to ensure that schools set appropriate targets?
- Are schools ensuring that there is a broad and balanced curriculum and not fixated on a narrow set of subjects and areas of learning?
- What school data can be used for Local Authority self-evaluation purposes and how can this be presented?

Key Stage 4

- To what extent are all schools embracing the national change in direction and behaviour to maximise the performance of individual pupils across the ability range? Do school leaders have a clear vision for what to change and why?
- Have all schools developed effective self-evaluation arrangements which go beyond examination performance data to identify what they are doing well and what needs to change?
- How appropriate is the schools' curriculum across the region? Have all schools robustly evaluated the impact and contribution of individual non-core subjects into the revised C9 measure? Is this supported by leaders making effective and timely use of Welsh Government bulletin up-dates?
- Are current internal accountability and QA processes robust enough to ensure consistent performance by individual pupils across their option choices i.e. are leaders effectively addressing In School Variance?
- What actions are leaders undertaking with departments that are outperforming the school average and with those that are underperforming?
- To what extent do individual departments forensically analyse the data shared by WJEC on subject performance?
- To what extent do all departmental staff, across the range of subjects, understand the assessment weighting for each specification? How does this effectively impact on their planning and delivery and, where relevant, the understanding of grading, awarding and reporting?

- To what extent are departments making effective use of the Chief Examiner’s annual report which highlights strengths and weaknesses of performance?
- Many schools have members who are WJEC examination markers. To what extent are their expertise fully utilised within and across schools?
- Why has the performance in English dropped significantly in a number of historically strong performing departments?
- Why is there a variance in a number of regional schools between the performance of Mathematics and Maths-Numeracy?
- How well do current 14-19 local strategies ensure that funding is effectively used to deliver appropriate experiences and qualifications for targeted groups of pupils and to what extent do they contribute to the revised interim measures in each local authority?
- Are we confident that the national change in direction has sufficiently impacted on the local provision for EOTAS? To what extent has their performance in 2019 impacted on local authority outcomes?
- Are we confident that the national change in direction has sufficiently impacted on the local provision for Special Schools (145 pupils in Year 11) and Units? To what extent has their performance in 2019 impacted on local authority outcomes?
- Within the region there are 247 EOTAS pupils in year 11 – by grouping them together this is a larger cohort than what we have in any school. To what extent are leaders and staff within PRUs supported and skilled to clearly identify how best to maximise the performance of individual pupils across the revised performance measures?

4. 2019-20 BUSINESS PLAN PRIORITIES

The main areas for development, identified from self-evaluation, are priorities in our Business Plan for 2019-2020.

The Management Board and the GwE Joint Committee have approved our strategic objectives and priorities for improvement for 2019-20. The Business Plan is in 6 sections and is aligned with 'Education in Wales: Our national mission', clearly noting the contribution of the service to the transformation agenda.

The Business Plan links with more detailed service plans, with measurable targets for improvement and clear success criteria in order to accurately measure the region's progress. Progress against the Business Plan is reported on a quarterly basis, in line with the Accountability Framework (Appendix 3).

Each Local Authority has a detailed business plan which has been agreed upon by the head of service and the lead Core Advisers. In each plan, there are details about key issues pertaining to the local authority along with a unique improvement plan to address specific challenges. Progress towards meeting agreed outcomes on a local authority level is reviewed on a regular basis.

Our strategic objectives for 2019-20 are:

1: **Developing a high-quality education profession:**

- Ensure that all teachers and support staff are equipped to have a clear understanding of what constitutes effective teaching, based on reliable evidence. In addition, the ability to deliver a range of approaches, effectively matching the needs of the learners with the context, to ensure positive impact on learning and achievement is paramount.

2: **Inspirational leaders working collaboratively to raise standards:**

- Ensure that all leaders have a clear educational vision and can plan strategically to achieve this. Ensure that all learning organisations have the leadership capacity at all levels to inspire, coach, support, share practice and collaborate at all levels to ensure all learners' achieve their potential. Ensure that the principles of distributive leaderships are embedded in all learning organisations across the region.

3: **Strong and inclusive schools committed to excellence, equity and well-being:**

- Create the conditions to ensure that learners develop as healthy, resilient and globally responsible individuals and provide an inclusive, aspirational education system, committed to tackling inequality so that young people achieve their full potential.

4: **Robust assessment, evaluation and accountability arrangements supporting a self-improving system:**

- Ensure all schools have robust assessment processes in place with strong targeting, tracking and intervention procedures. Ensure that school leaders and teachers have the skills, capacity and commitment to continually learn and improve their practice so that every child achieves their potential.

5: **Transformational Curriculum**

- To ensure that all schools deliver an engaging curriculum which responds to the statutory requirements of the national curriculum. Ensure that all learners are supported to achieve qualifications which enable them to be ambitious capable learners that reach their potential.

6: Business

- Ensure that GwE has strong governance and effective business and operational support that provides value for money.

Our main priorities for improvement for 2019-20 are:

1: Developing a high-quality education profession:

- 1.1 Support schools to improve performance in the secondary sector
- 1.2 Cymraeg 2050 – A million Welsh speakers
- 1.3 Support Bangor and Chester University to develop high quality ITE provision

2: Inspirational leaders working collaboratively to raise standards:

- 2.1 Provide development programmes across the work force to ensure high quality leadership
- 2.2 Support secondary schools to improve middle leadership performance
- 2.3 Develop peer engagement model and processes with schools to ensure robust self-evaluation and improvement planning at all levels

3: Strong and inclusive schools committed to excellence, equity and well-being:

- 3.1 Supporting vulnerable learner's strategy
- 3.2 Further develop LAC strategy
- 3.3 Work with LA and Schools to best prepare for Additional Learning Needs transformation

4: Robust assessment, evaluation and accountability arrangements supporting a self-improving system:

Support schools to improve performance in the secondary sector:

- 4.1 Develop tracking and assessment systems
- 4.2 Develop accountability and management systems
- 4.3 Further develop accountability arrangements and processes for robust self-evaluation and improvement planning

5: Transformational Curriculum:

- 5.1 Preparing a Transformational Curriculum
- 5.2 Improve the quality of teaching, taking account of the 12 pedagogical principles (Successful Futures)

6: Business:

- 6.1 Undertake a budget and workforce review.

Appendix 1

Report on Standards in Anglesey LA

Changes to the Areas of Learning in the Foundation Phase

In October 2014 the Foundation Phase Areas of Learning (AoL) for Language, Literacy and Communication Skills and Mathematical Development were revised so as to align them with the National Literacy and Numeracy Framework (LNF) and to make them more challenging. In line with this, the Foundation Phase outcomes were recalibrated to align with the increased expectations of the revised Areas of Learning.

The revised AoL were introduced on a statutory basis from September 2015. This means that the cohort of children that started Reception in September 2015 were the first children to be formally assessed against the revised outcomes at the end of the Foundation Phase in the summer of 2018. 2019 was the first year where a comparison can be made with previous performance. However, it is apparent that the re-alignment and re-adapting of end of Foundation Phase assessment is ongoing, in line with new outcome descriptors. Therefore, as with last year, comparisons of Foundation Phase outcomes in language and maths to previous years at school level should be avoided as they are not measured on a comparable basis. Welsh Government is clear that the focus will be on learner progress from the baseline assessment to end of Key Stage. Therefore, for the first time, we will include this in our end of year reporting.

The Foundation Phase

Overall, taking into account learner progress and ESTYN inspection outcomes, standards in the Foundation Phase in Anglesey are satisfactory. The percentage of pupils achieving the Foundation Phase Indicator (FPI) is below the national average and has been for the past three years. As widely anticipated, following the implementation of the new Foundation Phase Framework, the percentage of pupils achieving the expected outcomes across Wales decreased in 2018-19. The Local Authority's performance reflected this in the FPI and in all Areas of Learning.

The impact of the significant decrease in Welsh O5+ has had an impact on performance in the FPI too. The main reason for this is that many schools reported on Welsh first language this year and in 2018 as opposed to second language in 2017.

The number of learners achieving the higher outcomes also decreased nationally. Again, this was reflected in Anglesey LA schools' outcomes. Outcomes in Anglesey schools were below the national average in all Areas of Learning.

Again, as widely anticipated, the percentage of eFSM pupils who achieved the expected outcomes across Anglesey LA decreased considerably in 2018-19, in the FPI and Welsh specifically. The number of eFSM learners achieving the higher outcomes across the Areas of Learning also decreased significantly.

The difference in performance between boys and girls in Anglesey has remained similar to last year, with girls outperforming boys in all Areas of Learning, by about 14%. The anomaly is at the higher outcomes where boys slightly outperform girls in Mathematical Development. The national averages also display a similar pattern to Anglesey.

Welsh Government has made it clear that Value Added progress between the baseline and end of Foundation Phase should be the focus when evaluating pupil achievement in the

Foundation Phase. Progress of matched pupils from Anglesey's 2017 Reception cohort baseline to end of Foundation Phase 2019 is good. Pupils make at least 3.28 outcomes of progress, in all areas. The most progress is made in Welsh Language, with pupils making on average 3.67 outcomes of progress. Pupils are expected to make 3.0 outcomes of progress during the Foundation Phase. This Value Added data confirms that Local Authority schools demonstrate an effective and sustained approach in supporting pupils to make progress throughout the Foundation Phase.

Emerging questions

- Why are Foundation Phase outcomes lower in all AoLs at the expected outcome in the last two years?
- Why are higher outcomes lower than the national average in every Area of Learning?
- Why have eFSM pupils' outcomes decreased significantly in Welsh Language and on the higher levels in the Areas of Learning?
- Is end of Foundation Phase assessment accurate and robust in Anglesey schools?
- Is baseline assessment accurate and robust in Anglesey schools?

Key Stage 2

Overall, taking into account learner progress and ESTYN inspection outcomes, standards in Key Stage 2 in Anglesey are good.

The Core Subject Indicator (CSI) is below the national average for the second year running.

Taking into account expected levels data, performance in 2019 was similar to the national average and to the average results of previous years in English, mathematics and science. Nevertheless, Welsh results are considerably lower than the national average and have fallen again in comparison to 2018 results.

Performance of Anglesey schools on the higher levels is also similar to the national average in English and mathematics, and slightly below the national average in science. Standards of attainment in Welsh are below the national average for the second year running.

There was a slight decrease in the percentage of eFSM pupil who achieved the expected outcomes in 2019 in the CSI. At the higher levels, Anglesey pupils' performance improved in English, mathematics and science with more eFSM pupils achieving the higher outcomes than any previous year. Average results in Welsh have fallen compared to 2018 results, and are considerably lower than 2017 results.

At the higher levels, Anglesey eFSM pupils' performance improved in English, mathematics and science compared to 2018. However, the number of eFSM pupils achieving the higher outcomes in Welsh language decreased slightly for the second year in succession. Nationally, the averages for eFSM pupils' performance show a general dip and Anglesey eFSM pupils compare just as good, if not better, in every subject, with the exception of Welsh. Boys' performance decreased at the expected levels in the CSI, while the boys/girls gap increased from that in 2018. The greatest difference in performance in the core subjects is to be seen in English results this year.

At the higher levels, the boys/girls gap has narrowed in Welsh, however, it has widened in English, mathematics and science. The greatest difference in performance in the core subjects, in terms of the higher levels, is to be seen in English results again this year. In comparison, national averages for boys'/girls' performance at the higher levels this year show an overall increase in the difference across the subjects.

As with the Foundation Phase, Welsh Government has made it clear that Value Added progress between end of Foundation Phase and end of Key Stage 2 should be the focus when evaluating pupil achievement. Progress of matched pupils from Anglesey's 2015 Foundation Phase cohort to end of Key Stage 2019 is positive, overall. Pupils made an average of at least 2.14 levels of progress in English, and 2.13 levels of progress in mathematics. Nevertheless, 1.90 levels of progress was the case in Welsh. Pupils are expected to make 2.0 levels of progress during Key Stage 2. This Value Added data confirms that Local Authority schools demonstrate an effective and sustained approach in supporting pupils to make progress throughout Key Stage 2.

Moderation has been verified as being accurate and robust in nearly all Anglesey primary schools with only a very few schools having any disagreement on their levels. Individual primary schools track progress data thoroughly and hold staff to account for outcomes.

Emerging questions:

- Why have Welsh assessments in KS2 fallen considerably over the last two years?
- What has led to the increase in higher level results in English, mathematics and science compared to 2018?
- Why is the KS2 CSI assessment for eFSM learners at its lowest since at least 6 years?
- Why is there an increasing difference between boys' and girls' CSI in KS2 compared to previous years? Why is there an increasing difference between boys' and girls' performance in English, given the expected levels and higher levels in KS2 compared to previous years?

Key Stage 3

This year's results are beginning to reflect the national changes, whereby the prime focus of teacher assessments has started to shift back to the progress and attainment of individual learners and away from aggregated data sets used to hold schools to account.

Nationally, the percentage of pupils achieving at least the expected level was lower than 2018 in the CSI and in all core subjects.

The Anglesey CSI is slightly higher than the national average with a decrease of 4.4% in comparison to 2018 performance [-1.9% nationally]. The performance of the 2019 cohort at the expected level was higher than the national average in almost all core subjects, with the exception of English. Performance in Welsh First Language was lower than 2018 and dropped -2.1% (-2.2% nationally); English was lower than 2018 and dropped -3.7% (-1.1% nationally); mathematics was lower than 2018 and dropped -3.3% (-1.3% nationally); science was lower than 2018 and dropped -1.8% (-1.3% nationally). With the exception of Welsh, performance in the core subjects falls below the national average for 2019. Performance at the higher levels is consistent with the national decrease in Welsh, mathematics and science, however dropped -6.6% in English in comparison to -1% nationally. Performance at the higher levels is higher than the national performance in Welsh. It is lower, however, in the remaining core subjects.

The performance of boys and girls fell in the CSI and across the core subjects in 2019. The performance of boys in the CSI, Welsh and science is higher than the national average, and their performance is on a par with the national average in mathematics. Performance of Anglesey girls is higher than the average in the CSI, and in each core subject. Performance of boys at the higher levels in mathematics has improved this year, but has fallen in the remaining core subjects. Girls' performance at the higher levels has fallen in all core subjects. At the higher levels, the performance of boys and girls was higher than the national average

in Welsh, but lower than the national averages in English, mathematics and science. Girls outperform the boys in all core subjects, with the largest gap between the genders to be seen at the highest levels in Welsh where girls perform better than boys by +20.7% (23% nationally), and English +19.6% (18.1% nationally). The gap between the genders in 2019 is similar to that seen in 2018 at the highest levels, but has increased at the expected level.

The percentage of eFSM pupils who achieved the expected outcomes across the Authority increased in 2019 in Welsh, but fell in the remaining core subjects and the CSI. At the higher levels, Anglesey eFSM pupils' performance improved in Welsh, mathematics and science, but fell in English. The eFSM/non-FSM gap is substantial across all indicators.

Emerging questions:

- Why is performance at the expected levels and higher levels still below the national average for almost all core subjects?
- Why has there been a dip in the performance of boys in Welsh, English and science at the higher levels?
- Why has the performance of girls at the higher levels fallen in every core subject?
- Why do girls outperform the boys at the highest levels in both languages?
- Why is there a considerable gap between the performance of eFSM and non-FSM pupils?
- What aspects of best practice in the highest performing departments/classrooms need to be cascaded, and how best do we facilitate this process?

Key Stage 4

Context

The Year 11 school cohort included:

- 12 pupils in PRU/EOTAS provision [performance of group included in all LA data]
- 89 eFSM pupils. Numbers in individual schools varied from 11 to 23. The size of the cohort should naturally be taken into consideration when analysing performance at individual school level.
- 3 secondary schools have an eFSM % which is lower than the national average of 16.5%. 2 schools have a higher percentage than the national average.

Capped 9

LA performance in the main indicator [Capped 9] is -2.35pt higher than the national average of 353.3pt. Performance in two schools is strong (Ysgol C and Ysgol D) and is above the national average and modelled performance. The Authority's 2019 performance is lower than the expected performance by -11.28pt, with two schools (Ysgol A and Ysgol E) considerably lower than the expected performance.

The performance of both boys and girls is lower than the national averages for 2019. The performance gap has narrowed between boys and girls this year. The performance of girls is higher than the national average of 370.4pt in 2 schools (Ysgol C and Ysgol Ch) and boys' performance is higher than the national average of 337.29pt in 3 schools (Ysgol C, D and E). The gap in boys' and girls' performance has fallen in all of the schools in comparison with 2018.

The performance of eFSM and non-FSM pupils is lower than the national average, with a slight increase in the performance gap compared to 2018 performance. Nevertheless, it is still lower than the national average (-72.1pt compared to -77.06pt nationally). Of the 5 secondary schools, 3 have an e-FSM% which is lower than the national average of 16.5%. In 2019, 2 schools (Ysgol C and D) performed above the national average. The gap in performance between eFSM and non-FSM pupils has increased in 3 schools (Ysgol A, B and E).

Literacy Indicator

LA performance in this indicator is 0.06pt above the national average of 38.96pt and matches the expected performance. The performance of both boys and girls is below the national average for 2019 [-0.1pt and 1.75pt respectively]. The gender gap has closed in 2019 and is smaller than the national average. The performance of eFSM pupils in Anglesey is better than the national average, and the eFSM/non-FSM performance gap is lower in Anglesey than nationally.

Of the 5 secondary schools, 3 schools (Ysgol C, D and E) were higher than the national average, with the performance of 1 (Ysgol C) higher than the expected performance. The performance of boys was higher than the national average of 36.3 in 4 schools (Ysgol C, D and E), and girls' performance was higher than the national average of 41.78pt in 2 schools (Ysgol C and D). The performance of eFSM pupils was better than the national average of 32.5pt in 3 schools (Ysgol C, D and E). The eFSM/non-FSM performance gap has fallen slightly compared to 2018 performance.

In the average points score for Welsh First Language, performance was lower than the national average by -2.6pt. There was a gap of -3.1 between boys and girls compared to -4.1pt nationally. The performance of e-FSM pupils was lower than the national average by -2.6pt. The average points score for Welsh Literature was also lower than the national figure by -2.3pt. There was a smaller gender performance gap in Anglesey (-2.1pt) than nationally (-4.2pt). The performance of e-FSM pupils was lower than the national average [-3.6pt].

In the average points score for English, performance was -1.3pt lower than the national average with a gap of -1.3pt between the genders compared to a national gap of -5.2pt.

The performance of e-FSM pupils was slightly lower than their national peers by -0.2pt. In English Literature, performance was -0.7pt lower than nationally with a gap of -3pt between the genders (-4.2pt nationally). The performance of e-FSM pupils was +1.3pt higher than the national average.

Numeracy Indicator

The LA performance in this indicator is +0.32 higher than the national average of 37.1pt and matches the expected performance. The performance of boys is slightly higher than the national average by +0.15pt and the performance of girls is slightly below the national average by -1.56pt. The gender gap has narrowed this year and is better than the national average. The performance of eFSM pupils is -0.22pt below the national average [29.4pt], and the eFSM/non-FSM performance gap is less than the national average [-9.15pt compared to -10.3pt nationally].

Of the 5 secondary schools, 2 schools (Ysgol C and D) performed above the national average. The performance of 1 school (Ysgol C) was better than expected performance, and the performance of 1 school (Ysgol A) was significantly below expected performance. The performance of both boys and girls was higher than the national average of 36.4pt in 2 schools (Ysgol C and D). The gender gap has narrowed in all schools this year in comparison to 2018. The eFSM/non-FSM performance gap is better than the national average of -10.3pt in 4 schools (Ysgol A, B, C, D).

In the average points score for mathematics, performance was -0.5pt below the national average with a gap of -0.6pt between the genders compared to a national average of -2.1pt. The performance of eFSM pupils was higher than the national average of 27.3pt and the

eFSM/non-FSM performance gap was less in Anglesey than in Wales. In mathematics-numeracy, the performance of the authority was above the national average of 34.2pt, with the performance of boys better than their national peers, and the performance of girls slightly below (-0.4pt). The performance of e-FSM pupils was also slightly higher than the national average of 26.1pt [+0.2pt].

The Science Indicator

The performance of the LA in this indicator is slightly below the national average of 36.8pt, with the performance of boys higher than their national peers by +1.64pt and the performance of girls -0.29pt lower. The gender gap is less than the national average by -1.94pt. The performance of eFSM pupils is higher than the national average of 28.2pt and the eFSM/non-FSM performance gap is less in Anglesey than nationally (-10.2 in comparison to -11.6pt nationally).

Of the 5 secondary schools, 2 schools (Ysgol C and D) performed above the national average. The performance of boys was higher than the national average of 35.5pt in 4 schools (Ysgol A, C, D, E). The performance of girls was slightly higher than the national average of 38.2pt in 2 schools (Ysgol C and D). The performance of eFSM pupils was better than the national average of 28.2pt in 3 schools (Ysgol B, C, D). The eFSM/non-FSM performance gap is also below the national average in 4 schools (Ysgol A, B, C, D).

Welsh Baccalaureate Skills Challenge Certificate Indicator

LA performance in this indicator is +1.83pt above the national average, and matches expected performance. The performance of both boys and girls is better than their national peers. The gender gap has narrowed to -6.30 and it is slightly more than the national average. The performance of eFSM pupils is +1.87pt higher than the national average [29.4pt], and the eFSM/non-FSM performance gap is also less than the national average [-7.51pt in comparison to -9.6pt nationally].

Of the 5 secondary schools, 4 schools (Ysgol A, B, C, D) were higher than the national average and better than expected performance. The performance of boys was higher than the national average of 33.5pt in 4 schools (Ysgol A, B, C, D), and the performance of girls was higher than the national average of 39.5pt in 4 schools (Ysgol A, B, C, D). The gender gap is wider than the national average in 3 schools (Ysgol A, B, D). The gap has narrowed in all schools this year. The performance of eFSM pupils was higher than the national average of 29.5pt in 4 schools (Ysgol A, B, C, D). The eFSM/non-FSM performance gap was better than the national average in 4 schools and on a par with the national average in 1 school.

Emerging questions:

Whole schools:

- Why are there such great variances in performance between individual schools in Anglesey?
- How confident are we that all Anglesey schools effectively evaluate the impact and contribution of individual non-core subjects in the revised C9 measure, and to what extent do their accountability processes robustly challenge In School Variance?
- What are the effective actions currently being taken by leaders with departments that are outperforming the school average and with those that are underperforming? How may it be ensured that schools learn from each other?
- To what extent do individual departments within schools forensically analyse the data shared by WJEC on subject performance, and to what extent do all departmental staff, across the range of subjects, understand the assessment weighting for each specification? How does this effectively impact on their planning and delivery and, where relevant, the understanding of grading, awarding and reporting?

- How appropriate is the provision across schools for boys, in particular those in danger of becoming disengaged?
- How well do current 14-19 local strategies ensure that funding is effectively used to deliver appropriate experiences and qualifications for targeted groups of pupils, and to what extent do they contribute to the revised interim measures in each local authority?
- How can we effectively ensure that leaders and staff within PRUs are supported and that they have the skills to clearly identify how best to maximise the performance of individual pupils across the revised performance measures?

Literacy:

- How effectively do schools develop 'higher-order writing skills' to improve performance?
- How can we best support classroom teachers and departments to improve the teaching of identified examination skills?
- What are the most effective strategies to further reduce the gender gap?
- Do all departments have a common and effective approach to the teaching of writing?
- How can we further empower Heads of Departments to lead teaching and learning?
- How can we improve the quality of Literacy Intervention in KS3?
- How can we support departments in increasing the level of challenge in KS3?

Numeracy:

- How can we best support classroom teachers and departments to improve the teaching of identified examination skills?
- What are the most effective strategies to improve the performance of girls?
- How can we support departments in increasing the level of challenge in KS3?
- How can we further improve the teaching of numeracy and mathematics in KS3?
- How can we best support collaborative working in KS4?

Science:

- How can we more effectively support the development of numeracy skills (30% assessment of mathematical skills in science across the GCSEs)?
- How can we more effectively develop literacy skills in science to support lower ability learners to deal with the high volume of text in examinations papers?
- What are the most effective strategies to further reduce the gender gap?
- How can we implement more effective action research in classrooms to improve teaching and learning?
- What are the best strategies for engaging boys in science?
- What are the best strategies to engage the interest of girls in science?
- What is the most effective way to start a science lesson? (linked to EEF research project)
- How can we use modelling to raise attainment in science?

Key Stage 5

The total number of entries at A-level in Anglesey in 2019 was 519, slightly lower than 2018 (532). Over a 3-year rolling period there was an improvement in outcomes on A*/A and A*-C grades. On A*/A grades there was an increase of 0.8% on 2018 to 18.5%, and an increase of 2.3% to 72.4% on A*-C grades. The performance of the Authority in 2019 is lower than the national performance, but the gap has narrowed in both cases (0.1% and 2.3% respectively). Both figures are higher than the figures for the LA in 2017 and 2018. On A*-B grades, there was a slight decrease on 2018 performance, 0.3%, and a 1.4% decrease on A*-E grades.

ALPS value added data based on information submitted by schools suggests that post-16 pupils in Anglesey make strong progress. This data suggests that on the 'T' score Anglesey schools performed in the top 40% of schools in the data base of schools across both England and Wales, which is an improvement on the performance of previous years. Four of the 5 secondary schools in Anglesey have improved their performance in the Quality Indicator, with one school making excellent progress this year (Ysgol B) and among the top 25% of schools in the data base of schools across both England and Wales. Based on AS entries, the 'T' score is 6, suggesting that pupils are making strong progress.

LA's Estyn Profile

The overall inspection profile for the LA is similar to that of 2017/18, and is stronger than the national profile.

Combined school inspections Sept 2017- July 2019

| Year | Wales LA | Number Inspected | Not in Follow-Up | | Estyn Review | | Significant Improvement | | Special Measures | |
|-----------|----------|------------------|------------------|-----|--------------|----|-------------------------|----|------------------|---|
| | | | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 2017-2018 | Anglesey | 8 | 75.0 | 6 | 12.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2017-2018 | Wales | 237 | 75.1 | 178 | 17.3 | 41 | 4.6 | 11 | 3.0 | 7 |
| 2018-2019 | Anglesey | 7 | 85.7 | 6 | 14.3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2018-2019 | Wales | 227 | 75.8 | 172 | 19.8 | 45 | 1.8 | 4 | 2.6 | 6 |

Judgements - all schools 2018-19

| | Standards | | Wellbeing | | Teaching | | Support | | Leadership | |
|----------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|------------|-------|
| | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales |
| Excellent | 0.00 | 11.45 | 0.00 | 19.82 | 0.00 | 11.89 | 0.00 | 18.94 | 0.00 | 17.18 |
| Good | 85.71 | 65.20 | 100.00 | 67.40 | 71.43 | 62.11 | 100.00 | 70.93 | 85.71 | 58.59 |
| Adequate | 14.29 | 21.15 | 0.00 | 12.33 | 28.57 | 24.23 | 0.00 | 8.37 | 14.29 | 20.70 |
| Unsatisfactory | 0.00 | 2.20 | 0.00 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 1.76 | 0.00 | 1.76 | 0.00 | 3.52 |

Primary School Inspections Sept 2017- July 2019

| Year | Wales LA | Number Inspected | Not in Follow-Up | | Estyn Review | | Significant Improvement | | Special Measures | |
|-----------|----------|------------------|------------------|-----|--------------|----|-------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 2017-2018 | Anglesey | 8 | 75.0 | 6 | 12.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2017-2018 | Wales | 200 | 80.5 | 161 | 14.5 | 29 | 3.5 | 7 | 1.5 | 3 |
| 2018-2019 | Anglesey | 6 | 83.3 | 5 | 16.7 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2018-2019 | Wales | 188 | 80.9 | 152 | 16.5 | 31 | 0.5 | 1 | 2.1 | 4 |

Secondary/All Age Schools Inspections Sept 2017- July 2019

| Year | Wales LA | Number Inspected | Not in Follow-Up | | Estyn Review | | Significant Improvement | | Special Measures | |
|-----------|----------|------------------|------------------|----|--------------|----|-------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 2017-2018 | Anglesey | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| 2017-2018 | Wales | 30 | 50.0 | 15 | 33.3 | 10 | 10.0 | 3 | 6.7 | 2 |
| 2018-2019 | Anglesey | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2018-2019 | Wales | 32 | 43.8 | 14 | 40.6 | 13 | 9.4 | 3 | 6.3 | 2 |

Special Schools/PRU Inspections

| Year | Wales LA | Number Inspected | Not in Follow-Up | | Estyn Review | | Significant Improvement | | Special Measures | |
|-----------|----------|------------------|------------------|---|--------------|---|-------------------------|---|------------------|---|
| | | | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # |
| 2017-2018 | Anglesey | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| 2017-2018 | Wales | 7 | 28.6 | 2 | 28.6 | 2 | 14.3 | 1 | 28.6 | 2 |
| 2018-2019 | Anglesey | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| 2018-2019 | Wales | 7 | 85.7 | 6 | 14.3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |

Primary Judgements

| | Standards | | Wellbeing | | Teaching | | Support | | Leadership | |
|----------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|------------|-------|
| | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales |
| Excellent | 0.00 | 10.11 | 0.00 | 19.15 | 0.00 | 11.17 | 0.00 | 17.55 | 0.00 | 17.55 |
| Good | 83.33 | 71.28 | 100.00 | 72.34 | 83.33 | 66.49 | 100.00 | 76.06 | 83.33 | 63.30 |
| Adequate | 16.67 | 18.09 | 0.00 | 8.51 | 16.67 | 21.28 | 0.00 | 4.79 | 16.67 | 16.49 |
| Unsatisfactory | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.06 | 0.00 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 2.66 |

Lifelong/Secondary Judgements

| | Standards | | Wellbeing | | Teaching | | Support | | Leadership | |
|----------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|------------|-------|
| | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales | Anglesey | Wales |
| Excellent | 0.00 | 12.50 | 0.00 | 18.75 | 0.00 | 9.38 | 0.00 | 21.88 | 0.00 | 9.38 |
| Good | 100.00 | 34.38 | 100.00 | 40.63 | 0.00 | 40.63 | 100.00 | 43.75 | 100.00 | 34.38 |
| Adequate | 0.00 | 40.63 | 0.00 | 37.50 | 100.00 | 43.75 | 0.00 | 31.25 | 0.00 | 46.88 |
| Unsatisfactory | 0.00 | 12.50 | 0.00 | 3.13 | 0.00 | 6.25 | 0.00 | 3.13 | 0.00 | 9.38 |

Primary - Six schools were inspected in 2018-19. It was judged that no follow-up action from Estyn was necessary in 5 of the 6 schools.

In the profile at present, there is 1 school in the least intensive follow-up category of 'Estyn Review' and 1 school remains in 'Significant Improvement' (it was judged during the second visit in 2018-19 that the level of follow-up activity in this school continues from the original inspection in 2017-18) .

Secondary - One school was inspected in 2018-19. It was judged that no follow-up action from Estyn is necessary.

In the profile at present, of the 5 secondary schools, there is 1 school in the least intensive follow-up category of Estyn Review.

Special Schools/PRUs - No Special schools were inspected in 2018-19.

LA Categorisation Profile - information to follow.

LA's monitoring arrangements for scrutinising individual school's performance

Fortnightly Local Quality Board meetings are held every fortnight between the GwE Primary and Secondary Core Leads and Anglesey LA officers. Schools causing concern are discussed and any strengths and areas for improvement are noted. Early identification of concerns in schools is also discussed and noted so as to provide early intervention and support. This links to the regular meetings held between the Anglesey Core Lead and the Supporting Improvement Advisers to discuss progress in all Anglesey schools. The regular communication between LA and GwE officers ensures shared intelligence about schools' capacity to improve, and where concerns are identified all parties work in partnership to review standards and provision in the school and to set and monitor clear targets for improvement.

Anglesey LA has a Schools Scrutiny Panel, which includes Education Officers, Anglesey Core Leads and Elected Members. The Panel meets on a regular basis to scrutinise the performance of individual schools, and school Headteachers and Chairs of Governors are invited to the Panel to report on standards. The Panel also scrutinises the support given by GwE to schools along with shadowing GwE's activities for quality assurance purposes and to ensure value for money.

LA's main areas for improvement to be included in Level 2 Business Plans

- Improve performance on the expected levels in the Foundation Phase, in all areas of learning.
- Improve performance on the higher levels in the Foundation Phase, in all areas of learning.
- Improve the performance of eFSM pupils on the higher levels in the Foundation Phase.
- Improve performance in Welsh in the Foundation Phase and in key stage 2.
- Improve the performance of eFSM pupils on the expected levels in key stage 2.
- Improve the performance of boys on the expected levels and on the higher levels in key stage 2.
- Improve performance on the higher levels in key stage 3.
- Improve performance in Welsh, English, mathematics and science in key stage 4.
- Improve the performance of boys in literacy, and improve the performance of girls in numeracy and science in key stage 4.
- Improve performance on the higher grades in key stage 4.
- Improve performance on A*-A grades in key stage 5.