**Figure 1.1: Academies and free schools open in August 2017 by year of opening[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**  
Figure 2.1: Average progress 8 score by pupil characteristics, 2017**[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Figure 2.2: Attainment and value-added measures used in secondary school performance tables**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Attainment / Threshold measures** | **‘Value-added’ type measures** |
| 2008 | 5+A\*-C GCSEs (and equivalent qualifications) including English and mathematics GCSE | Contextual value-added measures based on best 8 GCSEs and equivalent qualifications. |
| 2009 | As above | As above but with additional points for performance in English and mathematics |
| 2010 | As above | As above |
| 2011 | As above | Value-added measure based on best 8 GCSEs and equivalent qualifications |
| 2012 | As above | As above |
| 2013 | As above | As above |
| 2014 | As above but with a reduced contribution from equivalent qualifications.[[3]](#footnote-3) | As above but with a reduced contribution from equivalent qualifications. |
| 2015 | As above | As above |
| 2016 | Attainment 8 | Progress 8[[4]](#footnote-4) |
| 2017 | As above but with reformed GCSEs in English and mathematics. | As above but with reformed GCSEs in English and mathematics. |

Figure 2.3: Distribution of progress 8 scores for state-funded mainstream and special schools



Figure 3.1: The highest performing academy chains and local authorities at Key Stage 2[[5]](#footnote-5)



Figure 3.2: The lowest performing academy chains and local authorities at Key Stage 2[[6]](#footnote-6)



Figure 3.3: Distribution of improvement measure scores at Key Stage 2

Figure 3.4 The spread of school results (upper and lower quartile) within each academy chain and local authority

Figure 3.5: Comparison of contextualised current performance and contextualised improvement measures at Key Stage 2



Figure 3.6: The highest performing academy chains and local authorities at Key Stage 4[[7]](#footnote-7)



Figure 3.7: The lowest performing academy chains and local authorities at Key Stage 4[[8]](#footnote-8)



Figure 3.8: Distribution of improvement measure scores at Key Stage 4



Figure 3.9 The spread of school results (upper and lower quartile) within each academy chain and local authority at Key Stage 4



Figure 3.10: Comparison of contextualised current performance and contextualised improvement measures at Key Stage 4



Figure 3.11: Comparison of performance of mainstream schools at Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 for those academy chains and local authorities that have both



It shows that:

Stability of cohorts

Figure 3.12: Stability of cohorts in academy chains and local authorities at Key Stage 2 – ranked by improvement measure, highest and lowest performers



Figure 3.13: Stability of cohorts in academy chains and local authorities at Key Stage 4 – ranked by improvement measure, highest and lowest performers



Figure 3.14: Comparison of performance of non-disadvantaged pupils and disadvantaged pupils on current performance measure at Key Stage 2[[9]](#footnote-9)



Figure 3.15: Comparison of performance of non-disadvantaged pupils and disadvantaged pupils on current performance measure at Key Stage 4[[10]](#footnote-10)



Figure 3.16: Performance of pupils with special educational needs and disabilities at Key Stage 2 (rank of academy chains and local authorities)[[11]](#footnote-11)



Figure 3.17: Performance of pupils with special educational needs and disabilities at Key Stage 4 (rank of academy chains and local authorities)



1. Excludes schools that have subsequently closed so, whilst overall trend is the same, this is not the number open at each point in time. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. DfE, *‘Revised GCSE and equivalent results in England 2016 to 2017*’, January 2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. From 2014 the range of equivalent qualifications that were included in Performance Tables was greatly reduced. Those that remained had their size capped as being equivalent to one GCSE and a maximum of two non-GCSEs per pupil were included. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. This was the first year that a value-added measure had been central to school accountability as it formed the government’s floor standard. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The number of Key Stage 2 schools refers to the number of schools the group had in 2017, this may differ from 2015 and 2016. All groups had at least five schools with results in at least one year over this period. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The number of Key Stage 2 schools refers to the number of schools the group had in 2017, this may differ from 2015 and 2016. All groups had at least five schools with results in at least one year over this period. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The number of Key Stage 4 schools refers to the number of schools the group had in 2017, this may differ from 2015 and 2016. All groups had at least three schools with results in at least one year over this period. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The number of Key Stage 4 schools refers to the number of schools the group had in 2017, this may differ from 2015 and 2016. All groups had at least five schools with results in at least one year over this period. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The broken diagonal lines indicate differences between the two groups of 1 scaled point score. The solid line represents those scores where the groups achieve the same score. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The broken diagonal lines indicate differences between the two groups of 0.25 (or a quarter of a grade in each subject). The solid line represents those scores where the groups achieve the same score. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Vertical lines show the 95 per cent confidence interval around the measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)