



Ofsted Reporting of Provision for the Most Able Pupils:

Comparison of analyses of Ofsted reports published in
June 2018 and June 2019

Rebecca Howell and Hilary Ramsden

Published by Potential Plus UK

19 February 2020

Summary

Potential Plus UK carried out analyses of all reports published by Ofsted following inspections of schools in the months of June 2018 and June 2019. This report gives information about both analyses and compares them to see whether there are changes over time in the reporting of provision of the most able pupils.

Whilst both analyses are of a proportion (approximately one twelfth) of reports on school inspections in each year, they allow conclusions to be drawn about the quality of provision for the most able pupils in schools in England. The findings of the analyses and comparison between them indicate that a consistently high percentage of schools do not have good enough provision for the most able pupils, leading to these pupils not making the progress that they should.

The analyses consider what the changes are that need to be made in the schools where provision is not good enough. They further consider whether there are variations between schools with different Ofsted ratings, different types of schools, schools catering to different phases of education and in different regions.

Key findings:

- The percentage of schools in which provision for the most able pupils needed improvement was consistently high, with more than 44% of Ofsted reports highlighting the need for a change to provision.
- There continues to be a need for improvement to the provision for the most able pupils in every Ofsted category of school.
- The most common changes needed were in the level of challenge for the most able pupils and in the progress made by these pupils.
- There was rise in the number of comments expressing concern about the expectations teachers had for the most able pupils between June 2018 and June 2019.
- Early Years and Primary phase schools had the highest percentage (50%) of schools with poor provision for the most able pupils.
- There was a significant increase in the number of Secondary phase schools inspected that did not mention provision for the most able at all between June 2018 and June 2019.
- The South East and South West regions had the highest percentage of poorly performing schools with over 50% of schools needing a change to their provision for the most able pupils in 2019.
- The East Midlands had the lowest percentage (8%) of schools highlighted as having adequate provision for the most able in 2019.
- The London region had both the highest percentage of schools highlighted as having adequate provision for the most able pupils and the lowest percentage needing a change to their provision.
- The decrease in the percentage of schools with adequate provision for the most able pupils (-3.54%) contrasts with the increase in Ofsted ratings of Outstanding and Good (+3.50%) in this time period, suggesting that provision for the most able pupils was not being considered in overall judgements.

Recommendations:

The Department for Education should:

- Recognise that a large proportion of schools in all phases do not have good enough provision for the most able pupils.
- Encourage to schools to make sure that the most able pupils have learning experiences that meet their needs and are sufficiently challenging.
- Support schools to improve their provision for the most able pupils through leadership, professional development and Initial Teacher Training.
- Target poorly performing regions for support first.
- Fund further research to show the best strategies for supporting the most able learners.

Ofsted should:

- Ensure that school inspections under the Education Inspection Framework consider and report on the provision for the most able pupils with at least the same consistency as they were under the Common Inspection Framework.
- Consider provision for the most able pupils across the Framework as part of the overall judgement of a school's effectiveness.

Schools should:

- Ensure that provision for the most able pupils is led from the top and is regularly on the agenda of leadership and management meetings within the existing meeting structure.
- Ensure practices are in place for measuring and reviewing the performance of the most able pupils.
- Plan a curriculum that considers the needs of the most able pupils as part of the whole school profile, from intent, through implementation to impact.
- Consider the personal skills the most able pupils are developing through their school experience.
- Give teachers and support staff the knowledge and understanding they need to meet the needs of the most able pupils through leadership, guidance and continuing professional development.

Background

As an organisation with a vision for every young person with high learning potential in England and Wales to receive appropriate support and challenge, one of Potential Plus UK's main interests is in the quality of provision for the most able children in education.

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) inspects services providing education and skills for learners of all ages, including schools, and reports on the quality of their provision.

Potential Plus UK carried out an analysis of Ofsted reports on school inspections published in June 2018. Of concern is that this analysis identified that more than 44% of organisations required a change to their provision for the most able pupils. The vast majority of the changes required in these schools were either a need for more challenge (67%) or more progress (28%) for the most able pupils (definitions for the changes required are included in [Appendix 6](#)).

In order to ensure that this was not an anomaly, the analysis was repeated for schools inspection reports published in June 2019. The results showed a similar, dismal picture. The percentage of organisations requiring change to their provision for the most able pupils was at a similarly high level. The 2019 analysis showed that 45% of schools required a change to their provision for the most able pupils. The results of the analyses and a comparison between them is published here to highlight the pressing need for action to improve provision for the most able pupils.

Ofsted itself produced reports in 2013 and 2015 looking at provision for the most able pupils in non-selective secondary schools¹. The 2013 report highlighted that the most able pupils in these schools were not achieving as well as they should, with 65% of pupils achieving the highest level in English and maths at the end of primary school not achieving the highest levels in these subjects at GCSE. It was recommended at the time that schools should (among other recommendations) 'develop their culture and ethos so that the needs of the most able students are championed by school leaders' and 'ensure that senior leaders evaluate mixed ability teaching so that the most able students are sufficiently challenged and make good progress'. The follow-up 2015 report drew attention to the fact that still too many of the most able pupils were being let down and urged school leaders to develop a culture of high expectation for students and teachers alike. Ofsted said that it would be reporting "more robustly about how well schools promote the needs of the most able through the quality of their curriculum and the information, advice and guidance they offer to the most able students".

¹ Ofsted. (2015) The Most Able Students: An Update on Progress Since June 2013.

Until August 2019 schools were inspected under the Common Inspection Framework. September 2019 saw the implementation of the new Education Inspection Framework. Worryingly, the Schools Inspection Handbook that relates to the Education Inspection Framework does not mention the term 'most able' once². Instead, Ofsted state that all groups of pupils will be considered during inspections, that the focus is on understanding need, and that this should not be interpreted as any group being considered as less important. It is of significant concern that the issue of provision for the most able will be lost in inspections under the Education Inspection Framework.

The findings of this analysis present a very real need for changes to provision for the most able pupils to ensure they are sufficiently challenged and making the progress they should. Currently, too many pupils are being let down leading to negative impacts on their development of skills, achievement and wellbeing. Three recent documents outline what the literature says good provision is for the most able pupils, yet also highlight that more research is needed^{3,4,5}. The findings of these need be communicated more widely to schools and teachers, including in Initial Teacher Training programmes, so that school leaders and teachers can understand how best to support the most able pupils. Additionally, further research needs to be undertaken to refine recommendations to schools.

Methodology

Ofsted reports published in June 2019 were analysed for comments on more able provision using a search for the words 'able' and 'ability' in the text. 609 reports published during this period were included in the analysis. The results were compared with those of a previous analysis of 728 Ofsted reports published in June 2018 to consider the change or consistency over time. Reports relating only to academy conversion, boarding provision or tertiary only (18+) provision were not included in the analyses since they do not cover education for pupils of compulsory school age. The month of June was chosen arbitrarily and the same month was repeated in the following year for consistency of conditions in schools at that time of year.

For the purpose of these analyses, organisations were given a status for their provision for the most able pupils, Most Able Status, based on the inspectors' comments in the reports. Possible status categories were 'excellent', 'adequate', 'improving', 'change required' and 'not mentioned' (for Descriptions of the Most Able Status, see [Appendix 1](#)). This status did not necessarily reflect the Ofsted rating awarded to the school.

To compare schools with adequate provision for the most able pupils and those who were performing poorly in this area, schools that inspectors indicated had excellent,

² Ofsted. (2019) School Inspection Handbook November 2019

³ Montacute, R. (2018) Potential for Success: Fulfilling the Promise of Highly Able Students in Secondary Schools, The Sutton Trust.

⁴ Heller-Sahlgren, G. (2018) What Works in Gifted Education? A Literature Review, Centre for Education Economics.

⁵ Cullen, S.M., Cullen, M., Dytham, S. & Hayden, N. (2018) Research to Understand Successful Approaches to Supporting the Most Academically Able Disadvantaged Pupils. Department for Education.

adequate or improving provision for the most able pupils were grouped together as those with 'combined adequate' provision.

Findings

In June 2019, Ofsted inspectors' comments indicated that 45% of schools required a change to the current provision for the most able pupils, up slightly from 44% in 2018. Overall, 21% of schools were deemed to have combined adequate (including schools that inspectors commented had excellent, adequate or improving) provision for the most able pupils in 2019, down 4 percentage points from the 25% in 2018. In June 2019, 34% did not mention provision for the most able pupils compared with the lower figure of 31% in 2018 ([see Table 1.1](#)).

Excluding reports that did not mention provision for the most able pupils, schools requiring a change to their provision for the most able pupils in June 2019 was 68%. This figure represents a significant increase in the proportion of schools where the Ofsted report indicates a change was needed to their provision for the most able pupils from 64% in 2018 ([see Table 1.2](#)). The percentage of schools deemed to have combined adequate provision for the most able pupils was 32% in June 2019, down from 36% in 2018.

The changes that schools needed to make to their provision for the most able pupils were categorised from inspectors' comments and recommendations in the reports. These were typically about the lack of challenge and opportunities to learn at greater depth for the most able pupils, concerns about the progress that the most able pupils were making and the attainment of the most able pupils not being high enough. In some cases, inspectors' comments and recommendations expressed concern that the curriculum did not meet the needs of the most able pupils, that more professional development was needed to enable teachers to meet the needs of these pupils, or that strategies already being used for some pupils or by some teachers needed to be implemented more widely.

Where a change to provision for the most able pupils was required, a breakdown of the type of change schools needed to make, as indicated by inspectors, shows that the vast majority were required to either implement more 'challenge' (60% in 2019, down from 67% in 2018) or enable pupils to make more 'progress' (27% in 2019 compared with 28% in 2018). [Definitions of the changes required can be found in Appendix 2](#). Together these categories give an overall total of 87% (down from 93% in 2018) ([see Table 2.1](#)). Similar terminology requiring a change to the 'expectations' for the most able pupils was used more in the June 2019 reports, with an increase of 5 percentage points. The above terms were often used interchangeably in reports; highlighting a belief that more challenge and high expectations would lead to better progress for the most able pupils.

A comparison of Ofsted ratings with the status of provision for the most able pupils ([see Appendix 3](#)), shows that there continues to be a need for improvement in every Ofsted category. Indeed, three schools rated Outstanding by Ofsted in June 2019 were recommended to improve their most able provision. A further 44% of schools rated Good by Ofsted in June 2019 (188 schools) were also recommended to improve their provision.

Between June 2018 and June 2019, there was a decrease in the percentage of schools with combined adequate provision for the most able pupils (-3.5%). This contrasts with the increase in Ofsted ratings of Outstanding and Good (+3.5%) in the same time periods ([see Table 3.2](#)). This suggests that provision for the most able pupils was not being considered in overall judgements.

Analysis by type of school shows that in June 2019 just 22% (down from 26% in 2018) of state schools, 27% (up from 25% in 2018) of special schools and 8% (significantly down from 19% in 2018) of independent schools had provision for the most able pupils that was reported as adequate ([see Table 4.2](#)). In addition, 47% (stable from 48% in 2018) of state schools, 27% (a significant increase from 18% in 2018) of special schools and 37% (stable from 38% in 2018) of independent schools were highlighted as requiring a change to their provision for the most able pupils.

The worst performing school phase was Early Years and Primary, with 50% of schools reported as requiring a change to their provision for the most able pupils in June 2019. This remains consistent with the analysis of a year previous. ([See Appendix 5.](#)) 44% of Primary schools required a change to their provision in 2019, up from 41% a year previous. 35% (down from 40% in 2018) of Secondary schools and 35% (up from 28% in 2018) of All-through schools required a change to their provision for the most able pupils. Although All-through schools seem to perform well here, apart from Early Years and Primary schools at 19%, they have the lowest percentage of schools with combined adequate provision at 22.5% in 2019, despite an increase from 19% in 2018. Of particular concern is that there was a significant increase in the proportion of Secondary schools reports that did not mention provision for the most able pupils at all, from 33% in 2018 to 40% in 2019 ([see Table 5.1](#)). [Definitions of school phases can be found in Appendix 5.](#)

An analysis of regional variations shows that all regions apart from London had a similar proportion of schools needing a change to their provision for the most able pupils. There were two regions in which over 50% of schools had a change required to their provision for the most able pupils in June 2019 ([see Table 6.2](#)). These poorly performing regions were the South East region, with 53% of schools, and the South West region, with 51% of schools needing a change to their provision. In both regions, the proportion of schools needing a change to their provision had increased since June 2018; in the South East by more than nine percentage points.

The East Midlands region had the lowest percentage (8%) of schools with combined adequate provision and also had the biggest reduction in this figure since 2018 (from 23%), together with an increase in the percentage of schools needing an improvement in their provision from 45% in 2018 to 47% in 2019.

The region with the highest percentage of schools with combined adequate provision for their most able pupils was once again in London (27% in 2019 and 30% in 2018), which also had the lowest percentage of schools needing a change to their provision (27% in 2019 and 37.5% in 2018). The region with the next highest percentage was the North West (26% in both years), despite there also being a high percentage of schools in this region requiring a change to their provision at 47% ([see Appendix 6](#)).

Conclusions

Many schools across England fall short of meeting the needs of the most able pupils. In reports published by Ofsted in June 2019 this figure was 45%. Furthermore, there is a need for a change to provision across every Ofsted category of school.

Inspectors commented with the highest frequency that schools needed to raise the level of challenge the most able pupils received and improve the progress that these pupils made. June 2019 showed an increase in the frequency with which inspectors commented that teachers needed to raise their expectations for the most able pupils' learning.

The proportion of schools that received Outstanding and Good Ofsted judgements was higher by 3.5% in June 2019 than in June 2018. In the same period, there was a similar decrease in the proportion of schools that were highlighted as having adequate provision for the most able pupils. This suggests that provision for the most able pupils was not always considered in the overall judgement of the school.

In the Early Years and Primary phase, 50% of schools require a change to their provision for the most able pupils. Of concern is that between June 2018 and June 2019 there was a significant increase in the number of Secondary school reports that did not mention provision for the most able pupils at all.

The percentage of schools needing a change to their provision for the most able pupils was consistently high in all the Ofsted regions except London. The South East and the South West had the highest percentages of schools needing a change to provision. The East Midlands had the lowest percentage of schools with recognised adequate provision, at just 8%.

The above findings have implications for those responsible for the quality of in education in England. The Department for Education should recognise that a large proportion of schools are not providing well enough for the most able learners. They are in a position to use the available information about the strategies that are effective for the most able learners to encourage schools to improve their provision in this domain to improve the quality of provision overall. This can be done through continuing professional development and Initial Teacher Training. Targets for interventions of this sort should be the poorly performing regions first. Further, the Department for Education should fund research to give more information about the best strategies for providing challenge the most able pupils that also supports their progress.

The lack of clarification about the expectations for schools to provide for the most able pupils within the Schools Handbook under the Education Inspection Framework is a concern given the high number of schools that required improvements to this provision under the previous Framework. Therefore, Ofsted should ensure that, despite this, school inspections under the Education Inspection Framework report on the provision for the most able pupils regularly and consistently, and that this is considered in the overall judgement of the school.

Many schools are not giving the provision for the most able enough emphasis in their strategic development, monitoring, curriculum or its implementation. Therefore, schools are recommended to lead this area of provision from the top, with monitoring filtering throughout the management structures of the school. Curriculum reviews should take account of the needs of the most able pupils starting with its intent for these pupils, how it will be implemented and whether its impact is in line with the intent. Further, the development of the personal skills, such as confidence and resilience, of the most able pupils should be considered throughout their experience in the school. Schools need to equip teachers with the depth of subject knowledge and skills to meet the needs of the most able pupils, ensuring they can sufficiently challenge them in their learning.

Appendix 1 Comparison of Percentage of Schools Requiring Change to Most Able Provision in June 2018 and June 2019

Table 1.1 Rating by Most Able Status (see Definitions of Most Able Status below)

Most Able Status	Number of Schools 2019	% Total Schools 2019	Number of Schools 2018	% Total Schools 2018
*Excellent	25	4.11%	18	2.47%
*Adequate	76	12.48%	126	17.31%
*Improving	28	4.60%	36	4.95%
*Change required	273	44.83%	321	44.09%
*Not mentioned	207	33.99%	227	31.18%
Total	609	100.00%	728	100.00%

Table 1.2 Percentage Change in Combined Adequate versus Change Required Status, including and excluding Not Mentioned Status

Most Able Status	2019 Figures	Excluding Not Mentioned 2019	2018 Figures	Excluding Not Mentioned 2018	Change Excluding Not Mentioned
*Combined adequate	21.18%	32.09%	24.73%	35.93%	-3.84%
*Change required	44.83%	67.91%	44.09%	64.07%	3.84%
*Not Mentioned	33.99%		31.18%		

Definitions of Most Able Status

***Excellent** – Ofsted rating of Outstanding and inspectors’ comments indicated most able provision is at an appropriate level or better.

***Adequate** – Ofsted rating other than Outstanding and inspectors’ comments indicated most able provision is at an appropriate level or better.

***Improving** – Previous inspection stated that most able provision should be improved; this has started but there is room for further improvement.

***Combined adequate** – Excellent, Adequate and Improving status combined to show all schools deemed to have adequate most able provision.

***Change required** – Inspectors’ comments indicated that improvement in most able provision is necessary. This section includes some Good and Outstanding schools where improvement of most able provision is required.

***Not mentioned** – There is no mention of most able or ability in relation to most able provision in the report.

Appendix 2 Comparison of Changes Required Categorisation in June 2018 and June 2019

Table 2.1 Categorisation of Changes Required June 2018 and 2019
(See below for Definitions of Change Required)

Change Required	Number 2019	% 2019	Number 2018	% 2018	Change 2018 to 2019
Attainment	10	3.67%	9	2.79%	0.90%
Challenge	164	60.07%	214	65.85%	-5.77%
Challenge mentioned	3	1.10%	1	0.31%	
Clarity of instructions	1	0.37%	0	0.00%	
Curriculum	2	0.73%	2	0.62%	
Expectations	16	5.86%	3	0.93%	4.94%
Extension	2	0.73%	1	0.31%	
Greater depth	2	0.73%	0	0.00%	
Progress	73	26.74%	89	27.38%	-0.64%
Staff training	0	0.00%	1	0.31%	
Strategies	0	0.00%	1	0.31%	
Total	273	100.00%	321	100.00%	
Challenge and Progress Combined	237	86.81%	303	93.23%	-7.58%

Definitions of Change Required

Attainment – Concern expressed about levels of attainment of the most able pupils.

Challenge – Challenge for the most able pupils included in recommendations at the end of the report.

Challenge mentioned – Challenge mentioned but not included in recommendations.

Clarity of instructions – Inspectors commented that the most able pupils could achieve more if there were improved clarity of instructions in teaching.

Curriculum – Inspectors commented that there was a need for a more appropriate curriculum for the most able pupils.

Expectations – Inspectors recommended that teachers expectations of the most pupils were raised.

Extension – Concern expressed that teaching and learning of some subjects does not extend the thinking of the most able pupils.

Greater depth – An increase of opportunities to work at greater depth was recommended.

Progress – Improvements in teaching needed to improve progress of the most able pupils.

Staff training – More staff training required to meet the needs of the most able pupils.

Strategies – Strategies for teaching the most able needed to be 'sharpened'.

Appendix 3 Comparison of Ofsted Ratings and Most Able Status in June 2018 and June 2019

Table 3.1 Comparison of Ofsted ratings and Most Able status

(See Appendix 1 for Definitions of Most Able status)

Most Able Status by Ofsted Rating	Number of Schools 2019	% Schools 2019	Number of Schools 2018	% Schools 2018	Ofsted Rating Change 2018 to 2019
Outstanding	45	7.39%	35	4.81%	2.58%
*Excellent	25	55.56%	20	57.14%	
*Change required	3	6.67%	1	2.86%	
*Not mentioned	17	37.78%	14	40.00%	
Good	423	69.46%	499	68.54%	0.92%
*Adequate	76	17.97%	111	22.24%	
*Improving	19	4.49%	26	5.21%	
*Change required	188	44.44%	197	39.48%	
*Not mentioned	140	33.10%	165	33.07%	
Requires improvement	117	19.21%	146	20.05%	-0.84%
*Adequate	0	0.00%	11	7.53%	
*Improving	9	7.69%	9	6.16%	
*Change required	67	57.26%	91	62.33%	
*Not mentioned	41	35.04%	35	23.97%	
Inadequate	24	3.94%	47	6.44%	-2.50%
*Adequate	0	0.00%	2	4.26%	
*Improving	0	0.00%	1	2.13%	
*Change required	15	62.50%	32	68.09%	
*Not mentioned	9	37.50%	12	25.53%	
Not yet rated	0	0.00%	1	0.14%	
*Not mentioned	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	
Total	609	100.00%	728	100.00%	

Table 3.2 Change in Ofsted ratings between June 2018 and June 2019

Ofsted rating	Change 2018 to 2019
Outstanding and Good combined	3.50%
Requires Improvement and Inadequate combined	-3.34%

Appendix 4 Comparison of Most Able Status by School Type in June 2018 and June 2019

Table 4.1 Rating by School Type
(see Definitions of School Type below)

School Type	Number of Schools 2019	% All Schools 2019	% School Type 2019	Number of Schools 2018	% All Schools 2018	% School Type 2018
Independent	38	6.24%		89	12.23%	
*Excellent	0	0.00%	0.00%	3	0.41%	3.37%
*Adequate	2	0.33%	5.26%	13	1.79%	14.61%
*Improving	1	0.16%	2.63%	1	0.14%	1.12%
*Change required	14	2.30%	36.84%	34	4.67%	38.20%
*Not mentioned	21	3.45%	55.26%	38	5.22%	42.70%
Pupil Referral Unit	9	1.48%		13	1.79%	
*Adequate	1	0.16%	11.11%	1	0.14%	7.69%
*Change required	1	0.16%	11.11%	1	0.14%	7.69%
*Not mentioned	7	1.15%	77.78%	11	1.51%	84.62%
Special	33	5.42%		44	6.04%	
*Excellent	6	0.99%	18.18%	4	0.55%	9.09%
*Adequate	3	0.49%	9.09%	6	0.82%	13.64%
*Improving	0	0.00%	0.00%	1	0.14%	2.27%
*Change required	9	1.48%	27.27%	8	1.10%	18.18%
*Not mentioned	15	2.46%	45.45%	25	3.43%	56.82%
State	529	86.86%		582	79.95%	
*Excellent	19	3.12%	3.59%	11	1.51%	1.89%
*Adequate	70	11.49%	13.23%	106	14.56%	18.21%
*Improving	27	4.43%	5.10%	34	4.67%	5.84%
*Change required	249	40.89%	47.07%	278	38.19%	47.77%
*Not mentioned	164	26.93%	31.00%	153	21.02%	26.29%
Total	609	100.00%		728	100.00%	

Table 4.2 Percentage Change in Combined Adequate and Change Required Status by School Type

School Type	Most Able Status	2019	2018	Change 2018 to 2019
Independent	*Combined adequate	7.89%	19.10%	-11.21%
	*Change required	36.84%	38.20%	-1.36%
Pupil Referral Unit	*Combined adequate	11.11%	7.69%	3.42%
	*Change required	11.11%	7.69%	3.42%
Special	*Combined adequate	27.27%	25.00%	2.27%
	*Change required	27.27%	18.18%	9.09%
State	*Combined adequate	21.93%	25.95%	-4.02%
	*Change required	47.07%	47.77%	-0.70%

Definitions of School Type

Independent – schools that are independent in their finances and governance. Also known as private schools, non-governmental, privately funded, or non-state schools.

Pupil referral units (PRUs) – Schools that teach children who aren't able to attend school and may not otherwise receive suitable education. This could be because they have a short- or long-term illness, have been excluded or are a new starter waiting for a mainstream school place.

Special – Schools that specialise in 1 of the 4 areas of special educational needs: communication and interaction; cognition and learning; social, emotional and mental health; and, sensory and physical needs.

State – schools that receive state funding other than PRUs and special schools, including academies, free schools, community schools etc.

Appendix 5 Comparison of Most Able Status by School Phase in June 2019 and June 2018

Table 5.1 Most Able Status by School Phase
(see below for Definition of School Phases)

Phase of School	Number of Schools 2019	% Total Schools 2019	% School Phase 2019	Number of Schools 2018	% Total Schools 2018	% School Phase 2018
All-through	40	6.57%		68	9.34%	
*Excellent	4	0.66%	10.00%	4	0.55%	5.88%
*Adequate	4	0.66%	10.00%	9	1.24%	13.24%
*Improving	1	0.16%	2.50%	0	0.00%	0.00%
*Change required	13	2.13%	32.50%	19	2.61%	27.94%
*Not mentioned	18	2.96%	45.00%	36	4.95%	52.94%
EY & Primary	357	58.62%		383	52.61%	
*Excellent	13	2.13%	3.64%	7	0.96%	1.83%
*Adequate	44	7.22%	12.32%	66	9.07%	17.23%
*Improving	12	1.97%	3.36%	19	2.61%	4.96%
*Change required	179	29.39%	50.14%	191	26.24%	49.87%
*Not mentioned	109	17.90%	30.53%	100	13.74%	26.11%
Primary	72	11.82%		92	12.64%	
*Excellent	0	0.00%	0.00%	1	0.14%	1.09%
*Adequate	15	2.46%	20.83%	18	2.47%	19.57%
*Improving	2	0.33%	2.78%	7	0.96%	7.61%
*Change required	32	5.25%	44.44%	38	5.22%	41.30%
*Not mentioned	23	3.78%	31.94%	28	3.85%	30.43%
Middle	4	0.66%		5	0.69%	
*Excellent	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
*Adequate	0	0.00%	0.00%	1	0.14%	20.00%
*Improving	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
*Change required	2	0.33%	50.00%	1	0.14%	20.00%
*Not mentioned	2	0.33%	50.00%	3	0.41%	60.00%
Secondary	134	22.00%		174	23.90%	
*Excellent	7	1.15%	5.22%	5	0.69%	2.87%
*Adequate	13	2.13%	9.70%	32	4.40%	18.39%
*Improving	13	2.13%	9.70%	10	1.37%	5.75%
*Change required	47	7.72%	35.07%	70	9.62%	40.23%
*Not mentioned	54	8.87%	40.30%	57	7.83%	32.76%
16-19	2	0.33%		6	0.82%	
*Excellent	1	0.16%	50.00%	1	0.14%	16.67%
*Adequate	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
*Improving	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
*Change required	0	0.00%	0.00%	2	0.27%	33.33%
*Not mentioned	1	0.16%	50.00%	3	0.41%	50.00%
Total	609	100.00%		728	100.00%	

Table 5.2 Percentage Change in Combined Adequate and Change Required Status by School Phase

School Phase	Most Able Status	2019	2018	Change 2018 to 2019
All-through	*Combined adequate	22.50%	19.12%	3.38%
	*Change required	32.50%	27.94%	4.56%
EY & Primary	*Combined adequate	19.33%	24.02%	-4.69%
	*Change required	50.14%	49.87%	0.27%
Primary	*Combined adequate	23.61%	28.26%	-4.65%
	*Change required	44.44%	41.30%	3.14%
Middle**	*Combined adequate	0.00%	20.00%	**
	*Change required	50.00%	20.00%	**
Secondary	*Combined adequate	24.63%	27.01%	-2.38%
	*Change required	35.07%	40.23%	-5.16%
16-19**	*Combined adequate	50.00%	16.67%	**
	*Change required	0.00%	33.33%	**

**sample size too small to be significant

Definitions of School Phases

All-through – Age range includes some aspects of all phases e.g. 2 years to 18 years

EY (Early Years) & Primary – Age range is from under 5 years to 11 years

Primary – Age range is within the 5 years to 11 years phase and includes infant and junior schools

Middle – Age range spans the primary to secondary phases e.g. 9 years to 13 years

Secondary – Age range is from 11 years to 18 years

16-19 – Age range spans from 16 years to 19 years or above

Organisations that only provided education for under 5 years or over 18 years were not included in the analysis.

Appendix 6 Comparison of Most Able Status by Region in June 2018 and June 2019

Table 6.1 Most Able Status by Ofsted Region

Region	Number of Schools 2019	% Schools 2019	Number of Schools 2018	% Schools 2018
London	63	10.34%	80	10.99%
*Excellent	8	12.70%	7	8.75%
*Adequate	7	11.11%	16	20.00%
*Improving	2	3.17%	1	1.25%
*Change required	17	26.98%	30	37.50%
*Not mentioned	29	46.03%	26	32.50%
South East	134	22.00%	139	19.09%
*Excellent	4	2.99%	2	1.44%
*Adequate	20	14.93%	27	19.42%
*Improving	3	2.24%	4	2.88%
*Change required	71	52.99%	61	43.88%
*Not mentioned	36	26.87%	45	32.37%
South West	63	10.34%	71	9.75%
*Excellent	2	3.17%	0	0.00%
*Adequate	12	19.05%	9	12.68%
*Improving	2	3.17%	5	7.04%
*Change required	32	50.79%	34	47.89%
*Not mentioned	15	23.81%	23	32.39%
East of England	67	11.00%	106	14.56%
*Excellent	2	2.99%	3	2.83%
*Adequate	7	10.45%	17	16.04%
*Improving	4	5.97%	10	9.43%
*Change required	25	37.31%	44	41.51%
*Not mentioned	29	43.28%	32	30.19%
East Midlands	49	8.05%	69	9.48%
*Excellent	1	2.04%	2	2.90%
*Adequate	2	4.08%	9	13.04%
*Improving	1	2.04%	5	7.25%
*Change required	23	46.94%	31	44.93%
*Not mentioned	22	44.90%	22	31.88%
West Midlands	70	11.49%	83	11.40%
*Excellent	4	5.71%	1	1.20%
*Adequate	7	10.00%	19	22.89%
*Improving	4	5.71%	5	6.02%
*Change required	30	42.86%	37	44.58%
*Not mentioned	25	35.71%	21	25.30%

Region (cont.)	Number of Schools 2019	% Schools 2019	Number of Schools 2018	% Schools 2018
Yorkshire and The Humber	69	11.33%	66	9.07%
*Excellent	2	2.90%	1	1.52%
*Adequate	9	13.04%	9	13.64%
*Improving	4	5.80%	1	1.52%
*Change required	30	43.48%	33	50.00%
*Not mentioned	24	34.78%	22	33.33%
North East	27	4.43%	33	4.53%
*Adequate	3	11.11%	4	12.12%
*Improving	2	7.41%	2	6.06%
*Change required	13	48.15%	14	42.42%
*Not mentioned	9	33.33%	13	39.39%
North West	66	10.84%	81	11.13%
*Excellent	2	3.03%	2	2.47%
*Adequate	9	13.64%	16	19.75%
*Improving	6	9.09%	3	3.70%
*Change required	31	46.97%	37	45.68%
*Not mentioned	18	27.27%	23	28.40%
Wales	1	0.16%	0	0.00%
*Change required	1	100.00%	0	100.00%
Total	609	100.00%	728	100%

Table 6.2 Percentage Change in Combined Adequate and Change Required Status by Ofsted Region (excluding Wales)

Region	Most Able Status	2019	2018	Change 2018 to 2019
London	*Combined adequate	26.98%	30.00%	-3.02%
	*Change required	26.98%	37.50%	-10.52%
South East	*Combined adequate	20.15%	23.74%	-3.59%
	*Change required	52.99%	43.88%	9.10%
South West	*Combined adequate	25.40%	19.72%	5.68%
	*Change required	50.79%	47.89%	2.91%
East of England	*Combined adequate	19.40%	28.30%	-8.90%
	*Change required	37.31%	41.51%	-4.20%
East Midlands	*Combined adequate	8.16%	23.19%	-15.03%
	*Change required	46.94%	44.93%	2.01%
West Midlands	*Combined adequate	21.43%	30.12%	-8.69%
	*Change required	42.86%	44.58%	-1.72%
Yorkshire and The Humber	*Combined adequate	21.74%	16.67%	5.07%
	*Change required	43.48%	50.00%	-6.52%
North East	*Combined adequate	18.52%	18.18%	0.34%
	*Change required	48.15%	42.42%	5.72%
North West	*Combined adequate	25.76%	25.93%	-0.17%
	*Change required	46.97%	45.68%	1.29%