

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

This document demonstrates how the council is meeting its duties under the Equality Act 2010, by giving due regard to the requirement to: eliminate discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; and promote good relations.

1. Background

Directorate	Children Services
Service area	Education
Title of the activity being assessed i.e. the strategy, plan, policy or service	Banded Funding
Brief outline of the proposal(s)	<p>Banded Funding initiative will enable earlier intervention for children with additional needs and SEND by enabling funding or support available when a child's need is identified.</p> <p>The number of children who need help and support because they have learning difficulties or they struggle to cope with life at school continues to grow, and the education system is not currently working well for some children with additional needs.</p> <p>We knew we needed to re-think the way we do things. A consultation in 2018 with children and their families, schools, and other professionals informed our Joint Additional Needs Strategy and High Needs Strategy. To help us fulfil these strategies, the Joint Additional and High Needs Transformation Programme was set up to drive this work forward.</p> <p>The programme aims to identify a child's needs at the earliest point so that professionals in education, health and social care can work together sooner to put a plan in place, which will further enhance a child's whole school-life experience. 'Providing the right support at the right time so every child can fulfil their potential'</p> <p>The initiative is in response to what people said in the 2018 High Needs consultation and some of the comments received from families, educators, professionals and specialists include:</p>

	<p><u>A multiagency collaborative approach to intervention and support with:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Coordinated access to specialist staff support and expertise” • “Better multi-agency support with earlier intervention & investment to enable integration/inclusion into mainstream schools & colleges” • “More effective multi-agency support/working; particularly Health and Social Care” • “Quicker access to Emotional & Mental Health services, therapy services and school nurses”. <p><u>Clarity on how funding will be allocated</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Proposals for the Primary hubs need much more clarity on how they will work in practice, how funding will be allocated and the mechanisms for monitoring and accountability.” • “Flexible funding according to need, used creatively and linked to outcomes.” • “Access to additional funding for the long-term and transparency on allocation of funding which is ring-fenced.” • “Funding - there needs to be more, longer-term and ability to use it flexibly.” <p><u>Quality support and intervention</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “More person-centred understanding, parent/carer involvement and less Behaviour Policy ‘zero-tolerance’ enforcement.” • “Early intervention – making sure young people have access to the right support to help prevent exclusions” • “Focus on inclusion and managing behaviours and integration into mainstream schools” • “More support in mainstream schools before exclusion by accessing specialist services to provide greater inclusion” • “One to one support does not promote independence.” • “Earlier identification, assessment and intervention” • “There needs to be a complete rethink as the system is failing many children and young people”
Who is affected by the proposals?	<p>Service users <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Workforce <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other, please specify: <input type="text"/></p>
Decision to be taken and decision maker	Agree the proposal for Banded Funding

Person(s) responsible for completing this assessment	Tracy Oosthuizen, Specialist Commissioning Manager Victoria Burt, Locality Inclusion Lead
Date of this assessment	September to December 2020

2. Information Gathering

Briefly outline your approach to consultation and engagement, together with details of any other information and data sources you have utilised:

Research, Consultation and Engagement	
Service users	<p>An High Needs consultation was carried out in 2018 with children and their families, schools, and other professionals. This informed our Joint Additional Needs Strategy and High Needs Strategy. To help us fulfil these strategies, the Joint Additional and High Needs Transformation Programme was set up to drive this work forward.</p> <p>The Banded Funding Engagement Pack 2020 survey was live from October to December 2020 for service users and members of the public to respond to the proposal.</p>
Workforce	
Partners	The Banded Funding Engagement Pack 2020 survey was live from October to December 2020 for people to respond to the proposal. There was targeted engagement with professionals and practitioners from health, education and social care areas, and families.
Other	

3. Equality Assessment

Briefly explain your assessment of the impact of the proposed activity on the protected characteristics below. This section evidences how the council is giving due regard to the three aims of the general equality duty, which are to: eliminate discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; and promote good relations.

Protected Characteristic	Service Users	Workforce
Age	<p>The number of children who need help and support because they have learning difficulties or they struggle to cope with life at school continues to grow, and the education system is not currently working well for some children with additional needs.</p> <p>Banded Funding will enable earlier intervention for children with additional needs and SEND by enabling funding or support available when a child's need is identified by providing the right support at the right time so every child can fulfil their potential.</p> <p>The initiative aims to identify a child's needs at the earliest point so that professionals in education, health and social care can work together sooner to put a plan in place, which will further enhance a child's whole school-life experience.</p> <p>This in turn will help support children and young people (CYP) to avoid permanent exclusions as Banded Funding has positive benefits for CYP aged 0-25 with additional needs and EHCP. The reduction in permanent exclusions impacts positively on all ages and increasingly for secondary age CYP.</p> <p>The initiative is in response to what people said in the 2018 High Needs consultation and some of the age related comments received from families, educators, professionals and specialists include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Families need a Transition Pathway for Post 11 for those receiving Special Education Needs (SEN) support not just EHCPs. Secondary schools are not reviewing the SEN Support Plans they inherit." • "Primary - focus on early intervention as it is really important to identify the needs at an early age." 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “All ages are important as no age is more important than another. All children need to receive the help and support equally and be child centred and needs led.” • “One young man around 14 years old who had recently moved to a specialist school and who recognised he was academically more able than his new class mates but he said the understanding he received and the small groups and more nurture time had made a hugely positive impact on him. He felt upset at how he had been left to struggle for a long time in mainstream and that he was now able to catch up on his education.” • “These young people are likely to need more than 2 years in Post16 education (personalisation).” • “Learning opportunities/support be funded to 24/25 to align to EHCP.” 	
Disability	<p>The number of children who need help and support because they have learning difficulties or they struggle to cope with life at school continues to grow, and the education system is not currently working well for some children with additional needs.</p> <p>Banded Funding will enable earlier intervention for children with additional needs and SEND by enabling funding or support available when a child’s need is identified by providing the right support at the right time so every child can fulfil their potential.</p> <p>The initiative aims to identify a child’s needs at the earliest point so that professionals in education, health and social care can work together sooner to put a plan in place, which will further enhance a child’s whole school-life experience.</p> <p>This in turn will help support CYP with a disability to have earlier access to funded support. The data below shows that reduction in permanent exclusions impacts positively on SEND CYP. Reduction in persistent absenteeism impacts on all CYP with increased benefit for SEND.</p> <p>The initiative is in response to what people said in the 2018 High Needs consultation and disability related comments received from families, educators, professionals and specialists include having more choices/support for severely disabled CYP for those aged 16 and over.</p>	
Sex	<p>The number of children who need help and support because they have learning difficulties or they struggle to cope with life at school continues to grow, and the education system is not currently</p>	

	<p>working well for some children with additional needs.</p> <p>Banded Funding will enable earlier intervention for children with additional needs and SEND by enabling funding or support available when a child's need is identified by providing the right support at the right time so every child can fulfil their potential.</p> <p>The initiative aims to identify a child's needs at the earliest point so that professionals in education, health and social care can work together sooner to put a plan in place, which will further enhance a child's whole school-life experience.</p> <p>This in turn will help support males above female CYP as more males are supported by either an EHCP or SEN provisions in Gloucestershire, with a higher percentage of the overall 0 to 25 population with an EHCP being male.</p> <p>The reduction in permanent exclusions and fixed term exclusions has benefits for all CYP and increasingly for males.</p> <p>The reduction in Persistent Absenteeism related to SEMH impacts positively on all CYP.</p> <p>The reduction in Elective Home Education for non philosophical/ religious reasons impacts positively on males and marginally more for females.</p>	
Race	<p>The number of children who need help and support because they have learning difficulties or they struggle to cope with life at school continues to grow, and the education system is not currently working well for some children with additional needs.</p> <p>Banded Funding will enable earlier intervention for children with additional needs and SEND by enabling funding or support available when a child's need is identified by providing the right support at the right time so every child can fulfil their potential.</p> <p>The initiative aims to identify a child's needs at the earliest point so that professionals in education, health and social care can work together sooner to put a plan in place, which will further enhance a child's whole school-life experience.</p>	

	<p>In turn, Banded Funding proposal has positive benefits for people of different ethnicities.</p> <p>The percentage of those with SEN and an EHCP is greater for white British and white Other in Gloucestershire when compared to the national data, therefore the proposal would have a positive impact on this group.</p> <p>The proposal benefits children with English as a first language who are 33% more likely to be permanently excluded compared to children with English as an additional language.</p> <p>In addition, a reduction in Persistent Absenteeism related to SEMH benefits all CYP.</p> <p>There are positive impacts of this proposal when there is a reduction in permanent exclusion as identified in the Timpson Review of exclusions for Irish and Black Caribbean pupils, and those of Gypsy and Roma children and Travellers of Irish heritage. Pupils from Black African, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Indian children all had lower exclusion rates than the national average in 2016/17.</p>	
Gender reassignment	No identified significant impact	
Marriage & civil partnership	No identified significant impact	
Pregnancy & maternity	No identified significant impact	
Religion and/or belief	No identified significant impact	
Sexual orientation	No identified significant impact	
Economic impact	Banded Funding proposal supports CYP to remain in education and reduce the number Not In Education, Employment or Training (NEET).	

	<p>CYP eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) are positively impacted by receiving funding earlier.</p> <p>Educational Inclusion improves life chances for CYP, especially as those educated at an Alternative Provision School (APS) are more likely to be NEET. The Timpson Review of exclusions shows that excluded children have worse trajectories in the long term. Over one third of children who completed Key Stage 4 in an AP go on to be NEET. Exclusion is an indicator for being at higher risk of becoming a victim or perpetrator of crime with 13 – 23% of young offenders sentenced to less than 12 months in custody, in 2014, had been permanently excluded from school prior to their sentence date. Reduction in permanent exclusions improves chances for those who are economically disadvantaged. The number of children eligible for FSM is used as an indicator for economic disadvantage – and those who receive FSM are around four times more likely to be excluded permanently or for a fixed period than children who are not eligible for FSM.</p> <p>CYP in Gloucestershire with FSM and those experiencing higher deprivation and therefore more likely to be NEET potentially benefit from this proposal.</p> <p>The initiative is in response to what people said in the 2018 High Needs consultation and disability related comments received from families, educators, professionals and specialists include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Children who are excluded often have a long history of school refusal and so do their siblings” • “Money would be better spent on preventing exclusion in the first place by understanding behaviours and looking at alternatives” • “Improved advice & guidance/planning around transitions/Preparing for Adulthood (PfA)” • “Life skills/independence/learning a trade/shadowing/informal placements/employment opportunities/apprenticeships/internships”. 	
<p>Social impact</p>	<p>Banded Funding proposal of earlier access to funded intervention positively impacts all CYP, and for those with social care interaction (in particular those with permanent exclusions) this impact is likely to be greater. This in turn would lead to improved academic and wellbeing outcomes, and better life chances.</p> <p>The proposal enables schools to procure from more diverse range of providers to select the most suitable intervention for the child.</p>	

Environmental impact	Banded Funding proposal potentially reduces the need for out of county placements because the initiative aims to reduce needs becoming more complex through specialist support and intervention. This in turn reducing long distance commuter/ transport activity. Early Identification and provision for children with additional needs keeps children in local schools thereby reducing impact on the environment due to less transport requirements.	

4. Completed Actions

Set out how the proposed activity has already been amended following the equality assessment, to maximise the positive impact or minimise the negative impact:

Change	Reason for Change

5. Planned Actions

Set out improvements that will be undertaken, following the equality assessment, to further maximise the positive impact or minimise the negative impact:

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action	By when	Owner
Positive	Start of the implementation of Banded Funding pending cabinet	April 2021.	Specialist Commissioning Manager Head of Education Strategy and Development.


	approval.		

6. Monitoring and review


The following processes/actions will be put in place to keep this 'activity' under review:
Impact on equality groups will continue to be monitored for children with additional needs and high needs.


7. Officer / Decision-maker Sign off

Officer: By signing this statement off as complete you are confirming that 'you' have examined sufficient information across all the protected characteristics and used that information to show due regard to the three aims of the general duty. This has informed the development of the activity

Signature of Senior Officer	
Name of Senior Officer	Philip Haslett
Date	8/3/21

Decision maker: I am in agreement that sufficient information and analysis has been used to inform the development of this 'activity' and that any proposed improvement actions are appropriate and I confirm that I, as the decision maker, have been able to show due regard to the needs set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

Signature of decision maker	
Name of decision maker	ClIr Richard Boyles
Date	9.3.21

Signature of decision maker	
Name of decision maker	ClIr Patrick Molyneux
Date	9.3.21

8. Publication

Nursery 1	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.6%	
Nursery 2	0.3%	3.0%	0.4%	2.9%	0.4%	2.8%	
Reception	7.8%	8.0%	7.6%	7.7%	7.5%	7.7%	
Year 1	8.0%	8.2%	7.8%	7.9%	7.7%	7.7%	
Year 2	8.0%	8.2%	8.0%	8.2%	7.8%	7.9%	
Year 3	8.0%	8.1%	7.9%	8.1%	8.0%	8.1%	
Year 4	7.7%	7.9%	7.9%	8.0%	7.9%	8.1%	
Year 5	7.9%	8.0%	7.6%	7.9%	7.9%	7.9%	
Year 6	7.5%	7.7%	7.8%	7.9%	7.6%	7.8%	
Year 7	7.8%	7.3%	7.9%	7.5%	8.4%	7.7%	
Year 8	7.5%	7.2%	7.7%	7.3%	7.9%	7.4%	
Year 9	7.5%	7.1%	7.4%	7.1%	7.7%	7.2%	
Year 10	7.5%	6.9%	7.4%	7.0%	7.4%	7.1%	
Year 11	7.0%	6.5%	7.4%	6.7%	7.3%	6.9%	
Year 12	3.8%	2.7%	3.6%	2.6%	3.7%	2.7%	
Year 13	3.5%	2.4%	3.4%	2.4%	3.3%	2.3%	
Year 14	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	
Not followed	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total	87,107	8,105,840	88,001	8,191,953	88,554	8,266,654	

Primary vs secondary PEX differences

national from published exclusion data, Glos from local PEX data dashboard (denominators from spc)

Permanent Exclusions	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
-----------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

	Glos	Nat	Glos	Nat	Glos	Nat	Glos	Nat
% of Year 1 and below with PEX	0.04%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	tbc		
% of Year 2 with PEX	0.04%	0.02%	0.03%	0.02%	0.04%	tbc		
% of Year 3 with PEX	0.13%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.01%	tbc		
% of Year 4 with PEX	0.04%	0.04%	0.03%	0.03%	0.06%	tbc		
% of Year 5 with PEX	0.04%	0.05%	0.07%	0.04%	0.03%	tbc		
% of Year 6 with PEX	0.11%	0.03%	0.06%	0.03%	0.04%	tbc		
% of Year 7 with PEX	0.12%	0.11%	0.10%	0.11%	0.01%	tbc		
% of Year 8 with PEX	0.26%	0.21%	0.24%	0.20%	0.12%	tbc		
% of Year 9 with PEX	0.43%	0.29%	0.47%	0.30%	0.19%	tbc		
% of Year 10 with PEX	0.53%	0.37%	0.35%	0.37%	0.28%	tbc		
% of Year 11 with PEX	0.33%	0.16%	0.28%	0.15%	0.26%	tbc		
% of Year 12 and above with PEX	0.00%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%	tbc		

Permanent Exclusions	2017/18		2018/19		2019/20		2020/21	
	Glos	Nat	Glos	Nat	Glos	Nat	Glos	Nat
% of all PEX for Primary-aged	21.7%	15.6%	14.3%	13.7%	20.8%	tbc		tbc
% of all PEX for Secondary-aged	78.3%	81.9%	85.7%	84.3%	79.2%	tbc		tbc
% of all PEX for Unclassified	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	tbc		tbc

Disability percentage/pro file of service users who have a disability

SEND / Disability				
<i>source: Special Educational Needs in England, January 2020.</i>				
	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Pupils in all schools (including state-funded schools and academies, PRUs, Independent schools and Non-maintained special schools):				
Pupils with Statements of SEN / EHC plan	Glos	2.8%	3.0%	3.3%
	Nat	2.9%	3.1%	3.3%

Pupils with SEN Support	Glos	12.6%	12.8%	13.5%
	Nat	11.7%	11.9%	12.1%
Pupils in state-funded primary, secondary and special schools and academies only:				
Pupils with Statements of SEN / EHC plan	Glos	2.9%	3.1%	3.3%
	Nat	2.9%	3.0%	3.3%
Pupils with SEN Support	Glos	12.4%	12.8%	13.3%
	Nat	11.5%	11.7%	11.9%

SEND does not automatically mean disabled: primary needs - PD, C&I - C&L and SEMH often not disabled

from Special Educational Needs in England, January 2020. Figures for state-funded primary, secondary and special schools and academies only.

% of All pupils with SEN by Primary Need		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Autistic spectrum disorder	Glos	4.75%	4.83%	5.43%	
	Nat	10.22%	10.90%	11.84%	
Hearing impairment	Glos	1.33%	1.35%	1.22%	
	Nat	1.82%	1.81%	1.80%	
Moderate learning difficulty	Glos	31.80%	32.08%	30.29%	
	Nat	21.66%	20.48%	19.19%	
Multi-sensory impairment	Glos	0.14%	0.19%	0.18%	
	Nat	0.26%	0.27%	0.28%	

No specialist assessment	Glos	2.73%	2.36%	2.70%
	Nat	3.32%	3.30%	3.19%
Other difficulty/disability	Glos	5.53%	5.51%	6.01%
	Nat	4.57%	4.37%	4.19%
Physical disability	Glos	2.27%	2.40%	2.40%
	Nat	2.96%	2.93%	2.88%
Profound and multiple learning difficulty	Glos	1.12%	0.95%	0.93%
	Nat	0.93%	0.87%	0.85%
Social emotional and mental health	Glos	14.54%	16.07%	17.71%
	Nat	16.59%	17.08%	17.77%
Speech language and communications needs	Glos	15.80%	15.56%	15.53%
	Nat	21.17%	21.68%	21.94%
Severe learning difficulty	Glos	4.22%	4.11%	4.17%
	Nat	2.79%	2.72%	2.66%
Specific learning difficulty	Glos	14.91%	13.69%	12.55%
	Nat	12.68%	12.54%	12.40%
Visual impairment	Glos	0.86%	0.90%	0.87%
	Nat	1.04%	1.04%	1.02%
Unclassified	Glos			
	Nat	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Reduction in PEX positively impacts on SEND CYP

national from published exclusion data, Glos from local PEX data dashboard (denominators from special educational need)

Permanent Exclusions	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
----------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------

% of all PEX for pupils with EHCP	Glos	8.70%	11.61%	9.72%
	Nat	4.76%	4.94%	n/a
% of all PEX for pupils with SEN Support	Glos	43.48%	45.54%	34.72%
	Nat	40.15%	38.71%	n/a
% of pupils with EHCP with PEX	Glos	0.48%	0.47%	0.22%
	Nat	0.16%	0.15%	n/a
% of pupils with SEN Support with PEX	Glos	0.56%	0.45%	0.19%
	Nat	0.34%	0.32%	n/a

Reduction in FTE positively impacts on SEND CYP

national from published exclusion data, Glos from local FTE data dashboard (denominators from special educational need)

Permanent Exclusions		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all FTE instances for pupils with EHCP	Glos	11.43%	12.03%	11.58%	
	Nat	9.14%	9.26%	n/a	
% of all FTE instances for pupils with SEN Support	Glos	38.61%	37.08%	34.43%	
	Nat	34.28%	34.02%	n/a	
% of pupils with EHCP with 1+ FTE	Glos	7.32%	8.83%	6.78%	
	Nat	6.43%	6.51%	n/a	
% of pupils with SEN Support with 1+ FTE	Glos	5.19%	6.36%	4.60%	
	Nat	7.05%	6.17%	n/a	

Reduction in Persistent Absenteeism (related to SEMH) impacts positively on all CYP

Source = Absence by characteristics (published)

% by cohort who are Persistent Absentees	2017/18		2018/19		Nat
	Glos	Nat	Glos	Nat	
Autistic spectrum disorder	18.0%	18.4%	17.8%		28.7%

Hearing impairment	6.6%	15.4%	10.6%	15.0%
Moderate learning difficulty	18.7%	18.5%	17.6%	18.0%
Multi-sensory impairment	18.8%	17.3%	27.8%	25.2%
No specialist assessment	17.3%	16.4%	15.2%	16.1%
Other difficulty/disability	19.7%	21.2%	17.0%	20.7%
Physical disability	29.0%	29.1%	26.1%	32.0%
Profound and multiple learning difficulty	36.4%	44.6%	40.2%	44.1%
Social emotional and mental health	27.3%	27.6%	25.4%	27.2%
Speech language and communications needs	12.3%	13.7%	14.2%	13.3%
Severe learning difficulty	22.9%	22.1%	23.1%	22.7%
Specific learning difficulty	14.8%	15.8%	13.1%	15.3%
Visual impairment	11.5%	17.7%	9.6%	19.6%
Unclassified	20.8%	23.4%	23.6%	24.2%
Pupils with SEN (EHCP or Support)	18.8%	19.6%	18.3%	19.2%
ALL Pupils	10.9%	11.2%	10.2%	10.9%
% of all pupils in absence tables with SEMH	2.3%	2.5%	2.7%	2.6%
% of Persistent Absentees with SEMH	5.8%	6.1%	6.6%	6.5%

EHCP and SEN support data broken down by SC input (CP & CIN)

Source: Data from the January School census for state-funded primary, secondary and special schools and academies matched to LiquidLogic data.

CP Plan	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

% of all pupils with EHCP with CP Plan	Glos	1.3%	1.6%	1.4%
% of all pupils with SEN Support with CP Plan	Glos	1.4%	1.7%	1.2%
% of pupils with EHCP who are CiC	Glos	2.7%	2.7%	2.3%
% of pupils with SEN Support who are CiC	Glos	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%
% of pupils with EHCP who are CiN	Glos	7.0%	5.1%	5.5%
% of pupils with SEN Support who are CiN	Glos	3.6%	3.6%	3.6%

SEN Home to School Transport

Source: Capita One

SEN average daily cost of home to school transport is £35; for the out of county and independent specials schools the average daily cost is £75 (£70 for in county and £81 for out of county).

All children and young people aged 0-25 with an EHCP

Source: SEN2 Census for published data; Capita One for current figures

Age Range	Jan-18	Jan-19	Jan-20	Nov-20 (current)
-----------	--------	--------	--------	------------------

Under 5	Glos	4.1%	4.3%	3.9%	3.3%
	Nat	3.9%	4.0%	3.9%	n/a
Age 5 to 10	Glos	37.5%	38.7%	38.7%	36.1%
	Nat	33.0%	33.1%	33.0%	n/a
Age 11 to 15	Glos	36.3%	35.2%	36.3%	37.0%
	Nat	36.7%	35.7%	35.3%	n/a
Age 16 to 19	Glos	20.3%	19.9%	18.9%	20.4%
	Nat	21.9%	21.9%	21.3%	n/a
Age 20 to 25	Glos	1.8%	1.8%	2.1%	3.2%
	Nat	4.4%	5.3%	6.5%	n/a
TOTAL	Glos	3290	3658	3922	4225
	Nat	319819	353995	390109	n/a

Sex
percentage/pro
file of service
users who are
male and who
are female

Gender		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Male	Glos	51.0%	50.8%	50.8%	
	Nat	51.0%	51.0%	51.0%	
Female	Glos	49.0%	49.2%	49.2%	
	Nat	49.0%	49.0%	49.0%	

source: published schools, pupils and characteristics

Total No.	Glos	87,145	88,042	88,596
	Nat	8,105,840	8,191,953	8,266,654

Reduction in PEX impacts positively on all CYP, Impact for males greater than females
national from published exclusion data, Glos from local PEX data dashboard (denominators from spc)

		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all PEX for males	Glos	71.0%	72.3%	79.2%	
	Nat	77.4%	76.1%	tbc	tbc
% of males with PEX	Glos	0.22%	0.18%	0.13%	
	Nat	0.15%	0.14%	tbc	tbc
% of females with PEX	Glos	0.09%	0.07%	0.03%	
	Nat	0.05%	0.05%	tbc	tbc

Reduction in FTE impacts positively on all CYP, Impact for males greater than females

		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all FTE instances for males	Glos	72.15%	73.18%	71.63%	
	Nat	72.64%	71.85%	tbc	tbc
% of males with 1+ FTE	Glos	2.98%	3.68%	2.85%	
	Nat	3.30%	3.43%	tbc	tbc
% of females with 1+FTE	Glos	1.20%	1.45%	1.16%	
	Nat	1.33%	1.41%	tbc	tbc

Reduction in Persistent Absenteeism (related to SEMH) impacts positively on all CYP

Source = Absence by characteristics (published)

		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all PAs who are male	Glos	51.6%	51.5%		
	Nat	52.4%	52.4%		
% of all males who are PA	Glos	11.0%	10.3%		
	Nat	11.4%	11.1%		
% of all females who are PA	Glos	10.8%	10.1%		
	Nat	10.9%	10.6%		

Reduction in EHE for non philosophical/religious reasons

Source = local EHE data (no national comparators available)

		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all EHE new starters who are male		50.7%	47.9%	49.6%	
% of EHE new starters due to reasons other than Philosophical / religious	Male	88.8%	93.1%	92.7%	
	Female	87.2%	88.9%	97.2%	
	All	88.0%	90.9%	94.9%	

Male vs female EHCP will impact one one group more than other. SEN support males vs females

from Special Educational Needs in England, January 2020. Figures for state-funded primary, secondary and special schools and academies only.

SEN by Gender		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all females with EHCP	Glos	1.50%	1.67%	1.77%	
	Nat	1.58%	1.68%	1.79%	

% of all males with EHCP	Glos	4.23%	4.55%	4.83%
	Nat	4.10%	4.35%	4.68%
% of all females with SEN Support	Glos	9.21%	9.65%	10.09%
	Nat	8.21%	8.38%	8.64%
% of all males with SEN Support	Glos	15.45%	15.93%	16.34%
	Nat	14.72%	14.88%	15.08%

SEN by Gender		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all EHCPs that are for females	Glos	25.49%	26.23%	26.19%	
	Nat	27.11%	27.05%	26.93%	
% of all EHCPs that are for males	Glos	74.51%	73.77%	73.81%	
	Nat	72.89%	72.95%	73.06%	
% of SEN Support for females	Glos	36.45%	36.99%	37.42%	
	Nat	34.93%	35.16%	35.55%	
% of SEN Support for males	Glos	63.55%	63.01%	62.58%	
	Nat	65.07%	64.84%	64.45%	

Race
percentage/pro
file of service
users who are
from black and
minority ethnic
backgrounds

Ethnicity (Race)					
<i>source: published schools, pupils and characteristics</i>					
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Asian (Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, Any Other Asian)	Glos	3.1%	3.2%	3.5%	
	Nat	11.0%	11.2%	11.4%	

Black (African, Caribbean, other Black)	Glos	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%
	Nat	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%
Chinese	Glos	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
	Nat	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%
Mixed (White Asian, White Black African, White Black Caribbean, other Mixed)	Glos	4.7%	4.8%	5.0%
	Nat	5.8%	6.0%	6.2%
White British	Glos	82.7%	82.1%	81.1%
	Nat	67.0%	66.1%	65.4%
Other White Background (Gypsy/Roma, Irish, Traveller of Irish Heritage, other White)	Glos	6.1%	6.3%	6.4%
	Nat	7.0%	7.3%	7.4%
Any other ethnic group	Glos	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
	Nat	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Unclassified	Glos	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%
	Nat	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%
Total No.	Glos	87,145	88,042	88,596
	Nat	8,105,840	8,191,954	8,266,655

Ethnicity (Race)					
<i>source: published schools, pupils and characteristics</i>					
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Asian (Bangladeshi, Indian, Pakistani, Any Other Asian)	Glos	3.1%	3.2%	3.5%	
	Nat	11.0%	11.2%	11.4%	
Black (African, Caribbean, other Black)	Glos	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	
	Nat	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%	
Chinese	Glos	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	

	Nat	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%
Mixed (White Asian, White Black African, White Black Caribbean, other Mixed)	Glos	4.7%	4.8%	5.0%
	Nat	5.8%	6.0%	6.2%
White British	Glos	82.7%	82.1%	81.1%
	Nat	67.0%	66.1%	65.4%
Other White Background (Gypsy/Roma, Irish, Traveller of Irish Heritage, other White)	Glos	6.1%	6.3%	6.4%
	Nat	7.0%	7.3%	7.4%
Any other ethnic group	Glos	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
	Nat	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Unclassified	Glos	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%
	Nat	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%
Total No.	Glos	87,145	88,042	88,596
	Nat	8,105,840	8,191,954	8,266,655

Reduction in permanent exclusion impacts positively on all CYP. Impact between ethnic groups differs.

national from published exclusion data, Glos from local PEX data dashboard (denominators from spc)

% of cohort with PEX		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Asian	Glos	0.04%	0.11%	0.00%	
	Nat	0.40%	0.04%	tbc	
Black	Glos	0.24%	0.23%	0.07%	
	Nat	0.13%	0.11%	tbc	
Chinese	Glos	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
	Nat	0.01%	0.01%	tbc	
Mixed	Glos	0.27%	0.33%	0.16%	
	Nat	0.16%	0.13%	tbc	
White British	Glos	0.16%	0.11%	0.08%	

	Nat	0.10%	0.10%	tbc	
Other white	Glos	0.11%	0.11%		0.05%
	Nat	0.08%	0.07%	tbc	
Other	Glos	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%
	Nat	0.06%	0.08%	tbc	
Unclassified	Glos	0.25%	0.31%		0.40%
	Nat	0.18%	0.17%	tbc	
TOTAL	Glos	0.16%	0.13%		0.08%
	Nat	0.10%	0.10%	tbc	

% of PEX from cohort		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Asian	Glos	0.72%	2.7%		0.00%
	Nat	4.57%	4.6%	tbc	
Black	Glos	2.17%	2.7%		1.39%
	Nat	7.44%	6.7%	tbc	
Chinese	Glos	0.00%	0.0%		0.00%
	Nat	0.04%	0.0%	tbc	
Mixed	Glos	7.97%	12.5%		9.72%
	Nat	9.42%	8.3%	tbc	
White British	Glos	82.61%	73.2%		76.39%
	Nat	69.79%	71.4%	tbc	
Other white	Glos	4.35%	5.4%		4.17%
	Nat	5.41%	5.1%	tbc	
Other	Glos	0.00%	0.0%		0.00%
	Nat	1.21%	1.5%	tbc	
Unclassified	Glos	2.17%	3.6%		8.33%

	Nat	2.11%	2.3%	tbc
TOTAL	Glos	138	112	72
	Nat	7905	7894	tbc

% of cohort with 1+ FTE		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Asian	Glos	0.71%	1.23%	2.30%	
	Nat	1.22%	1.36%	tbc	
Black	Glos	3.79%	4.67%	2.66%	
	Nat	3.42%	3.45%	tbc	
Chinese	Glos	0.43%	0.87%	0.82%	
	Nat	0.36%	0.40%	tbc	
Mixed	Glos	3.68%	4.39%	3.07%	
	Nat	2.92%	3.08%	tbc	
White British	Glos	2.01%	2.38%	1.82%	
	Nat	2.42%	2.53%	tbc	
Other white	Glos	1.77%	2.47%	2.30%	
	Nat	1.86%	1.94%	tbc	
Other	Glos	1.91%	1.51%	1.37%	
	Nat	1.94%	2.10%	tbc	
Unclassified	Glos	5.98%	9.93%	9.23%	
	Nat	3.73%	3.84%	tbc	
TOTAL	Glos	2.11%	2.58%	2.02%	
	Nat	2.33%	2.44%	tbc	

% of FTE incidences from cohort		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Asian	Glos	0.73%	0.9%	1.05%	
	Nat	3.83%	4.3%		

Black	Glos	2.04%	2.2%	1.30%
	Nat	6.22%	5.9%	
Chinese	Glos	0.02%	0.1%	0.07%
	Nat	0.04%	0.0%	
Mixed	Glos	9.46%	8.2%	8.21%
	Nat	6.72%	7.0%	
White British	Glos	78.87%	78.4%	73.09%
	Nat	75.17%	74.1%	
Other white	Glos	5.11%	5.8%	8.65%
	Nat	5.02%	5.3%	
Other	Glos	0.19%	0.1%	0.19%
	Nat	1.18%	1.2%	
Unclassified	Glos	3.57%	4.2%	7.44%
	Nat	1.83%	2.1%	
TOTAL	Glos	4112	5469	4300
	Nat	410753	438265	

EHCP by ethnic groups

from Special Educational Needs in England, January 2020. Figures for state-funded primary, secondary and special schools and academies only.

% of cohort with EHCPs		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Asian	Glos	2.82%	2.72%	2.83%	
	Nat	9.90%	10.01%	10.14%	
Black	Glos	2.03%	1.93%	2.08%	
	Nat	6.98%	6.99%	7.00%	

Chinese	Glos	0.24%	0.22%	0.20%
	Nat	0.35%	0.35%	0.34%
Mixed	Glos	5.13%	5.12%	5.35%
	Nat	5.90%	6.16%	6.36%
White British	Glos	82.94%	83.04%	81.81%
	Nat	68.89%	68.14%	67.43%
Other white	Glos	4.93%	4.94%	5.04%
	Nat	4.98%	5.20%	5.43%
Other	Glos	0.32%	0.36%	0.44%
	Nat	1.64%	1.68%	1.75%
Unclassified	Glos	1.59%	1.67%	2.25%
	Nat	1.36%	1.46%	1.55%
TOTAL	Glos	2515	2753	2936
	Nat	231835	248321	269022

SEN support by ethnic group

from Special Educational Needs in England, January 2020. Figures for state-funded primary, secondary and special schools and academies only.

% of cohort with SEN Support		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Asian	Glos	1.75%	1.70%	1.74%	
	Nat	8.72%	8.70%	8.54%	
Black	Glos	1.51%	1.51%	1.49%	
	Nat	5.87%	5.72%	5.61%	
Chinese	Glos	0.20%	0.14%	0.10%	

	Nat	0.22%	0.22%	0.21%
Mixed	Glos	4.21%	4.39%	4.58%
	Nat	5.68%	5.86%	6.02%
White British	Glos	84.55%	84.41%	83.94%
	Nat	70.46%	70.25%	70.22%
Other white	Glos	6.22%	6.39%	6.28%
	Nat	6.29%	6.37%	6.36%
Other	Glos	0.30%	0.32%	0.38%
	Nat	1.68%	1.69%	1.73%
Unclassified	Glos	1.26%	1.14%	1.49%
	Nat	1.07%	1.20%	1.30%
TOTAL	Glos	10768	11276	11728
	Nat	932682	956206	983559

1st Language (Race)

source: published schools, pupils and characteristics

		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Known or believed to be English	Glos	92.6%	92.4%	91.9%	
	Nat	80.6%	80.4%	80.2%	
Known or believed to be other than English	Glos	7.2%	7.4%	7.7%	
	Nat	19.2%	19.3%	19.4%	
Language unclassified	Glos	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	
	Nat	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	
Total	Glos	87,145	88,042	88,596	
	Nat	8,105,840	8,191,954	8,266,655	

Children with English as an additional language are around 33% less likely to be permanently excluded compared to children with English as a first language.

Not reported nationally, Glos from local PEX data dashboard (denominators from spc)

Permanent Exclusions		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all PEX for pupils with EAL	Glos	0.72%	0.00%	0.00%	
	Nat	n/a	n/a	n/a	
% of EAL pupils with PEX	Glos	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	
	Nat	n/a	n/a	n/a	
% of non-EAL pupils with PEX	Glos	0.17%	0.14%	0.09%	
	Nat	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Fixed Term Exclusions		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all FTE incidences for EAL pupils	Glos	0.24%	0.07%	0.05%	
	Nat	n/a	n/a	n/a	
% of EAL pupils with 1+ FTE	Glos	0.13%	0.06%	0.03%	
	Nat	n/a	n/a	n/a	
% of non-EAL pupils with 1+ FTE	Glos	2.25%	2.78%	2.19%	
	Nat	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Gender reassignment <i>percentage/profile of service users who have indicated they are transgender</i>	No identified significant impact
Marriage & civil partnership <i>percentage/profile of service users who are married or in a civil partnership</i>	No identified significant impact
Pregnancy & maternity <i>percentage/profile of service users who are female and who are pregnant or on a maternity leave</i>	No identified significant impact
Religion and/or belief <i>percentage/profile of service users religious beliefs</i>	No identified significant impact
Sexual orientation <i>percentage/pro</i>	No identified significant impact

file of service users who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, heterosexual

Economic

FSM eligibility

source: published schools, pupils and characteristics

		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Known to be eligible for free school meals	Glos	9.4%	11.0%	12.4%	
	Nat	13.6%	15.5%	17.4%	
Other	Glos	90.6%	89.0%	87.6%	
	Nat	86.4%	84.5%	82.6%	
Total	Glos	87,145	88,042	88,596	
	Nat	8,105,840	8,191,954	8,266,655	

Not in education, employment or training

NEET

Current NEET (as at September 2020):

440

IMD2019 national quintile:	No. of NEET matched to IMD2019 based on postcode of residence*	%
1 (Most deprived)	90	21.4%
2	86	20.5%
3	113	26.9%
4	85	20.2%
5	46	11.0%
Total	420	

* Please note: not all CYP who are NEET have a Capita ID / Gloucestershire postcode

Reduction in PEX improves chances for those with economic disadvantage.

national from published exclusion data, Glos from local PEX data dashboard (denominators from spc)

Permanent Exclusions		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all PEX for FSM eligible	Glos	42.03%	48.21%	44.44%	
	Nat	38.60%	43.02%	tbc	tbc
% of FSM eligible with PEX	Glos	0.71%	0.56%	0.29%	
	Nat	0.28%	0.27%	tbc	tbc
% of non-FSM eligible with PEX	Glos	0.10%	0.07%	0.05%	
	Nat	0.07%	0.06%	tbc	tbc

Fixed Term Exclusions		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all FTE incidences for FSM eligible	Glos	46.33%	47.05%	47.37%	
	Nat	36.46%	39.60%	tbc	tbc
% of FSM eligible with 1+ FTE	Glos	8.74%	9.44%	6.80%	
	Nat	5.42%	5.49%	tbc	tbc
% of non-FSM eligible with 1+ FTE	Glos	1.44%	1.74%	1.35%	
	Nat	1.84%	1.89%	tbc	tbc

EHCP/SEN support with FSM comparison (data)

from Special Educational Needs in England, January 2020. Figures for state-funded primary, secondary and special schools and academies only.

SEND		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all EHCP pupils FSM eligible	Glos	26.16%	27.24%	28.51%	
	Nat	31.06%	32.85%	34.61%	
% of all SEN support pupils FSM eligible	Glos	20.37%	23.23%	25.28%	
	Nat	24.53%	27.12%	29.81%	
% of FSM eligible with EHCP	Glos	8.12%	7.79%	8.01%	
	Nat	6.57%	6.47%	6.51%	
% of FSM eligible with SEN Support	Glos	27.06%	27.20%	27.22%	
	Nat	20.87%	20.61%	20.51%	

Social

Social Care

source: January School census matched to LiquidLogic data.

		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
All Pupils on roll at state-funded primary, secondary and special schools and academies:					
Pupils with CiN	Glos	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	
Pupils with CP Plan	Glos	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	
Pupils Looked After	Glos	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	

Reduction in PEX has positive impact on all CYP but for those with social care interaction this impact is greater

source = Social Care status as at time of PEX, PEX local data, denominators from census / local social care data

		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
% of all PEX for pupils with CiN	Glos			16.67%	
% of all PEX for pupils with CP Plan	Glos			4.17%	
% of CiN with PEX	Glos			0.82%	
% of pupils with CP Plan with PEX	Glos			0.80%	
Number of Child in Care Transfer Protocols invoked (alternative to PEX for CiC)	Glos	6	12	3	

Environmental

No identified significant impact

Appendix 2 – GCC Workforce Data

Details of Gloucestershire County Council staff affected by the proposed activity

Protected Characteristic	Total number of GCC staff affected:
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Age	
Disability	
Sex	
Race	
Gender reassignment	
Marriage & civil partnership	
Pregnancy & maternity	
Religion and/or belief	
Sexual orientation	
