

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 28.06.05.	MEETING NAME: Cross-Party Ouseley Review Working Group.
Report title:		Education themed report	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Strategic Director of Education	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Working Group:
 - Notes the extent and complexity of the issues outlined in the report and the clear priority placed by the education department on equalities and diversity
 - Endorses the priority actions as identified by the department
 - Considers identifying some of its members and some members from the Strategic reference Group to visit jointly a range of schools with good practice in respect of education and inclusion of vulnerable pupils
 - Supports the active role of the Strategic Reference Group (SRG) as indicated in the identified key areas

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. At their meeting on 4 April the Cross-Party Ouseley Review Working Group agreed that there should be an education themed report brought to the group to address the recommendations in Lord Ouseley's report (see appendix 1) and to review equalities and diversity issues in education.
3. This report comes at a time of growing confidence in education services. These services are transferring back to direct council management in August, and there are increasing areas of success. GCSE results are at their highest for some years, secondary attendance is at its highest in the borough's history and exclusions from schools are declining.
4. This report sets out some of the key priorities and challenges which continue to face the education department, supported where possible by data (in appendices as indicated), and outlines key actions to be implemented across all schools and the department. It is worth noting that Southwark is not working in isolation on these areas of challenge. Many of them are also issues for all inner London boroughs, as well as cross London and nationally. Part of our strategic response comes through work within London Challenge.
5. The council is seeking input from the SRG on the issues raised in this report, especially on the following:
 - Encouraging parental involvement in their children's education, recognising that breaking cycles of low aspiration rests to a significant extent with parents and families
 - Extending cross-community representation on governing bodies so that black leadership in education is increasingly visible
 - Acting proactively to spread good practice, especially between governing bodies
6. The education department has a key role in challenging and influencing schools. It is, however, crucial to recognise that, under principles of self-management, a significant locus of responsibility for equalities and diversity rests with governors and head teachers. Building the capacity of the LEA and strengthening its ability to hold schools to account through a more rigorous approach to support and challenge is critical to moving forward the equalities and diversity agenda in education.

7. The education department business plan links directly into the corporate priority on equalities and diversity. It makes explicit the department's central focus on the range of equality/ diversity aspects of service delivery, reinforced in all business unit level plans and individual work plans. Significant areas of focus include:
 - Attainment: addressing issues for underachieving groups including provision for pupils with English as an additional language (EAL)
 - Inclusion: implementing the Inclusion Strategy including support for children and young people with disabilities and learning difficulties/ special educational needs (SEN)
 - Staffing and training issues
 - Community engagement: development of governing bodies – ensuring that there is ethnic minority representation and that all governors understand their responsibilities with regard to equalities and diversity and receive appropriate training; customer service provision including communications and standards for contractors
 - Schools: Addressing issues of school responsibility including requirements under Race Relations (Amendment) Act and Disability Discrimination Act
 - Undertaking Equality Impact Assessments across the education service
8. The Education Development Plan (EDP) – a key plan for delivering aspects of the departmental business plan – is predicated on the need to improve attainment, achievement and inclusion for all pupils, with specific focus on those identified as vulnerable to underachieving or to social exclusion. In defining vulnerable children, we include children who are:
 - Living in poverty
 - Children for whom English is their second language
 - Pregnant schoolgirls and schoolgirl mothers
 - Pupils unable to attend school because of medical needs
 - Children in public care
 - Children on the child protection register
 - Young carers
 - Asylum seekers and refugees
 - Pupils with statements of SEN
 - Pupils with mental health problems
 - Travellers
 - Pupils returning from secure estate
 - Pupils permanently excluded from school and those receiving fixed term exclusions of more than 15 days
9. The six priorities of the EDP are:
 - Priority 1: Raising attainment in the early years and primary phases
 - Priority 2: Raising attainment in Key Stages 3 and 4
 - Priority 3: Support for schools causing concern
 - Priority 4: Social and educational inclusion; improving participation and the quality of education for all
 - Priority 5: Ensuring a consistently high quality education is provided for all through the development of self managing schools
 - Priority 6: Recruitment and retention
10. Improving the overall achievement of pupils in Southwark schools will only progress through detailed analysis of issues around equalities and diversity – they are inextricably linked. Only by strengthening all our schools and building collective commitment to all pupils will equalities and diversity issues be addressed. The EDP reflects the complexity of building effective schools and identifies the inter-relationship between strong leadership and management, high quality teaching from skilled staff and attention to the needs of individual pupils. These criteria are at the heart of the work of the education department, driving strategies to support and challenge schools.
11. Across each of the six priorities identified within the EDP there are specific areas of

focus for addressing the needs of BME pupils, underachieving gender groups and those with disabilities/ SEN. Examples of specific activity are set out in appendix 2.

12. The Inclusion Strategy is a major vehicle for addressing equalities and diversity issues in education in Southwark. It sets out a definition of inclusion that goes beyond access for children and young people with disabilities or SEN, and refocuses on tackling all forms of discrimination, disadvantage and exclusionary processes. This widens inclusive schooling to something which links to social justice, human rights and social inclusion, and expects that all staff are aware of who are the vulnerable children in their school, where they are and how well their needs are being met.
13. Throughout each of the major plans there is an increased emphasis on the use of critical analysis of data so that we can be very specific about the needs of identified groups and tailor our responses accordingly. Use of data at individual level in this way is a clear requirement of all services as outlined in the departmental business plan. This is crucial if we are to target resources appropriately and fully evaluate the impact of intervention.
14. Monitoring progress against key actions in respect of attainment, achievement and inclusion has been strengthened substantially and is more embedded in the culture of the department. Regular reporting mechanisms include: the department's quarterly reports to Executive; the monthly contract monitoring reports; the self-assessments under the Ofsted criteria and subsequent progress reports; reports to the Independent Review Panel; and reports to Scrutiny on identified themes (examples of reports are available on request). This report focuses on activities currently being undertaken or included in plans, and we recognise that the impact of work to date has not always been fully realised, hence the need for services to keep their work under constant review.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

15. The education department approach to planning and service delivery is based on an understanding of the range of equalities and diversity issues and their complex interplay in improving the life chances of all children. The following areas represent our main focus.

Attainment

16. The department uses the rich data on individual pupils to distinguish between all groups of pupils as there are marked differences in attainment levels between groups, and between schools for the same groups. Some comparative examples are highlighted below.
 - There is wide variation in attainment between BME groups, with significant underachievement amongst some, while others out-perform the Southwark average (see appendix 3). Analysis of black pupils' performance at GCSE in 2004 shows that Caribbean pupil attainment was the lowest at 28% (5+A*-C grades) compared to 42% overall; African pupil attainment is the highest at 48%. Within the overall Black African grouping, however, there are also marked differences, for example, 51% of Nigerian pupils attained at this level compared to 23% of Somali pupils.
 - White British pupils' level of attainment is below the Southwark average and below the overall Black African level as well as certain groups of Black African pupils, including Nigerian and Ghanaian.
 - At Key Stage 2, 3 and 4 girls outperform boys. In secondary schools the attainment of White British boys increased at a higher rate over three years compared to boys overall in Southwark. Caribbean boys results improved at a faster rate than boys in Southwark overall for 5+A*-C at GCSE.
 - Further detailed analysis of pupils with SEN identifies that this is a critical factor influencing attainment levels. The percentage of pupils with SEN (non stated) achieving L4 at Key Stage 2 English in Summer 2004 was 37% compared to 69% for all pupils. At GCSE, 19% of pupils with SEN (non

- statemented) achieved 5+ A* - C grades compared to 42% of all pupils.
- Eligibility for free school meals – a proxy measure for poverty and deprivation – has a significant impact on attainment. At GCSE, 34% of those pupils eligible for FSM achieved 5 + A* to C grades, compared to 48% of those not eligible (against the Southwark average of 42%).
 - There are some positive signs of improvement. At KS3, Caribbean pupil performance in English and Maths rose at a faster rate than that of Black African pupils between 2002 and 2004. This needs to be balanced, however, against the generally lower levels of performance by Caribbean pupils in comparison to these groups.
17. There is significant disparity between the attainment of the same pupil group across different schools. Some schools make excellent provision for BME children and young people and have very good attainment results for Black African and Caribbean pupils. Analysis of those primary schools with a significant number (5 or more) of Caribbean pupils in year 6 last year shows that 44% achieved below the Southwark average (58%) for this ethnic group at KS2 English. Using the same approach, 50% of primary schools with significant numbers of White British pupils achieved below the Southwark average at KS2 English for this group (70%).
18. There is not necessarily a correlation between those schools who are achieving well with BME pupils and those schools with teaching staff and leadership representative of their pupil populations.
19. Case studies outline the work of some very successful primary schools.

Primary school 1 is situated in one of the most deprived estates in the borough. The pupils come from a rich diversity of backgrounds, 41% of whom have English as an additional language. Twenty eight percent of pupils are on the school's SEN register, which is well above the national average. Sixty two percent of pupils have been identified as being eligible for free school meals, which is very high when compared to the national average.

100% of Black African and Caribbean pupils achieved a 100% pass rate at English KS2 level 4, well above the LEA average, with similar results for Level 4 Maths.

Primary school 2 has above average proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals (46% compared to borough average of 38%), 35% of pupils with first language not English, 23% with SEN needs (both stated and non-stated), and 60% black pupils – this breaks down as 24% Black African, 24% Black Caribbean, 11% Black Other - and 16% White British.

Between Summer 2003 and 2004, the school achieved remarkable gains at KS2 in English in particular: pupils achieving Level 4 rose by 31 percentage points, which was above average compared to all schools nationally, and the school achieved a national benchmark grade A at Level 5, putting it well above average at this higher level.

The school was able to make highly effective use of individual pupil tracking and targeting to support rigorous and challenging target setting at individual pupil level. The LEA has brokered training for over 50 heads building on identified best practice, including involvement from this head teacher.

Primary school 3 has above borough average levels of FSM eligibility, pupils with first language not English and SEN needs. 24% of the pupils are Black Caribbean across the school as a whole.

In Summer 2004, 71% of Black Caribbean pupils in year 6 achieved level 4 in English, compared to 69% of all pupils and 58% of all Black Caribbean pupils.

20. Over the past three years there have been some significant interventions to address attainment and inclusion for BME children and young people, including: the Southwark

Black Mentors Leaders of Tomorrow Programme, which has increased confidence and leadership skills for identified Caribbean 14 – 18 year olds; partnership with the Southwark Travellers' Action Group, which has raised pupil attainment (1 A* - G at GCSE from 17% to 86% between 1999 and 2004). The challenge is to learn from these examples and embed them in mainstream practice.

21. These examples highlight the importance of challenging and supporting schools at an individual level as defined in the EDP.

Inclusion

22. The Inclusion Strategy identifies a number of key areas that are to be addressed in order to improve support for vulnerable pupils, including those from BME groups. A key priority is to review the way in which SEN funding is allocated to pupils and schools and to focus sharply on the impact that additional resources are having in terms of improved pupil achievement.
23. The department is developing a revised funding formula to better reflect variables such as EAL (English as an additional language) and prior achievement and more robust monitoring systems will be implemented to ensure that schools allocate resources appropriately and fully evaluate support strategies.
24. The impact of the Inclusion Strategy has also been felt much wider. Admissions processes across all schools have been reviewed so that they are transparent, including for academies and voluntary schools. The capital strategy is being used as a vehicle for improving access and participation of all children and young people in their education through building design. New buildings will fundamentally change the way in which children and young people with SEN are able to access high quality education within a mainstream setting.
25. The development of the strategy has also highlighted some key areas for the LEA to address. Inclusive practice is variable across schools. Use of specific funding such as the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant needs to be reviewed so that we have a clearer understanding of the use schools are making of it. Closer analysis of data shows that some specialist provision has disproportionate representation from ethnic groups, for example, black children and autism in one unit. This raises the potential issue of diagnostic bias, which needs further exploration with the PCT.
26. The early years sector as a whole is more inclusive of children with special needs than the schools sector, to the extent that most children with high levels of need receive support in integrated early years settings alongside children of all abilities. However, there are a limited number of settings able to offer support to children with more complex needs. There is to be a strategy to increase the number of settings able to include children with complex needs and disabilities, with the support of Children's Centres, the Early Intervention Team, and Special Schools.
27. Increasing our critical analysis of data and focusing interventions more sharply has had a very positive outcomes on exclusion levels. In the 2003/04 academic year there was a worrying number of exclusions from special schools. Focused work with these schools resulted in a dramatic reduction in exclusions to date in 2004/05 with a positive impact on totals. The total number of permanent exclusions in primary, secondary and special schools last year September 03 to July 04 was 66 and this year to date (May 2005) was 27.
28. Data on permanent exclusions by ethnic group (see appendix 4) shows that some pupil groups such as White British and Black Caribbean are over-represented. The overall rate of exclusions per 1000 pupils to date (part year figures only) is 1.0, compared to a rate of 1.8 for Black Caribbean pupils and 1.6 for White British. This is in the context of the marked decline in total numbers of exclusions for both these groups.
29. Precise interrogation of the data at school level highlighted a disproportionate number of fixed term exclusions by one primary school, including a high proportion of black

pupils. Targeted intervention with this school has reduced the number of exclusions significantly this year.

30. Behaviour is a key issue across Southwark. The links between exclusions from school and further disengagement and involvement in crime are well documented. The Behaviour Improvement Project is core to working with schools to improve behaviour of individual children and young people and supports the development of positive behavioural strategies, which recognise cultural differences.
31. Southwark schools and the department use the expertise of the voluntary sector in this area. The Boyhood to Manhood Foundation, for example, works with BME boys at risk of exclusion through offering support for anger management, behaviour management, developing self esteem and uses mentoring to support these boys.
32. Specific strategies are being developed to assist teachers in better understanding specific behaviours that may be misconstrued as behavioural problems. As an example, a conference has been organised in partnership with The Tavistock¹ to increase awareness of African Caribbean culturally biased behaviours.

Staffing, recruitment and retention

33. Analysis of teacher ethnicity in Southwark schools compared to pupil and resident populations (see appendix 5) shows that the majority of teachers are white (70%) and the majority of school leaders (head teachers and senior management team) are also white (82%) compared to a 33% white average pupil population.
34. However, this data also illustrates the fact that the pupil population is more diverse than the Southwark residential population. Analysis of the teaching workforce in schools compared to the overall residential population shows that the percentage of white teachers is much more closely in line with the 63% of white residents. Similarly, Black Caribbean school leaders form 8% of the total, and teachers 8.7% of the total, in comparison to a residential population which is 8% Black Caribbean, that is, the proportions are comparable.
35. The LEA does not recruit school staff and there is not necessarily a link between those schools performing well with BME pupils and those schools with BME leadership. However, the LEA has a significant role in influencing schools to ensure that they recruit the best possible staff and that they are fully committed to providing career pathways for all, including teachers from BME groups.
36. In terms of internal recruitment, there has been insufficient training for managers and other staff on equalities issues, including those relating to recruitment. Our approach to recruitment, and our message to schools in their own recruitment, is that only the best person for the job should be appointed, but that this must be done with full understanding of the equalities implications of the recruitment process. Equalities training has been identified as part of the department's central training and development plan and will be mandatory for all managers over the coming year.
37. There have been long-term problems with the recruitment of staff for the Ethnic Minority Achievement project for the authority. This has been addressed by incorporating activities within the Primary and Secondary Strategy teams, although more emphasis needs to be given to this strand of work. Strategies will be developed in partnership with corporate colleagues in order to increase representation at more senior levels within the education department.

Involvement and engagement with the community

¹ The Tavistock Clinic has a worldwide reputation for therapeutic approaches in mental health in the public sector

38. Community engagement and involvement is generally a piecemeal process and is driven more by individual schools and parents in their local communities than by the LEA. The exception to this is when major consultation is undertaken on statutory issues or plans. We are working to develop a more structured approach that builds on the extended schools strategy. This will enable us to develop services for particular groups across community areas. The fundamental aim of the Extended schools strategy is to ensure that schools are rooted in their community and promoting wider access to all, including BME children, young people and their families.
39. Some specific community linked work, such as the South Bermondsey/ North Livesey neighbourhood management project, includes specific focus on building community cohesion through formal and informal curriculum opportunities, and contributing to raising standards of educational achievement through supporting and improving school/ community links.
40. Grant funding provided to voluntary mother tongue and supplementary schools has had positive outcomes, such as grade improvements for individual children and additional GCSEs in their mother tongue languages. We are planning for the supplementary school team to be relocated into the Achievement and Improvement division so that we can make more of the links between supplementary school approaches and the mainstream curriculum.
41. The newly emerging Community Development team will be considering grants made to voluntary and community groups for education related projects so that they can demonstrate a focus more specifically on planned outcomes and impact, rather than simply on activity.
42. Our pupil attitudinal survey to be conducted for all Year 5 pupils, seeking to record pupils to record their attitudes to a wide range of issues linked to the 5 outcomes of Every Child Matters, including school, transition, aspiration and living environment. All pupils will be asked to record their ethnicity on their survey. This will enable schools to consider variations and analyse the reason for them. Cross-school data will assist the LEA to plan specific support programmes to meet the needs of specific groups. It will also enable us to identify patterns across ethnic groups.
43. There has been a substantial effort to expand the participation of parents and governors, and this remains a priority although there are some positive signs that show increased involvement.

Schools

44. Schools have responsibilities under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act for race equality policies and racist incident reporting. We have identified through analysis of Ofsted criteria (JRS 5.7) areas of weakness in school practice and insufficient challenge by the local authority. We have therefore put plans in place to improve levels of racist incident reporting, follow up and training for staff.
45. There will also be a more detailed analysis by the LEA of all schools' race equality policies. It is vital that the LEA provides support and challenge to schools when they do not comply with the statutory framework on equalities. The new self-evaluation framework for schools demands that they are evaluating how they are meeting the 5 key outcomes of Every Child Matters. The LEA must address the full range of equalities and diversity issues.

Areas for action

46. The following issues have been identified as critical in strengthening services and outcomes for all, including vulnerable groups:
 - Implement EIAs across all service areas, starting with highest priority areas of Achievement, Access and Inclusion, but also extending to support services – this will enable us to articulate an even clearer ethos and

- philosophy as a department in respect of equalities and diversity
- Focus on learning from best practice, such as individual schools' successes in improving attainment of Caribbean pupils and other BME groups, and encourage the community learning networks to use best practice towards collective improvement in identified areas
- Strengthen the use of tracking and monitoring to ensure that service areas and schools are using this approach to target resources and support more effectively those groups needing it most, including BME groups, boys and those with SEN
- Expand strategy to engage with parents and governors, including BME parent/ governors to ensure that they are actively shaping the future of education in Southwark
- Use data to support the evaluation of impact and to ensure resources are targeted appropriately
- Development of the use of School Improvement Partners and Education Improvement Partnerships/ community learning networks to promote equalities
- Use the extended schools strategy to improve links with community and voluntary projects and building on local expertise and community knowledge
- Ameliorate the impact of poverty and deprivation by working with social services and health, and wider partners outside of the council; the every child matters framework is a significant development towards making a greater difference.
- Apply the same rigor in evaluating the quality of Early Years provision, as is currently applied to primary phases.

Resource implications

47. Southwark's recognised deprivation attracts considerable additional resources into each of the key agencies. Nevertheless, there is a sense that in spite of a substantial increase in funds to support vulnerable and SEN pupils, there is not enough support for certain groups.
48. Over the past five years there have been many individual funding streams coming into the borough, each with specific criteria for participation and accountability. While a number of these projects have been highly innovative, the lack of cohesion across the agencies has led to fragmentation and in some cases duplication.
49. In order to optimise the resources that are coming into Southwark there must be joint consideration of the totality of resources, and a strategic approach to initiating new programmes. We need to move away from short-term projects and programmes, to more strategic and sustainable services that are embedded in universal services. This strategy must take into account all resources that are targeted towards children and young people, including those for Early Years, the Youth Service, Connexions and core agencies of Social Services, Health and Education. In the future, all new funding streams will be considered jointly by 'Young Southwark' and programmes will be reviewed more rigorously in order to avoid duplication, improve equity and inform future planning. Monitoring and evaluation of outcomes will be strengthened so that there is a more systematic approach to planning innovation and change throughout the authority. This will be increasingly important as Southwark moves towards combining children's services within a Children's Trust.

Legal Implications

50. The LEA and schools must comply with the current legislation on equalities.

Consultation

51. The Cross Party Working Group agreed at its meeting of 31 May to establish a Strategic Reference Group to help provide a community voice and to work with the council on implementing Lord Ouseley's recommendations and tackling equalities and diversity issues in general. This report is being shared with the Strategic Reference Group at its first meeting on 22 June.
52. In particular, we welcome a focus by the SRG on the key areas for action identified in the Background section of this report (paragraph 5 page 1).

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
<i>Education Development Plan</i>	<i>John Smith House</i>	<i>Daphne Macarthy x55152</i>
<i>Education department business plan</i>	<i>John Smith House</i>	<i>Kate Sturdy x55185</i>
<i>Independent Review Panel Reports</i>	<i>Town Hall</i>	<i>Graeme Gordon x57384</i>
<i>Quarterly reports (education department)</i>	<i>Town Hall</i>	<i>Angela D'Urso x54285</i>
<i>Monthly contract monitoring reports</i>	<i>John Smith House</i>	<i>Maria Nawrocka x55032</i>
<i>Scrutiny reports</i>	<i>John Smith House</i>	<i>Sara Tucker x55106</i>
<i>Education department organisational development plan</i>	<i>John Smith House</i>	<i>Amy Deas x50555</i>
<i>Early Years Policy Review</i>	<i>John Smith House</i>	<i>Neil Gordon-Orr x55234</i>

APPENDIX A

Audit Trail

Lead Officer	<i>Alison Delyth, Strategic Director of Education</i>	
Report Author	<i>Denise Skidmore, Deputy Director and Kate Sturdy, Head of Strategic Planning and Business Management</i>	
Version	<i>Final</i>	
Dated	<i>20 June 2005</i>	
Key Decision	<i>No</i>	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	No	
Chief Finance Officer	No	
<i>List other Officers here</i>	Chief Executive Head of Social Inclusion.	Yes Yes
Executive Member	N/A.	
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services		

Appendix 1

Extract from Lord Ouseley's report – recommendations relating to education

16.18 Strengthen schools' work in promoting good community relations

16.19 Greater diversity in the teacher workforce should be a clear target

16.20 Give high priority to improving parental involvement in schools

16.21 Improve educational achievement by developing school/community partnerships, making learning attractive, and getting and using feedback from young people

Appendix 2: activities from the Education Development Plan

Examples of specific activities from the Education Development Plan which address equalities and diversity issues. (Note that these are listed at general activity level – more detail of specific actions and outcomes are listed in full in the EDP):

- Development of the curriculum so that it reflects the ethnic diversity within Southwark and supports pupils at risk of underachieving including those with EAL and SEN
- Support for schools in preparing BME pupils through primary-to-secondary transition
- Training for senior managers, Ethnic Minority Achievement and EAL coordinators on curricular, race equality and EAL issues to improve provision in schools
- Improve access to ethnic minority attainment data for schools
- Improve access for EAL learners, BME pupils and new entrants to secondary schools
- Increase participation rates of learners post-16 including strategies for identified disadvantaged groups
- Use data analysis to identify underachieving pupils and work with schools to set appropriately ambitious performance targets
- Improve EMA and EAL attainment
- Ensure that vulnerable pupils including children looked after, new arrivals, Travellers and asylum seekers and SEN pupils have a schools place and that their attendance and achievement are monitored
- Improve the quality of support to vulnerable pupils through more effective partnership work with families and key partner agencies
- Review the allocation of SEN funding and improve the capacity of schools to meet SEN needs of vulnerable pupils
- Monitor how resources for SEN are allocated to schools with particular attention to the impact on pupil progress
- Improve support for refugees and asylum seekers
- Promote effective approaches to managing diversity and promoting racial harmony
- Support the development of assessment practices which promote evidence based improvement and effective deployment of resources, including identification of underachieving groups
- Improve the strategies, systems and data to support the identification of under-achieving pupils, including base-lining and benchmarking of underperforming BME groups
- Develop links between schools and community/ cultural groups to promote supplementary education and out of hours learning
- Monitor data on teacher ethnicity and carry out more detailed analysis of retention and career progression for teachers from ethnic minority backgrounds

Appendix 3: Achievement of Ethnic Minority groups

Key Stage 2 (Percentage at Level 4 and above)	English			Difference 02 to 04	Maths			Difference 02 to 04
	2002	2003	2004		2002	2003	2004	
Southwark	67%	71%	69%	2%	62%	63%	64%	2%
Caribbean	59%	60%	58%	-1%	54%	48%	50%	-4%
African	71%	75%	72%	1%	65%	63%	66%	1%
Ghanaian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 126</i>)		82%	82%			72%	68%	
Nigerian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 450</i>)		80%	73%			69%	71%	
Sierra Leonian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 84</i>)		67%	64%			57%	52%	
Somali (<i>cohort size 2004 = 27</i>)		61%	56%			48%	56%	
Other Black African (<i>cohort size 2004 = 138</i>)		64%	70%			51%	58%	
White British	67%	72%	70%	3%	62%	66%	65%	3%
LEA target	75%	72%	75%	0%	70%	71%	74%	4%
National Actual	75%	75%	78%	3%	73%	73%	74%	1%
Difference: LEA - National	-8%	-4%	-9%		-11%	-10%	-10%	

Key Stage 3 (Percentage at Level 5 and above)	English			Difference 02 to 04	Maths			Difference 02 to 04	Science			Difference 02 to 04	ICT (TA)			Difference 02 to 04
	2002	2003	2004		2002	2003	2004		2002	2003	2004		2002	2003	2004	
Southwark	49%	51%	63%	14%	45%	52%	58%	13%	44%	49%	49%	5%	45%	49%	48%	3%
Caribbean	36%	42%	51%	15%	29%	40%	44%	15%	32%	36%	36%	4%	No Pupil Data			
African	58%	54%	67%	9%	50%	52%	59%	9%	50%	52%	48%	-2%				
Ghanaian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 90</i>)		60%	80%			58%	61%			63%	58%					
Nigerian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 352</i>)		56%	67%			56%	58%			53%	47%					
Sierra Leonian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 50</i>)		32%	64%			26%	46%			36%	40%					
Somali (<i>cohort size 2004 = 28</i>)		30%	32%			24%	46%			27%	36%					
Other Black African (<i>cohort size 2004 = 210</i>)		58%	66%			54%	65%			53%	49%					
White British	41%	52%	60%	19%	39%	55%	57%	18%	36%	50%	51%	15%				
LEA target	n/a	53%	60%		n/a	52%	60%		n/a	52%	56%		n/a	52%	60%	
National Actual	67%	69%	71%	4%	67%	71%	73%	6%	67%	68%	66%	-1%	66%	67%	67%	1%
Difference: LEA - National	-18%	-18%	-8%		-22%	-19%	-15%		-23%	-19%	-17%		-89%	-86%	-84%	

GCSE and equivalents (Percentage achieving 5+A*-C grades)	5+ A*-C			Difference 02 to 04	Ave. Point Score			Difference 02 to 04
	2002	2003	2004		2002	2003	2004	
Southwark	37%	40%	42%	5%	35.2	35.3	36.9	1.7
Caribbean	23%	28%	28%	5%	29.5	28.6	30.0	0.5
African	44%	48%	48%	4%	37.5	39.5	40.7	3.2
Ghanaian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 99</i>)		43%	49%			38.8	41.3	
Nigerian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 294</i>)		52%	51%			42.2	42.8	
Sierra Leonian (<i>cohort size 2004 = 65</i>)		25%	31%			29.9	32.0	
Somali (<i>cohort size 2004 = 31</i>)		24%	23%			27.9	27.1	
Other Black African (<i>cohort size 2004 = 188</i>)		55%	52%			40.4	42.3	
White British	28%	38%	41%	13%	30.6	34.8	35.5	4.9
LEA target	n/a	38%	40%		33.0	36.0	37.5	4.5
National Actual	52%	53%	53%	2%	40.1	40.7	41.4	1.3
Difference: LEA - National	-15%	-13%	-11%		-4.9	-5.4	-4.5	

Appendix 4: Permanent Exclusions By Ethnic Breakdown : 2002/03 to 2004/05 * (exclusions as rate per 1000 pupils)

Ethnicity	Number of exclusions			Rate per 1000 pupils		
	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05 *	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05 *
African	8	5	3	0.9	0.6	0.4
Any other Asian background	1	0	0	4.8	0.0	0.0
Black Caribbean	13	20	7	2.9	4.8	1.8
Any other Black background	4	5	0	4.5	4.9	0.0
Any Other Mixed Background	0	2	0	0.0	2.8	0.0
White & Asian	1	0	0	8.7	0.0	0.0
White & Black Caribbean	1	6	3	1.1	6.5	3.2
White British	11	20	12	1.4	2.7	1.6
White Irish	0	1	0	0.0	2.7	0.0
Turkish Cypriot	0	0	1	0.0	0.0	7.1
Any Other White Background	1	1	0	3.0	3.2	0.0
Any Other Ethnic Group	1	1	0	0.8	0.8	0.0
Unclassified	6	5	1	5.6	10.7	3.7
Total	47	66	27	1.6	2.3	1.0

Notes:

Only ethnic groups with permanent exclusions, in maintained primary, secondary and special schools are shown

Unclassified covers the following ethnic backgrounds: - Refused to say, missing and information not obtained

* Figures for 2004/05 are not comparable as they do not represent a full academic year; data is as at 09 May 2005

Appendix 5: Ethnic diversity in Southwark Schools

Ethnic Origin (%) : School Characteristic Breakdown											
				ASIAN OR ASIAN BRITISH				BLACK OR BLACK BRITISH			
DfES No	School Name	Role	With Disability (no.)	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Any other Asian background	Black Caribbean	Black African	Any other Black background	Chinese
Total (Nos.)		Leadership	1	4	0	0	0	25	5	6	0
		Teachers	9	24	10	7	26	177	105	67	7
		Pupils	n/a	208	187	904	308	4599	10124	1405	422
Total (%)		Leadership	0.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	1.6	2.0	0.0
		Teachers	0.4	1.2	0.5	0.3	1.3	8.7	5.2	3.3	0.3
		Pupil	n/a	0.6	0.5	2.6	0.9	13.4	29.5	4.1	1.2
		Residents	n/a	1.5	0.5	1.5	0.6	8.0	16.1	1.8	1.8

Cont:

			Ethnic Origin (%) : School Characteristic Breakdown										Total number	
DfES No	School Name	Role	MIXED/ DUAL BACKGROUND				WHITE					Any Other Ethnic Group		Unclassified
			White And Black Caribbean	White and Black African	White And Asian	Any other mixed background	White British	Irish	Traveller of Irish Heritage	Gypsy / Roma	Any Other White Background			
Total (Nos.)	Leadership		3	0	1	1	220	18	0	0	10	2	10	305
	Teachers		15	3	8	24	1036	66	0	0	314	31	116	2036
	Pupils		1118	329	180	921	9016	424	54	20	1910	1726	467	34322
Total (%)	Leadership		1.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	72.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.7	3.3	100.0
	Teachers		0.7	0.1	0.4	1.2	50.9	3.2	0.0	0.0	15.4	1.5	5.7	100.0
	Pupil		3.3	1.0	0.5	2.7	26.3	1.2	0.2	0.1	5.6	5.0	1.4	100.0
	Residents		3.7				62.9					1.5	n/a	

Sources: PLASC 2005; 618G 2005; Census - GLA, 2003 Round of Projections; Mid Year Estimates, O.N.S

Note: Ethnic breakdown of pupils not available for PRUs

Disability data not recorded at pupil level

Ethnic Background of teachers / leaders with disability have been shaded