

Outcome of consultation and proposal to close Riverside Business and Enterprise College

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Introduction

The accompanying report recommends that Cabinet publish a Statutory Notice and Detailed Proposal stating the intent of the City Council to close Riverside Business and Enterprise College over the period September 2010 - August 2012.

This recommendation follows the recent presentation and consultation upon a business case that concluded there are strong educational, financial and business reasons to close this School.

The business case and details of the consultation themselves can be found at:

www.leicester.gov.uk/riversideconsultation

Closure is proposed at this point following a collapse in parental secondary transfer preferences, associated financial concerns, low educational attainments and central government policy guidance in this particular area.

Further detail is contained within the accompanying report.

Public authorities have a legal duty to conduct Equality Impact Assessments on key policies and programmes in relation to disability, ethnicity and gender. This document meets this requirement.

Equality Impact Assessments are not about compliance, they are about ensuring the life chances of every child and family are maximised by helping decision makers to identify and address potential barriers to improved outcomes.

This Equality Impact Assessment is based on guidance prepared by the Department for Children, Schools and Families Equality and Diversity Unit. It has been prepared following an *initial screening* exercise that has determined that there could be both negative and positive impacts associated with the proposal to close Riverside Business and Enterprise College.

As a result the City Council has completed a full Equality Impact Assessment on this proposed course of action with a view to identifying problems and opportunities that can be addressed to ensure more young people reach their potential and associated staff needs are met as far as practicably possible.

Throughout this assessment two key questions are asked with respect to three separate dimensions of equality – disability, ethnicity and gender.

Key questions

- *Could the closure of Riverside Business and Enterprise College have a negative impact on one or more of the dimensions of equality? If so, how can the City Council implement its proposal to minimise impact or justify it?*
- *Could the closure of Riverside Business and Enterprise College have the potential to have a positive impact on equality by reducing and removing inequalities and barriers that already exist? If so, how can the City Council maximise this potential?*

Key principles informing assessment

This Equality Impact Assessment reflects certain key principles and criteria. These are:

1. *All learners are of equal value* and should benefit from this proposal equally regardless of their disability, ethnicity, culture, religious affiliation and faith, national origin or national status and their gender.
2. *Relevant differences should be recognised such that the proposal does not discriminate and is differentiated as necessary* to take account of differences of life experience, outlook and background in relation to disability, ethnicity and gender.
3. *Workforce Development. This proposal should not adversely impact upon any particular group within the workforce* in terms of their employment, and disability, ethnicity, culture, religious affiliation and faith, national origin or national status or gender.
4. *Positive attitudes and relationships should be fostered towards disabled people and good relations between disabled and non-disabled people.* The proposal must foster positive interaction and good relationships between groups and communities that are distinctly different from each other in terms of ethnicity, culture, religious affiliation and faith, national origin or national status. The proposal should promote mutual respect and good relations between boys and girls and women and men.
5. *Society as a whole should benefit.* This proposal should benefit society as a whole both locally and across the City by fostering greater cohesion and participation by disabled people, people from a wide range of ethnic cultural and religious backgrounds and boys and girls and women as well as men.
6. *Current inequalities and barriers should be addressed and reduced.*
7. *Proposal should acknowledge consultation concerns and seek to secure involvement through both direct and representative organisations based on transparency and accountability.* Reflect the views of disabled people, people of minority ethnic cultural and religious backgrounds and women as well as men.

Summary issues for consideration

From consideration of the principles the following questions arise:

Key topics	Disability	Ethnicity	Gender
<i>1. Outcomes for learners</i>	Does the proposal benefit all learners and potential learners or are disabled learners potentially excluded, disadvantaged or marginalised?	Does the proposal benefit all learners and potential learners, whatever their ethnic, cultural or religious background? Or are people from certain backgrounds losing out?	Does the proposal benefit all learners and potential learners, whichever their gender? Or are outcomes different for females and males, with some being disadvantaged?
<i>2. Recognising relevant differences</i>	Is due account taken of the specific needs and experiences of disabled people? Or is a 'one size fits all' approach adopted?	Is due account taken of different cultural backgrounds? Or is a 'one size fits all' approach adopted?	Is due account taken of girls and boys differing experiences? Or is a 'one size fits all' approach adopted?
<i>3. Impact upon the workforce</i>	Does the proposal affect all members of the workforce equally; are reasonable adjustments for disabled staff being made?	Does the proposal affect all members of the workforce equally, whatever their ethnic, cultural or religious background? Or are some excluded?	Does the proposal affect all members of the workforce equally, whichever their gender? Or are there differential impacts, both positive and negative?
<i>4. Impact upon attitudes, relationships and community cohesion</i>	Does the proposal promote positive attitudes towards disabled people, and good relations between disabled and non-disabled people? Or does it result in negativity and little mutual contact?	Does the proposal promote positive interaction and good relations between different groups and communities? Or are there tensions and negative attitudes?	Does the proposal promote good relations between girls and boys and women and men?
<i>5. Benefits for society</i>	Does the proposal benefit society as a whole by encouraging participation or are disabled people excluded or marginalised?	Does the proposal benefit society as a whole by encouraging participation in public life of citizens from a wide range of backgrounds? Or are certain communities excluded or marginalised?	Does the proposal benefit society as a whole by encouraging participation of girls as well as boys/ men of women? Or are girls/ women excluded or marginalised?
<i>6. Positive impact on equality</i>	Does this proposal help to reduce and remove inequalities between disabled and non-disabled people that currently exist? Or does inequality for disabled people continue?	Does this proposal help to reduce and remove inequalities and poor relations between different communities that currently exist? Or do barriers and inequalities continue?	Does this proposal help to reduce and remove inequalities between women and men and girls and boys that currently exist? Or do inequalities continue?
<i>7. Consultation, involvement and accountability</i>	Is this proposal based on involvement of and consultation with disabled people? Or are the views and experiences of disabled people not sought or not heeded?	Is this proposal based on involvement of and consultation with people from a range of backgrounds? Or are certain views and experiences not sought or not heeded?	Is this proposal based on involvement of and consultation with both women and men and girls and boys? Or are the views and experiences of women or men not sought or heeded?

To address the above a broad evidence base must be interrogated and cohort level data reviewed.

The evidence base

This Assessment is informed by the following evidence:

- Data from School & LA management information systems with respect to disability, ethnicity, gender and social deprivation by postcode*.
- Special Educational Needs register
- Free School meals entitlement data
- Outcomes from the City Council's HR system – Resource Link*

* Although current legislation relates only to disability, ethnicity and gender the City Council is mindful of the local context and plans being developed by the new Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) for the future. The City Council has therefore included reference to special educational needs and social deprivation within this assessment with regard to pupil cohorts. Similarly workforce analysis has paid due regard to age.

**Riverside Business and Enterprise College:
Pupil Cohort and staff profiles 2010 - 2012**

Respective pupil cohort profiles for the following can be found at **Schedule 1** to this Assessment:

These profiles address:

- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Disability
- Special Educational Needs
- Social deprivation

Respective staff profiles can be found on page 8.

Key Issues for consideration**Children, young people and families****Pupil cohort 2010 - 2012****Methodology**

Pupil data has been examined at respective cohort level for each year group from September 2010 onwards.

i.e.

September 2009 year 7 intake which will form Year 8 cohort Autumn 2010
 September 2009 year 8 intake which will form Year 9 cohort Autumn 2010
 September 2009 year 9 intake which will form Year 10 cohort Autumn 2010
 September 2009 year 10 intake which will form Year 11 cohort Autumn 2010

(Comparisons have been drawn against relevant City wide cohorts using data current at 17 August 2009.)

Key facts – pupil cohort

The Riverside cohorts vary but across the cohorts that will still be in the School in September 2010, if this proposed closure is agreed, the following issues will need to be considered:

- The number of boys is higher than the city average particularly in those groups who will be in Y8, Y9 and Y10 in September 2010.
- The ethnic make-up of most groups reflect the local cohort rather than the rest of the city. The majority of pupils come from White British backgrounds.
- There are no pupils who are registered disabled (- however 2 have hearing impairments - 1 in Y9 this autumn and 1 in year 10.)
- There are more pupils with special educational needs than the same year groups across the City. Particular consideration will need to be made for the group who will begin Y10 in 2010.
- There are also significant groups of pupils who currently require *school action*. The majority of pupils with identified special educational needs have moderate learning difficulties, speech and language associated difficulties or behaviour, social and emotional difficulties.
- The social context of these cohorts shows that a higher proportion than in the rest of the City come from the 10% most deprived (nationally) Lower Super Output Areas. This is also the case for pupils living in the 5% most deprived.

Pupil Cohort: 2010 – 2012:

Strategies to address potential equality issues

Analysis of the evidence has identified:

1. A requirement to pay particular need to the special educational needs in transitional planning. In particular regard will need to be paid to the needs of the September 2010 Year 10 cohort.
2. Issues in connection with pupils with hearing impairment will be addressed through individual education plans.
3. The number of pupils presenting with moderate learning and behaviour difficulties suggests that this aspect too should feature in transitional plans.
4. The above suggest that consideration should be given to providing a mechanism whereby friendship groups be maintained where practicably possible in admissions allocations. This cannot, of course, be guaranteed.
5. Given the number of pupils within all cohorts who reside in the top 10% of deprived lower super output areas there is a clear need to provide consideration to issues in connection with the promotion and provision of transport assistance as required.

Summary conclusions – pupil cohort:

Development and incorporation of strategies in connection with the (1) – (5) above will help mitigate negative effects of change if this proposal is implemented.

Potential strategies include:

- All pupils to have a personalised transfer and transition plan;
- The LA to work closely with families and other schools to ensure that the best placement and provision is secured;
- The LA to work closely with the school to ensure a curriculum to meet the needs of all pupils during the time leading up to closure, including continued high-quality support for pupils with SEN;

Given the above the City Council would expect all pupils to make at least the same progress as if they remained at Riverside, and that many pupils will make better progress. In future, pupils who would have gone to Riverside will go to schools where they will make better progress. So the impact on equalities is positive for most pupils.

It is noted that a number of respondents within the recent consultation have raised concerns about the impact of school closure upon the immediate school community and the broader West Leicester community. Concerns have been raised about divisive community and school based behaviours across West Leicester – an area characterised by poor educational achievement and attainment. This finds expression in a view expressed that primary schools have specifically briefed against Riverside at secondary transfer option and concerns about behaviour management and bullying in other secondary schools within the area. These reflect deep-seated tensions within communities and themselves mitigate against community cohesion.

The proposed closure of Riverside School will help ensure more sustainable schools within this immediate part of Leicester.

The proposed closure and revised admission arrangements documented in the accompanying Detailed Proposal will also help open up access to improved educational opportunities for young people – something that parents within the current priority area who are expressing first preferences for alternative schools are clearly trying to achieve.

In this sense the proposed closure of this school contributes not only to improved individual outcomes but greater social mobility, inclusion and ultimately improved community cohesion itself.

With regard to the provision of education for young people an adverse impact is therefore unlikely; on the contrary, the proposal has the clear potential to have a positive impact by reducing and removing barriers and inequalities that currently exist.

Key Issues for consideration

Workforce

Analysis of Resource Link has identified the following:

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY SCHOOL –TEACHING STAFF PROFILE

Age groups	Male	Male	Female	Female	Total	Total
	Posts	People	Posts	People	Posts	People
20-30	6	6	3	3	9	9
31-40	8	6	8*	8*	16	14
41-50	4	3	14	14	18	17
51-60	5	5	11	10	16	15
Above 61	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	23	20	36	35	59	55

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY SCHOOL –SUPPORT STAFF PROFILE

Age groups	Male	Male	Female	Female	Total	Total
	Posts	People	Posts	People	Posts	People
20-30	4	4	8	8	12	12
31-40	3	3	19	17*	22	20
41-50	5	5	29	23	34	28
51-60	8	6	16	16	24	22
Above 61	2	2	3	3	5	5
TOTAL	22	20	75	67	97	87

RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY SCHOOL – ALL STAFF PROFILE

Age groups	Male	Male	Female	Female	Total	Total
	Posts	People	Posts	People	Posts	People
20-30	10	10	11	11	21	21
31-40	11	9	27	25	38	34
41-50	9	8	43	37	52	45
51-60	13	11	27	26	40	37
Above 61	2	2	3	3	5	5
TOTAL	45	40	111	102	156	141*(142)

Gender, disability and ethnicity: The majority of employees within both the teaching and support staff are female and therefore school closure will naturally impact greater upon this group. This position is more pronounced amongst support staff which is 77% female.

Age: 27% of teaching staff are currently aged 51 and above. 31% of support staff are currently aged 51 and above and overall 29.7% of all staff are currently aged 51 and above.

No staff members have a registered disability on the Council Resource Link system. There is therefore no anticipated impact upon this target group.

Information with regard to ethnicity is very patchy as staff have self declared and a full profile is not known. There is therefore no anticipated impact upon this target group.

Workforce: 2010 – 2012:**Strategies to address potential equality issues**

- Careful consideration would need to be given to staffing matters including meeting the welfare needs of all staff affected. The provision of welfare, counselling, training, development and careers advice and guidance to staff would form part of the strategy to mitigate adverse impact for staff. Interviewing skills training will form part of a targeted approach.
- The City Council would undoubtedly wish to retain as many staff as possible within other schools and would need to broker agreements to this effect to reduce possibility of compulsory redundancy.
- Dedicated support from the Human Resources team would provide assistance in either redeployment to other educational establishments within the city or support in the event of termination of contract.

Summary conclusions - workforce

Analysis of the evidence and proposed strategies has determined that there is no one employee group more than another likely to be adversely affected by these proposals.

While the City Council recognise that it is preferable that school organisation decision contribute towards community cohesion and community safety for young people and their families, and that there is an accord with all stakeholders on this, there is of course also a requirement upon the Authority to reconcile this with its duty to secure school improvement, deliver value for money and meet public law obligations.

With regard to the workforce an adverse impact is probable for all groups however the proposal as a whole can nevertheless be justified.

Relationship of Equality Impact Assessment to current proposal

This Assessment has been prepared in accordance with current guidance from the Department for Children, Schools and Families. This assessment is intended to inform planning, independent scrutiny and decision taking by elected members.

The findings of this Equality Impact Assessment have informed the transitional plans within the accompanying Detailed Proposal.

As a result of this process it is recommended that a stakeholder transition group be established to advise upon operational issues associated with this particular school closure and to assist the smooth transition of pupils to other schools and reconciliation of workforce related matters.

This Group would work closely with local schools, agencies and services to ensure that curriculum offer and extended services offered to pupils formally at Riverside would be maintained and wherever possible improved and staff interests protected.

**Trevor Pringle
Divisional Director
Planning & Commissioning**

September 2009

Schedule 1

Pupil Cohort Analysis 2010 – 2012

Year 8 Cohort – September 2010

Number on role

There are 30 pupils currently registered to enter Riverside in September 2009 who will form the September 2010 Year 8 cohort.

Gender

Of these pupils 43% are girls and 57% are boys.

Ethnicity

The pupils' ethnic make up is predominantly White (87%). However there are 3 boys from non-white ethnic minorities - 1 Indian and 2 Black African other.

There is only one non-white girl - Asian Indian.

This ethnic make up is very different from the other year groups currently within the school.

It is also different to the rest of the city where within the Year 7 intake for 2009 there are 58% of pupils from non-white ethnic groups - 42% from White ethnic groups.

Disability

There are no registered disabled pupils in the September 2009 Year 7 intake group

Special Educational Needs

37% the pupils have an identified special educational need. 23% of girls are at school action, whilst 24% of boys are at school action with an equal number being at school action plus.

There are no statemented pupils.

There are three children each of whom have a different identified need - one Behaviour, social and emotional difficulties, 1 with moderate learning difficulties and one with other needs.

This SEN data shows that fewer of the intake have a recognised SEN than in other year groups within the school.

Across the new year 7 intake for the local authority as a whole there are 27% of pupils with an identified special educational need. Of these 15% are at school action, 8% at school action plus and 3% are statemented

There are no pupils in this intake group who are identified as being gifted and talented.

School meal eligibility

40% of the new cohort is eligible for Free School Meals - this represents 53% of boys and 23% of girls. This is the second highest level of free school meals in a cohort.

Across the Local Authority there are 25% of the year 7 cohort who are eligible for FSM (this is higher than other cohorts). 25.3% of boys and 24.9% of girls are eligible.

Social Deprivation

Deprivation analysis show that there is no significant difference between the IDACI* average score and other year groups - however boys entering year 7 have a significantly higher, and therefore more deprived IDACI score (0.51) than girls (0.33).

*(*IDACI = the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index which is a supplementary index to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation and focuses on aspects affecting children.)*

The percentage of new Y7 pupils who live in the 5% most deprived lower super output areas (LSOAs) is 10% which is significantly lower than that for other year groups see (2) and (3). Compared to the local authority percentage of pupils in the 5% most deprived LSOAs in the same year group (15%) this group is less deprived.

The percentage of new Y7 pupils who live in the 10% most deprived lower super output areas (LSOAs) is 37% which is also significantly lower than that for other year groups see (2) and (3). Compared to the local authority percentage of pupils in the 10% most deprived LSOAs in the same year group (33%) this group is slightly more deprived.

Year 9 Cohort – September 2010

Number on roll

There are 58 pupils currently registered to begin Year 8 in September 2009 - these will be Year 9 at the beginning of the autumn term 2010

Gender

Of these pupils 35% are girls and 66% are boys. This is a significant variance from the local authority.

Ethnicity

The pupils ethnic make up is predominantly White (80%). Of the 21% of pupils from non-white backgrounds 12% are of Asian Indian backgrounds. Other groups represented are 3 Black African pupils (1 Somali) and 1 mixed white and black african pupil. A third (26% of all pupils) are of White European or White Other backgrounds.

This ethnic make up is similar to older year groups within the school.

It is different to the rest of the City where within the Year 8 cohort for September 2009 there are 61% of pupils from non-white ethnic groups - 32% Asian Indian. Of the 39% from White ethnic groups 4% are not White British.

Disability

There are no registered disabled pupils in the September 2009 Year 8 group

Special Educational Need

47% the pupils have an identified special educational need. 25% of girls are at school action with 10% (2) at school action plus and 10% have a Statement of SEN, whilst 34% of boys are at school action, 11% at school action plus and 1 boy has a Statement.

This year group has the highest proportion of pupils with SEN.

Across the year 8 cohort for the local authority as a whole there are 31% of pupils with an identified special educational need. Of these 19% are at school action, 9% at school action plus and 4% are statemented. There are 5 pupils identified as having moderate learning difficulties, one with speech and language difficulties and one with other needs.

3.4% of pupils in this intake group are identified as being gifted and talented.

Free school meal eligibility

47% of the Y8 cohort is eligible for Free School Meals - this represents 47% of boys and 45% of girls. This is the highest level of free school meals for any cohort - see (2) and (3)

Across the Local Authority there are 27% of the year 8 cohort who are eligible for FSM. 26.3% of boys and 27.8% of girls are eligible.

Social Deprivation

Deprivation analysis show that there is no significant difference between the IDACI average score and other year groups or between the genders however the Riverside cohort scores 0.05 above the figures for the same cohort in the LA.

The percentage of Year 8 pupils who live in the 5% most deprived lower super output areas (LSOAs) is 21% which is line with older year groups. This is much higher than the same cohort for the LA which is 15%.

The percentage of September 2009 Y8 pupils who live in the 10% most deprived lower super output areas (LSOAs) is 47%. Compared to the local authority percentage of pupils in the 10% most deprived LSOAs in the same year group (32%) this group is more deprived.

Year 10 Cohort – September 2010

Number on roll

There are 74 pupils currently registered to begin Year 9 in September 2009 - these will be Year 10 at the beginning of the autumn term 2010

Gender

Of these pupils 38% are girls and 62% are boys. This is a significant variance from the local authority.

Ethnicity

The pupils' ethnic make up is predominantly White (66%). Of the 34% of pupils from non-white backgrounds 9% are of Asian Indian backgrounds and 10% are of Black African ethnicity (1girl and 8 boys) - (3% Somali). Other pupils are from mixed heritage backgrounds (6 pupils). A fifth (20% of all pupils) are of White European or White Other backgrounds.

This ethnic make up is similar to older year groups within the school.

It is different to the rest of the city where within the Year 9 for September 2009 there are 61% of pupils from non-white ethnic groups 33% Asian Indian. Of the 39% from White ethnic groups 4% are not White British.

Disability

There are no registered disabled pupils in the September 2009 Year 9 group

Special Educational Needs

39% the pupils have an identified special educational need. 21% of girls are at school action with 4% (1) at school action plus and none have a Statement of SEN, whilst 13% of boys are at school action, 24% at school action plus and 11% have a Statement. There are 9 pupils with Behaviour, Social and Emotional Difficulties, 1 hearing impaired, 11 with moderate learning difficulties. 1 other difficulties, 4 with Speech, language and communication needs and 2 with speech and language difficulties. This is across 16 pupils, 12 of whom have more than one special educational need.

This year group has the highest proportion of pupils with Statements of Special Educational Needs.

Across the year 9 cohort for the local authority as a whole there are 27% of pupils with an identified special educational need. Of these 16% are at school action, 8% at school action plus and 4% are statemented.

9.5% of pupils in this intake group are identified as being gifted and talented.

Free school meal eligibility

35% of the Year 9 cohort is eligible for Free School Meals - this represents 46% of boys and 21% of girls.

Across the Local Authority there are 25% of the year 9 cohort who are eligible for FSM. 26% of boys and 25% of girls are eligible.

Social Deprivation

Deprivation analysis show that there is no significant difference between the IDACI average score and other year groups. However this cohort shows a variance of 0.1 between boys and girls with girls having a lower IDACI score - 0.4 - this is still more deprived than the girls across the LA.

The percentage of Year 9 pupils who live in the 5% most deprived lower super output areas (LSOAs) is 22% which is line with other year groups. This is much higher than the same cohort for the LA which is 16%.

The percentage of September 2009 Y9 pupils who live in the 10% most deprived lower super output areas (LSOAs) is 55%. Compared to the local authority percentage of pupils in the 10% most deprived LSOAs in the same year group (32%) this group is more deprived.

Year 11 Cohort – September 2010Number on roll

There are 126 pupils currently registered to begin Year 10 in September 2009 - these will be Year 11 at the beginning of the autumn term 2010

Gender

Of these pupils 52% are girls and 48% are boys. This is slightly different from the local authority for the same cohort which is 48% girls.

Ethnicity

The pupils' ethnic make up is predominantly White (79%). Of the 21% of pupils from non-white backgrounds 9% are Asian (6% Indian) and 6% are of Black African ethnicity. Other pupils are from mixed heritage backgrounds (5%) . 28% of all pupils are of White European or White Other backgrounds.

This ethnic make up is similar to other year groups within the school.

It is different to the rest of the city where within the Year 10 for September 2009 there are 60% of pupils from non-white ethnic groups 32% of Asian Indian heritage. Of the 40% from White ethnic groups 4% are not White British.

Disability

There are no registered disabled pupils in the September 2009 Year 10 group

Special Educational Needs

39% the pupils have an identified special educational need. 22% of girls are at school action with 5% at school action plus and 2% have a Statement of SEN, whilst 25% of boys are at school action, 17% at school action plus and 8% have a Statement. There is one pupil with a hearing impairment, 4 with behaviour, social and emotional difficulties, 1 has

an autistic spectrum condition, 10 with moderate learning difficulties, 2 with other needs and 1 with speech and language difficulties across 17 pupils 2 with additional needs.

Across the year 10 cohort for the local authority there are 27% of pupils with an identified special educational need. Of these 15% are at school action, 8% at school action plus and 4% are statemented.

5.6% of pupils in this cohort are identified as being gifted and talented.

Free school meal eligibility

31% of the Y10 cohort is eligible for Free School Meals - this represents 33% of boys and 29% of girls.

Across the Local Authority there are 23% of the year 10 cohort who are eligible for FSM. 24% of boys and 23% of girls are eligible.

Social Deprivation

Deprivation analysis show that there is no significant difference between the IDACI average score and other year groups or between the genders.

The percentage of Year 10 pupils who live in the 5% most deprived lower super output areas (LSOAs) is 25% which is the highest across the year groups. This is much higher than the same cohort for the LA which is 15%.

The percentage of September 2009 Year 10 pupils who live in the 10% most deprived lower super output areas (LSOAs) is 48%. Compared to the local authority percentage of pupils in the 10% most deprived LSOAs in the same year group (32%) this group is more deprived.

Comparative cohort and Leicester City data tables

Gender

Year cohort as at Sept 09	F	M	All Pupils	Girls	Boys
7	13	17	30	43.3%	56.7%
8	20	38	58	34.5%	65.5%
9	28	46	74	37.8%	62.2%
10	66	60	126	52.4%	47.6%
All pupils	114	144	258	44.2%	55.8%

Social Deprivation

Yr7 Deprivation	Up to 5% most deprived	5 - 10% most deprived	Up to 10% most deprived
F	15.4%	15.4%	30.8%
M	5.9%	35.3%	41.2%
All Y7	10.0%	26.7%	36.7%

Yr8 Deprivation	Up to 5% most deprived	5 - 10% most deprived	Up to 10% most deprived
F	15.0%	25.0%	40.0%
M	23.7%	26.3%	50.0%
All Y8	20.7%	25.9%	46.6%

Yr 9 Deprivation	Up to 5% most deprived	5 - 10% most deprived	Up to 10% most deprived
F	25.0%	17.9%	42.9%
M	19.6%	43.5%	63.0%
All Y9	21.6%	33.8%	55.4%

Yr10 Deprivation	Up to 5% most deprived	5 - 10% most deprived	Up to 10% most deprived
F	22.7%	25.8%	48.5%
M	26.7%	21.7%	48.3%
All Y10	24.6%	23.8%	48.4%

Y7	Average IDACI score	Y9	Average IDACI score
Girls	0.33	Girls	0.40
Boys	0.51	Boys	0.50
Cohort Average	0.43	Cohort Average	0.46

Y8	Average IDACI score	Y10	Average IDACI score
Girls	0.45	Girls	0.45
Boys	0.44	Boys	0.45
Cohort Average	0.44	Cohort Average	0.45

APPENDIX F

Ethnicity

Yr 7 Intake ethnicity	Girls	Boys	All Y7
AIND - Indian	1	1	2
BAOF - Other Black African		2	2
WBRI - British	11	13	24
WEUR - White European	1	1	2
No of Y7	13	17	30
Yr 8 ethnicity	Girls	Boys	All Y8
AIND - Indian	5	2	7
BAOF - Other Black African	1	1	2
BSOM - Somali		1	1
MWBA - White/Black African		1	1
OOTH - Any other Ethnic Group		1	1
WBRI - British	11	20	31
WEUR - White European	2	5	7
WIRI - Irish	1		1
WOTW - Other White		7	7
No of Y8	20	38	58
Yr 9 Ethnicity	Girls	Boys	All Y9
AIND - Indian	2	5	7
APKN - Pakistani	1		1
BAOF - Other Black African	1	4	5
BCRB - Black Caribbean		2	2
BSOM - Somali		2	2
MOTH - Any other Mixed backgro		1	1
MWBA - White/Black African	1		1
MWBC - White/Black Carribbea	2		2
OOTH - Any other Ethnic Group	2	2	4
WBRI - British	12	22	34
WEUR - White European	1	2	3
WOTW - Other White	6	6	12
No of Y9	28	46	74
Yr 10 Ethnicity	Girls	Boys	All Y10
AAFR - African Asian	1		1
AIND - Indian	5	3	8
AOTA - Other Asian	1		1
APKN - Pakistani	2		2
BAOF - Other Black African	2	1	3
BCRB - Black Caribbean		2	2
BOTH - Any other Black backgro	2		2
BSOM - Somali		1	1
MOTH - Any other Mixed backgro	3		3
MWAS - White/Asian		1	1
MWBC - White/Black Carribbea	1	1	2
WBRI - British	33	32	65
WEUR - White European	5	9	14
WIRI - Irish	1	1	2
WOTW - Other White	10	9	19
No of Y10	66	60	126

Girls	Boys	All
7.7%	5.9%	6.7%
0.0%	11.8%	6.7%
84.6%	76.5%	80.0%
7.7%	5.9%	6.7%
7.7%	17.6%	13.3%
Girls	Boys	All
25.0%	5.3%	12.1%
5.0%	2.6%	3.4%
0.0%	2.6%	1.7%
0.0%	2.6%	1.7%
0.0%	2.6%	1.7%
55.0%	52.6%	53.4%
10.0%	13.2%	12.1%
5.0%	0.0%	1.7%
0.0%	18.4%	12.1%
30.0%	15.8%	20.7%
Girls	Boys	All
7.1%	10.9%	9.5%
3.6%	0.0%	1.4%
3.6%	8.7%	6.8%
0.0%	4.3%	2.7%
0.0%	4.3%	2.7%
0.0%	2.2%	1.4%
3.6%	0.0%	1.4%
7.1%	0.0%	2.7%
7.1%	4.3%	5.4%
42.9%	47.8%	45.9%
3.6%	4.3%	4.1%
21.4%	13.0%	16.2%
32.1%	34.8%	33.8%
Girls	Boys	All
1.5%	0.0%	0.8%
7.6%	5.0%	6.3%
1.5%	0.0%	0.8%
3.0%	0.0%	1.6%
3.0%	1.7%	2.4%
0.0%	3.3%	1.6%
3.0%	0.0%	1.6%
0.0%	1.7%	0.8%
4.5%	0.0%	2.4%
0.0%	1.7%	0.8%
1.5%	1.7%	1.6%
50.0%	53.3%	51.6%
7.6%	15.0%	11.1%
1.5%	1.7%	1.6%
15.2%	15.0%	15.1%
25.8%	15.0%	20.6%

Special Educational Needs

Special Educational Needs Status	No of Y7	No identified SEN	School Action	School Action Plus	Statemented
F	13	76.9%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%
M	17	52.9%	23.5%	23.5%	0.0%
All Y7	30	63.3%	23.3%	13.3%	0.0%

Special Educational Needs Status	No of Y8	No identified SEN	School Action	School Action Plus	Statemented
F	20	55.0%	25.0%	10.0%	10.0%
M	38	52.6%	34.2%	10.5%	2.6%
All Y8	58	53.4%	31.0%	10.3%	5.2%

Special Educational Needs Status	No of Y9	No identified SEN	School Action	School Action Plus	Statemented
F	28	75.0%	21.4%	3.6%	0.0%
M	46	52.2%	13.0%	23.9%	10.9%
All Y9	74	60.8%	16.2%	16.2%	6.8%

Special Educational Needs Status	No of Y10	No identified SEN	School Action	School Action Plus	Statemented
F	66	71.2%	22.7%	4.5%	1.5%
M	60	50.0%	25.0%	16.7%	8.3%
All Y10	126	61.1%	23.8%	10.3%	4.8%

Gifted and talented by year group and gender

NCY	All pupils	All G&T pupils		All G&T pupils
		Girls	Boys	
8	58	1.7%	1.7%	3.4%
9	74	6.8%	2.7%	9.5%
10	126	3.2%	2.4%	5.6%
All G&T	258	3.9%	2.3%	6.2%