

Written Response for Overview and Scrutiny – Exclusions by ethnicity.

Permanent exclusions 2006-07 by ethnicity

1. The table below shows both the percentage of all permanent exclusions analysed by ethnic group and the percentage of each ethnic group in the statutory school age population that was permanently excluded.

| Ethnicity | %age – of all exclusions | %age of school-age cohort excluded |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Black African | 17% | 0.1% |
| Black Caribbean | 28% | 0.53% |
| Black other | 3% | 0.78% |
| Greek | 3% | 0.55% |
| Kurdish | 3% | 0.66% |
| Mixed – W & Black Caribbean | 14% | 0.47% |
| Not specified | 3% | Too small to calculate |
| Turkish | 12% | 0.14% |
| White British | 11% | 0.23% |
| White European | 3% | 0.15% * |
| White Irish | 3% | |

*merged because small numbers of each group in cohort

2. When analysed by school phase, in primary schools the largest percentage of any ethnic group that was permanently excluded was White British (0.04%) with 2 exclusions. At secondary it was mixed race (white and black Caribbean) at 1.19% of that age of the school population with White Irish (0.83%) and Turkish (0.62%) as the next highest.

Fixed-term exclusions

3. The data analysis below formed part of Report Seven to the scrutiny review panel and was made in response to questions about the number of excluded pupils from any ethnic groups and if this was significantly different from what might be expected from the ethnic profile of the cohorts.
4. The final three columns on the two tables at paragraphs 9 and 10 indicate the number of exclusions that could have been expected if exclusions were equally spread across all the ethnic groups; the actual number of exclusions made for each ethnic group and; the numbers over or under the expectation made - assuming that exclusions would be spread equally across all ethnic groups.
5. The report made clear that no assumptions should be made one way or the other about the actual numbers over or under the 'expected' number as there are a range of factors which are known to impact on behaviour and certain ethnic groups are known to be represented differently in these situations. Rather, the analysis of such data enables the schools and the local authority to look at their exclusions and take steps to address any findings.
6. For example, research indicates that the presence of a strong male role model has a positive impact on boys' behaviour. Similarly, good health is more likely to be associated with good attendance at school, which is more likely to impact positively on engagement with education, and thereby a more positive feeling of self-worth and increased aspiration and therefore an increase in positive behaviour.

7. Analysis by ethnicity is only useful when the reasons behind the exclusions are examined and measures put in place to address what may be a whole range of underlying causal factors. Nevertheless, the data showed some interesting differences for different ethnic groups across the local authority as a whole and in individual schools.
8. When interpreting the data it is also important to recognise that where there are small numbers in any one group the statistical relevance of that data is less reliable, and any number needs to be viewed in relation to the actual size of the cohort in question.

9. Fixed-term exclusions 2006-07 – primary

| Ethnicity | % of FTX 2006-07 | Ethnic group as % of roll for that year | Number if proportional to PLASC cohort | Number of actual exclusions in 2006/07 | Number over/under |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| African Caribbean | 33% | 12.7% | 26 | 68 | 42 |
| Any Other | 0% | 3.4% | 7 | 1 | -6 |
| Bangladeshi | 0% | 2.7% | 6 | 0 | -6 |
| Black African | 24% | 18.4% | 38 | 50 | 12 |
| Black Other | 4% | 1.4% | 3 | 8 | 5 |
| Chinese | 0% | 0.6% | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Indian | 0% | 1.5% | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| Kurdish | 0% | 3.0% | 6 | 0 | -6 |
| Mixed Other | 0% | 3.6% | 7 | 1 | -6 |
| Mixed Race - As&Bl | 0% | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mixed Race - W&A/C | 13% | 3.5% | 7 | 27 | 20 |
| Mixed Race - W&As | 0% | 1.2% | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| Mixed Race - W&B/A | 0% | 1.2% | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| Not Obtained | 0% | 1.6% | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| Other Asian | 1% | 1.5% | 3 | 2 | -1 |
| Pakistani | 0% | 1.1% | 2 | 0 | -2 |
| Turkish | 4% | 7.3% | 15 | 8 | -7 |
| Turkish Cypriot | 2% | 0.9% | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Vietnamese | 0% | 0.7% | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| White British | 11% | 20.0% | 42 | 22 | -20 |
| White Gypsy/Roma | 0% | 0.3% | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| White Irish | 0% | 1.5% | 3 | 1 | -2 |
| White Irish Traveller | 1% | 0.3% | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| White Other | 6% | 11.5% | 24 | 13 | -11 |

10. Fixed-term exclusions 2006-07 - secondary

| Ethnicity | 2006/07 % of all FTX | Ethnic group as % of roll for that year | Number if proportional to PLASC cohort | Number of actual exclusions in 2006/07 | Number over/ under |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| African Caribbean | 28% | 13% | 183 | 379 | 196 |
| Any Other | 1% | 4% | 58 | 19 | -39 |
| Bangladeshi | 0% | 3% | 35 | 3 | -32 |
| Black African | 22% | 17% | 230 | 304 | 74 |
| Black Other | 3% | 2% | 33 | 38 | 5 |
| Chinese | 0% | 0% | 5 | 0 | -5 |
| Indian | 0% | 2% | 29 | 0 | -29 |
| Kurdish | 4% | 4% | 48 | 58 | 10 |
| Mixed Other | 2% | 3% | 44 | 23 | -21 |
| Mixed Race - W&A/C | 8% | 4% | 51 | 109 | 58 |
| Mixed Race - W&Asian | 0% | 1% | 10 | 3 | -7 |
| Mixed Race - W&B/A | 1% | 1% | 17 | 15 | -2 |
| Not Obtained | 0% | 1% | 16 | 3 | -13 |
| Other Asian | 1% | 2% | 29 | 20 | -9 |
| Pakistani | 0% | 1% | 15 | 0 | -15 |
| Turkish | 8% | 6% | 78 | 109 | 31 |
| Turkish Cypriot | 1% | 2% | 34 | 11 | -23 |
| Vietnamese | 0% | 1% | 12 | 2 | -10 |
| White British | 12% | 20% | 270 | 158 | -112 |
| White Gypsy/Roma | 0% | 0% | 4 | 2 | -2 |
| White Irish | 1% | 1% | 15 | 18 | 3 |
| White Irish Traveller | 0% | 0% | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| White Other | 6% | 10% | 141 | 77 | -64 |