



UNDERSTANDING SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN ENGLAND: 2011 TO 2016

THE CHALLENGE



SchoolDash
UNDERSTAND.EDUCATION

the iCoCo foundation
interculturalism, community cohesion



UNDERSTANDING SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN ENGLAND: 2011 TO 2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
PREVIOUS STUDIES	4
WHY IT MATTERS	8
THE METHODOLOGY	11
THE FINDINGS	13
RECOMMENDATIONS	17
APPENDIX 1	18
APPENDIX 2	19

INTRODUCTION

This study has been carried out by the iCoCo Foundation, SchoolDash and The Challenge. For this study, we have reviewed school-level data from the Department for Education for 2016, compared to 2011. It covers almost all schools in England for which the data is available (a sample in excess of 20,000), though independent and unregistered schools are not included as they are under no obligation to provide information about their pupils.

The study sets out to assess whether schools are segregated by socio-economic status and ethnicity and the extent and nature of such trends over the five year period. Trends are also examined by school type: free schools, local authority maintained, academies, grammar and other selective schools and those of a religious character. Trends are also examined by reference to local authority area. Information is presented for both secondary and primary schools, with the relatively few number of middle schools allocated according to their primary or secondary bias. More detail on findings and methodology are available on the SchoolDash website at:

www.schooldash.com/segregation2017

To determine the socio-economic characteristics of each school, the data for free school meals (FSM) has been used as a proxy and each school compared with the FSM eligibility in local schools more generally. For ethnicity, the standard classification for the School Census has been used, with comparisons made between the White British pupils in each school and the White British in schools in the local area (and for selected areas, with the White British Census population in 2011 in appendix 1), with some further analysis as appropriate. This approach follows on from previous studies more than ten years ago, as discussed in the next chapter.

SCHOOL SEGREGATION:

The Casey Review suggested school segregation to be understood as 'the extent to which [schools] are representative of local populations in terms of different characteristics such as social class, ethnicity or religion'.

It is largely this view of school segregation which is operationalised by our study.

However, the data we review only indicates the distribution of pupils, and the extent of separation. We therefore see the importance of the definition adopted by the Cantle Report:

'segregation should be understood as a multi-faceted concept related to the various possible divisions within and between communities, with the most extreme cases being 'when geographic, educational, cultural, social and religious divisions reinforce each other to the extent that there is little or no contact with other communities at any level'.

This means that even where a school's intake itself is mixed, there still could be in-school social segregation due to a lack of mixing between pupils of different backgrounds.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

There has been considerable concern about school segregation over the last fifteen years or so. This was first identified as a problem in the reports that followed the riots in Northern towns and the description of ‘parallel lives’ in the Cantle Report, published in 2001.¹ Studies of school segregation were then undertaken and the earlier findings were supported by national reviews that drew upon School Census data in 2004 and in 2006.^{2, 3} These produced similar results with the 2006 study reviewing ‘the levels of school segregation for Whites and each of the main ethnic groups ... compared with the levels of residential segregation for the same groups across the country’s 149 Local Education Authorities to inquire whether schools are more or less segregated than the neighbourhoods from which they draw their students’.

This study found:

‘National patterns of both residential and school segregation, with the clear suggestion that the latter is greater than the former, especially among those of South Asian ethnicity.’

In London, one of the UK’s least residentially segregated cities, this also holds true particularly in respect of primary schools where the highest levels of segregation are to be found:

‘Although about 75 per cent of the Black population were living in census neighbourhoods with a majority white population (in 2001), only 42 per cent of Black primary school pupils and 51 per cent of Black secondary pupils attended a school where the same was true. Similarly, though about 60 per cent of the South Asian population lived in white majority neighbourhoods, only 35 per cent of South Asian pupils were in white majority primary schools, and 46 per cent in white majority secondary schools. Overall the results of the study showed greater ethnic segregation in schools than in neighbourhoods, more so for primary schools than secondary schools, more so for Black and South Asian pupils, especially Pakistani ones, and generally more so in London than in other places’⁴

Prof Simon Burgess has also examined the National Pupil Database for the Integration Hub and found:

‘In 2013, over 50 per cent of ethnic minority students were in schools where ethnic minorities were in the majority (although not necessarily their own minority). This compares to over 90 per cent of White British pupils who are in majority White British schools. But there is some variation between cohorts. For instance 52 per cent of ethnic minority pupils in Year 11 are in schools where ethnic minority pupils are in the majority compared to 60.8 per cent of Year 1 ethnic minority pupils. As recently as 2008 only 49.1 per cent of ethnic majority pupils in Year 13 were in ethnic minority majority schools, by 2013 the share had risen to 54 per cent.

In London alone, 90 per cent of ethnic minority Year 1s are in ethnic minority majority schools. This compares to 49 per cent of White British in majority White British schools.

There are 7 local authorities where no White British Year 11s are attending schools where White British pupils are the majority. All are found in London and they are Lambeth, Southwark, Westminster, Brent, Ealing, Harrow, and Newham. By contrast, there are 71 local authorities where all White British Year 11s are in White British majority schools. These are mostly found in the South East and West as well as the North of England’.⁵

The Integration Hub also has the advantage of an open access data base for schools in England allowing for the comparison of results with this study.⁶

¹ Cantle T. (2001) *Community Cohesion: Report of the Independent Review Team (The Cantle Report)* London: Home Office

² Burgess, S, Wilson, D and Lupton, R (2004) ‘Parallel Lives and Ethnic Segregation in the Playground and the Neighbourhood’, CMPO Working Paper No 04/094 (Bristol: CMPO).

³ Johnston, R., Burgess, S., Wilson, D. and Harris, R., (2006) ‘School and Residential Ethnic Segregation: An Analysis of Variations Across England’s Local Education Authorities’. CMPO paper 06/145 (Bristol: Bristol University)

⁴ Harris, R. (2011) ‘Sleepwalking Towards Johannesburg?’ *Local Measures of Ethnic Segregation Between London’s Secondary Schools, 2003–2008/9.* Centre for Market and Public Organisation Working Paper No. 11/275 (Bristol: Bristol University).

⁵ Integration Hub, see: <http://www.integrationhub.net/module/education/>

⁶ See map at: <http://www.integrationhub.net/map/education-map/>

By 2015, the Government had begun to accept that segregation was a significant problem and that some intervention was required in order to create a society which was at ease with itself, as David Cameron said in a speech in July:

*'It cannot be right, that people can grow up and go to school and hardly ever come into meaningful contact with people from other backgrounds and faiths. That doesn't foster a sense of shared belonging and understanding – it can drive people apart ... But it is right to look again more broadly at how we can move away from segregated schooling in our most divided communities. We have already said that all new faith academies and free schools must allocate half their places without reference to faith.'*⁷

More recently, Prime Minister Theresa May expressed her clear view on the role of schools in promoting social integration:

*'There must be strict and properly enforced rules to ensure that every new faith school operates in a way that supports British values. And we should explore new ways of using the school system to promote greater integration within our society generally.'*⁸

This focus from central Government led to the Casey Review of Opportunity and Integration, which reported in late 2016. Casey reviewed the evidence on segregation (as set out above) and appeared to endorse the findings, noting that these were often reinforced by her local visits.⁹

However, Casey did provide new evidence of segregation in the free school category and reported Department for Education statistics as follows:

- 'Sikh, Muslim and Hindu Free Schools do not seem to be very ethnically diverse despite the 50% faith admissions rule – although many are located in wards with a high proportion of minority ethnic pupils and are therefore relatively close to the overall ethnic make-up of the local ward.
- Christian Free Schools tend to be close to the ethnicity average for their wards and, on this measure, are more ethnically diverse than minority faith schools. This does not necessarily mean that they are religiously diverse – it may reflect the ethnic diversity of Christians.
- Church of England and Roman Catholic schools were near the average for their localities on both proportions of White British pupils and Asian pupils, but some 'other' minority Christian schools had fewer than average Asian pupils'

The Casey Review went on to note:

*'On the face of these submissions and the Department for Education's analysis for the review, the Free Schools policy on admissions appears not to have been having a positive effect on integration, with new minority faith schools being set up and the proportion of minority faith schools in areas with existing high levels of segregation in schools being allowed to grow.'*¹⁰

Despite these earlier statements, Government policy appeared to change direction with the announcement of a consultation on the possible withdrawal of the requirement for 'half of places in new faith schools to be allocated without reference to faith'.¹¹ The results of this consultation are awaited.

There is, of course, also evidence that the diversity of many areas and schools is increasing, particularly as Black and minority ethnic (BME) communities expand out of their traditional areas into neighbouring predominantly White areas. What is less clear is whether those areas then become dominated by BME households as a result of their continuing in-movement and the subsequent outward movement, or 'avoidance' of such areas by White households, as has recently been suggested.¹² It is hoped that this study will begin to shed some further light on the extent and nature of segregation and the longer term trends.

It should also be noted that, whilst 'segregation' is often interpreted in terms of ethnicity, it can be based upon social class, faith and other characteristics. In its 2012 report, Education at a Glance, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), found that the UK had unusually high levels of segregation with poorer and immigrant pupils concentrated in the same schools rather than being more evenly distributed.¹³ Among the children of immigrant families, 80% were in schools with high concentrations of other immigrant or disadvantaged pupils, reinforcing the interconnection between faith, ethnicity and social class.

In terms of social selection, a Sutton Trust Report in 2016 found considerable variation in how much primary school intakes diverge from their local neighbourhood, but also found that the top 10% most socially selective primary schools had a proportion of disadvantaged pupils that was at least 9.2 percentage points different than the communities they serve.¹⁴ There were 1,576 schools in this category, with 310,000 pupils.

7 Cameron, D. (2015) Prime Minister's Speech 20th July 2015, Birmingham. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/speeches/extremism-pm-speech

8 May, T (2016) 'Britain, the great meritocracy: Prime Minister's speech'. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/speeches/britain-the-great-meritocracy-prime-ministers-speech

9 The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration, London: DCLG, available at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-casey-review-a-review-into-opportunity-and-integration

10 The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration, London: DCLG, paragraph 3.95, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-casey-review-a-review-into-opportunity-and-integration>

11 HM Government 2016. Schools that Work For Everyone: Government Consultation. HM Government 2016

12 Cantle T. and Kaufmann E. (2016) Is Segregation Increasing in the UK? Open Democracy.Net www.opendemocracy.net/wfd/ted-cantle-and-eric-kaufmann/is-segregation-on-increase-in-uk

13 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2012) Education at a glance 2012: OECD Indicators, OECD publishing. Available at: www.oecd.org/edu/EAG%202012_e-book_EN_200912.pdf

14 Allen R and Parameshwaran M (2016) Caught Out, London: Sutton Trust/Education Datalab

15 Bolton, P. (2016). Grammar School Statistics. London: House of Commons Library.

School type

It is well-known that grammar schools tend to be segregated by socio-economic status, with just 2.5% of pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM), compared to an average in the secondary-age population of around 14%.¹⁵ Evidence from the Sutton Trust indicates this is not due to the areas served by grammars, as there is an 'even greater gap when you look at the catchment areas around these schools'.¹⁶ The starkness of this gap is indicated by the finding that a 'pupil attending a private prep school is ten times more likely to enter a grammar than a pupil on free school meals'.¹⁷

However, what is less well reported is that grammars are also more likely to over-represent ethnic minorities in their intakes, particularly Indian, mixed ethnicity, other Asian and Chinese pupils – the Education Policy Institute reports that 'Indian pupils make-up 2.9 per cent of all secondary-aged pupils but 8.2 per cent of pupils in selective schools'.¹⁸ Based on a case study of four selective local authorities (Kent, Medway, Buckinghamshire and Lincolnshire), Education Datalab demonstrated that White British pupils were around half as likely to attend grammars as black or Asian pupils, and that when taking account of the geographic distribution of schools, this gap became even more significant.¹⁹

For faith schools, using school and neighbourhood level statistics on free school meals eligibility, and taking into account the age of the pupils at each school and the difference in eligibility between primary and secondary schools, the Fair Admissions Campaign (FAC) constructed a profile for every secondary school based on what it should look like if it admitted those children living nearest to it.²⁰

The Campaign then compared this with the actual pupil profile at each school, as shown by the Department for Education's annual School Census. The FAC found that faith schools admitted fewer children eligible for free school meals than lived locally to them. However, by simultaneously looking at the extent to which each schools' admissions policy privileged applications on faith grounds, it was able to make a direct comparison between how socio-economically inclusive a faith school was with the level of religious selection it permitted. The Campaign found that secondary schools without a religious character admitted, in proportional terms, 11% more pupils entitled to free school meals than if they admitted those children living nearest to them (it should be factored in that this group included the very large majority of grammar schools). In contrast however, faith schools admitted 18% fewer.

However, there was a marked difference between those faith schools that selected by faith and those that did not. Those faith secondary schools that had an admissions policy that permitted all pupils to be selected on faith grounds if sufficiently oversubscribed (the majority of secondary faith schools) admitted 27% fewer pupils entitled to free school meals than if they admitted local children. Those that did not select by faith in any way (a small, but noticeable and growing number of faith schools) admitted 4% more. Due to their large number, the FAC found that religiously selective schools make a greater contribution in making the state funded school system more segregated on socio-economic grounds at the secondary stage than grammar schools do. It also calculated that religious selection by state funded schools (at both primary and secondary stages) makes the whole school system in England (both the fee paying and state funded sectors combined) more segregated on socio-economic grounds than all selection at these schools due to academic ability, aptitude and ability to pay fees.

¹⁶ Cribb, J., Sibieta, L. and Vignoles, A. (2003). *Entry into Grammar Schools in England*. London: Sutton Trust. p.7

¹⁷ Cullinane, C (2016) *Gaps in Grammar*, London: Sutton Trust. Available at: www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Gaps-in-Grammar_For-website.pdf

¹⁸ Andrews J, Hutchinson J and Johns R (2016) *Grammar Schools and Social Mobility*, London: Education Policy Institute. Available at: epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Grammar-schools-and-social-mobility_.pdf

¹⁹ Allen, R (2016) 'Ethnic minority groups are great at passing the 11-plus', Education Datalab. Available at: ducatiodatalab.org.uk/2016/11/ethnic-minority-groups-are-great-at-passing-the-11-plus/

These results also have the benefit of providing an open access comparison of pupils to neighbourhood FSM eligibility on a school by school basis and can therefore be checked against our own results. The FAC study is also consistent with a recent study of pupil performance and segregation in faith schools by the Education Policy Institute, which found:

*'firstly, that the demographic profile of pupils at faith schools differs from that of pupils at non-faith schools. In particular, disadvantaged pupils are under-represented at faith schools, while those with high prior attainment are over-represented. The percentage of faith school pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM, a proxy for disadvantage) is below both the national average and the figure for non-faith schools; this is the case across faith schools as a whole and for almost all religious categories. The difference is particularly stark at primary level. Conversely, the proportion of pupils in the top 25 per cent nationally for prior attainment is above 25 per cent across faith schools as a single group and in each faith group analysed.'*²¹

Surprisingly, given the faith ethos of the schools, the study also found:

'Faith schools also educate a lower proportion of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) (16.8 per cent at Key Stage 2 versus 19.7 per cent; 14.4 per cent at Key Stage 4 versus 16.6 per cent).'

Researchers have also examined the impact of academy status on school segregation, with a 2014 study by Gorard concluding that: 'Converter Academies, on average, take far less than their fair share of disadvantaged pupils. Sponsor-led Academies, on the other hand, tend to take more than their fair share.'²² However, this is attributed by the study to the pre-existing inequity in school mixes in the locality, although it does note that the creation of new academies does not appear to be reducing segregation by socio-economic status.

For both ethnicity and socio-economic status, our study is largely consistent with previous findings, though these have been extended in a number of ways, generally suggesting a rising trend of school segregation alongside a growing diversity of school populations. We also show how faith schools add a further layer of segregation due to the links between faiths and ethnicities.



²⁰ For further details on these findings, see the drop down table in the 'How socio-economically selective are different types of secondary school?' section under 'Overall averages' tab at <http://fairadmissions.org.uk/map/>

²¹ Andrews J and Johnes R. (2016) *Faith Schools, Pupil Performance and Social Selection* London: Education Policy Institute

²² Gorard, S. (2014). 'The link between academies in England, pupil outcomes and local patterns of socio-economic segregation between schools', *Research Papers In Education*, 29, 3, 268–84

WHY IT MATTERS

Young people are more exposed than ever before to influences of all types and from all parts of the globe. Yet, many have little chance of gaining a reasoned and nuanced world view and are unlikely to be equipped with the critical thinking skills to enable them to navigate safely through this new array of communications. This finds its most severe consequence in the increasing risk of radicalisation faced by young people. As Louise Richardson, now Vice Chancellor of Oxford University, has described it, young people are vulnerable to the appeal of extremists because they promote an 'oversimplified view of the world, which they see in black and white terms' and suggests that:

*'Education robs you of that simplification and certitude. Education is the best possible antidote to radicalisation.'*²³

There is now general agreement that young people also need the skills to equip them for 'life in modern multicultural Britain' as both the Government and Ofsted would argue²⁴, and that means acquiring the cultural navigation skills and religious literacy to enable them to become comfortable with diversity and to thrive in a more diverse and complex world of competing and contradictory views.

There is clear evidence, however, that the segregation of children contributes to the distrust and intolerance of the 'other'. Schools are, of course, only part of a wider divide in which young people grow up without any real knowledge of people from other backgrounds and the term 'parallel lives'²⁵ describes the complete separation of daily life based on residential, educational, occupational and community based experiences. The adoption of community cohesion by the Government in 2001 aimed to counteract the impact of these exclusive and silo based experiences and led to the introduction of 'contact theory' into policy and practice and saw it extend to cross many divides, not just in relation to ethnicity and faith.

The impact of intercultural contact is now well established. A meta-analysis by Pettigrew and Tropp examined 713 independent samples from 515 studies and found that intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup prejudice. The study concluded that:

*'Results from the meta-analysis conclusively show that intergroup contact can promote reductions in intergroup prejudice. Moreover, the meta-analytic findings reveal that contact theory applies beyond racial and ethnic groups to embrace other types of groups as well.'*²⁶

Janmaat focused his 2014 study specifically on the impact of mixing in schools and considered the attitudes of 14-year-old native students in 14 Western countries to assess how out-group size, as measured by the proportion of first- and second-generation migrant children in a class, is related to inclusive views on immigrants. He concluded that: 'on the whole, the results of this study are welcome news for the advocates of desegregation, as they suggest that ethnically mixed schools are well positioned to promote inclusive out-group attitudes among native students'.²⁷

Our study is clearly focused on educational patterns, but we are well aware that they are entwined with patterns those of residential segregation and are often mutually interdependent and reinforcing. We are also aware that there are concerns that the polarisation of White British and other communities may be growing.²⁸ The school data which we have examined tends to support the thesis of growing polarisation of population and can perhaps predict a continuing and deepening trend for a number of towns and cities (see Appendix 1). Our results also tend to reaffirm the connection between residential and educational segregation in that many of the towns and cities that are residentially segregated have the highest levels of school segregation. However, it is also clear that the emerging trends show that school segregation is becoming independent of residential patterns, probably due to the impact of more variable school admissions policies and parental choice. This builds on a previous study by Burgess et al that showed 'on average school segregation is greater than the segregation of the same group in the surrounding neighbourhood'.²⁹

Schools can contribute to – and reinforce – this view of 'otherness' and have even been thought to contribute to the development of conflict, as in the extreme case of Northern Ireland:

*'by perpetuating or maintaining, community differences. This is thought to happen because the segregated schools present children with two very different views of the world (the cultural hypothesis), or because the categorisation of children into different schools itself contributes to mutual ignorance and hostility.'*³⁰

23 Louise Richardson, speaking at the British Council's Going Global Conference in London, June 2nd 2015

24 Secretary of State for Education (2015) Government Response to the Education Select Committee Report: Extremism in Schools, the 'Trojan Horse' Affair. Cmnd 9094. London: HMSO

25 Cantle T. (2001) Community Cohesion: Report of the Independent Review Team London: Home Office

26 Pettigrew T. and Tropp L. (2006) 'A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2006, Vol. 90, No. 5, 751–783

27 Janmaat, J.G (2014) 'Do Ethnically Mixed Classrooms Promote Inclusive Attitudes Towards Immigrants Everywhere? A Study Among Native Adolescents in 14 Countries'. *European Sociological Review* V 30 No6 2014 810–822 810 DOI:10.1093/esr/jcu075, available online at www.esr.oxfordjournals.org Online publication 16 October 2014

28 Cantle T. and Kaufmann E. (2016) 'Is Segregation Increasing in the UK?' *Open Democracy*.Net www.opendemocracy.net/wfd/ted-cantle-and-eric-kaufmann/is-segregation-on-increase-in-uk

29 Burgess, S., Wilson, D. and Lupton, R. (2004) *Parallel Lives and Ethnic Segregation in the Playground and the Neighbourhood*, CMPO Working Paper No 04/094 (Bristol: CMPO).

30 Niens, U. and Cairns E. (2008) 'Integrated Education in Northern Ireland: A Review'. In, David C. Berliner & Haggai Kupermintz (eds.), *Fostering Change In Institutions, Environments, and People: a festschrift in Honor of Gavriel Salomon*, Routledge: New York and London

Mixed schools by contrast, have a beneficial effect on community cohesion. Professor Miles Hewstone from the Oxford Centre for the Study of Intergroup Conflict has explored the role of intergroup contact in areas of high ethnic diversity. Part of this work included a review of intergroup contact and social integration in all state schools in Oldham.³¹ This used longitudinal surveys, social network analysis, and observational methods, relations between 11 to 18 year old White British and Asian British (primarily Muslim) pupils in mixed, segregated, and recently-merged schools. The fieldwork demonstrated the reliability of intergroup contact in improving intergroup attitudes by improving trust, enhancing positive behaviour towards outgroups, and reducing prejudice.

The Casey Review was set up in part due to concerns about the lack of integration and the growth of extremism in schools, and followed the so-called Trojan Horse affair and a number of other school based concerns (see earlier reference to David Cameron's July 2015 speech).³² Dame Louise Casey's report urges the Government to 'focus on de-segregation' and recognises that 'some children's experience of school marked by segregation' and also that 'some communities are becoming more divided'. Casey calls 'for radical change and a new approach across all schools' and hints at the need for firm proposals 'to encourage a range of school provision and projects to ensure that children from different communities learn alongside those from different backgrounds'.

Casey did not propose a programme to establish more mixed schools although this would indeed ensure that children would grow up alongside each other and naturally learn about their similarities and differences. Instead, the emphasis is put on to inter-school mixing, such as through twinning or linking arrangements. She also suggests that schools have to do more to give children a wider view of the world, through a new British Values curriculum to 'build integration, tolerance, citizenship'. Dame Louise rightly notes that teachers' skills in this area will have to be developed and the effectiveness needs to be tested in the school Ofsted inspection. However, such teaching would be much easier through the experiential learning process in mixed schools.

The Government also propose to amend a measure which currently only applies to new faith free schools, and that instead of enforcing a 50% mixed intake requirement, on what are almost entirely state-funded schools, they will try to engineer regular contact between those of different backgrounds.³³

In place of the 50% rule, they propose the following requirements for new faith free schools:

'Establish twinning arrangements with other schools not of their faith, creating links between young people in different schools in structured programmes, including sharing teachers and resources and conducting joint lessons and assemblies.'

'Consider setting up mixed-faith multi-academy trusts, including becoming a sponsor for underperforming non-faith schools.'

'Consider placing an independent member or director who is of a different faith or no faith at all on the governing body of new faith free schools to help ensure that there is independent input into the governance of the school and will help ensure that they have a wider perspective beyond their own faith.'

Whilst these proposed inter-school mixing arrangements and the governance measures envisaged will be helpful, they are not a substitute for the day to day mixing of children at school. Their impact will also be more limited – children can be positively influenced by their school experiences, but this can be undermined and even countermanded by negative influences within the home and the local community. As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the point here is that mixed school intakes do not just influence the pupils, they also have a profound impact on the whole community.³⁴ Children form friendships, go to each other's homes and attend out of school events together on an ongoing basis. Moreover, parents also meet at the school gate and through school-based activities and therefore are drawn into the friendship networks of the child.

From the above, we believe that the education sector offers the greatest opportunities for providing young people with the skills and experience to further integration and to live successfully in an ever increasingly diverse and globalised world. Indeed, they will need such skills to compete in the future job market. Every opportunity should be taken to build critical thinking and resilience by introducing key contemporary issues into all areas of the school society. This should include 'dangerous conversations' where extremist views are debated and challenged and which are often avoided in schools, partly because teachers lack the confidence and training, and partly because of the fear of upsetting some part of the school's community.³⁵

³¹ Hewstone, M. et al (2017), forthcoming.

³² *The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration*, London: DCLG, available at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-casey-review-a-review-into-opportunity-and-integration

³³ HM Government 2016. *Schools that Work For Everyone: Government Consultation*. HM Government 2016

³⁴ Christ O., Schmid K., Lollot S., Swart H., Stolle D., Tausch N., Hewstone M. (2014). 'Contextual effect of positive intergroup contact on outgroup prejudice'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 111, 3996-4000.

³⁵ Cantle, T. (2015) 'Dangerous Conversations' in *RE Today*, September 2015

However, at present many of our schools have become more segregated than the areas which they serve, with increasingly segmented populations based on faith, ethnicity and social class – a challenge to the Government’s previously stated policy to ‘building a shared community where children of many faiths and backgrounds learn not just with each other, but from each other too’.³⁶ This is more likely to be realised if schools develop a mixed intake in which students interact with each other and moreover, develop friendships across boundaries which bring family networks and communities together.

Whatever the composition of the school, however, the learning experience does need to ensure that a rounded ‘world view’ and intercultural education are provided, as these are critical to tackling prejudice and intolerance. In Britain, this is mostly taken forward through the ‘British Values’ agenda (and formerly under the ‘duty to promote community cohesion’³⁷) and through religious education.³⁸ There are clear concerns about the extent and nature of the teaching in this respect, as evidenced by the numerous criticisms of the work of individual schools by Ofsted. Similarly, the Commission on Religious Education (the Woolf Review), established to review the legal, education and policy frameworks for Religious Education, undertook a wide-ranging, inclusive and evidence-based process designed to inform policy makers about these areas.³⁹ The subsequent Living With Difference report was critical of existing arrangements and recommended (inter alia):

‘Much greater religion and belief literacy is needed in every section of society, and at all levels. The potential for misunderstanding, stereotyping and oversimplification based on ignorance is huge... All pupils in state-funded schools should have a statutory entitlement to a curriculum about religion, philosophy and ethics that is relevant to today’s society.... Bodies responsible for admissions and employment policies in schools with a religious character (‘faith schools’) should take measures to reduce selection of pupils and staff on grounds of religion.’

With regard to attitudes of young people towards others, evidence suggests that this is slightly more positive than older generations but there is clearly a considerable amount of work to do in this area, perhaps reflected in a recent attitudinal survey that found that 23% of 15 to 29 year olds would prefer to live in ‘an area where people are from the same background as me’ (compared to 29% of all age ranges).⁴⁰ Another survey found that 25% of 17 to 34 year olds admitted to some level of racial prejudice.⁴¹ There is clearly more concern about how this relates to the everyday experience of young people, with a Youth Select Committee noting:

*‘Most of our evidence suggested that young people were not confident in reporting and therefore tackling racism and religious discrimination. There is under-reporting of racism and religious discrimination by young people. Two causes of under-reporting are: that people cannot identify racism and religious discrimination; and racism and religious discrimination have been normalised to the extent that people do not have confidence that any action will be taken’.*⁴²

This is supported by a recent EHRC report that found:

*‘Racist language is still commonly used/heard in primary and secondary schools; such language sometimes relates to religion. Requests for counselling from children and young people experiencing racist/religiously motivated bullying in schools have increased in recent years. For example, in 2012/13 over 1,400 young people across Britain told ChildLine that they were experiencing racist bullying, a 69% increase within a year.’*⁴³

As such, there are clear links between the extent of segregation and the levels of cohesion and tolerance, due largely to the way in which diversity becomes familiar and is less likely to be seen as a threat – again, contact works but is constrained by segregation.⁴⁴

³⁶ Cameron, D, (2015) Prime Minister’s Speech 20th July 2015, Birmingham. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/speeches/extremism-pm-speech

³⁷ It should be noted that this is still a statutory obligation on schools but no longer part of the Ofsted inspection regime.

³⁸ Department for Education (2014) Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools Departmental advice for maintained schools. London: HMSO

³⁹ Woolf Institute (2015). Living With Difference, Report of the Commission on Religion and Belief in British Public Life

⁴⁰ Duffy, B and Frere-Smith, T (2014) Perceptions and Reality: Public Attitudes to Immigration. London: Ipsos Mori

⁴¹ NatCen Social Research (2013) ‘30 years of British Social Attitudes’, self-reported racial prejudice data.

Available at: www.natcen.ac.uk/media/338779/selfreported-racial-prejudice-datafinal.pdf

⁴² British Youth Council (2016) Youth Select Committee 2016 Young people and the issues of racism and religious discrimination. London: BYC

⁴³ EHRC (2016) Healing a Divided Britain, the Need for a Comprehensive Race Equality Strategy London: EHRC www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/healing_a_divided_britain_-_the_need_for_a_comprehensive_race_equality_strategy_final.pdf

⁴⁴ Sturgis, P, Brunton-Smith, I, Kuha, J and Jackson J. (2014) ‘Ethnic diversity, segregation and the social cohesion of neighbourhoods in London’ in *Ethnic And Racial Studies* Vol. 37, Iss. 8.

THE METHODOLOGY

The methodology we have adopted breaks new ground and presents a much more revealing picture of school segregation and integration by better reflecting the local population within the local area of each school.

Previous studies have tended to focus on the extent of diversity within each school, without reference to the local context. The latest such review was contained in the previously mentioned consultation on the possible lifting of the 50% cap on new faith free schools which reported national level data on the ethnicity of faith schools' intakes without reference to the local population mix⁴⁵. This therefore led to an inaccurate portrayal of faith school intakes and their impacts on other schools. Other studies have also tended to compare school populations with Census and other wide-area data, rather than school localities. Our methodology is also able to use very up to date data, by applying the 2016 school census to both the school population and the local area population. It therefore also excludes people who are beyond compulsory school age rather than comparing school-age children with the full adult range of each group that has often been used in the past.

We accept that this new methodology may need further refinement, but it does already offer a fairer and more accurate view of pupil characteristics in relation to their localities. The project does this primarily by comparing schools' intake in terms of ethnicity and FSM take-up with those of the 10 schools nearest to them, using the DfE's 2016 data on schools (as a result of using DfE data, this analysis excludes independent and unregistered schools, as they are not required to provide this data.) We have compared the proportion of White British pupils in each school with that of their local area. This reflects the majority/minority distinction has been evident in race relations debates over the last 50 years or so and which is foremost in the current debate in respect of immigration, and in tandem with the residency analysis presented in Appendix 1 enables us to better understand the patterns of recent immigration and internal migration within England.⁴⁶

In these terms, a school is 'segregated' if the proportion of pupils from either ethnic or socio-economic group differs from its local area by double or half, or by more than 15 percentage points. Schools are therefore categorised as 'high', 'medium' and 'low' based on their representation of such pupils. A medium representation is not considered to be problematic as the school representation is roughly in line with the area representation. Schools that feature a 'high' and 'low' proportion are aggregated together to indicate a more problematic over- or under-representation, forming our category of interest. This means that some schools will be 'segregated' by previous definitions but are not counted by us.

This is particularly the case if segregation is simply understood as a majority of the school population being ethnic minority, or FSM-eligible. For example, in respect of ethnicity, Birmingham has 40 primary schools with a 'low' White British pupil representation and Bradford has 33 by our methodology. By contrast, when simply applying a threshold of 30% or less of the school population being White British, Birmingham has 132 primary schools and Bradford has 56. By the same token, Plymouth has 19 primary schools judged 'segregated' by our comparison to the local area and West Sussex 19, compared to none and 1 by the 'over 70% minority' definition. We therefore believe that our methodology better reflects local circumstances.

The effective average distances for primary schools will be shorter because they are more densely distributed than secondaries – however, even in rural areas, schools are no more than 7km away from one another on average. We believe that this geographic basis corresponds with evidence from the Casey Review:

*'The degree of segregation or ethnic concentration in schools appears to be a product of where people live, family size, parental and pupil choice and admissions policies: most children do not travel very far to school. At primary schools, the average distance travelled by pupils is 1.6 miles, while at secondary schools, it is 3.4 miles.'*⁴⁷

⁴⁵ HM Government 2016. *Schools that Work For Everyone: Government Consultation*. HM Government 2016

⁴⁶ It should be noted that in multi-ethnic areas where the White British population is in the minority, this binary approach does not provide the whole picture in terms of inter-ethnic minority integration, for example between black and Asian pupils. However, in the interests of developing a method that allows comparison of the whole of England we believe the approach adopted is appropriate.

⁴⁷ *The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration*, London: DCLG, paragraph 3.82. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-casey-review-a-review-into-opportunity-and-integration

This will mean that, on occasion, schools are compared with others outside that local authority area or with other parts within that local authority area that are not considered as part of a 'catchment', perhaps because of limited communications between different areas, or just following local traditions. However, in the longer run, parental choice will enable more cross-border movement, as it has already done in many areas, and it is important that the local context is further researched and reviewed. It should also be borne in mind that schools should be actively looking to work together to broaden their appeal and intake and therefore challenging existing patterns to enable children to maximise integration opportunities.

With this in mind, by reviewing the relative distribution of pupils within schools in each local authority area, we are able to invite schools to consider their impacts on each other. In order to present this picture we also suggest that whilst a school may not recognise itself as 'segregated' in the sense that there is no over-representation of a minority community, a number of schools that each have a significant disproportionate intake of the majority community could be contributing to the deep segregation of a smaller number of schools. So for example, a school which has a far greater proportion of non-FSM students, or White British students, compared to their 10 nearest schools, is likely to be contributing to school segregation in the area, even though such schools may not be individually described as 'segregated' in previous reviews.

However, it cannot be stressed enough that despite the identification of schools and local authorities as segregated or contributing to segregation through our analysis, the prevailing impetus of parental choice combined with the current approach to admissions means that both schools and local authorities have limited powers to address this at an individual level.



THE FINDINGS

In this chapter, we present the findings of our analysis, by both ethnicity and socio-economic status. We begin by reviewing the current status of schools and reviewing how this has changed since 2011, before examining the results by school type.

Across all schools in 2016, 26% of primary schools and 40.6% of secondary schools were found to be ethnically segregated or potentially contributing to segregation by our measure; while 29.6% of primary schools and 27.6% of secondary schools were found to be segregated by socio-economic status, using FSM-eligibility as a proxy.

Ethnicity

By focusing on local authority areas, we are able to develop a local picture. Combining the results for schools across 150 local authority areas (excluding the City of London and Isles of Scilly, with only one state school each) allows us to present a national picture of school segregation, to identify where in the country schools are most segregated and where they are contributing to local area segregation. Full results by local authority are available in appendix 2.

Further, we are able to compare the trends in the segregation of schools over the last five years, using data from 2011 to 2016. Even though this is a relatively short period of time, a number of worrying trends are evident. In particular, looking at the performance of schools within local authority areas on the basis of 'high' and 'low' proportions of White British in relation to their local areas, we find for primary schools, from a total of 150 local authority areas, 84 saw an increase in 'low' and 'high' White British in relation to their local areas with 63 improving, and three seeing no change. For secondary schools, 64 areas saw an increase in the number of segregated schools, whereas 74 areas saw a decrease (with 12 seeing no change).

However, the results suggest some even more worrying trends. The more deeply segregated areas in 2011 have made little progress, some have become even more segregated, others have stayed the same and others have improved slightly. This suggests that new areas, not previously associated with segregation, now give cause for concern.

For previously segregated areas, those that have increased include Blackburn with Darwen which now has over 71% of primaries and 83% of secondaries in this category; Kirklees has also increased with over 48% of primaries and 79% of secondaries; Leicester has seen an increase in secondaries to 89%, though its primaries have reduced a little to 40%; similarly Tower Hamlets has seen an increase in secondaries to 76% and a reduction to 68% of primaries; and Bolton increased to 79% of secondaries, with a reduction to 48% for primaries. These are all very high levels of school segregation.

For previously segregated areas, some have seen a slight improvement or stayed the same, for example Rochdale now has 92% of secondaries and 64% of primaries in this category; Birmingham still has over half its secondaries and around a quarter of its primaries in this category; Bradford has seen the proportion of its secondary schools which are segregated reduce to 79% and its primaries to 58%; Oldham has 71% of secondaries and 62% of primaries. Again these are very high levels.

For county areas, the results are also worrying in some cases. Lancashire, with a large number of schools (568) and distinct communities some of which are notably segregated, has now seen an increase to 38% of primaries and 54% of secondaries in the 'high' plus 'low' category; though not previously associated with segregation, Northamptonshire has also seen an increase in this category for primaries to 29% and a decrease in its secondaries to 45%; and North Lincolnshire has one of the highest levels in secondary schools of 79%, though with a small reduction in primaries to 30%. It is recognised that county areas may have to cope with more geographic spread for comparison purposes, but such trends certainly need to be examined in the local context.

This is less likely to impact upon free standing smaller towns and cities however, and very notable increases are evident in some areas. For example, Bedford has seen its primaries increase to 35% and its secondaries to 55% in the 'low' plus 'high' category; Luton's secondaries remain at 69% with a small reduction in primaries to 46%; Peterborough has seen an increase in primaries to 49% and secondaries to 75%; Slough has had a small increase in secondaries to 50%, with a reduction in primaries to 31%, but both sectors with a substantial number in the 'low' category. Reading is also notable for the large increase in secondaries in this category – from 57% to 70%. Darlington scores highly for primaries at 53%, though with a much smaller number of schools and only 3 schools in the 'low' category. Other areas with a smaller number of schools that have seen significant changes include Telford and Wrekin (primaries); Redcar and Cleveland (secondaries, though with none in the 'low' category); and Stockton-on-Tees (primaries).

In the larger city category, Derby has seen an increase in secondaries in the 'high' plus 'low' category to 80% and with a reduction in primaries to 27%; Sheffield has also seen an increase for secondaries to 70%, with no real change in primaries at 39%.

The connection with residential segregation is only clear in some cases and especially in some northern and midland cities (see appendix 1). However, London is multi-diverse and, apart from a small number of areas, is not marked by high levels of residential segregation.⁴⁸ Yet London is experiencing high levels of school segregation in many areas, including some rapid movement which perhaps suggest the impact of parental choice and ‘choice’ exercised by the school itself through specialised admissions regimes.

LONDON BOROUGH	PRIMARY (% SEGREGATED)		SECONDARY (% SEGREGATED)	
	2011	2016	2011	2016
Barnet	40	55	39	48
Brent	53	53	57	64
Hackney	55	58	42	47
Lambeth	45	44	33	45
Tower Hamlets	80	68	53	76
Westminster	46	48	80	82

Socio-economic status

The results in terms of socio-economic segregation (as measured by FSM eligibility) also reveal a significant divide, albeit one which appears to have been improving over the past five years. In 2016, 30% of primary schools and 28% of secondary schools were found to be segregated by FSM eligibility. Interestingly, for 2011 these figures were 34% and 32% respectively, indicating that schools have become slightly less socio-economically segregated over this period, although this may be due to a change in FSM eligibility criteria given changes to benefits eligibility over this period.⁴⁹

When examining the 2016 results geographically, for primary schools the five most segregated local authority areas are Hartlepool, Darlington, Blackpool, Stockton-on-Tees and Halton; while for secondary schools they are Poole, Reading, Southend-on-Sea, Middlesbrough and Warrington.

For primaries, in Hartlepool, Darlington, Stockton-on-Tees and Halton, this is driven predominantly by schools that feature lower proportions of FSM-eligible students than neighbouring schools, whereas for Blackpool it is a more even split between schools with high and low proportions of disadvantaged students. All of these areas are above the mean for FSM-eligibility for all primaries in our analysis, which is 14.2%.

As regards secondary schools, the socio-economic segregation in Poole, Southend-on-Sea and Warrington appears to be more driven by schools with lower proportions of FSM students, whereas in Middlesbrough it is predominantly due to schools with higher proportions of disadvantaged students. In Reading it is equally split between schools who have lower, and higher, proportions. Among these areas, only Middlesbrough is above the mean for FSM eligibility for secondaries in our analysis of 14.7%. However, the existence of grammar schools in Poole, Southend-on-Sea and Reading may be a significant factor in driving their high socio-economic segregation score.

The most socio-economically integrated areas for primary schools are Waltham Forest, Islington, Greenwich, Barking and Dagenham and Sandwell; while for secondary schools they are Barking and Dagenham, Hartlepool, the Isle of Wight, Lewisham, Rochdale and Waltham Forest, all six of which feature no schools with significantly high or low proportions of FSM-eligible pupils compared to neighbouring schools. All of these areas, except the Isle of Wight, are above the national average for FSM-eligibility, and it is perhaps notable that none feature grammar schools.

⁴⁸ Catney, G (2013) ‘Has neighbourhood ethnic segregation decreased?’ ESRC Centre on Dynamics of Ethnicity: University of Manchester, available at: www.ethnicity.ac.uk/medialibrary/briefingsupdated/has-neighbourhood-ethnic-segregation-decreased.pdf

⁴⁹ See for example: www.gov.uk/government/publications/changes-to-working-tax-credit-and-free-school-meals-entitlement

School types

It is also possible to average these results across different types of schools, whether faith, selective, single-sex, Ofsted rating, or by academy status. Again, a school is considered to be ‘low’ or ‘high’ in its intake if the proportion of pupils from either ethnic, or socio-economic, group differs from its local area by double or half, or by more than 15 percentage points.

When doing so for ethnic integration, at primary, sponsor-led academies tend to have fewer White British students compared with other neighbouring schools than the average (13.3% of sponsor-led academies versus an average of 9.9%); while the small number of free schools (128) are also more likely to over-sample ethnic minorities, with 15.6% of these schools having a lower proportion of White British students than nearby schools. Both Local Authority maintained (LA-maintained) and converter academy primary schools are very similar to the average on ethnic integration for all primaries. At Secondary, the story is more muted – LA-maintained schools are again close to the average, as are sponsor-led. Converter academies tend to be more White British than surrounding schools, but free schools (of which there are 195 in the sample) are again the outlier, with 17.9% of these schools featuring a greater proportion of ethnic minorities than their neighbours, compared with the average of 13.4%.

Faith schools at primary are more ethnically segregated than schools of no faith (28.8% of faith schools compared with 24.5% of those of no faith) when compared with neighbouring schools. This is particularly pronounced for Roman Catholic schools, of which 26.7% have a low proportion of White British students (compared with 9.1% of non-faith schools and 9.9% of all schools). It is also true of the very few non-Christian faith schools, of which 84.5% are segregated by our measure (32.8% under-sample White British, and 51.7% over-sample, although the small sample of 58 schools should be taken into account). It is a similar picture at secondary level, except that the few schools of other, non-Christian faiths are even more likely to under-sample White British students, with 64.5% of these schools falling into this category, compared to an average for all schools of 13.4% (again bearing in mind the sample of 31).

However, the collective impact of faith schools, particularly the predominant Catholic and Church of England schools which are by far the most numerous, needs to be examined. As an example, in one London Borough the 17 faith primary schools that have somewhat diverse intakes, take between one and five times the proportion of White British compared to the area and this substantially reduces the potential for other schools to become more mixed.

We find that grammar schools tend to over-sample ethnic minority students and under-sample White British when compared with neighbours, than the average for all schools (19.6% of grammars against an average of 13.4% and 2.5% against an average of 27.2% respectively). However, grammars are less likely to be ethnically segregated overall, with only 22.1% being recorded as segregated by our measure, compared with an average of 40.6% for all secondary schools. In general, boys’ and girls’ schools tend to have far fewer White British students than the average, with 26% of single-sex schools having a lower intake of White British students than neighbouring schools, compared with the average of 13.4%.

Interestingly, we find that, at secondary level, schools rated ‘Inadequate’ by Ofsted tend to be more ethnically segregated compared with neighbouring schools, at 50%, compared to an average of 40.6%. The opposite is true of ‘outstanding’ schools, which are more likely to be integrated than average, with 35.7% of these schools being ethnically segregated. This relationship is also evident for primary schools, albeit more weakly, with 27.2% of Inadequate schools and 25% of Outstanding schools being segregated, compared with an average of 26%.

For socio-economic integration, as assessed by FSM take-up: at primary, sponsor-led academies are far more likely to feature high numbers of FSM pupils compared with surrounding schools, than the average for all schools (21.4% of sponsor-led academies v an all-school average of 8.8%); while converter academies and the small number of free schools (a sample of 147) are more likely to feature lower numbers of disadvantaged pupils than their neighbours, with 25.3% of converters and 27.2% of free schools having a lower proportion (compared with an average of 20.8%). For academies, it is possible this reflects the pre-existing intake of the school. LA-maintained primary schools are very similar to the average on socio-economic integration for all schools.

At secondary level, LA-maintained and free schools are more likely to be integrated than other school types, at 77.8% and 80% of these schools respectively, compared to an average for all schools of 72.3%. Converter academies are again far more likely to feature low proportions of FSM pupils than their neighbours, at 29.4% compared with an average of 18.8%. Sponsor-led academies appear to be significantly skewed towards FSM pupils, with 23.1% of these schools having a higher FSM intake than surrounding schools, compared with an average of 8.8%.

At primary level, faith schools are more likely to cater to more advantaged students, with 4.4% of faith schools having a high FSM intake compared with nearby schools, versus 11.4% for non-faith. This is particularly pronounced for Roman Catholic schools (of which 38.3% have a low FSM intake, versus 17.1% of non-faith) and the small number of non-Christian faith schools (sample of 58), of which 63.8% have a low FSM intake, and none at all have an intake with significantly higher numbers of FSM students. The relationship at secondary level is similar but not as strong, with 23.8% of Catholic schools having a low FSM intake, compared with 17.2% of non-faith schools. The few schools of other faiths (sample of 32) are still a big outlier – with 43.8% having a low FSM intake, and again none at all having a high FSM intake compared with other schools around them.

As has been documented before, grammar schools are starkly divided by socio-economic status. In this analysis, non-selective schools were similar to the average for all schools, whereas 98.2% of selective schools had low FSM intakes compared to other schools around them, and none at all had intakes with high proportions of FSM students. Similarly, boys' and girls' schools tend to have far fewer FSM students than the average for schools around them, with 44.2% of single sex schools featuring a low FSM intake, compared with the average of 18.8%.

At primary level, as would be expected given the relationship between socio-economic disadvantage, academic attainment and school performance, schools rated 'outstanding' by Ofsted were much less likely to feature FSM pupils, with 36.3% of schools under-sampling such students when compared with neighbours, against an average for all schools of 20.8%. The same is true at secondary level, where 47.9% of 'outstanding' schools under-represent FSM pupils compared to their neighbours, against an average for all schools of 18.8%.



RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these findings, we believe that the following actions are now desirable to encourage school intakes that are more representative of local communities across both ethnicity and socio-economic status:

- 1.** As part of its response to the Casey Review, the Government should recognise the trends that Casey, ourselves and many others have identified and set a clear direction to reduce the growth of school segregation and to reduce segregation wherever it is at a high level and encourage all agencies to act accordingly, providing advice, support, guidance and resources as appropriate.
- 2.** Local Government, faith authorities, academy chains, and individual schools should review practice, not only in relation to individual schools but also to consider the impact upon neighbouring schools, encouraging and supporting joint interventions wherever possible.
- 3.** School Governors should publish a clear commitment to this end and be required to publish details of their intake, comparing trends over time and taking responsibility for them. They should also engage with parents, developing open and transparent arrangements to build the widest possible support for integration.
- 4.** 'Inter-school' measures, such as school linking and joint activities should continue, but must not be seen as an alternative for school and community integration through both child and parental networks which schools naturally engender.
- 5.** The Government, local authorities, academy chains and school leaders should continue to promote National Citizen Service and other 'out-of-school' social action schemes that have the express purpose of bringing together young people from different schools and backgrounds, to provide them with the experience of difference that is vital to an integrated and strong society. This should include supporting those schemes that build on the success of NCS, such as HeadStart, to encourage young people to continue to mix across social divides and play an active role in society.
- 6.** All schools, especially those that do not represent the areas they serve or the country as a whole, should re-double their efforts to ensure that all young people learn about difference, in the context of British values, and have the opportunity to build intercultural competence and religious literacy.

APPENDIX 1

The school data also provides the opportunity to examine the link between the general population in the area, as measured by the Census, and that of the younger school population. The school population is also much more up to date, with the latest data from 2016 compared to the Census which was last published in 2011.

Cantle and Kaufmann⁵⁰ examined the trends in the White British population in a number of local authority areas, including those with a below average White British population by comparing the 2001 and 2011 Census data. The table adds the younger (0-16) population for both 2011 and 2016 by adding the SchoolDash pupil data to that analysis and may go some way to explaining some of the trends identified in our findings:

TABLE	WB POPN CENSUS %		WB PUPILS 0-16 AGE %	
	2001	2011	2011	2016
Local Authority Districts in England: Examples				
with below average White British Population	WB%	WB%	WB%	WB%
England Average	86.8%	79.8%	75%	70%
Slough	58.3%	34.5%	23.3%	17.1%
Birmingham	65.6%	53.1%	38.7%	31.9%
Bradford	76.0%	63.9%	49.5%	43.9%
Leicester	60.5%	45.1%	34.7%	28.9%
Luton	64.9%	44.6%	33.9%	24.3%
Blackburn with Darwen	76.0%	66.5%	55.7%	48.0%
Coventry	78.3%	66.6%	62.3%	53.1%
Brent	29.4%	18.0%	8.7%	7.3%
Tower Hamlets	43.1%	31.2%	12.0%	9.0%
Newham	33.6%	16.7%	8.7%	5.8%
Hounslow	55.7%	37.9%	27.1%	20.9%
Redbridge	57.2%	34.5%	21.6%	14.8%

Whilst the school populations are not equitable to the Census data which measures total population, they are a clear indication of future trends and it may be supposed that the 2016 total population, had there been a Census this year, would roughly mirror the relationship between the school and Census populations for 2011 and be an indication of the present population trend, not previously evidenced beyond 2011.

⁵⁰ Cantle T. and Kaufmann E. (2016) *Is Segregation Increasing in the UK?* Open Democracy.Net
www.opendemocracy.net/wfd/ted-cantle-and-eric-kaufmann/is-segregation-on-increase-in-uk

APPENDIX 2

Local Authority Ethnicity Analysis 2011 to 2016: Primary Schools 2016

2016 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Barking and Dagenham	5	38	3	10.9	82.6	6.5	17.4
Barnet	30	41	20	33.0	45.1	22.0	55.0
Barnsley	6	56	16	7.7	71.8	20.5	28.2
Bath and North East Somerset	3	55	3	4.9	90.2	4.9	9.8
Bedford	5	42	18	7.7	64.6	27.7	35.4
Bexley	9	45	5	15.3	76.3	8.5	23.8
Birmingham	40	231	34	13.1	75.7	11.1	24.2
Blackburn with Darwen	18	16	22	32.1	28.6	39.3	71.4
Blackpool	4	24	4	12.5	75.0	12.5	25.0
Bolton	15	51	31	15.5	52.6	32.0	47.5
Bournemouth	4	23	3	13.3	76.7	10.0	23.3
Bracknell Forest	2	29	0	6.5	93.5	0.0	6.5
Bradford	33	67	61	20.5	41.6	37.9	58.4
Brent	23	29	10	37.1	46.8	16.1	53.2
Brighton and Hove	6	45	1	11.5	86.5	1.9	13.4
Bristol City of	18	81	7	17.0	76.4	6.6	23.6
Bromley	12	51	13	15.8	67.1	17.1	32.9
Buckinghamshire	16	113	55	8.7	61.4	29.9	38.6
Bury	8	40	15	12.7	63.5	23.8	36.5
Calderdale	8	44	33	9.4	51.8	38.8	48.2
Cambridgeshire	5	146	54	2.4	71.2	26.3	28.7
Camden	7	26	9	16.7	61.9	21.4	38.1
Central Bedfordshire	2	101	14	1.7	86.3	12.0	13.7
Cheshire East	12	89	23	9.7	71.8	18.5	28.2
Cheshire West and Chester	6	104	20	4.6	80.0	15.4	20.0
Cornwall	10	212	13	4.3	90.2	5.5	9.8
Coventry	14	60	11	16.5	70.6	12.9	29.4
Croydon	13	63	8	15.5	75.0	9.5	25.0
Cumbria	10	250	11	3.7	92.3	4.1	7.8
Darlington	3	14	13	10.0	46.7	43.3	53.3
Derby	9	53	11	12.3	72.6	15.1	27.4
Derbyshire	8	308	35	2.3	87.7	10.0	12.3
Devon	16	274	19	5.2	88.7	6.1	11.3
Doncaster	13	60	25	13.3	61.2	25.5	38.8
Dorset	5	123	13	3.5	87.2	9.2	12.7
Dudley	10	51	17	12.8	65.4	21.8	34.6
Durham	11	194	13	5.0	89.0	6.0	11.0
Ealing	16	46	6	23.5	67.6	8.8	32.3
East Riding of Yorkshire	8	99	16	6.5	80.5	13.0	19.5
East Sussex	12	121	19	7.9	79.6	12.5	20.4
Enfield	8	54	9	11.3	76.1	12.7	24.0
Essex	28	353	70	6.2	78.3	15.5	21.7
Gateshead	5	51	11	7.5	76.1	16.4	23.9
Gloucestershire	17	203	27	6.9	82.2	10.9	17.8
Greenwich	11	42	10	17.5	66.7	15.9	33.4
Hackney	24	23	8	43.6	41.8	14.5	58.1
Halton	3	45	2	6.0	90.0	4.0	10.0
Hammersmith and Fulham	12	18	9	30.8	46.2	23.1	53.9
Hampshire	18	364	46	4.2	85.0	10.7	14.9
Haringey	11	47	7	16.9	72.3	10.8	27.7
Harrow	17	19	6	40.5	45.2	14.3	54.8
Hartlepool	2	21	7	6.7	70.0	23.3	30.0
Havering	4	49	6	6.8	83.1	10.2	17.0
Herefordshire	6	59	14	7.6	74.7	17.7	25.3
Hertfordshire	24	338	46	5.9	82.8	11.3	17.2
Hillingdon	6	50	13	8.7	72.5	18.8	27.5
Hounslow	11	39	5	20.0	70.9	9.1	29.1
Isle of Wight	3	34	3	7.5	85.0	7.5	15.0
Islington	5	32	9	10.9	69.6	19.6	30.5
Kensington and Chelsea	7	16	3	26.9	61.5	11.5	38.4
Kent	40	353	62	8.8	77.6	13.6	22.4
Kingston upon Hull City of	10	49	12	14.1	69.0	16.9	31.0
Kingston upon Thames	3	29	3	8.6	82.9	8.6	17.2
Kirklees	28	76	43	19.0	51.7	29.3	48.3
Knowsley	2	42	6	4.0	84.0	12.0	16.0
Lambeth	19	35	8	30.6	56.5	12.9	43.5
Lancashire	46	302	135	9.5	62.5	28.0	37.5
Leeds	23	157	43	10.3	70.4	19.3	29.6
Leicester	22	50	11	26.5	60.2	13.3	39.8
Leicestershire	19	159	50	8.3	69.7	21.9	30.2
Lewisham	16	45	11	22.2	62.5	15.3	37.5
Lincolnshire	16	208	55	5.7	74.6	19.7	25.4
Liverpool	13	90	16	10.9	75.6	13.4	24.3
Luton	14	26	8	29.2	54.2	16.7	45.9
Manchester	30	77	28	22.2	57.0	20.7	42.9

2016 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Medway	5	66	8	6.3	83.5	10.1	16.4
Merton	5	36	3	11.4	81.8	6.8	18.2
Middlesbrough	5	23	13	12.2	56.1	31.7	43.9
Milton Keynes	9	70	10	10.1	78.7	11.2	21.3
Newcastle upon Tyne	9	52	15	11.8	68.4	19.7	31.5
Newham	9	53	7	13.0	76.8	10.1	23.1
Norfolk	19	288	48	5.4	81.1	13.5	18.9
North East Lincolnshire	5	38	4	10.6	80.9	8.5	19.1
North Lincolnshire	6	44	13	9.5	69.8	20.6	30.1
North Somerset	7	49	5	11.5	80.3	8.2	19.7
North Tyneside	3	45	12	5.0	75.0	20.0	25.0
North Yorkshire	20	251	41	6.4	80.4	13.1	19.5
Northamptonshire	18	186	58	6.9	71.0	22.1	29.0
Northumberland	6	141	5	3.9	92.8	3.3	7.2
Nottingham	13	53	9	17.3	70.7	12.0	29.3
Nottinghamshire	15	221	47	5.3	78.1	16.6	21.9
Oldham	18	32	35	21.2	37.6	41.2	62.4
Oxfordshire	13	180	43	5.5	76.3	18.2	23.7
Peterborough	10	30	19	16.9	50.8	32.2	49.1
Plymouth	6	56	8	8.6	80.0	11.4	20.0
Poole	3	18	8	10.3	62.1	27.6	37.9
Portsmouth	4	42	3	8.2	85.7	6.1	14.3
Reading	4	30	4	10.5	78.9	10.5	21.0
Redbridge	19	25	10	35.2	46.3	18.5	53.7
Redcar and Cleveland	3	40	1	6.8	90.9	2.3	9.1
Richmond upon Thames	2	35	7	4.5	79.5	15.9	20.4
Rochdale	12	25	32	17.4	36.2	46.4	63.8
Rotherham	11	61	23	11.6	64.2	24.2	35.8
Rutland	2	12	3	11.8	70.6	17.6	29.4
Salford	8	63	5	10.5	82.9	6.6	17.1
Sandwell	16	61	17	17.0	64.9	18.1	35.1
Sefton	2	63	10	2.7	84.0	13.3	16.0
Sheffield	26	83	27	19.1	61.0	19.9	39.0
Shropshire	8	110	12	6.2	84.6	9.2	15.4
Slough	8	20	1	27.6	69.0	3.4	31.0
Solihull	3	49	8	5.0	81.7	13.3	18.3
Somerset	18	167	38	8.1	74.9	17.0	25.1
South Gloucestershire	6	72	16	6.4	76.6	17.0	23.4
South Tyneside	4	35	6	8.9	77.8	13.3	22.2
Southampton	10	38	6	18.5	70.4	11.1	29.6
Southend-on-Sea	3	29	2	8.8	85.3	5.9	14.7
Southwark	17	45	12	23.0	60.8	16.2	39.2
St. Helens	3	45	6	5.6	83.3	11.1	16.7
Staffordshire	20	220	70	6.5	71.0	22.6	29.1
Stockport	8	65	11	9.5	77.4	13.1	22.6
Stockton-on-Tees	6	43	11	10.0	71.7	18.3	28.3
Stoke-on-Trent	12	37	22	16.9	52.1	31.0	47.9
Suffolk	20	193	45	7.8	74.8	17.4	25.2
Sunderland	5	60	18	6.0	72.3	21.7	27.7
Surrey	20	248	35	6.6	81.8	11.6	18.2
Sutton	4	33	4	9.8	80.5	9.8	19.6
Swindon	5	47	11	7.9	74.6	17.5	25.4
Tameside	9	44	21	12.2	59.5	28.4	40.6
Telford and Wrekin	5	36	12	9.4	67.9	22.6	32.0
Thurrock	6	26	7	15.4	66.7	17.9	33.3
Torbay	2	26	2	6.7	86.7	6.7	13.4
Tower Hamlets	31	23	17	43.7	32.4	23.9	67.6
Trafford	4	60	4	5.9	88.2	5.9	11.8
Wakefield	10	79	23	8.9	70.5	20.5	29.4
Walsall	17	57	12	19.8	66.3	14.0	33.8
Waltham Forest	6	40	6	11.5	76.9	11.5	23.0
Wandsworth	15	32	12	25.4	54.2	20.3	45.7
Warrington	3	56	10	4.3	81.2	14.5	18.8
Warwickshire	13	133	45	6.8	69.6	23.6	30.4
West Berkshire	3	51	12	4.5	77.3	18.2	22.7
West Sussex	19	171	41	8.2	74.0	17.7	25.9
Westminster	12	22	8	28.6	52.4	19.0	47.6
Wigan	6	82	14	5.9	80.4	13.7	19.6
Wiltshire	14	159	26	7.0	79.9	13.1	20.1
Windsor and Maidenhead	5	36	9	10.0	72.0	18.0	28.0
Wirral	4	83	4	4.4	91.2	4.4	8.8
Wokingham	2	46	5	3.8	86.8	9.4	13.2
Wolverhampton	11	53	10	14.9	71.6	13.5	28.4
Worcestershire	21	134	42	10.7	68.0	21.3	32.0
York	2	40	8	4.0	80.0	16.0	20.0

Local Authority Ethnicity Analysis 2011 to 2016: Primary Schools 2011

2011 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Barking and Dagenham	5	42	2	10.2	85.7	4.1	14.3
Barnet	22	53	14	24.7	59.6	15.7	40.4
Barnsley	5	66	11	6.1	80.5	13.4	19.5
Bath and North East Somerset	1	57	4	1.6	91.9	6.5	8.1
Bedford	6	44	14	9.4	68.8	21.9	31.3
Bexley	8	48	3	13.6	81.4	5.1	18.7
Birmingham	41	225	36	13.6	74.5	11.9	25.5
Blackburn with Darwen	16	20	19	29.1	36.4	34.5	63.6
Blackpool	4	22	4	13.3	73.3	13.3	26.6
Bolton	12	44	39	12.6	46.3	41.1	53.7
Bournemouth	2	21	5	7.1	75.0	17.9	25.0
Bracknell Forest	3	27	0	10.0	90.0	0.0	10.0
Bradford	38	58	62	24.1	36.7	39.2	63.3
Brent	24	29	9	38.7	46.8	14.5	53.2
Brighton and Hove	3	47	4	5.6	87.0	7.4	13.0
Bristol City of	21	76	9	19.8	71.7	8.5	28.3
Bromley	8	54	12	10.8	73.0	16.2	27.0
Buckinghamshire	12	119	52	6.6	65.0	28.4	35.0
Bury	7	45	11	11.1	71.4	17.5	28.6
Calderdale	9	39	37	10.6	45.9	43.5	54.1
Cambridgeshire	6	153	42	3.0	76.1	20.9	23.9
Camden	10	21	10	24.4	51.2	24.4	48.8
Central Bedfordshire	5	92	21	4.2	78.0	17.8	22.0
Cheshire East	8	98	18	6.5	79.0	14.5	21.0
Cheshire West and Chester	7	109	13	5.4	84.5	10.1	15.5
Cornwall	12	219	5	5.1	92.8	2.1	7.2
Coventry	10	61	14	11.8	71.8	16.5	28.3
Croydon	11	66	7	13.1	78.6	8.3	21.4
Cumbria	11	251	12	4.0	91.6	4.4	8.4
Darlington	2	15	12	6.9	51.7	41.4	48.3
Derby	9	48	17	12.2	64.9	23.0	35.2
Derbyshire	8	323	20	2.3	92.0	5.7	8.0
Devon	18	283	14	5.7	89.8	4.4	10.1
Doncaster	9	79	14	8.8	77.5	13.7	22.5
Dorset	6	128	11	4.1	88.3	7.6	11.7
Dudley	11	45	22	14.1	57.7	28.2	42.3
Durham	10	210	7	4.4	92.5	3.1	7.5
Ealing	15	43	8	22.7	65.2	12.1	34.8
East Riding of Yorkshire	3	113	10	2.4	89.7	7.9	10.3
East Sussex	13	123	20	8.3	78.8	12.8	21.1
Enfield	12	45	10	17.9	67.2	14.9	32.8
Essex	22	378	63	4.8	81.6	13.6	18.4
Gateshead	3	57	8	4.4	83.8	11.8	16.2
Gloucestershire	10	216	18	4.1	88.5	7.4	11.5
Greenwich	10	46	7	15.9	73.0	11.1	27.0
Hackney	21	24	8	39.6	45.3	15.1	54.7
Halton	6	42	3	11.8	82.4	5.9	17.7
Hammersmith and Fulham	10	18	8	27.8	50.0	22.2	50.0
Hampshire	19	372	37	4.4	86.9	8.6	13.0
Haringey	9	45	9	14.3	71.4	14.3	28.6
Harrow	27	16	7	54.0	32.0	14.0	68.0
Hartlepool	2	22	6	6.7	73.3	20.0	26.7
Havering	4	49	6	6.8	83.1	10.2	17.0
Herefordshire	7	70	5	8.5	85.4	6.1	14.6
Hertfordshire	30	329	44	7.4	81.6	10.9	18.3
Hillingdon	8	50	8	12.1	75.8	12.1	24.2
Hounslow	14	33	9	25.0	58.9	16.1	41.1
Isle of Wight	4	27	10	9.8	65.9	24.4	34.2
Islington	6	31	8	13.3	68.9	17.8	31.1
Kensington and Chelsea	7	15	4	26.9	57.7	15.4	42.3
Kent	34	350	68	7.5	77.4	15.0	22.5
Kingston upon Hull City of	8	53	10	11.3	74.6	14.1	25.4
Kingston upon Thames	8	23	3	23.5	67.6	8.8	32.3
Kirklees	25	83	45	16.3	54.2	29.4	45.7
Knowsley	1	50	3	1.9	92.6	5.6	7.5
Lambeth	20	34	8	32.3	54.8	12.9	45.2
Lancashire	47	318	119	9.7	65.7	24.6	34.3
Leeds	21	152	47	9.5	69.1	21.4	30.9
Leicester	22	44	16	26.8	53.7	19.5	46.3
Leicestershire	19	165	45	8.3	72.1	19.7	28.0
Lewisham	15	44	12	21.1	62.0	16.9	38.0
Lincolnshire	14	227	35	5.1	82.2	12.7	17.8
Liverpool	11	90	25	8.7	71.4	19.8	28.5
Luton	11	24	14	22.4	49.0	28.6	51.0
Manchester	29	73	29	22.1	55.7	22.1	44.2

2011 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Medway	7	64	13	8.3	76.2	15.5	23.8
Merton	3	38	2	7.0	88.4	4.7	11.7
Middlesbrough	5	25	12	11.9	59.5	28.6	40.5
Milton Keynes	15	67	9	16.5	73.6	9.9	26.4
Newcastle upon Tyne	7	57	12	9.2	75.0	15.8	25.0
Newham	13	50	4	19.4	74.6	6.0	25.4
Norfolk	9	323	34	2.5	88.3	9.3	11.8
North East Lincolnshire	6	39	2	12.8	83.0	4.3	17.1
North Lincolnshire	9	43	14	13.6	65.2	21.2	34.8
North Somerset	7	47	7	11.5	77.0	11.5	23.0
North Tyneside	2	49	9	3.3	81.7	15.0	18.3
North Yorkshire	16	278	29	5.0	86.1	9.0	14.0
Northamptonshire	16	208	42	6.0	78.2	15.8	21.8
Northumberland	8	139	8	5.2	89.7	5.2	10.4
Nottingham	14	55	12	17.3	67.9	14.8	32.1
Nottinghamshire	14	226	46	4.9	79.0	16.1	21.0
Oldham	18	30	40	20.5	34.1	45.5	66.0
Oxfordshire	14	188	31	6.0	80.7	13.3	19.3
Peterborough	9	31	18	15.5	53.4	31.0	46.5
Plymouth	6	50	11	9.0	74.6	16.4	25.4
Poole	1	22	5	3.6	78.6	17.9	21.5
Portsmouth	3	47	3	5.7	88.7	5.7	11.4
Reading	7	25	5	18.9	67.6	13.5	32.4
Redbridge	18	24	12	33.3	44.4	22.2	55.5
Redcar and Cleveland	1	43	1	2.2	95.6	2.2	4.4
Richmond upon Thames	1	35	5	2.4	85.4	12.2	14.6
Rochdale	13	25	31	18.8	36.2	44.9	63.7
Rotherham	7	65	27	7.1	65.7	27.3	34.4
Rutland	1	16	0	5.9	94.1	0.0	5.9
Salford	8	60	9	10.4	77.9	11.7	22.1
Sandwell	20	54	20	21.3	57.4	21.3	42.6
Sefton	7	55	13	9.3	73.3	17.3	26.6
Sheffield	23	81	30	17.2	60.4	22.4	39.6
Shropshire	4	124	6	3.0	92.5	4.5	7.5
Slough	10	16	2	35.7	57.1	7.1	42.8
Solihull	1	53	8	1.6	85.5	12.9	14.5
Somerset	10	201	16	4.4	88.5	7.0	11.4
South Gloucestershire	4	73	17	4.3	77.7	18.1	22.4
South Tyneside	5	38	5	10.4	79.2	10.4	20.8
Southampton	8	45	8	13.1	73.8	13.1	26.2
Southend-on-Sea	4	31	2	10.8	83.8	5.4	16.2
Southwark	12	45	13	17.1	64.3	18.6	35.7
St. Helens	3	49	2	5.6	90.7	3.7	9.3
Staffordshire	15	243	51	4.9	78.6	16.5	21.4
Stockport	5	69	14	5.7	78.4	15.9	21.6
Stockton-on-Tees	2	50	8	3.3	83.3	13.3	16.6
Stoke-on-Trent	12	36	23	16.9	50.7	32.4	49.3
Suffolk	15	212	37	5.7	80.3	14.0	19.7
Sunderland	3	69	11	3.6	83.1	13.3	16.9
Surrey	23	251	32	7.5	82.0	10.5	18.0
Sutton	4	33	4	9.8	80.5	9.8	19.6
Swindon	6	49	6	9.8	80.3	9.8	19.6
Tameside	10	41	23	13.5	55.4	31.1	44.6
Telford and Wrekin	4	47	4	7.3	85.5	7.3	14.6
Thurrock	6	27	9	14.3	64.3	21.4	35.7
Torbay	3	24	4	9.7	77.4	12.9	22.6
Tower Hamlets	38	14	18	54.3	20.0	25.7	80.0
Trafford	5	54	10	7.2	78.3	14.5	21.7
Wakefield	11	84	21	9.5	72.4	18.1	27.6
Walsall	17	57	13	19.5	65.5	14.9	34.4
Waltham Forest	8	38	7	15.1	71.7	13.2	28.3
Wandsworth	16	27	13	28.6	48.2	23.2	51.8
Warrington	5	58	6	7.2	84.1	8.7	15.9
Warwickshire	14	146	34	7.2	75.3	17.5	24.7
West Berkshire	2	58	6	3.0	87.9	9.1	12.1
West Sussex	19	185	29	8.2	79.4	12.4	20.6
Westminster	11	21	7	28.2	53.8	17.9	46.1
Wigan	6	89	8	5.8	86.4	7.8	13.6
Wiltshire	7	170	22	3.5	85.4	11.1	14.6
Windsor and Maidenhead	5	35	9	10.2	71.4	18.4	28.6
Wirral	8	77	7	8.7	83.7	7.6	16.3
Wokingham	1	43	6	2.0	86.0	12.0	14.0
Wolverhampton	13	55	6	17.6	74.3	8.1	25.7
Worcestershire	17	152	29	8.6	76.8	14.6	23.2
York	2	43	9	3.7	79.6	16.7	20.4

Local Authority Ethnicity Analysis 2011 to 2016: Secondary Schools 2016

2016 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Barking and Dagenham	1	9	2	8.3	75.0	16.7	25.0
Barnet	8	13	4	32.0	52.0	16.0	48.0
Barnsley	1	7	2	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0
Bath and North East Somerset	0	11	5	0.0	68.8	31.2	31.2
Bedford	3	9	8	15.0	45.0	40.0	55.0
Bexley	3	8	5	18.8	50.0	31.2	50.0
Birmingham	35	39	13	40.2	44.8	14.9	55.1
Blackburn with Darwen	4	2	6	33.3	16.7	50.0	83.3
Blackpool	1	4	2	14.3	57.1	28.6	42.9
Bolton	6	4	9	31.6	21.1	47.4	79.0
Bournemouth	1	11	0	8.3	91.7	0.0	8.3
Bracknell Forest	0	6	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bradford	13	7	14	38.2	20.6	41.2	79.4
Brent	7	5	2	50.0	35.7	14.3	64.3
Brighton and Hove	0	9	1	0.0	90.0	10.0	10.0
Bristol City of	4	14	4	18.2	63.6	18.2	36.4
Bromley	2	13	2	11.8	76.5	11.8	23.6
Buckinghamshire	5	24	8	13.5	64.9	21.6	35.1
Bury	2	6	5	15.4	46.2	38.5	53.9
Calderdale	2	5	6	15.4	38.5	46.2	61.6
Cambridgeshire	1	23	9	3.0	69.7	27.3	30.3
Camden	1	8	1	10.0	80.0	10.0	20.0
Central Bedfordshire	0	18	16	0.0	52.9	47.1	47.1
Cheshire East	2	18	2	9.1	81.8	9.1	18.2
Cheshire West and Chester	2	15	2	10.5	78.9	10.5	21.0
Cornwall	0	28	4	0.0	87.5	12.5	12.5
Coventry	4	12	7	17.4	52.2	30.4	47.8
Croydon	6	16	2	25.0	66.7	8.3	33.3
Cumbria	4	24	10	10.5	63.2	26.3	36.8
Darlington	0	7	1	0.0	87.5	12.5	12.5
Derby	5	3	7	33.3	20.0	46.7	80.0
Derbyshire	1	25	19	2.2	55.6	42.2	44.4
Devon	1	35	6	2.4	83.3	14.3	16.7
Doncaster	1	7	10	5.6	38.9	55.6	61.2
Dorset	0	26	6	0.0	81.2	18.8	18.8
Dudley	5	8	7	25.0	40.0	35.0	60.0
Durham	2	18	11	6.5	58.1	35.5	42.0
Ealing	6	6	2	42.9	42.9	14.3	57.2
East Riding of Yorkshire	1	6	11	5.6	33.3	61.1	66.7
East Sussex	1	25	3	3.4	86.2	10.3	13.7
Enfield	4	13	3	20.0	65.0	15.0	35.0
Essex	7	43	30	8.8	53.8	37.5	46.3
Gateshead	0	6	4	0.0	60.0	40.0	40.0
Gloucestershire	1	28	10	2.6	71.8	25.6	28.2
Greenwich	3	8	2	23.1	61.5	15.4	38.5
Hackney	4	8	3	26.7	53.3	20.0	46.7
Halton	0	7	1	0.0	87.5	12.5	12.5
Hammersmith and Fulham	3	4	4	27.3	36.4	36.4	63.7
Hampshire	3	47	20	4.3	67.1	28.6	32.9
Haringey	5	6	2	38.5	46.2	15.4	53.9
Harrow	6	4	2	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7
Hartlepool	2	1	2	40.0	20.0	40.0	80.0
Havering	1	13	4	5.6	72.2	22.2	27.8
Herefordshire	0	12	4	0.0	75.0	25.0	25.0
Hertfordshire	5	60	19	6.0	71.4	22.6	28.6
Hillingdon	4	11	6	19.0	52.4	28.6	47.6
Hounslow	5	12	0	29.4	70.6	0.0	29.4
Isle of Wight	0	8	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Islington	2	8	0	20.0	80.0	0.0	20.0
Kensington and Chelsea	1	5	0	16.7	83.3	0.0	16.7
Kent	5	76	19	5.0	76.0	19.0	24.0
Kingston upon Hull City of	3	5	4	25.0	41.7	33.3	58.3
Kingston upon Thames	3	7	1	27.3	63.6	9.1	36.4
Kirklees	10	6	12	35.7	21.4	42.9	78.6
Knowsley	0	3	3	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Lambeth	7	10	1	38.9	55.6	5.6	44.5
Lancashire	12	39	34	14.1	45.9	40.0	54.1
Leeds	5	13	22	12.5	32.5	55.0	67.5
Leicester	10	2	6	55.6	11.1	33.3	88.9
Leicestershire	2	21	30	3.8	39.6	56.6	60.4
Lewisham	3	11	0	21.4	78.6	0.0	21.4
Lincolnshire	4	36	15	7.3	65.5	27.3	34.6
Liverpool	3	23	5	9.7	74.2	16.1	25.8
Luton	5	4	4	38.5	30.8	30.8	69.3
Manchester	8	15	4	29.6	55.6	14.8	44.4

2016 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF WHITE BRITISH			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Medway	2	14	2	11.1	77.8	11.1	22.2
Merton	0	8	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Middlesbrough	2	4	1	28.6	57.1	14.3	42.9
Milton Keynes	1	10	1	8.3	83.3	8.3	16.6
Newcastle upon Tyne	2	9	5	12.5	56.2	31.2	43.7
Newham	3	13	3	15.8	68.4	15.8	31.6
Norfolk	5	32	16	9.4	60.4	30.2	39.6
North East Lincolnshire	0	9	1	0.0	90.0	10.0	10.0
North Lincolnshire	2	3	9	14.3	21.4	64.3	78.6
North Somerset	2	7	2	18.2	63.6	18.2	36.4
North Tyneside	0	11	5	0.0	68.8	31.2	31.2
North Yorkshire	2	26	14	4.8	61.9	33.3	38.1
Northamptonshire	4	22	14	10.0	55.0	35.0	45.0
Northumberland	2	31	9	4.8	73.8	21.4	26.2
Nottingham	4	9	3	25.0	56.2	18.8	43.8
Nottinghamshire	4	22	20	8.7	47.8	43.5	52.2
Oldham	5	4	5	35.7	28.6	35.7	71.4
Oxfordshire	7	20	11	18.4	52.6	28.9	47.3
Peterborough	4	3	5	33.3	25.0	41.7	75.0
Plymouth	0	15	4	0.0	78.9	21.1	21.1
Poole	0	7	2	0.0	77.8	22.2	22.2
Portsmouth	3	6	1	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0
Reading	5	3	2	50.0	30.0	20.0	70.0
Redbridge	9	6	3	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7
Redcar and Cleveland	0	3	7	0.0	30.0	70.0	70.0
Richmond upon Thames	0	5	5	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Rochdale	3	1	8	25.0	8.3	66.7	91.7
Rotherham	2	6	8	12.5	37.5	50.0	62.5
Rutland	0	1	2	0.0	33.3	66.7	66.7
Salford	1	9	5	6.7	60.0	33.3	40.0
Sandwell	2	9	7	11.1	50.0	38.9	50.0
Sefton	0	19	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Sheffield	7	8	12	25.9	29.6	44.4	70.3
Shropshire	1	17	3	4.8	81.0	14.3	19.1
Slough	5	7	2	35.7	50.0	14.3	50.0
Solihull	0	6	8	0.0	42.9	57.1	57.1
Somerset	3	32	3	7.9	84.2	7.9	15.8
South Gloucestershire	0	13	5	0.0	72.2	27.8	27.8
South Tyneside	2	2	5	22.2	22.2	55.6	77.8
Southampton	3	7	2	25.0	58.3	16.7	41.7
Southend-on-Sea	2	7	3	16.7	58.3	25.0	41.7
Southwark	5	8	5	27.8	44.4	27.8	55.6
St. Helens	0	8	1	0.0	88.9	11.1	11.1
Staffordshire	2	34	34	2.9	48.6	48.6	51.5
Stockport	0	8	5	0.0	61.5	38.5	38.5
Stockton-on-Tees	0	7	6	0.0	53.8	46.2	46.2
Stoke-on-Trent	4	10	2	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5
Suffolk	4	34	11	8.2	69.4	22.4	30.6
Sunderland	3	4	11	16.7	22.2	61.1	77.8
Surrey	2	43	10	3.6	78.2	18.2	21.8
Sutton	3	8	3	21.4	57.1	21.4	42.8
Swindon	2	6	4	16.7	50.0	33.3	50.0
Tameside	2	6	7	13.3	40.0	46.7	60.0
Telford and Wrekin	2	10	1	15.4	76.9	7.7	23.1
Thurrock	2	7	1	20.0	70.0	10.0	30.0
Torbay	0	8	1	0.0	88.9	11.1	11.1
Tower Hamlets	9	4	4	52.9	23.5	23.5	76.4
Trafford	2	16	0	11.1	88.9	0.0	11.1
Wakefield	2	11	5	11.1	61.1	27.8	38.9
Walsall	5	6	8	26.3	31.6	42.1	68.4
Waltham Forest	2	15	0	11.8	88.2	0.0	11.8
Wandsworth	2	6	3	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5
Warrington	0	12	1	0.0	92.3	7.7	7.7
Warwickshire	1	19	15	2.9	54.3	42.9	45.8
West Berkshire	0	6	4	0.0	60.0	40.0	40.0
West Sussex	3	34	4	7.3	82.9	9.8	17.1
Westminster	6	2	3	54.5	18.2	27.3	81.8
Wigan	1	15	4	5.0	75.0	20.0	25.0
Wiltshire	1	25	3	3.4	86.2	10.3	13.7
Windsor and Maidenhead	1	6	7	7.1	42.9	50.0	57.1
Wirral	0	16	5	0.0	76.2	23.8	23.8
Wokingham	0	6	3	0.0	66.7	33.3	33.3
Wolverhampton	4	14	1	21.1	73.7	5.3	26.4
Worcestershire	3	30	12	6.7	66.7	26.7	33.4
York	1	7	1	11.1	77.8	11.1	22.2

Local Authority Ethnicity Analysis 2011 to 2016: Secondary Schools 2011

2011 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Barking and Dagenham	1	5	3	11.1	55.6	33.3	44.4
Barnet	5	14	4	21.7	60.9	17.4	39.1
Barnsley	0	10	3	0.0	76.9	23.1	23.1
Bath and North East Somerset	2	5	6	15.4	38.5	46.2	61.6
Bedford	3	11	8	13.6	50.0	36.4	50.0
Bexley	3	9	4	18.8	56.2	25.0	43.8
Birmingham	25	34	17	32.9	44.7	22.4	55.3
Blackburn with Darwen	4	2	4	40.0	20.0	40.0	80.0
Blackpool	1	6	1	12.5	75.0	12.5	25.0
Bolton	4	5	8	23.5	29.4	47.1	70.6
Bournemouth	0	10	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bracknell Forest	0	6	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Bradford	10	3	15	35.7	10.7	53.6	89.3
Brent	7	6	1	50.0	42.9	7.1	57.1
Brighton and Hove	1	7	1	11.1	77.8	11.1	22.2
Bristol City of	3	11	6	15.0	55.0	30.0	45.0
Bromley	2	13	2	11.8	76.5	11.8	23.6
Buckinghamshire	4	24	6	11.8	70.6	17.6	29.4
Bury	3	5	6	21.4	35.7	42.9	64.3
Calderdale	2	3	9	14.3	21.4	64.3	78.6
Cambridgeshire	3	17	10	10.0	56.7	33.3	43.3
Camden	2	6	1	22.2	66.7	11.1	33.3
Central Bedfordshire	1	15	17	3.0	45.5	51.5	54.5
Cheshire East	2	15	3	10.0	75.0	15.0	25.0
Cheshire West and Chester	2	15	2	10.5	78.9	10.5	21.0
Cornwall	1	29	1	3.2	93.5	3.2	6.4
Coventry	1	11	7	5.3	57.9	36.8	42.1
Croydon	7	13	2	31.8	59.1	9.1	40.9
Cumbria	4	25	8	10.8	67.6	21.6	32.4
Darlington	0	6	1	0.0	85.7	14.3	14.3
Derby	3	4	7	21.4	28.6	50.0	71.4
Derbyshire	1	20	25	2.2	43.5	54.3	56.5
Devon	1	32	4	2.7	86.5	10.8	13.5
Doncaster	1	9	7	5.9	52.9	41.2	47.1
Dorset	2	27	5	5.9	79.4	14.7	20.6
Dudley	5	9	6	25.0	45.0	30.0	55.0
Durham	2	17	16	5.7	48.6	45.7	51.4
Ealing	5	4	4	38.5	30.8	30.8	69.3
East Riding of Yorkshire	1	5	12	5.6	27.8	66.7	72.3
East Sussex	2	22	3	7.4	81.5	11.1	18.5
Enfield	2	14	2	11.1	77.8	11.1	22.2
Essex	5	52	22	6.3	65.8	27.8	34.1
Gateshead	0	6	5	0.0	54.5	45.5	45.5
Gloucestershire	1	28	11	2.5	70.0	27.5	30.0
Greenwich	3	8	1	25.0	66.7	8.3	33.3
Hackney	4	7	1	33.3	58.3	8.3	41.6
Halton	0	2	5	0.0	28.6	71.4	71.4
Hammersmith and Fulham	2	3	3	25.0	37.5	37.5	62.5
Hampshire	2	45	24	2.8	63.4	33.8	36.6
Haringey	5	5	2	41.7	41.7	16.7	58.4
Harrow	5	4	2	45.5	36.4	18.2	63.7
Hartlepool	2	2	1	40.0	40.0	20.0	60.0
Havering	0	16	2	0.0	88.9	11.1	11.1
Herefordshire	1	11	3	6.7	73.3	20.0	26.7
Hertfordshire	4	59	17	5.0	73.8	21.2	26.2
Hillingdon	3	8	7	16.7	44.4	38.9	55.6
Hounslow	4	7	3	28.6	50.0	21.4	50.0
Isle of Wight	1	16	2	5.3	84.2	10.5	15.8
Islington	2	6	2	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0
Kensington and Chelsea	1	3	1	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0
Kent	9	70	21	9.0	70.0	21.0	30.0
Kingston upon Hull City of	4	4	6	28.6	28.6	42.9	71.5
Kingston upon Thames	3	7	0	30.0	70.0	0.0	30.0
Kirklees	9	7	15	29.0	22.6	48.4	77.4
Knowsley	0	1	6	0.0	14.3	85.7	85.7
Lambeth	4	10	1	26.7	66.7	6.7	33.4
Lancashire	8	43	30	9.9	53.1	37.0	46.9
Leeds	4	16	18	10.5	42.1	47.4	57.9
Leicester	6	5	7	33.3	27.8	38.9	72.2
Leicestershire	3	19	32	5.6	35.2	59.3	64.9
Lewisham	4	9	1	28.6	64.3	7.1	35.7
Lincolnshire	7	33	18	12.1	56.9	31.0	43.1
Liverpool	3	20	6	10.3	69.0	20.7	31.0
Luton	4	4	5	30.8	30.8	38.5	69.3
Manchester	8	14	4	30.8	53.8	15.4	46.2

2011 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Medway	1	13	3	5.9	76.5	17.6	23.5
Merton	0	8	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Middlesbrough	2	3	2	28.6	42.9	28.6	57.2
Milton Keynes	1	10	1	8.3	83.3	8.3	16.6
Newcastle upon Tyne	3	8	3	21.4	57.1	21.4	42.8
Newham	4	9	2	26.7	60.0	13.3	40.0
Norfolk	4	33	15	7.7	63.5	28.8	36.5
North East Lincolnshire	1	6	3	10.0	60.0	30.0	40.0
North Lincolnshire	2	2	9	15.4	15.4	69.2	84.6
North Somerset	1	7	2	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0
North Tyneside	1	12	3	6.2	75.0	18.8	25.0
North Yorkshire	1	29	17	2.1	61.7	36.2	38.3
Northamptonshire	3	21	17	7.3	51.2	41.5	48.8
Northumberland	5	32	12	10.2	65.3	24.5	34.7
Nottingham	4	6	4	28.6	42.9	28.6	57.2
Nottinghamshire	3	23	19	6.7	51.1	42.2	48.9
Oldham	5	2	6	38.5	15.4	46.2	84.7
Oxfordshire	5	15	14	14.7	44.1	41.2	55.9
Peterborough	3	4	4	27.3	36.4	36.4	63.7
Plymouth	1	11	4	6.2	68.8	25.0	31.2
Poole	0	9	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Portsmouth	2	6	2	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0
Reading	4	3	0	57.1	42.9	0.0	57.1
Redbridge	8	6	3	47.1	35.3	17.6	64.7
Redcar and Cleveland	0	7	4	0.0	63.6	36.4	36.4
Richmond upon Thames	0	4	4	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Rochdale	4	0	8	33.3	0.0	66.7	100.0
Rotherham	1	8	7	6.2	50.0	43.8	50.0
Rutland	0	0	3	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Salford	1	8	6	6.7	53.3	40.0	46.7
Sandwell	3	10	4	17.6	58.8	23.5	41.1
Sefton	2	17	1	10.0	85.0	5.0	15.0
Sheffield	4	13	10	14.8	48.1	37.0	51.8
Shropshire	0	15	8	0.0	65.2	34.8	34.8
Slough	4	6	1	36.4	54.5	9.1	45.5
Solihull	0	6	8	0.0	42.9	57.1	57.1
Somerset	1	33	3	2.7	89.2	8.1	10.8
South Gloucestershire	0	8	8	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
South Tyneside	1	4	4	11.1	44.4	44.4	55.5
Southampton	3	6	3	25.0	50.0	25.0	50.0
Southend-on-Sea	1	10	1	8.3	83.3	8.3	16.6
Southwark	3	9	4	18.8	56.2	25.0	43.8
St. Helens	1	9	0	10.0	90.0	0.0	10.0
Staffordshire	3	33	32	4.4	48.5	47.1	51.5
Stockport	0	9	5	0.0	64.3	35.7	35.7
Stockton-on-Tees	0	6	6	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Stoke-on-Trent	3	8	5	18.8	50.0	31.2	50.0
Suffolk	3	53	22	3.8	67.9	28.2	32.0
Sunderland	1	9	7	5.9	52.9	41.2	47.1
Surrey	3	40	10	5.7	75.5	18.9	24.6
Sutton	1	10	3	7.1	71.4	21.4	28.5
Swindon	2	6	3	18.2	54.5	27.3	45.5
Tameside	2	6	7	13.3	40.0	46.7	60.0
Telford and Wrekin	1	10	3	7.1	71.4	21.4	28.5
Thurrock	2	8	0	20.0	80.0	0.0	20.0
Torbay	1	6	1	12.5	75.0	12.5	25.0
Tower Hamlets	6	7	2	40.0	46.7	13.3	53.3
Trafford	3	12	3	16.7	66.7	16.7	33.4
Wakefield	2	7	9	11.1	38.9	50.0	61.1
Walsall	6	5	8	31.6	26.3	42.1	73.7
Waltham Forest	1	13	2	6.2	81.2	12.5	18.7
Wandsworth	3	6	2	27.3	54.5	18.2	45.5
Warrington	0	11	1	0.0	91.7	8.3	8.3
Warwickshire	1	21	13	2.9	60.0	37.1	40.0
West Berkshire	0	8	2	0.0	80.0	20.0	20.0
West Sussex	1	29	8	2.6	76.3	21.1	23.7
Westminster	6	2	2	60.0	20.0	20.0	80.0
Wigan	1	14	5	5.0	70.0	25.0	30.0
Wiltshire	1	24	4	3.4	82.8	13.8	17.2
Windsor and Maidenhead	1	4	8	7.7	30.8	61.5	69.2
Wirral	1	17	4	4.5	77.3	18.2	22.7
Wokingham	0	7	1	0.0	87.5	12.5	12.5
Wolverhampton	6	9	2	35.3	52.9	11.8	47.1
Worcestershire	4	31	10	8.9	68.9	22.2	31.1
York	1	9	0	10.0	90.0	0.0	10.0

FSM Analysis by Local Authority Area: 2011 to 2016: Primary Schools 2016

2016 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Barking and Dagenham	4	42	1	8.5	89.4	2.1	10.6
Barnet	24	52	16	26.1	56.5	17.4	43.5
Barnsley	13	58	7	16.7	74.4	9.0	25.7
Bath and North East Somerset	16	40	5	26.2	65.6	8.2	34.4
Bedford	14	49	2	21.5	75.4	3.1	24.6
Bexley	13	39	7	22.0	66.1	11.9	33.9
Birmingham	43	223	39	14.1	73.1	12.8	26.9
Blackburn with Darwen	11	39	6	19.6	69.6	10.7	30.3
Blackpool	9	15	8	28.1	46.9	25.0	53.1
Bolton	26	64	7	26.8	66.0	7.2	34.0
Bournemouth	3	25	2	10.0	83.3	6.7	16.7
Bracknell Forest	8	23	0	25.8	74.2	0.0	25.8
Bradford	29	117	15	18.0	72.7	9.3	27.3
Brent	9	53	1	14.3	84.1	1.6	15.9
Brighton and Hove	10	36	6	19.2	69.2	11.5	30.7
Bristol City of	25	66	17	23.1	61.1	15.7	38.8
Bromley	23	45	9	29.9	58.4	11.7	41.6
Buckinghamshire	44	123	17	23.9	66.8	9.2	33.1
Bury	16	40	7	25.4	63.5	11.1	36.5
Calderdale	25	52	8	29.4	61.2	9.4	38.8
Cambridgeshire	39	162	5	18.9	78.6	2.4	21.3
Camden	6	35	2	14.0	81.4	4.7	18.7
Central Bedfordshire	14	98	5	12.0	83.8	4.3	16.3
Cheshire East	37	75	12	29.8	60.5	9.7	39.5
Cheshire West and Chester	33	83	14	25.4	63.8	10.8	36.2
Cornwall	39	179	17	16.6	76.2	7.2	23.8
Coventry	18	60	8	20.9	69.8	9.3	30.2
Croydon	14	64	8	16.3	74.4	9.3	25.6
Cumbria	40	211	20	14.8	77.9	7.4	22.2
Darlington	12	13	5	40.0	43.3	16.7	56.7
Derby	20	46	7	27.4	63.0	9.6	37.0
Derbyshire	64	261	26	18.2	74.4	7.4	25.6
Devon	63	219	27	20.4	70.9	8.7	29.1
Doncaster	28	61	9	28.6	62.2	9.2	37.8
Dorset	23	107	11	16.3	75.9	7.8	24.1
Dudley	21	47	10	26.9	60.3	12.8	39.7
Durham	53	140	25	24.3	64.2	11.5	35.8
Ealing	10	54	5	14.5	78.3	7.2	21.7
East Riding of Yorkshire	36	79	9	29.0	63.7	7.3	36.3
East Sussex	32	104	18	20.8	67.5	11.7	32.5
Enfield	14	55	2	19.7	77.5	2.8	22.5
Essex	84	334	33	18.6	74.1	7.3	25.9
Gateshead	14	47	6	20.9	70.1	9.0	29.9
Gloucestershire	41	182	24	16.6	73.7	9.7	26.3
Greenwich	5	57	1	7.9	90.5	1.6	9.5
Hackney	7	48	3	12.1	82.8	5.2	17.3
Halton	14	27	9	28.0	54.0	18.0	46.0
Hammersmith and Fulham	8	25	6	20.5	64.1	15.4	35.9
Hampshire	105	285	38	24.5	66.6	8.9	33.4
Haringey	12	51	2	18.5	78.5	3.1	21.6
Harrow	9	32	1	21.4	76.2	2.4	23.8
Hartlepool	11	13	6	36.7	43.3	20.0	56.7
Havering	10	47	3	16.7	78.3	5.0	21.7
Herefordshire	17	56	6	21.5	70.9	7.6	29.1
Hertfordshire	86	288	34	21.1	70.6	8.3	29.4
Hillingdon	11	57	2	15.7	81.4	2.9	18.6
Hounslow	7	46	3	12.5	82.1	5.4	17.9
Isle of Wight	10	26	4	25.0	65.0	10.0	35.0
Islington	3	42	1	6.5	91.3	2.2	8.7
Kensington and Chelsea	6	18	2	23.1	69.2	7.7	30.8
Kent	119	290	47	26.1	63.6	10.3	36.4
Kingston upon Hull City of	12	48	11	16.9	67.6	15.5	32.4
Kingston upon Thames	3	31	2	8.3	86.1	5.6	13.9
Kirklees	23	110	14	15.6	74.8	9.5	25.1
Knowsley	10	30	10	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0
Lambeth	4	51	7	6.5	82.3	11.3	17.8
Lancashire	116	320	47	24.0	66.3	9.7	33.7
Leeds	54	147	23	24.1	65.6	10.3	34.4
Leicester	10	65	8	12.0	78.3	9.6	21.6
Leicestershire	56	157	15	24.6	68.9	6.6	31.2
Lewisham	10	62	0	13.9	86.1	0.0	13.9
Lincolnshire	50	201	29	17.9	71.8	10.4	28.3
Liverpool	19	84	16	16.0	70.6	13.4	29.4
Luton	6	38	4	12.5	79.2	8.3	20.8
Manchester	14	108	14	10.3	79.4	10.3	20.6

2016 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Medway	20	50	9	25.3	63.3	11.4	36.7
Merton	9	33	2	20.5	75.0	4.5	25.0
Middlesbrough	9	25	7	22.0	61.0	17.1	39.1
Milton Keynes	15	65	9	16.9	73.0	10.1	27.0
Newcastle upon Tyne	17	47	12	22.4	61.8	15.8	38.2
Newham	3	61	5	4.3	88.4	7.2	11.5
Norfolk	48	280	27	13.5	78.9	7.6	21.1
North East Lincolnshire	16	28	3	34.0	59.6	6.4	40.4
North Lincolnshire	16	42	5	25.4	66.7	7.9	33.3
North Somerset	14	41	6	23.0	67.2	9.8	32.8
North Tyneside	13	39	8	21.7	65.0	13.3	35.0
North Yorkshire	44	244	24	14.1	78.2	7.7	21.8
Northamptonshire	60	190	12	22.9	72.5	4.6	27.5
Northumberland	25	114	13	16.4	75.0	8.6	25.0
Nottingham	9	54	12	12.0	72.0	16.0	28.0
Nottinghamshire	88	167	28	31.1	59.0	9.9	41.0
Oldham	15	64	6	17.6	75.3	7.1	24.7
Oxfordshire	44	174	18	18.6	73.7	7.6	26.2
Peterborough	13	43	3	22.0	72.9	5.1	27.1
Plymouth	15	46	9	21.4	65.7	12.9	34.3
Poole	7	17	5	24.1	58.6	17.2	41.3
Portsmouth	10	36	3	20.4	73.5	6.1	26.5
Reading	9	28	2	23.1	71.8	5.1	28.2
Redbridge	10	42	2	18.5	77.8	3.7	22.2
Redcar and Cleveland	12	24	8	27.3	54.5	18.2	45.5
Richmond upon Thames	12	32	2	26.1	69.6	4.3	30.4
Rochdale	15	49	5	21.7	71.0	7.2	28.9
Rotherham	22	63	10	23.2	66.3	10.5	33.7
Rutland	4	12	1	23.5	70.6	5.9	29.4
Salford	17	52	7	22.4	68.4	9.2	31.6
Sandwell	6	84	4	6.4	89.4	4.3	10.7
Sefton	18	49	8	24.0	65.3	10.7	34.7
Sheffield	30	94	12	22.1	69.1	8.8	30.9
Shropshire	25	96	9	19.2	73.8	6.9	26.1
Slough	8	21	1	26.7	70.0	3.3	30.0
Solihull	17	38	5	28.3	63.3	8.3	36.6
Somerset	44	162	17	19.7	72.6	7.6	27.3
South Gloucestershire	27	60	8	28.4	63.2	8.4	36.8
South Tyneside	10	30	5	22.2	66.7	11.1	33.3
Southampton	5	43	6	9.3	79.6	11.1	20.4
Southend-on-Sea	11	20	3	32.4	58.8	8.8	41.2
Southwark	12	57	5	16.2	77.0	6.8	23.0
St. Helens	17	32	5	31.5	59.3	9.3	40.8
Staffordshire	86	197	28	27.7	63.3	9.0	36.7
Stockport	25	49	10	29.8	58.3	11.9	41.7
Stockton-on-Tees	18	31	11	30.0	51.7	18.3	48.3
Stoke-on-Trent	12	55	4	16.9	77.5	5.6	22.5
Suffolk	48	192	18	18.6	74.4	7.0	25.6
Sunderland	19	47	17	22.9	56.6	20.5	43.4
Surrey	69	196	38	22.8	64.7	12.5	35.3
Sutton	12	26	3	29.3	63.4	7.3	36.6
Swindon	16	44	3	25.4	69.8	4.8	30.2
Tameside	17	52	6	22.7	69.3	8.0	30.7
Telford and Wrekin	14	36	4	25.9	66.7	7.4	33.3
Thurrock	6	33	1	15.0	82.5	2.5	17.5
Torbay	6	20	4	20.0	66.7	13.3	33.3
Tower Hamlets	7	59	5	9.9	83.1	7.0	16.9
Trafford	14	47	7	20.6	69.1	10.3	30.9
Wakefield	27	76	10	23.9	67.3	8.8	32.7
Walsall	17	63	6	19.8	73.3	7.0	26.8
Waltham Forest	2	50	1	3.8	94.3	1.9	5.7
Wandsworth	17	36	7	28.3	60.0	11.7	40.0
Warrington	26	38	5	37.7	55.1	7.2	44.9
Warwickshire	54	125	13	28.1	65.1	6.8	34.9
West Berkshire	12	49	5	18.2	74.2	7.6	25.8
West Sussex	35	183	13	15.2	79.2	5.6	20.8
Westminster	9	30	3	21.4	71.4	7.1	28.5
Wigan	34	57	11	33.3	55.9	10.8	44.1
Wiltshire	42	139	19	21.0	69.5	9.5	30.5
Windsor and Maidenhead	8	37	5	16.0	74.0	10.0	26.0
Wirral	21	50	20	23.1	54.9	22.0	45.1
Wokingham	11	39	3	20.8	73.6	5.7	26.5
Wolverhampton	7	62	5	9.5	83.8	6.8	16.3
Worcestershire	57	127	14	28.8	64.1	7.1	35.9
York	17	30	3	34.0	60.0	6.0	40.0

FSM Analysis by Local Authority Area: 2011 to 2016: Primary Schools 2011

2011 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Barking and Dagenham	7	39	3	14.3	79.6	6.1	20.4
Barnet	28	42	19	31.5	47.2	21.3	52.8
Barnsley	13	54	15	15.9	65.9	18.3	34.2
Bath and North East Somerset	18	30	11	30.5	50.8	18.6	49.1
Bedford	8	48	3	13.6	81.4	5.1	18.7
Bexley	13	37	9	22.0	62.7	15.3	37.3
Birmingham	46	209	47	15.2	69.2	15.6	30.8
Blackburn with Darwen	11	32	11	20.4	59.3	20.4	40.8
Blackpool	8	15	7	26.7	50.0	23.3	50.0
Bolton	22	65	8	23.2	68.4	8.4	31.6
Bournemouth	4	21	3	14.3	75.0	10.7	25.0
Bracknell Forest	9	21	0	30.0	70.0	0.0	30.0
Bradford	29	106	21	18.6	67.9	13.5	32.1
Brent	12	48	2	19.4	77.4	3.2	22.6
Brighton and Hove	16	33	5	29.6	61.1	9.3	38.9
Bristol City of	20	62	24	18.9	58.5	22.6	41.5
Bromley	18	44	11	24.7	60.3	15.1	39.8
Buckinghamshire	48	96	13	30.6	61.1	8.3	38.9
Bury	14	41	8	22.2	65.1	12.7	34.9
Calderdale	26	46	10	31.7	56.1	12.2	43.9
Cambridgeshire	42	135	16	21.8	69.9	8.3	30.1
Camden	7	30	4	17.1	73.2	9.8	26.9
Central Bedfordshire	20	82	8	18.2	74.5	7.3	25.5
Cheshire East	39	61	16	33.6	52.6	13.8	47.4
Cheshire West and Chester	41	62	17	34.2	51.7	14.2	48.4
Cornwall	33	176	15	14.7	78.6	6.7	21.4
Coventry	18	54	13	21.2	63.5	15.3	36.5
Croydon	15	58	11	17.9	69.0	13.1	31.0
Cumbria	44	154	27	19.6	68.4	12.0	31.6
Darlington	14	10	5	48.3	34.5	17.2	65.5
Derby	16	50	8	21.6	67.6	10.8	32.4
Derbyshire	58	237	28	18.0	73.4	8.7	26.7
Devon	57	214	18	19.7	74.0	6.2	25.9
Doncaster	29	58	15	28.4	56.9	14.7	43.1
Dorset	19	104	13	14.0	76.5	9.6	23.6
Dudley	22	47	9	28.2	60.3	11.5	39.7
Durham	52	137	32	23.5	62.0	14.5	38.0
Ealing	12	46	8	18.2	69.7	12.1	30.3
East Riding of Yorkshire	32	77	8	27.4	65.8	6.8	34.2
East Sussex	29	103	18	19.3	68.7	12.0	31.3
Enfield	18	41	8	26.9	61.2	11.9	38.8
Essex	88	322	44	19.4	70.9	9.7	29.1
Gateshead	18	36	13	26.9	53.7	19.4	46.3
Gloucestershire	45	157	29	19.5	68.0	12.6	32.1
Greenwich	9	46	8	14.3	73.0	12.7	27.0
Hackney	8	41	4	15.1	77.4	7.5	22.6
Halton	13	24	14	25.5	47.1	27.5	53.0
Hammersmith and Fulham	7	21	8	19.4	58.3	22.2	41.6
Hampshire	108	267	40	26.0	64.3	9.6	35.6
Haringey	15	46	1	24.2	74.2	1.6	25.8
Harrow	13	29	7	26.5	59.2	14.3	40.8
Hartlepool	10	11	9	33.3	36.7	30.0	63.3
Havering	12	41	6	20.3	69.5	10.2	30.5
Herefordshire	15	55	4	20.3	74.3	5.4	25.7
Hertfordshire	85	266	38	21.9	68.4	9.8	31.7
Hillingdon	15	44	6	23.1	67.7	9.2	32.3
Hounslow	7	41	8	12.5	73.2	14.3	26.8
Isle of Wight	9	27	4	22.5	67.5	10.0	32.5
Islington	3	36	6	6.7	80.0	13.3	20.0
Kensington and Chelsea	6	16	4	23.1	61.5	15.4	38.5
Kent	114	258	66	26.0	58.9	15.1	41.1
Kingston upon Hull City of	12	42	17	16.9	59.2	23.9	40.8
Kingston upon Thames	8	20	6	23.5	58.8	17.6	41.1
Kirklees	22	108	17	15.0	73.5	11.6	26.6
Knowsley	9	31	14	16.7	57.4	25.9	42.6
Lambeth	6	51	5	9.7	82.3	8.1	17.8
Lancashire	119	285	48	26.3	63.1	10.6	36.9
Leeds	53	136	26	24.7	63.3	12.1	36.8
Leicester	13	51	18	15.9	62.2	22.0	37.9
Leicestershire	57	141	13	27.0	66.8	6.2	33.2
Lewisham	9	56	6	12.7	78.9	8.5	21.2
Lincolnshire	60	174	32	22.6	65.4	12.0	34.6
Liverpool	15	86	24	12.0	68.8	19.2	31.2
Luton	4	39	6	8.2	79.6	12.2	20.4
Manchester	9	102	20	6.9	77.9	15.3	22.2

2011 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Medway	12	59	13	14.3	70.2	15.5	29.8
Merton	8	32	3	18.6	74.4	7.0	25.6
Middlesbrough	11	19	12	26.2	45.2	28.6	54.8
Milton Keynes	17	59	12	19.3	67.0	13.6	32.9
Newcastle upon Tyne	19	37	19	25.3	49.3	25.3	50.6
Newham	6	52	9	9.0	77.6	13.4	22.4
Norfolk	59	257	35	16.8	73.2	10.0	26.8
North East Lincolnshire	17	24	5	37.0	52.2	10.9	47.9
North Lincolnshire	17	38	7	27.4	61.3	11.3	38.7
North Somerset	14	40	5	23.7	67.8	8.5	32.2
North Tyneside	14	33	13	23.3	55.0	21.7	45.0
North Yorkshire	44	200	21	16.6	75.5	7.9	24.5
Northamptonshire	67	150	24	27.8	62.2	10.0	37.8
Northumberland	22	102	13	16.1	74.5	9.5	25.6
Nottingham	13	44	24	16.0	54.3	29.6	45.6
Nottinghamshire	85	159	33	30.7	57.4	11.9	42.6
Oldham	17	60	8	20.0	70.6	9.4	29.4
Oxfordshire	43	148	23	20.1	69.2	10.7	30.8
Peterborough	14	34	10	24.1	58.6	17.2	41.3
Plymouth	15	38	14	22.4	56.7	20.9	43.3
Poole	8	16	3	29.6	59.3	11.1	40.7
Portsmouth	9	35	9	17.0	66.0	17.0	34.0
Reading	4	26	5	11.4	74.3	14.3	25.7
Redbridge	7	45	2	13.0	83.3	3.7	16.7
Redcar and Cleveland	10	24	9	23.3	55.8	20.9	44.2
Richmond upon Thames	13	22	6	31.7	53.7	14.6	46.3
Rochdale	18	39	12	26.1	56.5	17.4	43.5
Rotherham	22	64	13	22.2	64.6	13.1	35.3
Rutland	1	14	1	6.2	87.5	6.2	12.4
Salford	15	49	13	19.5	63.6	16.9	36.4
Sandwell	9	75	10	9.6	79.8	10.6	20.2
Sefton	16	49	8	21.9	67.1	11.0	32.9
Sheffield	33	82	19	24.6	61.2	14.2	38.8
Shropshire	22	90	11	17.9	73.2	8.9	26.8
Slough	6	19	3	21.4	67.9	10.7	32.1
Solihull	20	36	5	32.8	59.0	8.2	41.0
Somerset	41	156	20	18.9	71.9	9.2	28.1
South Gloucestershire	26	56	9	28.6	61.5	9.9	38.5
South Tyneside	11	27	10	22.9	56.2	20.8	43.7
Southampton	9	41	11	14.8	67.2	18.0	32.8
Southend-on-Sea	9	18	9	25.0	50.0	25.0	50.0
Southwark	10	54	6	14.3	77.1	8.6	22.9
St. Helens	17	27	10	31.5	50.0	18.5	50.0
Staffordshire	80	174	32	28.0	60.8	11.2	39.2
Stockport	32	39	14	37.6	45.9	16.5	54.1
Stockton-on-Tees	16	29	12	28.1	50.9	21.1	49.2
Stoke-on-Trent	15	46	10	21.1	64.8	14.1	35.2
Suffolk	41	187	22	16.4	74.8	8.8	25.2
Sunderland	21	42	20	25.3	50.6	24.1	49.4
Surrey	68	186	45	22.0	62.2	15.1	37.8
Sutton	9	25	7	22.0	61.0	17.1	39.1
Swindon	20	33	7	33.3	55.0	11.7	45.0
Tameside	15	49	9	20.5	67.1	12.3	32.8
Telford and Wrekin	19	26	9	35.2	48.1	16.7	51.9
Thurrock	7	31	4	16.7	73.8	9.5	26.2
Torbay	5	23	3	16.1	74.2	9.7	25.8
Tower Hamlets	2	63	5	2.9	90.0	7.1	10.0
Trafford	15	44	10	21.7	63.8	14.5	36.2
Wakefield	30	73	13	25.9	62.9	11.2	37.1
Walsall	14	62	10	16.3	72.1	11.6	27.9
Waltham Forest	4	45	4	7.5	84.9	7.5	15.0
Wandsworth	14	30	12	25.0	53.6	21.4	46.4
Warrington	23	33	10	34.8	50.0	15.2	50.0
Warwickshire	54	117	12	29.5	63.9	6.6	36.1
West Berkshire	14	44	4	22.6	71.0	6.5	29.1
West Sussex	31	169	17	14.3	77.9	7.8	22.1
Westminster	9	22	8	23.1	56.4	20.5	43.6
Wigan	26	57	20	25.2	55.3	19.4	44.6
Wiltshire	45	112	19	25.6	63.6	10.8	36.4
Windsor and Maidenhead	9	33	5	19.1	70.2	10.6	29.7
Wirral	20	41	29	22.2	45.6	32.2	54.4
Wokingham	13	28	5	28.3	60.9	10.9	39.2
Wolverhampton	11	52	11	14.9	70.3	14.9	29.8
Worcestershire	59	111	17	31.6	59.4	9.1	40.7
York	25	19	8	48.1	36.5	15.4	63.5

FSM Analysis by Local Authority Area: 2011 to 2016: Secondary Schools 2016

2016 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Barking and Dagenham	0	12	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Barnet	5	14	6	20.0	56.0	24.0	44.0
Barnsley	1	8	1	10.0	80.0	10.0	20.0
Bath and North East Somerset	2	12	2	12.5	75.0	12.5	25.0
Bedford	5	15	0	25.0	75.0	0.0	25.0
Bexley	5	10	1	31.2	62.5	6.2	37.4
Birmingham	17	54	16	19.5	62.1	18.4	37.9
Blackburn with Darwen	1	11	0	8.3	91.7	0.0	8.3
Blackpool	0	4	3	0.0	57.1	42.9	42.9
Bolton	3	15	1	15.8	78.9	5.3	21.1
Bournemouth	2	8	2	16.7	66.7	16.7	33.4
Bracknell Forest	1	3	2	16.7	50.0	33.3	50.0
Bradford	2	31	1	5.9	91.2	2.9	8.8
Brent	1	14	0	6.7	93.3	0.0	6.7
Brighton and Hove	0	8	2	0.0	80.0	20.0	20.0
Bristol City of	4	14	4	18.2	63.6	18.2	36.4
Bromley	5	10	2	29.4	58.8	11.8	41.2
Buckinghamshire	14	19	4	37.8	51.4	10.8	48.6
Bury	5	7	1	38.5	53.8	7.7	46.2
Calderdale	4	8	1	30.8	61.5	7.7	38.5
Cambridgeshire	4	27	2	12.1	81.8	6.1	18.2
Camden	1	9	0	10.0	90.0	0.0	10.0
Central Bedfordshire	5	27	1	15.2	81.8	3.0	18.2
Cheshire East	5	14	3	22.7	63.6	13.6	36.3
Cheshire West and Chester	4	11	4	21.1	57.9	21.1	42.2
Cornwall	1	30	1	3.1	93.8	3.1	6.2
Coventry	4	17	2	17.4	73.9	8.7	26.1
Croydon	2	19	3	8.3	79.2	12.5	20.8
Cumbria	10	26	2	26.3	68.4	5.3	31.6
Darlington	2	5	1	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5
Derby	3	11	1	20.0	73.3	6.7	26.7
Derbyshire	8	34	3	17.8	75.6	6.7	24.5
Devon	2	40	0	4.8	95.2	0.0	4.8
Doncaster	2	16	0	11.1	88.9	0.0	11.1
Dorset	3	26	3	9.4	81.2	9.4	18.8
Dudley	3	17	0	15.0	85.0	0.0	15.0
Durham	2	26	3	6.5	83.9	9.7	16.2
Ealing	2	12	0	14.3	85.7	0.0	14.3
East Riding of Yorkshire	6	11	1	33.3	61.1	5.6	38.9
East Sussex	4	23	2	13.8	79.3	6.9	20.7
Enfield	1	18	1	5.0	90.0	5.0	10.0
Essex	13	56	11	16.2	70.0	13.8	30.0
Gateshead	3	6	1	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0
Gloucestershire	12	23	4	30.8	59.0	10.3	41.1
Greenwich	2	10	1	15.4	76.9	7.7	23.1
Hackney	2	13	0	13.3	86.7	0.0	13.3
Halton	0	6	2	0.0	75.0	25.0	25.0
Hammersmith and Fulham	3	6	2	27.3	54.5	18.2	45.5
Hampshire	14	46	10	20.0	65.7	14.3	34.3
Haringey	2	9	2	15.4	69.2	15.4	30.8
Harrow	1	11	0	8.3	91.7	0.0	8.3
Hartlepool	0	5	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Havering	3	14	1	16.7	77.8	5.6	22.3
Herefordshire	2	13	1	12.5	81.2	6.2	18.7
Hertfordshire	24	51	9	28.6	60.7	10.7	39.3
Hillingdon	3	16	2	14.3	76.2	9.5	23.8
Hounslow	2	15	0	11.8	88.2	0.0	11.8
Isle of Wight	0	8	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Islington	1	8	1	10.0	80.0	10.0	20.0
Kensington and Chelsea	1	5	0	16.7	83.3	0.0	16.7
Kent	33	55	12	33.0	55.0	12.0	45.0
Kingston upon Hull City of	1	9	2	8.3	75.0	16.7	25.0
Kingston upon Thames	2	8	1	18.2	72.7	9.1	27.3
Kirklees	4	21	3	14.3	75.0	10.7	25.0
Knowsley	0	3	3	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Lambeth	0	16	2	0.0	88.9	11.1	11.1
Lancashire	22	52	11	25.9	61.2	12.9	38.8
Leeds	8	30	3	19.5	73.2	7.3	26.8
Leicester	0	16	2	0.0	88.9	11.1	11.1
Leicestershire	15	34	4	28.3	64.2	7.5	35.8
Lewisham	0	14	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lincolnshire	19	28	8	34.5	50.9	14.5	49.0
Liverpool	7	18	6	22.6	58.1	19.4	42.0
Luton	0	12	1	0.0	92.3	7.7	7.7
Manchester	1	22	4	3.7	81.5	14.8	18.5

2016 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Medway	6	10	2	33.3	55.6	11.1	44.4
Merton	0	6	2	0.0	75.0	25.0	25.0
Middlesbrough	1	3	3	14.3	42.9	42.9	57.2
Milton Keynes	3	7	2	25.0	58.3	16.7	41.7
Newcastle upon Tyne	2	9	5	12.5	56.2	31.2	43.7
Newham	0	17	2	0.0	89.5	10.5	10.5
Norfolk	7	42	4	13.2	79.2	7.5	20.7
North East Lincolnshire	3	6	1	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0
North Lincolnshire	2	12	0	14.3	85.7	0.0	14.3
North Somerset	3	6	2	27.3	54.5	18.2	45.5
North Tyneside	3	12	1	18.8	75.0	6.2	25.0
North Yorkshire	11	29	2	26.2	69.0	4.8	31.0
Northamptonshire	6	34	1	14.6	82.9	2.4	17.0
Northumberland	11	30	1	26.2	71.4	2.4	28.6
Nottingham	2	10	4	12.5	62.5	25.0	37.5
Nottinghamshire	8	35	3	17.4	76.1	6.5	23.9
Oldham	3	10	1	21.4	71.4	7.1	28.5
Oxfordshire	8	27	3	21.1	71.1	7.9	29.0
Peterborough	2	10	0	16.7	83.3	0.0	16.7
Plymouth	3	13	3	15.8	68.4	15.8	31.6
Poole	4	3	2	44.4	33.3	22.2	66.6
Portsmouth	1	8	1	10.0	80.0	10.0	20.0
Reading	3	4	3	30.0	40.0	30.0	60.0
Redbridge	2	16	0	11.1	88.9	0.0	11.1
Redcar and Cleveland	2	8	0	20.0	80.0	0.0	20.0
Richmond upon Thames	1	9	0	10.0	90.0	0.0	10.0
Rochdale	0	12	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Rotherham	1	14	1	6.2	87.5	6.2	12.4
Rutland	1	2	0	33.3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Salford	3	10	2	20.0	66.7	13.3	33.3
Sandwell	1	17	0	5.6	94.4	0.0	5.6
Sefton	4	15	0	21.1	78.9	0.0	21.1
Sheffield	2	23	2	7.4	85.2	7.4	14.8
Shropshire	5	16	0	23.8	76.2	0.0	23.8
Slough	4	8	2	28.6	57.1	14.3	42.9
Solihull	4	10	0	28.6	71.4	0.0	28.6
Somerset	8	29	1	21.1	76.3	2.6	23.7
South Gloucestershire	4	14	0	22.2	77.8	0.0	22.2
South Tyneside	2	6	1	22.2	66.7	11.1	33.3
Southampton	1	8	3	8.3	66.7	25.0	33.3
Southend-on-Sea	5	5	2	41.7	41.7	16.7	58.4
Southwark	5	10	3	27.8	55.6	16.7	44.5
St. Helens	3	5	1	33.3	55.6	11.1	44.4
Staffordshire	17	52	1	24.3	74.3	1.4	25.7
Stockport	1	11	1	7.7	84.6	7.7	15.4
Stockton-on-Tees	3	8	2	23.1	61.5	15.4	38.5
Stoke-on-Trent	1	15	0	6.2	93.8	0.0	6.2
Suffolk	3	44	2	6.1	89.8	4.1	10.2
Sunderland	3	12	3	16.7	66.7	16.7	33.4
Surrey	12	40	3	21.8	72.7	5.5	27.3
Sutton	6	7	1	42.9	50.0	7.1	50.0
Swindon	3	8	1	25.0	66.7	8.3	33.3
Tameside	3	12	0	20.0	80.0	0.0	20.0
Telford and Wrekin	4	9	0	30.8	69.2	0.0	30.8
Thurrock	1	6	3	10.0	60.0	30.0	40.0
Torbay	3	6	0	33.3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Tower Hamlets	1	15	1	5.9	88.2	5.9	11.8
Trafford	7	10	1	38.9	55.6	5.6	44.5
Wakefield	3	14	1	16.7	77.8	5.6	22.3
Walsall	3	13	3	15.8	68.4	15.8	31.6
Waltham Forest	0	17	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Wandsworth	1	9	1	9.1	81.8	9.1	18.2
Warrington	5	6	2	38.5	46.2	15.4	53.9
Warwickshire	11	23	1	31.4	65.7	2.9	34.3
West Berkshire	2	8	0	20.0	80.0	0.0	20.0
West Sussex	7	32	2	17.1	78.0	4.9	22.0
Westminster	2	9	0	18.2	81.8	0.0	18.2
Wigan	4	13	2	21.1	68.4	10.5	31.6
Wiltshire	7	22	1	23.3	73.3	3.3	26.6
Windsor and Maidenhead	1	12	1	7.1	85.7	7.1	14.2
Wirral	7	12	2	33.3	57.1	9.5	42.8
Wokingham	2	7	0	22.2	77.8	0.0	22.2
Wolverhampton	2	16	1	10.5	84.2	5.3	15.8
Worcestershire	8	34	3	17.8	75.6	6.7	24.5
York	1	6	2	11.1	66.7	22.2	33.3

FSM Analysis by Local Authority Area: 2011 to 2016: Secondary Schools 2011

2011 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Barking and Dagenham	1	8	0	11.1	88.9	0.0	11.1
Barnet	5	13	5	21.7	56.5	21.7	43.4
Barnsley	0	12	1	0.0	92.3	7.7	7.7
Bath and North East Somerset	2	9	2	15.4	69.2	15.4	30.8
Bedford	4	14	4	18.2	63.6	18.2	36.4
Bexley	6	8	2	37.5	50.0	12.5	50.0
Birmingham	15	45	16	19.7	59.2	21.1	40.8
Blackburn with Darwen	2	7	1	20.0	70.0	10.0	30.0
Blackpool	0	6	2	0.0	75.0	25.0	25.0
Bolton	4	12	1	23.5	70.6	5.9	29.4
Bournemouth	2	7	1	20.0	70.0	10.0	30.0
Bracknell Forest	2	2	2	33.3	33.3	33.3	66.6
Bradford	4	22	2	14.3	78.6	7.1	21.4
Brent	3	11	1	20.0	73.3	6.7	26.7
Brighton and Hove	0	8	1	0.0	88.9	11.1	11.1
Bristol City of	4	11	5	20.0	55.0	25.0	45.0
Bromley	5	10	2	29.4	58.8	11.8	41.2
Buckinghamshire	13	14	5	40.6	43.8	15.6	56.2
Bury	4	9	1	28.6	64.3	7.1	35.7
Calderdale	4	8	2	28.6	57.1	14.3	42.9
Cambridgeshire	1	28	1	3.3	93.3	3.3	6.6
Camden	1	8	0	11.1	88.9	0.0	11.1
Central Bedfordshire	13	18	2	39.4	54.5	6.1	45.5
Cheshire East	7	11	2	35.0	55.0	10.0	45.0
Cheshire West and Chester	5	10	4	26.3	52.6	21.1	47.4
Cornwall	2	29	0	6.5	93.5	0.0	6.5
Coventry	4	13	2	21.1	68.4	10.5	31.6
Croydon	6	11	5	27.3	50.0	22.7	50.0
Cumbria	8	26	3	21.6	70.3	8.1	29.7
Darlington	0	6	1	0.0	85.7	14.3	14.3
Derby	3	10	1	21.4	71.4	7.1	28.5
Derbyshire	8	36	2	17.4	78.3	4.3	21.7
Devon	3	34	0	8.1	91.9	0.0	8.1
Doncaster	3	13	1	17.6	76.5	5.9	23.5
Dorset	4	28	2	11.8	82.4	5.9	17.7
Dudley	4	14	2	20.0	70.0	10.0	30.0
Durham	4	27	4	11.4	77.1	11.4	22.8
Ealing	2	11	0	15.4	84.6	0.0	15.4
East Riding of Yorkshire	8	9	1	44.4	50.0	5.6	50.0
East Sussex	4	19	4	14.8	70.4	14.8	29.6
Enfield	3	13	2	16.7	72.2	11.1	27.8
Essex	16	54	9	20.3	68.4	11.4	31.7
Gateshead	3	8	0	27.3	72.7	0.0	27.3
Gloucestershire	12	22	6	30.0	55.0	15.0	45.0
Greenwich	2	9	1	16.7	75.0	8.3	25.0
Hackney	1	11	0	8.3	91.7	0.0	8.3
Halton	0	5	2	0.0	71.4	28.6	28.6
Hammersmith and Fulham	3	1	4	37.5	12.5	50.0	87.5
Hampshire	18	46	7	25.4	64.8	9.9	35.3
Haringey	2	7	3	16.7	58.3	25.0	41.7
Harrow	1	7	3	9.1	63.6	27.3	36.4
Hartlepool	0	4	1	0.0	80.0	20.0	20.0
Havering	5	12	1	27.8	66.7	5.6	33.4
Herefordshire	1	13	1	6.7	86.7	6.7	13.4
Hertfordshire	23	48	9	28.7	60.0	11.2	39.9
Hillingdon	6	11	1	33.3	61.1	5.6	38.9
Hounslow	1	13	0	7.1	92.9	0.0	7.1
Isle of Wight	0	18	1	0.0	94.7	5.3	5.3
Islington	0	9	1	0.0	90.0	10.0	10.0
Kensington and Chelsea	1	4	0	20.0	80.0	0.0	20.0
Kent	34	53	11	34.7	54.1	11.2	45.9
Kingston upon Hull City of	1	9	4	7.1	64.3	28.6	35.7
Kingston upon Thames	3	6	1	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0
Kirklees	8	20	3	25.8	64.5	9.7	35.5
Knowsley	0	5	2	0.0	71.4	28.6	28.6
Lambeth	2	9	4	13.3	60.0	26.7	40.0
Lancashire	22	51	8	27.2	63.0	9.9	37.1
Leeds	11	21	6	28.9	55.3	15.8	44.7
Leicester	2	14	2	11.1	77.8	11.1	22.2
Leicestershire	20	32	2	37.0	59.3	3.7	40.7
Lewisham	0	14	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Lincolnshire	19	32	7	32.8	55.2	12.1	44.9
Liverpool	6	17	6	20.7	58.6	20.7	41.4
Luton	0	12	1	0.0	92.3	7.7	7.7
Manchester	3	12	11	11.5	46.2	42.3	53.8

2011 LOCAL AUTHORITY	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS BY PROPORTION OF FSM PUPILS			
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW + HIGH
Medway	6	10	1	35.3	58.8	5.9	41.2
Merton	1	7	0	12.5	87.5	0.0	12.5
Middlesbrough	0	4	3	0.0	57.1	42.9	42.9
Milton Keynes	3	7	2	25.0	58.3	16.7	41.7
Newcastle upon Tyne	2	9	3	14.3	64.3	21.4	35.7
Newham	1	12	2	6.7	80.0	13.3	20.0
Norfolk	7	38	6	13.7	74.5	11.8	25.5
North East Lincolnshire	3	6	1	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0
North Lincolnshire	2	10	1	15.4	76.9	7.7	23.1
North Somerset	3	6	1	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0
North Tyneside	4	11	1	25.0	68.8	6.2	31.2
North Yorkshire	12	32	3	25.5	68.1	6.4	31.9
Northamptonshire	13	28	1	31.0	66.7	2.4	33.4
Northumberland	11	36	2	22.4	73.5	4.1	26.5
Nottingham	1	8	5	7.1	57.1	35.7	42.8
Nottinghamshire	14	30	1	31.1	66.7	2.2	33.3
Oldham	5	5	3	38.5	38.5	23.1	61.6
Oxfordshire	3	29	2	8.8	85.3	5.9	14.7
Peterborough	2	9	0	18.2	81.8	0.0	18.2
Plymouth	7	5	4	43.8	31.2	25.0	68.8
Poole	4	3	2	44.4	33.3	22.2	66.6
Portsmouth	1	7	2	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0
Reading	2	3	2	28.6	42.9	28.6	57.2
Redbridge	3	13	1	17.6	76.5	5.9	23.5
Redcar and Cleveland	4	6	1	36.4	54.5	9.1	45.5
Richmond upon Thames	0	8	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Rochdale	0	10	2	0.0	83.3	16.7	16.7
Rotherham	2	12	2	12.5	75.0	12.5	25.0
Rutland	2	1	0	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7
Salford	3	9	3	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0
Sandwell	3	14	0	17.6	82.4	0.0	17.6
Sefton	4	15	1	20.0	75.0	5.0	25.0
Sheffield	3	21	3	11.1	77.8	11.1	22.2
Shropshire	6	16	0	27.3	72.7	0.0	27.3
Slough	4	6	1	36.4	54.5	9.1	45.5
Solihull	8	6	0	57.1	42.9	0.0	57.1
Somerset	5	30	2	13.5	81.1	5.4	18.9
South Gloucestershire	6	10	0	37.5	62.5	0.0	37.5
South Tyneside	1	6	2	11.1	66.7	22.2	33.3
Southampton	0	8	4	0.0	66.7	33.3	33.3
Southend-on-Sea	4	6	2	33.3	50.0	16.7	50.0
Southwark	3	12	1	18.8	75.0	6.2	25.0
St. Helens	3	5	2	30.0	50.0	20.0	50.0
Staffordshire	19	48	2	27.5	69.6	2.9	30.4
Stockport	2	12	0	14.3	85.7	0.0	14.3
Stockton-on-Tees	3	8	1	25.0	66.7	8.3	33.3
Stoke-on-Trent	1	12	3	6.2	75.0	18.8	25.0
Suffolk	7	68	3	9.0	87.2	3.8	12.8
Sunderland	3	13	1	17.6	76.5	5.9	23.5
Surrey	11	39	3	20.8	73.6	5.7	26.5
Sutton	6	6	2	42.9	42.9	14.3	57.2
Swindon	4	6	1	36.4	54.5	9.1	45.5
Tameside	5	10	0	33.3	66.7	0.0	33.3
Telford and Wrekin	3	9	1	23.1	69.2	7.7	30.8
Thurrock	2	5	3	20.0	50.0	30.0	50.0
Torbay	3	5	0	37.5	62.5	0.0	37.5
Tower Hamlets	3	10	2	20.0	66.7	13.3	33.3
Trafford	7	10	1	38.9	55.6	5.6	44.5
Wakefield	2	14	2	11.1	77.8	11.1	22.2
Walsall	4	10	5	21.1	52.6	26.3	47.4
Waltham Forest	0	15	1	0.0	93.8	6.2	6.2
Wandsworth	1	9	1	9.1	81.8	9.1	18.2
Warrington	5	5	2	41.7	41.7	16.7	58.4
Warwickshire	14	20	1	40.0	57.1	2.9	42.9
West Berkshire	3	6	1	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0
West Sussex	5	32	1	13.2	84.2	2.6	15.8
Westminster	1	7	2	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0
Wigan	4	14	2	20.0	70.0	10.0	30.0
Wiltshire	5	22	1	17.9	78.6	3.6	21.5
Windsor and Maidenhead	2	11	0	15.4	84.6	0.0	15.4
Wirral	7	13	2	31.8	59.1	9.1	40.9
Wokingham	2	6	0	25.0	75.0	0.0	25.0
Wolverhampton	3	11	3	17.6	64.7	17.6	35.2
Worcestershire	8	33	4	17.8	73.3	8.9	26.7
York	2	5	3	20.0	50.0	30.0	50.0



The Challenge is the UK's leading charity for building a more socially integrated society. We design and deliver programmes that bring different people together to develop their confidence and skills in understanding and connecting with others. The Challenge worked with the government to design National Citizen Service and is now a major provider of the programme – delivering places in London, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and beyond.

We also develop policy ideas to forge a more integrated Britain. During 2014 and 2015, we convened the Social Integration Commission. Following the Commission's conclusion, we set up the All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Social Integration, which is chaired by Chuka Umunna MP.

www.the-challenge.org

the iCoCo foundation

interculturalism, community cohesion

Professor Ted Cattle is the founder of the the Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo), the UK's leading authority on community cohesion and intercultural relations. In 2001 he was appointed by the Home Secretary to Chair the Community Cohesion Review Team and to lead the review the causes of the summer disturbances in a number of northern towns and cities. The "Cattle Report" was produced in December 2001 and made around 70 recommendations. Over the last ten years he has worked with local authorities, the voluntary sector, schools, governmental departments as well as the business sector and other agencies. He was the Chief Executive of Nottingham City Council between 1990 and 2001 and is currently chair of the Nottingham Castle Trust. He is also visiting professor at Nottingham Trent University and the University of Nottingham and has honorary doctorates from Oxford Brookes and Portsmouth Universities.

www.icocofoundation.com



SchoolDash is an education data analytics company, that provides insights for anyone interested in the achievements and activities of the nation's schools: educators, charities, companies, journalists, policy-makers, school governors, teachers, students and parents.

www.schooldash.com

