



**Exclusions and Special Educational Needs
across Milton Keynes mainstream secondary schools**

July 2022



Foreword

It is well-known that children with special needs are disproportionately excluded from mainstream schools. Each exclusion can be considered the result of a failure: a failure to provide adequate support, a failure of the child to behave in a manner appropriate to the setting, and / or a failure of the child to cope with the school environment or factors external to the school.

We found that there is a huge difference in the rate of exclusion between different schools, for children with no special needs, for those on “SEN Support” and for those with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP). Within each category, the difference in exclusion rates between the lowest-excluding and the highest-excluding schools was around 100 for children with no SEN or those on SEN support, and greater than 100 for those with an EHCP.

This difference between schools was only weakly linked to rates of community poverty as measured by the proportion of children eligible for free school meals. So external factors, as measured by a standard indicator, cannot account for such a large average difference in exclusion rates.

So, where does this difference in the rate of exclusions come from? Is it likely, on average, that children in some schools are 100x less able to control their behaviour? Or that their support is 100x less effective? This is highly unlikely – while these might be factors, they surely cannot explain such large disparities in rates of exclusion. Instead, this evidence points to differences in school policy – in other words, the rate of exclusion is a choice that each school makes, whether explicitly or implicitly. If the effectiveness of support were also a factor, this could obviously also point to differences in school management.

Here, we have categorised schools’ “attitude to exclusion” as high, medium or low excluders, reflecting clear differences in policy towards those with no SEN, with special needs, and especially those with an EHCP. We have given each school an opportunity to verify and explain their numbers – they are all on a journey, and some have different starting points. We hope that this report will inspire them to share best practice across Milton Keynes.

This report is full of statistics – schools are often data led – but behind each statistic are people. Children with special needs and disabilities who were prevented from attending school, sometimes for long periods. Families who had to drop everything to look after them, or risk leaving them on their own. This report is also for them.

Introduction

Children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) are well-known to be disproportionately excluded from school. This includes those on “SEN Support”, who are supported and funded from within a school’s delegated budget, and those with an EHCP (Education, Health and Care Plan), whose additional needs are met using top-up funding from the Local Authority (LA).

Some people might consider that exclusions are an unavoidable consequence of challenging behaviour that results from a child’s needs or disability. However, here lies a paradox. On the one hand, the exclusion of those with special needs, especially those with an EHCP, is often considered an indicator of unmet need. On the other hand, and specifically following a ruling on the matter in August 2018, the Equality Act effectively requires a school to meet a child’s needs in an anticipatory manner before it can impose an exclusion. Otherwise, to punish a child and withdraw their education, for reasons that flow from their disability and without having met their needs in a way that could have prevented the exclusion, is to discriminate against them.

So how can an exclusion be an indicator of unmet need, if the need has to be met before the exclusion is lawful? Surely this can only be the case if the exclusion had nothing to do with the child’s special needs. If that were the case, the rates of exclusion for those with and without SEND would be similar. But those rates are different, therefore there must be a substantial number of exclusions for those with SEND that may have been “open to challenge”.

Additionally, schools are required to consider the impact of the exclusion on those considered vulnerable to being removed from familiar routines and settings. One would therefore expect the length of fixed term exclusion (FTE) to be shorter for those with SEND. As we will see, in some schools it is shorter, but in others it is longer.

Although parents can challenge exclusions where needs have not been met, the process is time-consuming and ideally requires specialist support, for example from legal practices or SENDIAS. It can take 6 months for a case to go before a tribunal, by which time the damage has been done.

Our message to schools

This report shows that school exclusions are not an unavoidable consequence of behavioural issues, whether related to SEND or not. Some schools manage pupil behaviour without significant recourse to exclusion, either fixed term or permanent. We encourage the leaders of other schools to learn from this and develop alternative approaches. One school excluded pupils at an average rate of 1-2 exclusions per day, others at one every 2 days. Since only the Head Teacher can make the decision to exclude, how can they scrutinise the circumstances of each exclusion? Do they have time to take account of the SEND factors that might underpin an incident leading to an exclusion, as required by the statutory guidance? Surely there is a better way, one that is inclusive without compromising behavioural standards - the difference lies in how those standards are achieved.

Our message to parents

Schools’ behaviour policies are typically vague about their procedures and considerations regarding exclusion, especially with regard to SEND. No school’s prospectus will tell you that it excludes more pupils than any other in Milton Keynes, although this data is at least already in the public domain. You will not find information on an individual school’s propensity to exclude pupils with special needs. This report fills that gap. And as we see here, the difference between individual schools is vast.

No parent sends their child to school in the expectation that challenging behaviour will be the result, and therefore to choose a school purely on the basis of exclusion data would be absurd. However, a school’s exclusion data does offer a window into its approach to the support and inclusion of pupils with SEND. And should the worst happen, and a child is excluded, the report provides evidence of a school’s recent track record on exclusions, benchmarked against comparable schools. This may be helpful when challenging an individual exclusion.

Exclusion League Tables

To illustrate the differences between schools, we have presented our data in the form of league tables, with the highest excluders at the top and the lowest at the bottom. A Freedom of Information request to MK Council yielded a list of exclusions for each of the schools over a 5-year period (academic year 2015/16 to year 2019/20). Aggregating the data over a 5-year period has provided a larger total number of exclusions than would be the case for only one year's data, with more reliable and statistically significant calculations of exclusion rates.

The focus of this report is the over-exclusion of pupils with special needs, whether they are on SEN Support or have an EHCP. The rate of exclusion for those without SEN is also included as an important benchmark.

We included the following mainstream, state-funded secondary schools: Denbigh School, The Hazeley Academy, Sir Herbert Leon Academy, Kents Hill Park School, Lord Grey Academy, The Milton Keynes Academy, Oakgrove School, Ousedale School, The Radcliffe School, Shenley Brook End School, Stantonbury International / Stantonbury School, St Paul's Catholic School, Walton High.

We considered only official exclusions, i.e. exclusions for which there has been a formal letter of notification. Unofficial exclusions are unlawful and there is no central record of them that we could analyse.

PACA's approach

Before publication, each school was given the opportunity to verify the data obtained from the Council and to offer an explanation for its approach. We sent a letter to each school, highlighting its own data and including the data from other schools in anonymised form and requesting that they verify the data, correct it if necessary and / or comment. None of the schools provided a written response by our deadline. We reminded them and provided a second deadline, which they also missed. At the time of publication, PACA had not received any written responses from schools other than acknowledgement of our email.

Next steps

PACA met with representatives of the schools, at their request, to discuss the issues raised by this report. We look forward to working with them in future on this important issue. Specifically, we discussed the possibility of working towards an agreed behaviour policy for secondary schools in Milton Keynes, which would help schools make appropriate decisions about exclusions and provide consistency across the city.

We encourage individuals and families who might be affected by the issues raised in this report to contact the sources of support listed on page 9.

Number of fixed term exclusions (FTE)

Schools were ranked according to the rate of exclusion of different groups, per 100 pupils per year. Clearly, the number of pupils with an EHCP in a school is lower than 100, and therefore the actual number of exclusions per year for this group is smaller than the number shown in League Table 1. Expressing the exclusion rates in this way allows us to compare the rate of exclusion for the pupils in each group.

Schools have been grouped together as “low excluders”, “medium excluders” and “high excluders” based on their exclusion rates. Schools’ colour coding reflects their standing in Table 1 for no SEN. The schools’ attitudes to exclusion are very similar for both non-SEN pupils and those on SEN Support. The over-exclusion of those on SEN Support scales with the rate of exclusion of non-SEN pupils, and consequently the league tables for both these groups are very similar. At the medium and high excluders, children on SEN support are generally over-excluded by a factor of between 3 and 6. Kents Hill Park are an outlier, but do not yet have pupils in all years and this might affect their figures.

For EHCP pupils, schools’ attitudes to exclusion diverge and there are schools that move significantly up and down the tables. Ousedale is the highest climber, with over 10x more exclusions for those with an EHCP. Herbert Leon, Stantonbury and Kents Hill Park all drop.

The table also shows that, for children with no SEN and those on SEN support, there was about a 100x difference between the rates of exclusion between the lowest-excluding school, (Hazeley, MK Academy) and the highest-excluding school (Herbert Leon). For children with an EHCP, the difference was greater because a number of schools did not exclude any children with an EHCP in the 5-year period.

League Table 1: Rates of exclusion (exclusions per 100 pupils per year)

<u>no SEN</u>	<u>SEN Support</u>	<u>EHCP</u>
High excluders	High excluders	High excluders
Herbert Leon 13.5	Herbert Leon 61.1	Ousedale 28.0
Stantonbury 12.6	Stantonbury 51.8	Radcliffe 27.6
Medium excluders	Kents Hill Park 46.6	Walton High 26.4
Radcliffe 6.7	Medium excluders	Medium excluders
Lord Grey 5.9	Radcliffe 24.3	St Paul's 18.9
Walton High 5.1	Walton High 22.7	Herbert Leon 18
Kents Hill Park 3.3	St Paul's 17.1	Lord Grey 15.5
St Paul's 3.0	Lord Grey 16.4	Stantonbury 10.5
Ousedale 2.7	Ousedale 10.6	Low excluders
Low excluders	Low excluders	Oakgrove 1.9
Shenley 0.5	Oakgrove 2.0	Shenley x
Oakgrove 0.3	Denbigh 1.6	Denbigh 0
MK Academy 0.1	Shenley 1.2	Hazeley 0
Denbigh 0.08	Hazeley 0.7*	Kents Hill Park 0
Hazeley 0.06*	MK Academy 0.7	MK Academy 0

* These figures are based on low numbers of actual exclusions (< 5 in total over 5 years).

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance (see below) as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

We have followed DfE guidance on the reporting of exclusions^[1], namely:

- Where there were 1 or 2 exclusions only, the rate is reported as “x” to protect confidentiality.
- Zero exclusions are reported as zero.

Average length of exclusion

As mentioned before, children with SEN are especially vulnerable to being out of school and can take longer to reintegrate once the exclusion is over. This particularly applies to children with an EHCP.

First, we looked at the average length of exclusion for each school. Many schools had shorter exclusions for those on SEN support than those without SEN. Some imposed longer exclusions, notably Denbigh, Hazeley, Kents Hill, Shenley, Walton High (though some schools in this list are very low excluders so this is based on relatively few exclusions). For those with an EHCP, most schools imposed similar or shorter exclusions. However, Lord Grey and Ousedale imposed significantly longer exclusions on this population.

League Table 2: Average length of exclusion in days

<u>no SEN</u>	<u>SEN Support</u>	<u>EHCP</u>
High excluders	High excluders	High excluders
Ousedale 3.1	Denbigh 3.8	Ousedale 3.9
Medium excluders	Medium excluders	Medium excluders
Radcliffe 2.6	Ousedale 2.9	Lord Grey 3.0
Walton High 2.5	Hazeley 2.9*	Radcliffe 2.5
St Paul's 2.5	Shenley 2.7	St Paul's 2.3
Shenley 2.4	Walton High 2.7	Oakgrove 2.2
Oakgrove 2.3	St Paul's 2.5	Walton High 2.1
Stantonbury 2.2	Radcliffe 2.4	Shenley x
Lord Grey 2.1	Oakgrove 2.3*	Herbert Leon 1.9
MK Academy 1.9	Stantonbury 2.1	Stantonbury 1.9
Low excluders	Lord Grey 2.1	Low excluders
Hazeley 1.5*	MK Academy 2.0	Denbigh 0
Herbert Leon 1.5	Kents Hill Park 1.8	Hazeley 0
Denbigh 1.3	Low excluders	Kents Hill Park 0
Kents Hill Park 1.3	Herbert Leon 1.4	MK Academy 0

* These figures are based on low numbers of actual exclusions (< 5 in total over 5 years).

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance (see above) as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

Total number of days out of school

We ranked schools by the average number of excluded days per 100 pupils per year (the exclusion day rate – the number of exclusions multiplied by the length of each exclusion, as an average per 100 pupils). Colour coding remains the same as League Table 1, and schools have been grouped into high, medium and low excluders.

Again, the rankings are more similar for children with no SEN and those on SEN support. At medium and high – excluding schools, the total number of excluded days was generally between 3 and 6 times for those on SEN support than for those with no SEN. Again, Kents Hill Park are an outlier (19 times) but did not have a full school.

School attitudes to exclusion diverge for children with an EHCP; some have no exclusions whereas others see significantly increased rates of exclusion when measured by the number of days of education lost. This was especially true for Ousedale, where EHCP children were excluded at 13 times the exclusion rate for no SEN.

League Table 3: Number of excluded days (per 100 pupils per year)

<u>no SEN</u>	<u>SEN Support</u>	<u>EHCP</u>
High excluders	High excluders	High excluders
Stantonbury 27.4	Stantonbury 110.5	Ousedale 109.1
Medium excluders	Herbert Leon 85.2	Medium excluders
Herbert Leon 19.7	Kents Hill Park 83.6	Radcliffe 70.1
Radcliffe 17.2	Medium excluders	Walton High 56.6
Walton High 12.8	Walton High 60.3	Lord Grey 46.4
Lord Grey 12.6	Radcliffe 59.2	St Paul's 44.1
Ousedale 8.5	St Paul's 43.6	Herbert Leon 34.0
St Paul's 7.4	Lord Grey 33.8	Stantonbury 26.8
Kents Hill Park 4.3	Ousedale 31.0	Low excluders
Low excluders	Low excluders	Oakgrove 4.0
Shenley 1.1	Denbigh 5.9	Shenley x
Oakgrove 0.7	Oakgrove 4.5	Denbigh 0
MK Academy 0.23	Shenley 3.2	Hazeley 0
Denbigh 0.11	Hazeley 2.1*	Kents Hill Park 0
Hazeley 0.09*	MK Academy 1.4	MK Academy 0

* These figures are based on low numbers of actual exclusions (< 5 in total over 5 years).

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance (see above) as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

Serious exclusions: FTE of over 5 days and permanent exclusions

We classified serious exclusions as permanent exclusions (Px) and those FTE that were imposed for more than 5 days. For the latter, schools must arrange education in an alternative setting, usually by agreement with another school. Such a change of routine and placement could be especially distressing for a child with an EHCP, especially those with sensory needs or a need for familiarity. Schools go to great lengths in planning the transition of pupils with an EHCP from primary to secondary, with additional visits and taster days, and plenty of time to adapt. In contrast, a rapid transition as a result of exclusion, either to an alternative setting for the remainder of a FTE or as a result of Px, would not have the same level of active planning and could be destabilising.

Number of FTE over 5 days

As shown in Table 4, many schools appear to have a clear policy of imposing no exclusions of over 5 days. Even more imposed no exclusions of over 5 days for EHCP pupils. One school (Ousedale) imposed more FTE of over 5 days than the rest of the schools put together. At Ousedale, compared to pupils with no SEN, those on SEN Support were over twice as likely to be excluded for >5 days and those with an EHCP were 20 times as likely.

League Table 4: Number of FTE over 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)

no SEN	SEN Support	EHCP
High excluders	High excluders	High excluders
Ousedale 0.23	Ousedale 0.65	Ousedale 4.55
Medium excluders	Medium excluders	Medium excluders
Lord Grey 0.08*	Herbert Leon x	Lord Grey x
Stantonbury 0.04*	Stantonbury 0.33	Low excluders
Radcliffe x	Denbigh x	Denbigh 0
Walton High x	Lord Grey x	Hazeley 0
Low excluders	Shenley x	Herbert Leon 0
Denbigh 0	Low excluders	Kents Hill Park 0
Hazeley 0	Hazeley 0	MK Academy 0
Herbert Leon 0	Kents Hill Park 0	Oakgrove 0
Kents Hill Park 0	MK Academy 0	Radcliffe 0
MK Academy 0	Oakgrove 0	Shenley 0
Oakgrove 0	Radcliffe 0	Stantonbury 0
Shenley 0	St Paul's 0	St Paul's 0
St Paul's 0	Walton High 0	Walton High 0

* These figures are based on low numbers of actual exclusions (< 5 in total over 5 years).

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance (see above) because there were only 1-2 actual exclusions.

Number of permanent exclusions

The number of permanent exclusions (Px) was very low, even when looked at over a 5-year period. League Table 5 reveals that many schools imposed no Px and those that did imposed them rarely: most schools imposed only 1 or 2 exclusions (and their exclusion rates are therefore reported as “x” in line with DfE guidance).

One school (MK Academy) had the highest rate of Px for both pupils with no SEN and pupils on SEN Support. This is notable because this school was only a medium excluder for FTE, and this indicates a difference in policy compared to most other schools. Only two other schools (Radcliffe and Stantonbury) had reportable rates of exclusion, for pupils with no SEN. Many schools had only 1-2 actual exclusions over a 5-year period, which means rates cannot be reported.

We have therefore added an average rate of exclusion for all the schools. This reveals that overall, the rate of permanent exclusion for children on SEN Support was over 4x that of children with no SEN. For pupils with an EHCP, a zero rate of exclusion may be possible because there is an alternative mechanism, which is to review the EHCP and work with parents and the LA to move the child to a different school.

League Table 5: Number of permanent exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)

no SEN	SEN Support	EHCP
High excluders	High excluders	
MK Academy 0.14	MK Academy 0.40	
Radcliffe 0.10	Hazeley x	Low excluders
Medium excluders	Radcliffe 0.36	Denbigh 0
Stantonbury 0.05	Medium excluders	Hazeley 0
Herbert Leon x	Denbigh x	Herbert Leon 0
Lord Grey x	Ousedale x	Kents Hill Park 0
Walton High x	Low excluders	Lord Grey 0
Oakgrove x	Herbert Leon 0	MK Academy 0
Ousedale x	Kents Hill Park 0	Oakgrove 0
Hazeley x	Lord Grey 0	Ousedale 0
Low excluders	Oakgrove 0	Radcliffe 0
Denbigh 0	Shenley 0	Shenley 0
Kents Hill Park 0	Stantonbury 0	Stantonbury 0
Shenley 0	St Paul's 0	St Paul's 0
St Paul's 0	Walton High 0	Walton High 0
<i>Average for all schools above</i> 0.035	<i>Average for all schools above</i> 0.16	<i>Average for all schools above</i> 0

* These figures are based on low numbers of actual exclusions (< 5 in total over 5 years).

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance (see above) because there were only 1-2 actual exclusions.

References

[1] UK Department for Education. A guide to exclusion statistics, 2017. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/exclusions-statistics-guide>

Sources of support

ACE Education

<http://www.ace-ed.org.uk/advice-about-education-for-parents/exclusion-from-school>

Advice to parents and carers regarding school exclusions

Autism Education Trust

<https://www.autismeducationtrust.org.uk/exclusions>

Includes the following documents, which can also be applied to other forms of SEND:

- Steps to Avoid Exclusion of Autistic Pupils
- Successful Reintegration of Autistic Pupils Following School Exclusion
- A guide to equality law, rights and entitlements when a child is excluded or at risk of exclusion
- A guide to help governing boards (and indeed headteachers) comply with equality law when considering a headteacher's decision to exclude an autistic pupil. This can also be used by parents if they wish to challenge an exclusion.

Coram Children's Legal Centre

<https://www.childrenslegalcentre.com/>

Department for Education Statutory Guidance

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/921405/20170831_Exclusion_Stat_guidance_Web_version.pdf

Milton Keynes Council Guidance on Exclusions

<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/schools-and-lifelong-learning/information-for-schools/school-exclusions>

Includes a headteacher's checklist for the exclusion of pupils with SEND, designed to help protect schools from claims of discrimination.

National Autistic Society Exclusion Advice Line

<https://www.autism.org.uk/what-we-do/help-and-support/school-exclusion-service>

Advice to families on all aspects of exclusion from school.

Parents and Carers Alliance MK

<http://www.pacamk.org/>

School Exclusions Hub

<https://www.justforkidslaw.org/school-exclusions-hub>

The School Exclusion Project

<https://schoolexclusionproject.com/>

MK SENDIAS

<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/schools-and-lifelong-learning/special-educational-needs/mk-special-educational-needs-and-disability-information-advice-and-support-service>

Appendix A: Data for individual schools

Denbigh School URN 136468, LA reference 5410.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, with a Good rating for pupil behaviour.

Denbigh	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1360	80	15
2016-17	1440	105	15
2017-18	1477	105	17
2018-19	1565	109	23
2019-20	1623	115	23
Total (pupil years)	7465	514	93
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	6	8	0
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	0.08	1.6	0
The school was a low excluder. SEN Support pupils were 19x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN. However, these figures are based on relatively low rates overall. EHCP pupils were not excluded.			
Total number of excluded days	8	30.5	0
Average length of each exclusion (days)	1.3	3.8	-
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	0.1	5.9	0
The average exclusion for SEN support pupils was 3x longer than for non-SEN pupils SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 55x more days overall than non-SEN pupils However, these figures are based on relatively low rates overall.			
Number of FTE > 5days	0	x	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0	x	x
The school had very few exclusions of over 5 days.			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	0	x	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	0	x	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

The Hazeley Academy URN 136844, LA reference 4704.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, with a Good rating for pupil behaviour.

The Hazeley Academy	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1245	160	30
2016-17	1305	105	35
2017-18	1324	101	34
2018-19	1368	94	29
2019-20	1416	89	28
Total (pupil years)	6658	549	156
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	4	4	0
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	0.06	0.73	0
The school was a low excluder. SEN Support pupils were 12x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN. EHCP pupils were not excluded.			
Total number of excluded days	6	11.5	0
Average length of each exclusion (days)	1.5	2.9	-
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	0.1	2.1	0.0
On average, an exclusion for SEN support pupils was 2x longer than for non-SEN pupils Overall, SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 23x more days overall than non-SEN pupils			
Number of FTE > 5days	0	0	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0	0	0
The school had no exclusions of over 5 days			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	x	x	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	x	x	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request, but we did receive an acknowledgement of our email.

Sir Herbert Leon Academy URN 138439, LA reference 4002.

The latest Ofsted rating was Requires Improvement, with a Good rating for pupil behaviour.

Sir Herbert Leon Academy	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	550	110	10
2016-17	530	120	15
2017-18	490	109	6
2018-19	494	118	7
2019-20	489	98	12
Total (pupil years)	2553	555	50
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	345	339	9
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	13.5	61.1	18.0
The school was a high excluder of those with no SEN or on SEN Support; in fact, the highest excluder of these pupils in Milton Keynes. It was a medium excluder of those with an EHCP. SEN Support pupils were 4.5x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN. EHCP pupils were 1.3x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN			
Total number of excluded days	502	473	17
Average length of exclusion (days)	1.5	1.4	1.9
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	19.7	85.2	34.0
The average length of an exclusion was relatively short, but around 0.5 days longer for those with an EHCP. SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 4.3x more days overall than non-SEN pupils, and those with an EHCP for 1.7x more days			
Number of FTE > 5days	0	x	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0	x	0
There were very few exclusions of over 5 days			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	x	0	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	x	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

Kents Hill Park School URN 145063, LA reference 4004.

At the time of writing, the school had not yet been inspected by Ofsted.

Kents Hill Park School	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	0	0	
2016-17	0	0	
2017-18	0	0	
2018-19	120	25	3
2019-20	275	48	8
Total (pupil years)	395	73	11
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	13	34	0
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	3.3	46.6	0
The school was a medium excluder of those with no SEN, a high excluder of those on SEN support and a low excluder of those with an EHCP. SEN Support pupils were 14x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN. EHCP pupils were not excluded.			
Total number of excluded days	17	61	0
Average length of exclusion (days)	1.3	1.8	-
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	4.3	83.6	0
On average, each exclusion for SEN support pupils was 0.5 days longer than for non-SEN pupils SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 19x more days overall than non-SEN pupils			
Number of FTE > 5days	0	0	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0	0	0
There were no exclusions of over 5 days			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	0	0	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	0	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

Lord Grey Academy

Data from two schools have been combined over the 5 year period:

Lord Grey School, URN 110531, LA reference 5405.

Lord Grey Academy, URN 145736, LA reference 4005

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, with a Good rating for pupil behaviour.

Lord Grey Academy	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1200	195	20
2016-17	1165	200	15
2017-18	1171	228	18
2018-19	1180	224	19
2019-20	1197	230	25
Total (pupil years)	5913	1077	97
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	351	177	15
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	5.9	16.4	15.5
The school was a medium excluder of all groups. SEN Support pupils were 2.8x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN, and those with an EHCP were 2.6 times as likely.			
Total number of excluded days	743	364	45
Average length of exclusion (days)	2.1	2.1	3.0
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	12.6	33.8	46.4
The average length of exclusion was medium for those without SEN and with SEN support, but 0.9 days longer for those with an EHCP SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 2.7x more days overall than non-SEN pupils, and those with an EHCP for 3.7x more days.			
Number of FTE > 5days	5	x	x
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0.08	x	x
The school had a medium number of exclusions of over 5 days for those with no SEN, and low numbers for those with SEN. Relative rates of exclusion can't be calculated.			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	x	0	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	x	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

The Milton Keynes Academy URN 135665, LA reference 6905.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, with a Good rating for pupil behaviour.

The Milton Keynes Academy	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1020	255	15
2016-17	980	260	15
2017-18	1057	136	8
2018-19	1057	146	5
2019-20	972	208	6
Total (pupil years)	5086	1005	49
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	6	7	0
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	0.1	0.7	0
The school was a low excluder. SEN Support pupils were 6x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN. EHCP pupils were not excluded.			
Total number of excluded days	11.5	14	0
Average length of exclusion (days)	1.9	2.0	-
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	0.2	1.4	0
Average lengths of exclusion were similar across all groups SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 6x more days overall than non-SEN pupils			
Number of FTE > 5days	0	0	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0	0	0
There were no exclusions of over 5 days			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	7	4	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	0.14	0.40	0
There was a high rate of permanent exclusion for those with no SEN or on SEN support. Those on SEN support were 2.9x more likely to be permanently excluded than those with no SEN.			

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

Oakgrove School URN 136454, LA reference 4703.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, with an Outstanding rating for pupil behaviour.

Oakgrove School	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1315	50	30
2016-17	1600	70	35
2017-18	1779	74	35
2018-19	1923	92	29
2019-20	2001	117	33
Total (pupil years)	8618	403	162
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	28	8	3
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	0.3	2.0	1.9
The school was a low excluder. SEN Support pupils were 6.1x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN, and EHCP pupils were 5.7x as likely to be excluded.			
Total number of excluded days	63	18	6.5
Average length of exclusion (days)	2.25	2.25	2.17
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	0.7	4.5	4.0
On average, an exclusion for SEN support pupils was for the same number of days as for non-SEN pupils and slightly shorter for EHCP pupils. SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 6.1x more days overall than non-SEN pupils, and EHCP pupils for 5.5 times more days.			
Number of FTE > 5days	0	0	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0	0	0
There were no exclusions of over 5 days.			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	x	0	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	x	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

Ousedale School URN 137052, LA reference 4018.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, with a Good rating for pupil behaviour.

Ousedale School	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1995	180	25
2016-17	1960	215	30
2017-18	1936	236	23
2018-19	1927	228	24
2019-20	1908	225	30
Total (pupil years)	9726	1084	132
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	267	115	37
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	2.7	10.6	28.0
The school was a medium excluder of pupils with no SEN or SEN support. It was a high excluder of pupils with an EHCP; in fact, the highest in Milton Keynes. SEN Support pupils were 3.9x as likely to be excluded as those with no SEN and those with an EHCP were 10.2x as likely. The disparity in exclusion rates between pupils with an EHCP and those without SEN, or those on SEN support, was significantly greater than for any other school.			
Total number of excluded days	828	336	144
Average length of exclusion (days)	3.10	2.92	3.89
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	8.5	31.0	109.1
On average, an exclusion for EHCP pupils was 0.79 days longer than for non-SEN pupils, however those on SEN support were excluded for shorter periods. SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 3.6x more days overall than non-SEN pupils, and those with an EHCP for 12.8x as long. Again, the disparity for those with an EHCP was significantly higher than for any other school.			
Number of FTE > 5days	22	7	6
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0.23	0.65	4.55
The school imposed more exclusion of over 5 days than the rest of the schools put together. Children on SEN support were 2.9x more likely to be excluded for over 5 days than those with no SEN, and those with an EHCP were over 20x more likely.			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	x	x	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	x	x	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

The Radcliffe School URN 110532, LA reference 5406.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, with a Good rating for pupil behaviour.

The Radcliffe School	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	945	220	25
2016-17	1010	185	30
2017-18	1017	158	28
2018-19	1032	136	22
2019-20	1029	142	22
Total (pupil years)	5033	841	127
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	335	204	35
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	6.7	24.3	27.6
The school was a medium excluder of pupils with no SEN or on SEN support, and a high excluder of those with an EHCP. SEN Support pupils were 3.6x more likely to be excluded than those with no SEN, and pupils with an EHCP were 4.1x more likely.			
Total number of excluded days	867	498	89
Average length of exclusion (days)	2.60	2.44	2.54
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	17.2	59.2	70.1
On average, the length of each exclusion was similar across all groups. SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 3.4x more days overall than non-SEN pupils, and EHCP pupils for 4.1x more days.			
Number of FTE > 5days	x	0	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	x	0	0
The rate of exclusions over 5 days was very low for those with no SEN, and zero for pupils with SEN.			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	5	3	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	0.10	0.36	0
The rate of permanent exclusion for those with no SEN and those on SEN support was relatively high, with those on SEN support 3.6x more likely to be permanently excluded.			

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

Shenley Brook End School URN 136730, LA reference 4097.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, with a Good rating for pupil behaviour.

Shenley Brook End School	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1420	145	15
2016-17	1420	160	15
2017-18	1464	179	15
2018-19	1533	146	10
2019-20	1639	125	14
Total (pupil years)	7476	755	69
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	34	9	x
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	0.5	1.2	x
The school was a low excluder. SEN Support pupils were 2.6x more likely to be excluded than those with no SEN. Exclusion rates for those with an EHCP were based on too few exclusions to be calculated.			
Total number of excluded days	82	24	x
Average length of exclusion (days)	2.41	2.67	x
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	1.1	3.2	x
On average, an exclusion for SEN support pupils was 0.26 days longer than for non-SEN pupils. The length for those with an EHCP was based on too few exclusions to be calculated. SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 2.9 more days overall than non-SEN pupils.			
Number of FTE > 5days	0	x	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0	x	0
There were zero exclusions of over 5 days for non-SEN pupils or those with an EHCP, and for those on SEN support the exclusion rate was very low.			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	0	0	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	0	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

Stantonbury International URN 143134, LA reference 4003.

And URN 110526, LA reference 5400

The latest Ofsted rating was Inadequate, with an Inadequate rating for pupil behaviour.

Stantonbury International	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1700	105	30
2016-17	1560	155	25
2017-18	1434	191	21
2018-19	1374	213	20
2019-20	1385	238	18
Total (pupil years)	7453	902	114
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	941	467	12
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	12.6	51.8	10.5
The school was a high excluder of those with no SEN and on SEN support, and a medium excluder of those with an EHCP. SEN Support pupils were 4.1x more likely to be excluded than those with no SEN, and those with an EHCP were 0.8x as likely (ie were less likely).			
Total number of excluded days	2038.5	996.5	22.5
Average length of exclusion (days)	2.17	2.13	1.88
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	27.4	110.5	19.7
On average, the length of an exclusion for those with SEN support pupils was similar to one for those with no SEN. Exclusions for those with an EHCP were around 0.3 days shorter. SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 4x more days overall than non-SEN pupils, and pupils with an EHCP for 0.7x as many days.			
Number of FTE > 5days	3	3	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0.04	0.33	0
Exclusions of over 5 days were low for those with no SEN and on SEN support, and zero for those with an EHCP. The rate of exclusion for those on SEN support was 8.3x that for those with no SEN.			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	4	0	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	0.07	0	0
There was a medium rate of permanent exclusion for those with no SEN, while the rate was zero for those with SEN.			

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

St Paul's Catholic School URN 110517, LA reference 4702.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, and the latest rating for behaviour was Outstanding.

St Paul's Catholic School	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1690	50	65
2016-17	1515	225	55
2017-18	1508	234	46
2018-19	1510	236	47
2019-20	1474	317	57
Total (pupil years)	7697	1062	270
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	232	182	51
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	3.0	17.1	18.9
The school was a medium excluder. SEN Support pupils were 5.7x more likely to be excluded than those with no SEN, and those with an EHCP were 6.3x more likely.			
Total number of excluded days	571.5	463.5	119
Average length of exclusion (days)	2.46	2.55	2.33
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	7.4	16.7	44.1
On average, the length of an exclusion for those on SEN support was slightly longer than that for pupils with no SEN, and slightly shorter for pupils with an EHCP. SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 5.9x more days overall than non-SEN pupils, and those with an EHCP were also excluded for 5.9x more days.			
Number of FTE > 5days	0	0	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	0	0	0
Permanent exclusions			
There were no exclusions of over 5 days.			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	0	0	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	0	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request, but we did receive an acknowledgement of our email.

Walton High URN 136842, LA reference 4000.

The latest Ofsted rating was Good, and the latest rating for behaviour was Outstanding.

Walton High	No SEN	SEN support	EHCP
Population data (taken from Government census)			
2015-16	1405	145	5
2016-17	1560	150	10
2017-18	1739	174	10
2018-19	1873	180	12
2019-20	2031	167	16
Total (pupil years)	8608	816	53
Fixed Term Exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	443	185	14
Rate of exclusion (per 100 pupils per year)	5.1	22.7	26.4
The school was a medium excluder of those with no SEN and on SEN support, and a high excluder of those with an EHCP. SEN Support pupils were 4.4x more likely to be excluded than those with no SEN, and pupils with an EHCP were 5.1x more likely.			
Total number of excluded days	1099	492	30
Average length of exclusion (days)	2.48	2.66	2.14
Average number of days excluded (per 100 pupils per year)	12.8	60.3	56.6
On average, an exclusion for SEN support pupils was 0.18 days longer than for non-SEN pupils, whereas for pupils with an EHCP it was 0.34 days shorter. SEN support pupils were excluded from school for 4.7x more days overall than non-SEN pupils, and those with an EHCP for 4.4x more days.			
Number of FTE > 5days	x	0	0
Rate of FTE > 5 days (per 100 pupils per year)	x	0	0
Exclusions of over 5 days were very low for those with no SEN and zero for those with SEN.			
Permanent exclusions			
Number of exclusions over the 5 year period	x	0	0
Rate of exclusions (per 100 pupils per year)	x	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

School response

The school was contacted by email to verify their data, correct it if necessary, and to comment as they saw fit. At the time of writing, PACA had not received a written response to this request.

Appendix B: Notes on the data

Census data was obtained via the DfE website for each academic year and for each school. The census data was January in each academic year and therefore represents the number of pupils in each category on roll at that time (as sole or dual main registered pupils). Census data was used to calculate the rate of exclusion, ie the number of exclusions (or excluded days) per pupil within each category.

Exclusion data was obtained from MK Council via a series of 3 FOI requests. The first requested data on all mainstream secondary schools and the second two requests were placed to cover apparent gaps in the first set of data. FOI references were 248338307, 324301598 and 368721859.

Analysis of the data was completed using an Excel spreadsheet. Data were separated for each school and analysed according to the stated code for the pupil's category of SEN.

The category "EHCP" is taken to include the former category "Statement of Special Educational Needs", which it replaced. Exclusions have been coded for both of these categories within the data set and the census data also covers both categories.

The category "SEN Support" is taken to include both of the former categories "School Action" and "School Action Plus", which it replaced. Exclusions have been coded for all of these categories within the data set and the census data also covers all categories.

Lunchtime exclusions were rare, and not included in the analysis, which is also the approach adopted in national statistics.

The exclusion rate, as the average number of exclusions per 100 pupils per year, was calculated as

$$\text{exclusion rate} = \frac{\text{total number of exclusions (for a SEN category)} \times 100}{\text{total number of pupil years (for that SEN category)}}$$

Where the total number of exclusions was summed over the 5-year period AND the total number of pupil years was calculated by summing the number of pupils each year (taken from census data) for the 5-year period. So for example, a school with 1,000 non-SEN pupils on census each year would have a total of 5,000 pupil years in that category.

The average length of exclusions in days was calculated as

$$\text{average length of exclusion} = \frac{\text{total number of excluded days (for a SEN category)}}{\text{total number of exclusions (for that SEN category)}}$$

The exclusion day rate, also referred to as the number of excluded days per 100 pupils per year, was calculated as

$$\text{exclusion day rate} = \frac{\text{total number of excluded days (for a SEN category)} \times 100}{\text{total number of pupil years (for that SEN category)}}$$

Schools were given an opportunity to verify their data. The Council database is populated by schools themselves, logging in to register each exclusion, and there may have been opportunities for human error in data entry. This process of allowing schools to check their data provides a means of correcting any such errors.

Appendix C. Raw data.

To preserve anonymity, as recommended in reference [1], exclusions have been aggregated into groups by their length in days. As recommended in [1], any group with zero exclusions is recorded as zero, while any group with only 1-2 exclusions is recorded as “x”.

	<u>Totals – all schools</u>			<u>Denbigh</u>			<u>Hazeley</u>			<u>Herbert Leon</u>			<u>Kents Hill Park</u>		
	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP
Population:															
Total	82,681	9,636	1,383	7,465	514	93	6,658	549	156	2,553	555	50	395	73	11
2015-16	15,845	1,695	285	1,360	80	15	1,245	160	30	550	110	10			
2016-17	16,045	1,950	295	1,440	105	15	1,305	105	35	530	120	15			
2017-18	16,396	1,925	261	1,477	105	17	1,324	101	34	490	109	6			
2018-19	16,956	1,947	250	1,565	109	23	1,368	94	29	494	118	7	120	25	3
2019-20	17,439	2,119	292	1,623	115	23	1,416	89	28	489	98	12	275	48	8
FTE															
Total	3,005	1,739	177	6	8	0	4	4	0	345	339	9	13	34	0
Breakdown:															
0-1 day	1,196	727	59	4	x	0	X	x	0	232	232	3	10	20	0
1.5-2 days	760	433	43	x	3		x	0		58	63	5	x	7	
2.5-3 days	502	297	35		x			x		24	22	0	X	4	
3.5-5 days	514	266	33		x			x		31	20	x		3	
5.5-10 days	12	13	7		0						x				
10.5-15 days	19	x			x										
15.5+ days	x	x													
Permanent	26	12	0	0	x	0	x	x	0	x	0	0	0	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

	Lord Grey			MK Academy			Oakgrove			Ousedale			Radcliffe		
	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP
Population:															
Total	5,913	1,077	97	5,086	1,005	49	8,618	403	162	9,726	1,084	132	5,033	841	127
2015-16	1,200	195	20	1,020	255	15	1,315	50	30	1,995	180	25	945	220	25
2016-17	1,165	200	15	980	260	15	1,600	70	35	1,960	215	30	1,010	185	30
2017-18	1,171	228	18	1,057	136	8	1,779	74	35	1,936	236	23	1,017	158	28
2018-19	1,180	224	19	1,057	146	5	1,923	92	29	1,927	228	24	1,032	136	22
2019-20	1,197	230	25	972	208	6	2,001	117	33	1,908	225	30	1,029	142	22
FTE															
Total	351	177	15	6	7	0	28	8	3	267	115	37	335	204	35
Breakdown:															
0-1 day	113	45	4	x	3	0	10	4	x	77	38	6	122	84	12
1.5-2 days	123	75	x	x	x		10	x	x	80	33	10	55	32	7
2.5-3 days	66	38	7	x	x		3	x		45	20	6	72	42	7
3.5-5 days	44	17	x		x		5	x		43	17	9	84	46	9
5.5-10 days	3	x	x							4	5	6	x		
10.5-15 days	x									17	x				
15.5+ days										x	x				
Permanent	x	0	0	7	4	0	x	0	0	x	x	0	5	3	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.

	<u>Shenley</u>			<u>Stantonbury</u>			<u>St Paul's</u>			<u>Walton High</u>		
	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP	No SEN	SEN Support	EHCP
Population:												
Total	7,476	755	69	7,453	902	114	7,697	1,062	270	8,608	816	53
2015-16	1,420	145	15	1,700	105	30	1,690	50	65	1,405	145	5
2016-17	1,420	160	15	1,560	155	25	1,515	225	55	1,560	150	10
2017-18	1,464	179	15	1,434	191	21	1,508	234	46	1,739	174	10
2018-19	1,533	146	10	1,374	213	20	1,510	236	47	1,873	180	12
2019-20	1,639	125	14	1,385	238	18	1,474	317	57	2,031	167	16
FTE												
Total	34	9	x	941	467	12	232	182	51	443	185	14
Breakdown:												
0-1 day	10	4	0	406	207	5	70	39	22	138	48	5
1.5-2 days	11	3	x	246	114	5	51	58	8	118	43	5
2.5-3 days	5	0		135	75	x	74	56	12	75	35	x
3.5-5 days	8	x		151	68	x	37	29	9	111	59	x
5.5-10 days		x		x	3					x		
10.5-15 days				0								
15.5+ days				x								
Permanent	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	x	0	0

x Figures suppressed according to DfE guidance as there were 1 or 2 actual exclusions only.