**World of Inclusion**

I have recently done some work analysing the segregation figures in England for a forthcoming chapter in a book. I think these will be useful for shadow report.

In many ways the majority of mainstream schools are no better prepared to include a wide diversity of disabled children and students than they were 20 years ago. Indeed, there is much greater negative pressure on mainstream schools’ efforts to include SEND pupils through:

•   Narrowing league table results outcomes, with fears of being placed in a category and forced to be an academy.

•   A narrowing of the curriculum and how it is assessed.

•   Reductions in local authority SEN support teams and strategic oversight.

•   Fragmentation with Academy Trusts operating over wide geographic areas.

•   An emphasis on setting up free special schools and alternate provision which are under academy provision and outside local authority control. By 2019 128 had been opened or approved [[1]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D%22%20%5Cl%20%22x__ftn1)

•   Lack of time for teacher preparation and training for inclusion.

•   Payment by results on annual appraisal promotion of pay grade based on good performance, judged by normative results.

•   A policy emphasis by the government on setting up and expanding special schools.

•   Statutory presumption of mainstreaming with very little political or financial support.

The increase in demand for EHC Plans has been led by the above factors and the cuts environment has meant increasing numbers of parents are seeking an EHC Plan as ‘SEN support’ is not effective. In addition, the pressures on mainstream outlined above are leading to increasing numbers of parents seeking alternative placements outside the mainstream often in independent special schools. This in turn adds huge pressure to the higher needs budget and less resource for SEND in mainstream schools.

The education of disabled children with a statement or later an EHC Plan has reflected differing Government ideologies as the Table X below demonstrates. [ copy editor please insert number for table X]

[[1]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D%22%20%5Cl%20%22x__ftnref1) <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/thousands-of-places-created-in-new-special-free-schools--2>

They clearly show a large increase in children with Education Health and Care Plans and those who are disabled without in segregated settings.

**Table X Balance between proportion of school students with a Statement or EHC Plan in England in State funded special and mainstream schools**



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year  (A)) | %Mainstream Primary  & Secondary Schools (B)) | % State funded Special Schools, PRUs, NMSS and Independent schools (C) | Total students with a EHC Plan /Statement (D) | Nos of Pupils in Segregated settings with No EHC Plan /Statement (E) | Total School Population(F) | %Total School Population SegregatedNumber C +E /Total School Population (F)(G) |
| 2021 | 50.4 | 49.6 | 325,618 | 11,665 | 8,911,887 | 1.94 |
| 2020 | 49.8 | 51.2 | 294,800 | 15,619 | 8,890,245 | 1.87 |
| 2019 | 47.8 | 52.2 | 271,200 | 16,980 | 8,819,289 | 1.79 |
| 2018 | 47.7 | 52.3 | 253,680 | 18,124 | 8,735,100 | 1.72 |
| 2017 | 48.3 | 51.7 | 242,185 | 17,785 | 8,669,080 | 1.64 |
| 2016 | 49.2 | 50.8 | 236,805 | 17,430 | 8,559,540 | 1.61 |
| 2015 | 51.0 | 49.0 | 236,185 | 15,525 | 8,438,145 | 1.55 |
| 2014 | 52.1 | 47.9 | 232,190 | 14,760 | 8,331,385 | 1.50 |
| 2013 | 53.0 | 47.0 | 229,390 | 14,985 | 8,249,810 | 1.49 |
| 2012 | 53.7 | 46.3 | 226,125 | 15,295 | 8,178,200 | 1.47 |
| 2011 | 54.3 | 45.7 | 224,210 | 15,700 | 8,123,865 | 1.45 |
| 2010 | 55.2 | 44.8 | 225,945 | 16,655 | 8,098,360 | 1.45 |
| 2009 | 55.1 | 44.9 | 221,670 | 24,010 | 8,071,000 | 1.53 |
| 2008 | 56.3 | 43.7 | 227,315 | 23,560 | 8,102,190 | 1.48 |
| 2007 | 58.4 | 41.6 | 232,760 | 15,480 | 8,149,180 | 1.35 |
| 2006 | 59.1 | 40.9 | 236,750 | 15,110 | 8,215,690 | 1.36 |
| 2005 | 59.5 | 40.5 | 242,580 | 14,550 | 8,274,470 | 1.36 |
| 2004 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 247,590 | 13,560 | 8,334,880 | 1.35 |
| 2003 | 60.3 | 39.7 | 250,550 | 13,240 | 8,366,780 | 1.35 |
| 2002 | 60.2 | 39.8 | 248,982 | 12,291 | 8,369,081 | 1.33 |
| 2001 | 61.2 | 38.8 | 258,200 | 11,200 | 8,374,100 | 1.33 |
| 2000 | 60.5 | 39.5 | 252,875 | 11,827 | 8,345,815 | 1.34 |
| 1999 | 64.6 | 35.4 | 284,041 | 12,352 | 8,310,476 | 1.36 |
| 1998 | 58.4 | 41.6 | 242,041 | 11,774 | 8,260,582 | 1.36 |
| 1997 | 57.2 | 42.8 | 234,629 | 11,730 | 8,194,964 | 1.37 |
| 1996 | 55.9 | 44.1 | 226,923 | 10,670 | 8,116.543 | 1.36 |
| 1995 | 53.6 | 46.4 | 211,348 | 11,176 | 8,017,830 | 1.36 |
| 1994 | 51.9 | 48.1 | 195,410 | 10,462 | 7,882,835 | 1.32 |

Source

DFS, DFES, DfE Annual SEND Statistics

--The last column on the above table shows that in each year there were further likely disabled students segregated with between 10,000 to 24,000 without a Statement or EHC Plan. Further light is shed on this increasing exclusion/off rolling process from the mainstream by a cohort study of those in Year 6 in 2013/14 which tracks their destination through to Year 11 in 2019 (Thomson,2020)[[1]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D#x__ftn1). The study shows that those with identified SEND in Yr. 6 had left the state system at a far faster rate than their non-disabled peers.

By the end of 2019, more than 10% of pupils classified as having SEN met by either Statements or School Action had left the system. This figure was even higher (13%) among those with SEN met by School Action Plus…. In total, 21% of those with behavioural, social and emotional difficulties at the end of primary school were no longer in the state mainstream or special education by the end of secondary school. Rates were lower among other groups, although they still exceeded 10% for those whose primary SEN type was moderate learning difficulties, profound and multiple learning difficulties, dyslexia and the group not otherwise classified.

This suggests that there are negative factors at work in the current school system to exclude and off-roll disabled students. In addition, analysis of the proportion of children with SEND using the National Pupil Data Base (a record of each student from Reception to KS5 with sex, age SEN and achievements on national tests) does show a negative impact of academisation[[1]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D#x__ftn1)[[M1]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D%22%20%5Cl%20%22x__msocom_1)  on numbers ‘suggests that academisation events have small negative impacts in educational inclusiveness.’

    A third element which needs to be borne in mind is that the National Pupil Database is only average scores, but when broken down by Local Authority area there are strong differences in the degree of inclusion. Covering 2014 to 2017, an analysis for CSIE (Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education) by the Exeter team shows variation of school students in special schools from different Local Authoritys with a nearly 10-fold difference between Newham 0.181% and Torbay 1.748%. This is due to local policies, as all areas have roughly similar numbers of disabled pupils with more deprived areas such as Newham having more.[[2]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D%22%20%5Cl%20%22x__ftn2) Increasingly, as the academies programme comes to dominate, Local Authority policies will have less impact though historic differences still continue as can be seen from this study.

Further evidence come from a recent article in blog  SEN Jungle on capital expenditure for new schools which are in the main special segregated schools <https://www.specialneedsjungle.com/new-budget-funds-for-send-capital-spending-but-how-did-las-spend-previous-cash-we-checked/>

[[1]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D#x__ftnref1) Under the Academisation programme of the Government in England Local Authority schools if found unsatisfactory by OFSTED are automatically changed to Academies by Government and called Sponsored Academies. Schools can voluntarily decide by a vote of their Governors to become an academy called Converter Academies. Academies in [England](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_England) are a [state-funded school](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State-funded_schools_%28England%29) which are directly funded by the [Department for Education](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Department_for_Education), independent of [local authority](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Local_authority) control with their own admissions policy.

[[2]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D%22%20%5Cl%20%22x__ftnref2) Black, A, & Norwich, B, (2019 *Contrasting responses to diversity: school placement trends 2014-2017 for all local authorities in England* CSIE,Bristol <http://www.csie.org.uk/trends/report2019.pdf>

 [[M1]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D#x__msoanchor_1)This endnote needs rewriting

[[1]](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADZhYWI2ZmIwLTkyZjYtNDZhMS04YWRlLWFkNjdkMmI2MGMyNAAQAEjiOiVz2%2B5FtIyLlGWmcW4%3D#x__ftnref1) Thomson,D. 2020 ‘*The Department for Education needs to look at why so many pupils with SEND leave the state-funded school system’.*

<https://ffteducationdatalab.org.uk/2020/12/the-department-for-education-needs-to-look-at-why-so-many-pupils-with-send-leave-the-state-funded-school-system/>
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