

**Ethnic disproportionality in the identification of
Special Educational Needs (SEN):**

North Somerset Local Authority Feedback Pack

Contents of this pack

Summary of national findings

Interpreting the LA feedback: A brief guide

How to use the LA specific tables

North Somerset unadjusted Odds Ratios (OR) by ethnic group and SEN type	Table 1
National unadjusted Odds Ratios (OR) by ethnic group and SEN type	Table 2
North Somerset adjusted Odds Ratios (OR) by ethnic group and SEN type	Table 3
National adjusted Odds Ratios (OR) by ethnic group and SEN type	Table 4
North Somerset frequencies (counts) of number of pupils by ethnic group and SEN type	Table 5
National frequencies (counts) of number of pupils by ethnic group and SEN type	Table 6

How to use the All LA tables

All-LA incidence and Risk Ratio (RR) table - Any SEN	Table 7
All-LA incidence and Risk Ratio (RR) table: Moderate Learning Difficulty (MLD)	Table 8
All-LA incidence and Risk Ratio (RR) table: Social, Emotional & Mental Health (SEMH)	Table 9
All-LA incidence and Risk Ratio (RR) table: Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD)	Table 10

Abbreviations

Technical Appendix

Summary of key findings from the national data

This Local Authority (LA) feedback comes from a broader project investigating ethnic disproportionality in the identification of Special Educational Needs (SEN) in England (for the full project report, see Strand & Lindorff, 2018). Disproportionality exists when pupils from an ethnic minority group are more (or less) likely to be identified with SEN than pupils in the majority group (in England, White British pupils). We say an ethnic minority group is *over-represented* when pupils in that group are *more* likely to be identified, and we say an ethnic minority group is *under-represented* when pupils from that group are *less* likely to be identified, than those in the majority ethnic group.

We used data from the 2016 January School Census, and focused on pupils of compulsory school age (aged 5-16 years) looking at all pupils from Year 1 to Year 11. We present key findings here to provide background and context for the interpretation of the results.

Key findings

Prevalence rates have increased with the requirement introduced in the 2015 School Census to record the type of SEN for all pupils with SEN, not just those at School Action Plus or with a Statement/Education Health and Care plan. For example, between 2014 and 2016 the incidence of Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD) increased from 2.0% to 4.0%, Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) needs from 2.2% to 2.8% and Autistic Spectrum Disorders (ASD) from 1.0% to 1.3%. However, the extent of ethnic disproportionality in the identification of SEN has hardly varied at all, and indeed has changed very little since 2005.

There is substantial ethnic disproportionality for the following:

- Black Caribbean and Mixed White & Black Caribbean pupils are over-represented for SEMH
- Asian groups (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Other Asian) are under-represented for ASD
- Black Caribbean and Pakistani pupils are over-represented for MLD
- Pakistani pupils are over-represented for Hearing Impairment (HI) and Visual Impairment (VI)

The over-representation for MLD is accounted for by pupil background factors including age, socio-economic deprivation and gender, but the other ethnic disproportionalities remain apparent even after accounting for pupil background characteristics.

LAs account for relatively little (<5%) of the variation in the identification of SEN. For example disproportionality varies little in direction across LAs (e.g. 95 LAs show under-representation of Asian pupils for MLD, only 2 show over-representation; 84 LAs show over-representation of Black Caribbean/MWBC for SEMH, none show under-representation; 79 LAs show under-representation of Asian pupils for ASD, only 3 show over-representation). Nevertheless variation between LAs does exist and it is important that LA's identify whether disproportionate identification exists in their localities and if so to explore factors that may be associated with it.

This data pack presents some of our analyses as a starting point to address the above issues.

Interpreting the LA feedback: A brief guide

The purpose of this LA-specific feedback is to provide information on ethnic disproportionality in SEN identification within each LA. Just like the national analysis, the underlying data on which results are based include information on pupils in Year 1 to Year 11 (ages 5-16) at the time of the 2016 January School Census. At times, descriptive information provided here may differ slightly from DfE reports/tables that include children and young people outside of this age range.

Results are reported in terms of Odds Ratios (OR). ORs have an intuitive interpretation: If an ethnic group has an OR of 2.0 for example, this means the odds of being identified with SEN are twice as high for pupils from the ethnic group compared to the White British majority. If an ethnic group has an OR of 0.50 then the odds of being identified with SEN are half as high compared to the White British majority. We report *unadjusted ORs* that take into account only pupils' ethnic group membership and type of SEN, and *adjusted ORs* that account for other aspects of pupils' backgrounds and contexts (age, sex and socio-economic deprivation) that may be associated with SEN identification. Details of the analysis that produced these results can be found in the Technical Appendix at the end of this document.

We considered ORs according to the following cut-off values:

- <= **0.67** "**substantially under-represented**": reported in blue (bold)
- <= **0.75** "**under-represented**": reported in blue (plain font)
- >= **1.33** "**over-represented**": reported in red (bold)
- >= **1.50** "**substantially over-represented**": reported in red (plain font)

Reporting is limited to categories containing a sufficient number of pupils to produce reliable results. That is, in any instance for which there were fewer than 10 pupils with a particular SEN type in a particular ethnic group within your LA, results are not reported.

"Any SEN" refers to an indicator of SEN identification without regard to specific type of need.

Frequencies (counts) are also given in a table showing the total number of pupils within your LA (as of January 2016) in each ethnic group identified with each primary type of SEN.

We have not broken these results down by level of need (SEN support; Education, Health and Care Plan) as this leads to extremely small numbers of pupils, too low to report for many ethnic minority groups for many of the types of SEN.

How to use the LA specific tables

On the pages that follow, we report disproportionality estimates specific to your LA alongside the comparable results from national data.

The following questions may be useful to facilitate conversations about your LA's results, to identify any key issues, and to initiate thinking and discussion about what further investigation and/or action might be appropriate in response to any such issues. We suggest looking at one type of primary SEN at a time (e.g. one column in the OR tables) as you consider these questions.

Guiding questions

- In the “unadjusted” OR table for your LA, which groups are over-represented (in red)? Which groups are under-represented (in blue)?
 - Make a list of the groups you see are over- or under-represented for the particular type of SEN you are looking at, so that you can jot down notes next to each group.
- Do you notice any patterns in terms of which groups are over- or under-represented?
- Thinking about your own knowledge and experience of your LA and the schools within it, do these results surprise you? Why or why not?
- Are the same groups still over/under-represented in your LA “adjusted” OR table?
 - If so, can you think of any reasons why the groups you have identified are over- or under-represented? (*Note: This means reasons beyond the background characteristics we accounted for in the “adjusted” results i.e. socioeconomic disadvantage, gender, birth season, year group.*)
- Are the groups over/under-represented in the same way in the “unadjusted” and “adjusted” national tables?
 - If not, can you think of any reasons why your LA's results are different, based on your knowledge of your LA's particular context and of the schools within it?
- Comparing across the different types of SEN you have considered above, do you notice any patterns? (i.e. are the same groups over- or under-represented for different types of SEN?)
- What further information might help to explain why the groups you have identified are over- or under-represented? Where/how might you find this information?
- Can you think of any concrete steps that might be taken by the LA to follow up the issues you have identified?
- Can you think of any concrete steps that might be taken by schools and/or teachers to follow up the issues you have identified?

Table 1: North Somerset LA Unadjusted Odds-Ratios by type of SEN and ethnic group (Y1-11), 2016

Unadjusted Odds Ratios	Cognition & Learning				Social, Emotional & Mental Health	Communication & Interaction		Sensory & Physical				Unspecified/ Other		Any SEN	
	Ethnic Group	SpLD	MLD	SLD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	ASD	HI	VI	MSI	PD	Other		NSA
White Irish	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Traveller Irish	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Traveller Gypsy/Roma	25.02 *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8.26 *
White other groups	0.52 *	0.70	--	--	--	0.64	0.88	--	--	--	--	--	0.71	--	0.63 *
Mixed White & African	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.81
Mixed White & Caribbean	--	--	--	--	--	2.55 *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.76 *
Mixed White & Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.64
Other mixed	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.95
Indian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pakistani	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bangladeshi	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.92
Any Other Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black African	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black Caribbean	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black other groups	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chinese	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Any other group	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Unclassified/Refused	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.13

*=significant at the p<0.05 level.

See notes in the Technical Appendix for details of the underlying model.

Table 2: National Unadjusted Odds-Ratios by type of SEN and ethnic group (Y1-11), 2016

Unadjusted Ratios	Cognition & Learning				Social, Emotional & Mental Health	Communication & Interaction		Sensory & Physical				Unspecified/ Other		Any SEN
	Ethnic Group	SpLD	MLD	SLD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	ASD	HI	VI	MSI	PD	Other	
White Irish	1.16 *	0.82 *	0.91	1.29	0.92	0.96	1.04	1.24	0.77	--	0.97	1.03	1.21 *	0.97
Traveller Irish	2.33 *	4.37 *	1.84 *	-- *	2.86 *	2.79 *	0.44 *	1.67 *	2.05 *	--	1.43	2.95 *	5.38 *	2.92 *
Traveller Gypsy/Roma	1.58 *	3.79 *	2.10 *	1.11	1.64 *	2.47 *	0.38 *	3.13 *	1.59 *	--	1.02	1.71 *	3.40 *	2.26 *
White other groups	0.53 *	0.78 *	0.76 *	1.05	0.57 *	1.29 *	0.60 *	0.74 *	0.61 *	0.69 *	0.54 *	0.85 *	1.16 *	0.77 *
Mixed White & African	0.74 *	0.82 *	1.01	1.34 *	1.18 *	1.22 *	0.93	0.64 *	0.45 *	0.72	0.70 *	0.88 *	1.04	0.95 *
Mixed White & Caribbean	1.03	1.23 *	0.92	1.19	1.94 *	1.21 *	1.12 *	0.74 *	0.97	0.72	0.89 *	1.15 *	1.47 *	1.29 *
Mixed White & Asian	0.53 *	0.68 *	0.86 *	1.00	0.72 *	0.94 *	0.84 *	0.74 *	0.69 *	0.54 *	0.70 *	0.69 *	0.80 *	0.73 *
Other mixed	0.68 *	0.78 *	1.12 *	1.50 *	1.07 *	1.14 *	1.06 *	0.80 *	0.74 *	0.92	0.74 *	0.96	1.04	0.92 *
Indian	0.27 *	0.56 *	0.80 *	1.01	0.24 *	0.85 *	0.46 *	0.78 *	0.72 *	0.42 *	0.56 *	0.60 *	0.60 *	0.51 *
Pakistani	0.38 *	1.36 *	1.52 *	2.61 *	0.50 *	1.39 *	0.54 *	2.09 *	2.13 *	0.75 *	1.14 *	0.96	1.51 *	0.99 *
Bangladeshi	0.36 *	0.87 *	1.19 *	1.93 *	0.46 *	1.62 *	0.79 *	1.45 *	0.96	0.54 *	0.63 *	0.80 *	1.31 *	0.85 *
Any Other Asian	0.31 *	0.59 *	1.10 *	1.49 *	0.31 *	1.15 *	0.62 *	0.92	0.63 *	0.36 *	0.61 *	0.67 *	0.82 *	0.62 *
Black African	0.45 *	0.84 *	1.40 *	1.54 *	0.83 *	1.66 *	1.15 *	0.65 *	0.73 *	0.59 *	0.63 *	0.87 *	1.23 *	0.95 *
Black Caribbean	1.03	1.37 *	1.20 *	1.38 *	2.29 *	1.83 *	1.33 *	0.87	0.86	0.69	0.87 *	1.34 *	1.64 *	1.53 *
Black other groups	0.61 *	1.03	1.63 *	1.64 *	1.31 *	1.71 *	1.34 *	0.67 *	0.67 *	0.85	0.75 *	1.06	1.40 *	1.16 *
Chinese	0.24 *	0.30 *	0.72 *	0.81	0.20 *	1.20 *	0.91	0.82	0.45 *	--	0.27 *	0.45 *	0.62 *	0.50 *
Any other group	0.48 *	0.91 *	1.03	1.61 *	0.61 *	1.52 *	0.73 *	1.09	0.73 *	0.66 *	0.64 *	0.95	1.52 *	0.88 *
Unclassified/Refused	0.94 *	0.90 *	1.30 *	1.22	1.11 *	1.04	1.24 *	0.89	1.06	1.14	0.90	1.14 *	1.37 *	1.04 *

*=significant at the p<0.05 level.

See notes in the Technical Appendix for details of the underlying model.

Table 3: North Somerset LA Adjusted Odds-Ratios by type of SEN and ethnic group (Y1-11), 2016

Adjusted Odds Ratios	Cognition & Learning				Social, Emotional & Mental Health	Communication & Interaction		Sensory & Physical				Unspecified/ Other		Any SEN	
	Ethnic Group	SpLD	MLD	SLD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	ASD	HI	VI	MSI	PD	Other		NSA
White Irish	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Traveller Irish	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Traveller Gypsy/Roma	613.23 *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7.81 *
White other groups	0.81	0.85	--	--	0.85	0.91	--	--	--	--	--	0.92	--	--	0.66 *
Mixed White & African	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.67
Mixed White & Caribbean	--	--	--	--	1.60	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.42
Mixed White & Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.65
Other mixed	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.92
Indian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pakistani	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bangladeshi	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.88
Any Other Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black African	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black Caribbean	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black other groups	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chinese	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Any other group	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Unclassified/Refused	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.98

*=significant at the p<0.05 level.

See notes in the Technical Appendix for control variables and technical details of the underlying model.

Table 4: National Adjusted Odds-Ratios by type of SEN and ethnic group (Y1-11), 2016

Adjusted Ratios	Cognition & Learning				Social, Emotional & Mental Health	Communication & Interaction		Sensory & Physical				Unspecified/ Other		Any SEN
	Ethnic Group	SpLD	MLD	SLD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	ASD	HI	VI	MSI	PD	Other	
White Irish	1.12 *	0.77 *	0.86	1.29	0.85 *	0.94	1.01	1.21	0.74	--	0.95	0.99	1.18	0.93 *
Traveller Irish	2.05 *	2.45 *	1.01	--	1.53 *	1.47 *	0.31 *	1.29	1.49	--	0.94	2.02 *	3.16 *	1.77 *
Traveller Gypsy/Roma	1.50 *	2.70 *	1.61 *	0.91	1.17 *	1.78 *	0.33 *	2.76 *	1.36 *	--	0.85	1.41 *	2.51 *	1.74 *
White other groups	0.56 *	0.70 *	0.80 *	1.10	0.53 *	1.08 *	0.61 *	0.75 *	0.61 *	0.66 *	0.54 *	0.83 *	1.01	0.72 *
Mixed White & African	0.73 *	0.63 *	0.84 *	1.18	0.92 *	0.90 *	0.86 *	0.60 *	0.41 *	0.65	0.62 *	0.77 *	0.80 *	0.78 *
Mixed White & Caribbean	0.96 *	0.90 *	0.72 *	1.01	1.38 *	0.90 *	0.97	0.65 *	0.84 *	0.65 *	0.76 *	0.95	1.13 *	1.00
Mixed White & Asian	0.54 *	0.63 *	0.83 *	0.96	0.67 *	0.82 *	0.81 *	0.73 *	0.68 *	0.51 *	0.68 *	0.67 *	0.72 *	0.68 *
Other mixed	0.67 *	0.63 *	1.00	1.38 *	0.88 *	0.90 *	0.99	0.76 *	0.69 *	0.82	0.68 *	0.86 *	0.85 *	0.79 *
Indian	0.28 *	0.54 *	0.87 *	1.10	0.23 *	0.80 *	0.47 *	0.79 *	0.73 *	0.42 *	0.58 *	0.59 *	0.57 *	0.50 *
Pakistani	0.35 *	1.00	1.30 *	2.44 *	0.36 *	1.07 *	0.48 *	1.89 *	1.87 *	0.70 *	1.02	0.80 *	1.18 *	0.79 *
Bangladeshi	0.31 *	0.52 *	0.91	1.72 *	0.26 *	1.09 *	0.65 *	1.21 *	0.77 *	0.49 *	0.53 *	0.59 *	0.89 *	0.58 *
Any Other Asian	0.31 *	0.50 *	1.06	1.48 *	0.27 *	0.97	0.60 *	0.89 *	0.59 *	0.34 *	0.59 *	0.61 *	0.71 *	0.55 *
Black African	0.40 *	0.53 *	1.09 *	1.35 *	0.52 *	1.11 *	0.97	0.55 *	0.60 *	0.53 *	0.53 *	0.66 *	0.85 *	0.67 *
Black Caribbean	0.89 *	0.89 *	0.92	1.21	1.43 *	1.34 *	1.12 *	0.73 *	0.70 *	0.65	0.73 *	1.01	1.19 *	1.10 *
Black other groups	0.55 *	0.67 *	1.27 *	1.40 *	0.84 *	1.16 *	1.13 *	0.58 *	0.54 *	0.76	0.64 *	0.82 *	0.98	0.83 *
Chinese	0.25 *	0.30 *	0.80	0.87	0.21 *	1.09 *	0.96	0.85	0.47 *	--	0.28 *	0.46 *	0.59 *	0.51 *
Any other group	0.44 *	0.61 *	0.81 *	1.41 *	0.40 *	1.06 *	0.61 *	0.95	0.62 *	0.59 *	0.54 *	0.76 *	1.10 *	0.65 *
Unclassified/Refused	0.86 *	0.80 *	1.19 *	1.19	0.95 *	1.01	1.13 *	0.84 *	0.97	1.16	0.86 *	1.02	1.30 *	0.94 *

*=significant at the p<0.05 level.

See notes in the Technical Appendix for control variables and technical details of the underlying model.

North Somerset LA-specific results, Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

Table 5: North Somerset LA Frequency (count) by type of SEN and ethnic group (Y1-11), 2016

Ethnic Group	No SEN	Cognition & Learning				Social, Emotional & Mental Health SEMH	Communication & Interaction		Sensory & Physical				Unspecified/Other		Any SEN	Total
		SpLD	MLD	SLD	PMLD		SLCN	ASD	HI	VI	MSI	PD	Other	NSA		
White Irish	31	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	6	37
Traveller Irish	18	x	4	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	25
Traveller Gypsy/Roma	17	11	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	21	38
White other groups	973	13	18	x	x	20	18	7	x	x	x	x	11	x	92	1065
Mixed White & African	107	x	x	x	x	4	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	13	120
Mixed White & Caribbean	137	3	4	3	x	11	7	x	x	x	x	x	x	4	36	173
Mixed White & Asian	219	x	3	x	x	5	7	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	21	240
Other mixed	198	3	4	3	x	6	5	x	x	x	x	x	3	x	28	226
Indian	98	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	105
Pakistani	11	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	11
Bangladeshi	73	x	x	x	x	x	3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	10	83
Any Other Asian	100	x	x	x	x	3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	6	106
Black African	80	x	x	x	x	x	4	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	7	87
Black Caribbean	11	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	13
Black other groups	14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	16
Chinese	65	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	5	70
Any other group	40	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	3	43
Unclassified/Refused	59	3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	10	69
White British	19459	502	517	64	18	622	411	161	55	28	6	78	311	136	2909	22368
Total	21710	545	562	75	22	678	464	177	58	29	6	80	341	148	3185	24895

Note: Some numbers are slightly lower for calculations and reporting of adjusted ORs, as a very small number of pupil records were missing IDACI scores; see details in the Technical Appendix.

“x” in this table means the figure has been suppressed due to small numbers (See the NPD User Guide, 2018, p36).

Table 6: National Frequency (count) by type of SEN and ethnic group (Y1-11), 2016

Ethnic Group	No SEN	Cognition & Learning				Social, Emotional & Mental Health	Communication & Interaction		Sensory & Physical				Unspecified/Other		Any SEN	Total
		SpLD	MLD	SLD	PMLD	SEMH	SLCN	ASD	HI	VI	MSI	PD	Other	NSA		
White Irish	16086	568	640	63	26	528	451	280	65	23	9	87	158	113	3011	19097
Traveller Irish	3136	222	669	25	8	320	257	23	17	12	x	25	88	98	1766	4902
Traveller Gypsy/Roma	15197	733	2808	138	21	889	1103	98	155	45	x	86	247	300	6625	21822
White other groups	320500	5210	12142	1054	422	6472	12130	3211	776	367	88	956	2593	2149	47570	368070
Mixed White & African	38138	855	1523	166	64	1611	1370	598	80	32	11	149	321	230	7010	45148
Mixed White & Caribbean	77058	2411	4634	307	115	5326	2736	1445	185	140	22	381	843	658	19203	96261
Mixed White & Asian	69336	1110	2315	259	87	1773	1909	971	166	89	15	270	457	321	9742	79078
Any other mixed background	104261	2145	3967	505	196	3979	3493	1847	272	144	38	431	949	627	18593	122854
Indian	163363	1367	4468	564	207	1373	4088	1256	414	219	27	508	930	573	15994	179357
Pakistani	231457	2668	15409	1520	756	4117	9413	2101	1576	919	69	1462	2120	2029	44159	275616
Bangladeshi	93392	1022	3945	482	225	1527	4438	1244	440	168	20	325	711	708	15255	108647
Any other Asian	98770	946	2826	469	184	1100	3343	1035	297	116	14	335	631	471	11767	110537
Black African	199483	2709	8208	1210	385	5941	9719	3854	423	272	47	698	1649	1424	36539	236022
Black Caribbean	61919	1937	4150	321	107	5066	3316	1385	176	100	17	299	789	588	18251	80170
Black other groups	38486	713	1937	271	79	1799	1926	867	84	48	13	161	387	312	8597	47083
Chinese	23738	170	352	74	24	170	837	361	63	20	6	35	102	85	2299	26037
Any other ethnic group	95092	1393	4208	425	191	2076	4237	1161	336	129	25	338	862	837	16218	111310
Unknown	50534	1442	2226	284	77	2007	1549	1052	147	100	23	252	549	402	10110	60644
White British	3782520	115151	184642	16352	4730	134939	110969	63436	12312	7066	1506	21026	36015	21956	730100	4512620
Total	5482466	142772	261069	24489	7904	181013	177284	86225	17984	10009	1954	27824	50401	33881	1022809	6505275

Note: Some numbers are slightly lower for calculations and reporting of adjusted ORs, as a very small number of pupil records were missing IDACI scores; see details in the Technical Appendix.

“x” in this table means the figure has been suppressed due to small numbers (See the NPD User Guide, 2018, p36).

How to use the all LAs tables

On the following pages, we provide some key descriptive information on SEN identification incidence (i.e. percent of pupils identified) and *Risk Ratios* (RR) across all LAs, along with the national equivalent statistics for reference.

An RR is a comparison of the probability of being identified for a pupil in an ethnic minority group, to the probability of being identified for a pupil in the ethnic majority. Unlike the ORs reported above, RRs do not come from an involved statistical procedure - they are calculated simply from the percent of pupils identified in a given minority group, divided by the percent of pupils identified in the White British group. However, interpreting RRs is similar to interpreting ORs: An RR greater than 1 means a pupil in the particular ethnic minority group is *more* likely to be identified than a White British pupil, and an RR less than 1 means a pupil in the particular ethnic minority group is *less* likely to be identified than a White British pupil, on average. We can also apply the same thresholds we outlined earlier to decide what is a substantial RR.

For context, we report overall number of pupils, the percent eligible for FSM, and the SEN incidence for all pupils in each LA. We then report this information separately for White British pupils and for the focal ethnic minority group (see below for details), along with the percent of pupils belonging to both ethnic groups within each LA, and ending with the Risk Ratio comparing the incidence for the ethnic majority group against the incidence for White British pupils.

Explanation of combined ethnic group categories

For the All-LA incidence and Risk Ratio (RR) tables, we combined some ethnic group categories to make the presentation clearer.

For the overall “Any SEN” table, we use the major ethnic group categories defined by the DfE in the Annual School Census: White, Asian, Black, and Mixed.

For specific types of SEN, we used combined ethnic groups according to the patterns found in the national results (given in the summary at the beginning of this document), so:

- For MLD: As most Asian groups were under-represented (Indian, Bangladeshi, Other Asian, Mixed White & Asian, Chinese), we report combined results for all Asian groups, except Pakistani pupils
- For SEMH: As Black Caribbean and Mixed White & Black Caribbean groups were over-represented, we report combined results for these groups together
- For ASD: As Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Other Asian groups were under-represented, we report combined results for these four groups together.

In reporting results for combined groups, we are not making any statements regarding shared identity across specific ethnic minority groups; rather, we are combining groups according to empirically similar patterns of disproportionality and only to report large amounts of information in a readable format.

All-LA 'Any SEN' Table

The following pages report results across all LAs (with equivalent national statistics for comparison) for any SEN identification regardless of specific type of need, broken down by combined ethnic groups as previously described.

What this table tells you:

- 1) The first set of columns report the overall number of pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of pupils entitled to FSM in each LA overall, and the total incidence of any SEN in each LA.
- 2) The second set of columns reports the number of White British pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of pupils in the LA that this group constitutes, the percentage of White British pupils entitled to FSM, and the incidence of any identified SEN amongst White British pupils regardless of type of need.
- 3) The subsequent sets of columns report for Asian, Black and Mixed groups: the number of pupils in each LA belonging to the broad ethnic group category, the percentage of pupils in the LA that the particular broad ethnic group constitutes, the percentage of pupils in that particular group entitled to FSM, the incidence of any identified SEN regardless of type of need within the ethnic group, and the Risk Ratio (relative to White British pupils).

This facilitates comparisons across LAs for these ethnic group categories, and comparisons between LAs and the national equivalent statistics.

As a quick-start guide for looking at the data for specific LAs in this table, the distribution of risk ratios across all LAs is as follows:

	Asian	Black	Mixed
Total LAs	152	152	152
LAs with N<10 in ethnic group with any SEN	5	17	2
LAs with Reported Risk Ratios*	147	135	150
LAs with RR <= 0.75	97	27	8
LAs without apparent disproportionality	50	108	142
LAs with RR >= 1.33	0	8	0

**Recall that Risk Ratios are only reported when the number of pupils in an ethnic group with SEN identification is 10 or more.*

From this, it is apparent that there is relatively little variation across LAs, for the most part, but a bit more for the Asian group, with about two-thirds of LAs showing under-representation and about one-third showing no disproportionality in terms of the RRs for the Asian group.

When looking at the table, you may want to consider: Does the RR for your LA suggest over-representation (RR>=1.33), no disproportionality, or under-representation (RR<0.75) for these groups? How does this compare to the above distribution over all LAs?

All-LA MLD Table

The following pages report results across all LAs (with equivalent national statistics for comparison) for MLD identification, focusing specifically on the combined Asian (excluding Pakistani) group as previously described.

What this table tells you:

- 1) The first set of columns report the overall number of pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of pupils entitled to FSM entitlement in the LA overall, the number of pupils identified with MLD in the LA, and the total incidence of MLD identification in the LA for all pupils.
- 2) The second set of columns reports the number of White British pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of White British pupils in the LA, the percentage of White British pupils entitled to FSM, the number of White British pupils identified with MLD, and the incidence amongst White British pupils of MLD identification.
- 3) The third set of columns reports the number of Asian (excluding Pakistani) pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of pupils in the LA that this group constitutes, the percentage of pupils in this group entitled to FSM, the number of pupils in this group identified with MLD, the incidence of MLD identification in this group, and the Risk Ratio relative to White British pupils.

This facilitates comparisons across LAs for these ethnic group categories, and comparisons between LAs and the national equivalent statistics.

As a quick-start guide for looking at the data for specific LAs in this table, the distribution of risk ratios across all LAs is as follows:

	Asian (excl. Pakistani)
Total LAs	152
LAs with N<10 in ethnic group with MLD	24
LAs with Reported Risk Ratios*	128
LAs with RR <= 0.75	95
LAs without apparent disproportionality	31
LAs with RR >=1.33	2

**Recall that Risk Ratios are only reported when the number of pupils in an ethnic group with SEN identification is 10 or more.*

From this, it is apparent that there is some variation across LAs, but for the most part, the Asian (excluding Pakistani) group is under-represented in most LAs, not disproportionately represented in about one-quarter of LAs with reported RRs, and only over-represented in two LAs for MLD.

When looking at the table, you may want to consider: Does the RR for your LA suggest over-representation ($RR \geq 1.33$), no disproportionality, or under-representation ($RR \leq 0.75$) for MLD for Asian (excluding Pakistani) pupils? How does this compare to the above distribution over all LAs?

Table 8: MLD All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Asian (excluding Pakistani)</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils in LA)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in LA)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in group)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in group)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
Barking and Dagenham	33132	20.0%	1602	4.8%	8719	26.3%	30.4%	631	7.2%	4899	14.8%	10.6%	153	3.1%	0.43
Barnet	43852	16.0%	638	1.5%	13286	30.3%	11.3%	197	1.5%	6199	14.1%	10.1%	65	1.0%	0.71
Barnsley	27405	20.6%	1623	5.9%	25248	92.1%	20.5%	1544	6.1%	207	0.8%	18.4%	6	--	--
Bath and North East Somerset	21450	8.7%	747	3.5%	18466	86.1%	8.5%	667	3.6%	633	3.0%	5.5%	9	--	--
Bedford	22091	12.1%	1008	4.6%	12661	57.3%	9.8%	517	4.1%	3008	13.6%	15.2%	124	4.1%	1.01
Bexley	35179	12.0%	609	1.7%	20963	59.6%	12.7%	442	2.1%	2961	8.4%	6.7%	24	0.8%	0.38
Birmingham	158994	28.3%	11677	7.3%	49808	31.3%	25.8%	3792	7.6%	22885	14.4%	23.1%	1258	5.5%	0.72
Blackburn with Darwen	22285	16.7%	932	4.2%	10658	47.8%	18.9%	485	4.6%	5003	22.5%	11.8%	120	2.4%	0.53
Blackpool	16560	25.6%	758	4.6%	14866	89.8%	26.7%	715	4.8%	459	2.8%	13.5%	10	2.2%	0.45
Bolton	39894	17.6%	2462	6.2%	25810	64.7%	16.5%	1623	6.3%	5122	12.8%	13.0%	178	3.5%	0.55
Bournemouth	18818	13.1%	317	1.7%	14076	74.8%	14.0%	240	1.7%	969	5.1%	8.3%	7	--	--
Bracknell Forest	14242	8.6%	384	2.7%	11254	79.0%	9.4%	320	2.8%	959	6.7%	2.7%	17	1.8%	0.62
Bradford	78243	19.3%	5170	6.6%	34305	43.8%	18.3%	2103	6.1%	6601	8.4%	23.4%	414	6.3%	1.02
Brent	38225	14.0%	1462	3.8%	2697	7.1%	14.3%	98	3.6%	9526	24.9%	5.5%	214	2.2%	0.62
Brighton and Hove	27601	14.1%	791	2.9%	20769	75.2%	14.4%	603	2.9%	1749	6.3%	10.1%	49	2.8%	0.96
Bristol, City of	46034	21.1%	1480	3.2%	29296	63.6%	19.7%	972	3.3%	2962	6.4%	11.9%	73	2.5%	0.74
Bromley	39314	10.1%	963	2.4%	25172	64.0%	9.3%	657	2.6%	3111	7.9%	3.9%	41	1.3%	0.50
Buckinghamshire	65865	6.6%	1526	2.3%	44355	67.3%	5.5%	978	2.2%	6053	9.2%	4.3%	50	0.8%	0.37
Bury	24889	15.2%	1091	4.4%	18594	74.7%	13.6%	813	4.4%	1060	4.3%	19.4%	29	2.7%	0.63
Calderdale	29233	14.4%	1742	6.0%	22125	75.7%	13.0%	1209	5.5%	1075	3.7%	18.6%	39	3.6%	0.66
Cambridgeshire	70514	9.8%	2436	3.5%	55186	78.3%	10.1%	2010	3.6%	3649	5.2%	4.9%	78	2.1%	0.59
Camden	17336	27.8%	363	2.1%	3863	22.3%	24.2%	87	2.3%	3671	21.2%	27.0%	78	2.1%	0.94
Central Bedfordshire	33583	9.4%	1159	3.5%	28233	84.1%	8.9%	919	3.3%	1188	3.5%	7.2%	30	2.5%	0.78
Cheshire East	42748	8.4%	601	1.4%	37862	88.6%	8.3%	520	1.4%	1078	2.5%	6.1%	5	--	--
Cheshire West and Chester	39766	11.3%	1206	3.0%	36406	91.6%	11.4%	1125	3.1%	881	2.2%	7.5%	10	1.1%	0.37
City of London	176	24.4%	x	--	38	21.6%	7.9%	x	--	61	34.7%	19.7%	x	--	--
Cornwall	60692	11.9%	2149	3.5%	56290	92.7%	12.0%	2006	3.6%	738	1.2%	8.3%	20	2.7%	0.76
Coventry	43435	19.4%	2719	6.3%	23011	53.0%	19.7%	1646	7.2%	6883	15.8%	12.8%	230	3.3%	0.47
Croydon	45929	20.4%	1097	2.4%	13248	28.8%	19.8%	349	2.6%	6059	13.2%	10.1%	85	1.4%	0.53
Cumbria	56065	10.2%	1509	2.7%	52793	94.2%	10.5%	1448	2.7%	741	1.3%	7.2%	6	--	--
Darlington	13572	17.5%	568	4.2%	11948	88.0%	18.0%	498	4.2%	469	3.5%	13.9%	19	4.1%	0.97
Derby	34155	17.9%	2094	6.1%	20741	60.7%	17.5%	1246	6.0%	3118	9.1%	12.6%	105	3.4%	0.56
Derbyshire	87889	13.2%	4263	4.9%	81848	93.1%	13.2%	4019	4.9%	1503	1.7%	8.1%	37	2.5%	0.50
Devon	81099	13.3%	2899	3.6%	74608	92.0%	13.5%	2706	3.6%	1173	1.4%	8.3%	26	2.2%	0.61
Doncaster	37669	17.6%	1833	4.9%	32170	85.4%	17.9%	1536	4.8%	1032	2.7%	13.7%	32	3.1%	0.65
Dorset	45771	13.0%	928	2.0%	41869	91.5%	12.9%	857	2.0%	906	2.0%	8.3%	8	--	--
Dudley	40055	16.9%	2486	6.2%	30855	77.0%	15.2%	1881	6.1%	1780	4.4%	15.2%	83	4.7%	0.76
Durham	57713	19.9%	2540	4.4%	55024	95.3%	20.1%	2462	4.5%	660	1.1%	12.4%	12	1.8%	0.41
Ealing	40831	16.1%	1734	4.2%	6199	15.2%	12.6%	212	3.4%	9831	24.1%	9.5%	326	3.3%	0.97

Table 8: MLD All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Asian (excluding Pakistani)</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils in LA)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in LA)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in group)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in group)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
East Riding of Yorkshire	37908	11.9%	1758	4.6%	35345	93.2%	11.9%	1650	4.7%	310	0.8%	6.1%	9	--	--
East Sussex	56896	13.2%	1098	1.9%	49180	86.4%	13.0%	964	2.0%	1846	3.2%	8.2%	17	0.9%	0.47
Enfield	45573	18.8%	1261	2.8%	8992	19.7%	16.3%	219	2.4%	4079	9.0%	11.6%	44	1.1%	0.44
Essex	171466	11.1%	8712	5.1%	143717	83.8%	11.2%	7719	5.4%	5449	3.2%	5.1%	123	2.3%	0.42
Gateshead	22613	17.3%	978	4.3%	20357	90.0%	17.1%	901	4.4%	535	2.4%	10.7%	10	1.9%	0.42
Gloucestershire	71237	10.2%	3818	5.4%	60326	84.7%	10.0%	3164	5.2%	2563	3.6%	6.8%	71	2.8%	0.53
Greenwich	31881	19.6%	692	2.2%	10644	33.4%	24.6%	301	2.8%	2909	9.1%	11.9%	38	1.3%	0.46
Hackney	27041	33.0%	1425	5.3%	4259	15.8%	18.4%	181	4.2%	3318	12.3%	29.7%	166	5.0%	1.18
Halton	16300	28.5%	648	4.0%	15381	94.4%	28.7%	633	4.1%	115	0.7%	19.1%	x	--	--
Hammersmith and Fulham	15307	22.6%	415	2.7%	4142	27.1%	16.2%	97	2.3%	1219	8.0%	15.7%	26	2.1%	0.91
Hampshire	153538	8.9%	7036	4.6%	134531	87.6%	9.0%	6350	4.7%	5984	3.9%	4.9%	158	2.6%	0.56
Haringey	30434	22.0%	941	3.1%	5766	18.9%	8.7%	72	1.2%	2378	7.8%	17.3%	56	2.4%	1.89
Harrow	28671	11.0%	676	2.4%	3565	12.4%	12.4%	92	2.6%	12632	44.1%	7.2%	214	1.7%	0.66
Hartlepool	12113	23.9%	487	4.0%	11416	94.2%	24.0%	470	4.1%	299	2.5%	15.7%	6	--	--
Havering	32773	12.3%	1080	3.3%	22059	67.3%	12.7%	813	3.7%	2031	6.2%	6.5%	38	1.9%	0.51
Herefordshire	19958	9.1%	599	3.0%	17812	89.2%	9.2%	548	3.1%	238	1.2%	6.3%	3	--	--
Hertfordshire	148782	8.7%	4216	2.8%	106780	71.8%	8.7%	3099	2.9%	11563	7.8%	4.9%	179	1.5%	0.53
Hillingdon	39407	15.5%	852	2.2%	14033	35.6%	16.4%	362	2.6%	8899	22.6%	8.5%	148	1.7%	0.64
Hounslow	32490	15.6%	1253	3.9%	6902	21.2%	20.5%	316	4.6%	8155	25.1%	6.8%	236	2.9%	0.63
Isle of Wight	14227	13.9%	672	4.7%	13203	92.8%	14.2%	629	4.8%	223	1.6%	13.5%	8	--	--
Isles of Scilly	235	2.6%	5	--	184	78.3%	2.2%	5	--	x	--	0.0%	x	--	--
Islington	19300	31.9%	600	3.1%	5221	27.1%	31.0%	177	3.4%	1899	9.8%	28.8%	54	2.8%	0.84
Kensington and Chelsea	10017	21.6%	224	2.2%	2057	20.5%	16.9%	56	2.7%	568	5.7%	17.6%	7	--	--
Kent	183547	12.1%	3842	2.1%	149663	81.5%	12.7%	3221	2.2%	8899	4.8%	5.1%	69	0.8%	0.36
Kingston upon Hull, City of	31432	25.1%	1045	3.3%	25840	82.2%	26.3%	910	3.5%	528	1.7%	16.9%	9	--	--
Kingston upon Thames	19072	9.0%	321	1.7%	8877	46.5%	8.5%	187	2.1%	3745	19.6%	7.0%	37	1.0%	0.47
Kirklees	55687	20.6%	2046	3.7%	34046	61.1%	18.1%	1164	3.4%	5432	9.8%	19.8%	157	2.9%	0.85
Knowsley	16164	32.5%	1998	12.4%	15126	93.6%	33.1%	1915	12.7%	288	1.8%	11.8%	12	4.2%	0.33
Lambeth	29364	26.3%	1323	4.5%	4106	14.0%	15.9%	132	3.2%	1457	5.0%	20.9%	40	2.7%	0.85
Lancashire	144891	14.1%	5137	3.5%	117789	81.3%	14.1%	4211	3.6%	7571	5.2%	13.7%	170	2.2%	0.63
Leeds	93823	17.5%	4055	4.3%	63515	67.7%	16.3%	2612	4.1%	6724	7.2%	16.2%	232	3.5%	0.84
Leicester	44625	19.1%	2765	6.2%	12939	29.0%	29.6%	1210	9.4%	18475	41.4%	11.0%	786	4.3%	0.45
Leicestershire	80348	8.2%	3973	4.9%	66605	82.9%	8.4%	3485	5.2%	6914	8.6%	5.1%	160	2.3%	0.44
Lewisham	33307	20.3%	570	1.7%	7314	22.0%	20.1%	150	2.1%	2757	8.3%	12.2%	28	1.0%	0.50
Lincolnshire	85738	12.8%	4936	5.8%	74994	87.5%	13.5%	4408	5.9%	1400	1.6%	6.6%	22	1.6%	0.27
Liverpool	53960	27.4%	1860	3.4%	41423	76.8%	26.5%	1413	3.4%	2587	4.8%	17.7%	39	1.5%	0.44
Luton	32414	17.2%	1494	4.6%	7742	23.9%	18.4%	391	5.1%	6981	21.5%	16.5%	290	4.2%	0.82
Manchester	65210	27.8%	2737	4.2%	25252	38.7%	31.4%	1290	5.1%	5657	8.7%	18.4%	167	3.0%	0.58
Medway	35756	13.6%	1059	3.0%	27343	76.5%	14.2%	879	3.2%	1951	5.5%	6.5%	39	2.0%	0.62

Table 8: MLD All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Asian (excluding Pakistani)</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils in LA)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in LA)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in group)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with MLD in group)</i>	<i>MLD Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
Merton	21986	15.9%	618	2.8%	7024	31.9%	17.5%	239	3.4%	3617	16.5%	10.8%	65	1.8%	0.53
Middlesbrough	18350	31.0%	1183	6.4%	13793	75.2%	31.6%	888	6.4%	696	3.8%	23.7%	39	5.6%	0.87
Milton Keynes	36500	11.4%	1819	5.0%	21545	59.0%	11.9%	1240	5.8%	3586	9.8%	6.8%	99	2.8%	0.48
Newcastle upon Tyne	30490	25.0%	1703	5.6%	21600	70.8%	27.0%	1118	5.2%	3005	9.9%	14.9%	139	4.6%	0.89
Newham	47827	21.7%	1545	3.2%	2835	5.9%	39.6%	150	5.3%	16047	33.6%	17.4%	381	2.4%	0.45
Norfolk	93903	13.5%	3758	4.0%	81313	86.6%	13.7%	3272	4.0%	2061	2.2%	8.1%	44	2.1%	0.53
North East Lincolnshire	19673	17.9%	953	4.8%	18179	92.4%	18.5%	902	5.0%	230	1.2%	12.2%	6	--	--
North Lincolnshire	20691	14.2%	1102	5.3%	17912	86.6%	14.6%	1005	5.6%	805	3.9%	16.0%	13	1.6%	0.29
North Somerset	24895	9.9%	562	2.3%	22368	89.8%	10.0%	517	2.3%	604	2.4%	5.1%	7	--	--
North Tyneside	24077	14.8%	766	3.2%	22029	91.5%	14.9%	704	3.2%	749	3.1%	9.2%	17	2.3%	0.71
North Yorkshire	67652	7.6%	1789	2.6%	61992	91.6%	7.7%	1643	2.7%	1313	1.9%	4.4%	22	1.7%	0.63
Northamptonshire	93159	13.0%	2744	2.9%	71098	76.3%	13.1%	2235	3.1%	4689	5.0%	9.2%	82	1.7%	0.56
Northumberland	36031	13.3%	1834	5.1%	34231	95.0%	13.5%	1765	5.2%	595	1.7%	5.7%	16	2.7%	0.52
Nottingham	35040	26.2%	1772	5.1%	17118	48.9%	29.8%	1009	5.9%	2652	7.6%	15.5%	80	3.0%	0.51
Nottinghamshire	93984	12.7%	2312	2.5%	81044	86.2%	13.0%	2073	2.6%	2720	2.9%	6.2%	33	1.2%	0.47
Oldham	35816	19.5%	1384	3.9%	19967	55.7%	16.8%	680	3.4%	5906	16.5%	23.8%	278	4.7%	1.38
Oxfordshire	74436	9.3%	3890	5.2%	57076	76.7%	8.6%	2996	5.2%	4072	5.5%	9.1%	163	4.0%	0.76
Peterborough	29317	15.9%	1118	3.8%	15482	52.8%	17.8%	603	3.9%	1988	6.8%	11.1%	43	2.2%	0.56
Plymouth	30735	18.1%	973	3.2%	27220	88.6%	18.3%	899	3.3%	618	2.0%	10.7%	13	2.1%	0.64
Poole	15923	10.4%	479	3.0%	13818	86.8%	10.6%	418	3.0%	627	3.9%	3.2%	15	2.4%	0.79
Portsmouth	21935	18.8%	765	3.5%	17073	77.8%	19.8%	650	3.8%	1652	7.5%	10.6%	29	1.8%	0.46
Reading	16583	15.3%	297	1.8%	7583	45.7%	17.0%	168	2.2%	2592	15.6%	6.2%	23	0.9%	0.40
Redbridge	42397	17.0%	1865	4.4%	6095	14.4%	14.9%	188	3.1%	15452	36.4%	10.4%	553	3.6%	1.16
Redcar and Cleveland	17540	20.5%	1103	6.3%	16662	95.0%	20.4%	1055	6.3%	254	1.4%	13.0%	9	--	--
Richmond upon Thames	21349	8.6%	447	2.1%	12852	60.2%	7.4%	262	2.0%	2173	10.2%	7.9%	41	1.9%	0.93
Rochdale	29288	20.7%	1376	4.7%	18498	63.2%	19.5%	857	4.6%	1989	6.8%	26.0%	89	4.5%	0.97
Rotherham	36032	17.1%	1215	3.4%	29845	82.8%	16.6%	993	3.3%	844	2.3%	21.9%	28	3.3%	1.00
Rutland	4892	5.1%	254	5.2%	4504	92.1%	5.2%	237	5.3%	83	1.7%	3.6%	x	--	--
Salford	28375	21.7%	1635	5.8%	21091	74.3%	22.0%	1315	6.2%	759	2.7%	14.1%	22	2.9%	0.46
Sandwell	45416	23.1%	3495	7.7%	21308	46.9%	25.3%	1906	8.9%	9094	20.0%	14.6%	438	4.8%	0.54
Sefton	32517	15.7%	734	2.3%	30069	92.5%	15.9%	700	2.3%	509	1.6%	9.0%	3	--	--
Sheffield	64006	19.6%	2528	3.9%	42466	66.3%	16.1%	1585	3.7%	3683	5.8%	21.7%	85	2.3%	0.62
Shropshire	32237	9.6%	1334	4.1%	29612	91.9%	9.6%	1249	4.2%	528	1.6%	6.1%	8	--	--
Slough	22733	11.6%	749	3.3%	3992	17.6%	17.4%	211	5.3%	5705	25.1%	5.2%	99	1.7%	0.33
Solihull	31226	14.5%	1158	3.7%	23317	74.7%	14.0%	875	3.8%	2604	8.3%	8.4%	57	2.2%	0.58
Somerset	59688	10.4%	1535	2.6%	54021	90.5%	10.5%	1397	2.6%	1144	1.9%	5.5%	12	1.0%	0.41
South Gloucestershire	32888	9.0%	1110	3.4%	28089	85.4%	8.7%	992	3.5%	1209	3.7%	3.8%	26	2.2%	0.61
South Tyneside	17393	21.1%	639	3.7%	15848	91.1%	21.1%	574	3.6%	680	3.9%	19.7%	27	4.0%	1.10
Southampton	26380	18.8%	1936	7.3%	17494	66.3%	21.4%	1445	8.3%	2939	11.1%	11.5%	128	4.4%	0.53

Table 8: MLD All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	Overall				White British					Asian (excluding Pakistani)					Risk Ratio
	<i>N</i> (pupils in LA)	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N</i> (pupils with MLD in LA)	<i>MLD</i> <i>Incidence</i> (% in LA)	<i>N</i> (pupils in LA in group)	<i>% LA pupils</i> <i>in group</i>	<i>% FSM</i> <i>within group</i>	<i>N</i> (pupils with MLD in group)	<i>MLD</i> <i>Incidence</i> (% within group)	<i>N</i> (pupils in LA in group)	<i>% LA pupils</i> <i>in group</i>	<i>% FSM</i> <i>within group</i>	<i>N</i> (pupils with MLD in group)	<i>MLD</i> <i>Incidence</i> (% within group)	
Local Authority															
Southend-on-Sea	23237	13.2%	1161	5.0%	17527	75.4%	13.9%	946	5.4%	1601	6.9%	6.2%	29	1.8%	0.34
Southwark	32807	23.9%	1271	3.9%	6621	20.2%	20.8%	267	4.0%	2327	7.1%	22.3%	62	2.7%	0.66
St. Helens	21510	17.9%	1055	4.9%	20414	94.9%	18.2%	1011	5.0%	321	1.5%	4.4%	7	--	--
Staffordshire	99876	10.6%	4268	4.3%	88773	88.9%	10.6%	3823	4.3%	2787	2.8%	9.2%	85	3.0%	0.71
Stockport	34225	13.5%	1461	4.3%	28387	82.9%	13.1%	1275	4.5%	1487	4.3%	13.2%	39	2.6%	0.58
Stockton-on-Tees	24526	19.7%	1439	5.9%	21730	88.6%	19.1%	1289	5.9%	832	3.4%	20.1%	39	4.7%	0.79
Stoke-on-Trent	30677	22.2%	2344	7.6%	22067	71.9%	22.6%	1726	7.8%	1832	6.0%	19.1%	96	5.2%	0.67
Suffolk	82794	12.6%	2119	2.6%	69669	84.1%	12.6%	1848	2.7%	1956	2.4%	9.1%	24	1.2%	0.46
Sunderland	32842	21.7%	1499	4.6%	30231	92.0%	22.0%	1384	4.6%	1395	4.2%	12.5%	60	4.3%	0.94
Surrey	126564	7.5%	4195	3.3%	96893	76.6%	7.4%	3275	3.4%	8627	6.8%	4.0%	167	1.9%	0.57
Sutton	28224	11.6%	567	2.0%	14816	52.5%	13.2%	365	2.5%	5430	19.2%	5.2%	40	0.7%	0.30
Swindon	27468	12.7%	1274	4.6%	20359	74.1%	13.4%	1049	5.2%	2879	10.5%	6.0%	75	2.6%	0.51
Tameside	30254	19.8%	1339	4.4%	23875	78.9%	19.2%	1135	4.8%	2199	7.3%	21.0%	55	2.5%	0.53
Telford and Wrekin	23148	16.3%	1449	6.3%	18883	81.6%	16.9%	1230	6.5%	1147	5.0%	9.2%	38	3.3%	0.51
Thurrock	22661	14.6%	1095	4.8%	14979	66.1%	16.6%	859	5.7%	1080	4.8%	8.2%	19	1.8%	0.31
Torbay	15510	16.9%	457	2.9%	14093	90.9%	17.5%	431	3.1%	379	2.4%	6.3%	5	--	--
Tower Hamlets	33842	38.5%	868	2.6%	3199	9.5%	43.9%	121	3.8%	22377	66.1%	37.7%	532	2.4%	0.63
Trafford	31731	10.3%	1234	3.9%	21976	69.3%	9.4%	856	3.9%	3192	10.1%	8.3%	100	3.1%	0.80
Wakefield	41367	14.9%	1429	3.5%	35894	86.8%	15.2%	1278	3.6%	798	1.9%	15.7%	12	1.5%	0.42
Walsall	38721	21.8%	2527	6.5%	24372	62.9%	22.6%	1777	7.3%	5294	13.7%	13.6%	202	3.8%	0.52
Waltham Forest	34168	17.7%	1949	5.7%	5815	17.0%	14.5%	290	5.0%	4347	12.7%	14.3%	179	4.1%	0.83
Wandsworth	24561	18.6%	704	2.9%	6532	26.6%	14.8%	185	2.8%	2810	11.4%	13.2%	60	2.1%	0.75
Warrington	26913	10.5%	1250	4.6%	23802	88.4%	10.7%	1116	4.7%	856	3.2%	6.4%	21	2.5%	0.52
Warwickshire	65410	9.1%	3592	5.5%	53878	82.4%	9.3%	3019	5.6%	3989	6.1%	4.2%	127	3.2%	0.57
West Berkshire	20712	7.3%	300	1.4%	17509	84.5%	6.7%	260	1.5%	815	3.9%	6.5%	x	--	--
West Sussex	94292	8.5%	3184	3.4%	77620	82.3%	8.5%	2656	3.4%	4535	4.8%	4.8%	87	1.9%	0.56
Westminster	17440	28.5%	557	3.2%	2363	13.5%	17.6%	52	2.2%	2644	15.2%	24.3%	77	2.9%	1.32
Wigan	39700	14.7%	2179	5.5%	36676	92.4%	14.4%	2046	5.6%	601	1.5%	14.5%	12	2.0%	0.36
Wiltshire	55866	7.8%	1887	3.4%	49314	88.3%	7.9%	1700	3.4%	1296	2.3%	3.5%	17	1.3%	0.38
Windsor and Maidenhead	16960	6.4%	479	2.8%	11128	65.6%	5.9%	339	3.0%	1468	8.7%	3.6%	14	1.0%	0.31
Wirral	39877	18.4%	1082	2.7%	36642	91.9%	19.0%	1021	2.8%	1348	3.4%	6.3%	23	1.7%	0.61
Wokingham	20641	5.8%	375	1.8%	14456	70.0%	5.4%	275	1.9%	2171	10.5%	2.2%	20	0.9%	0.48
Wolverhampton	32091	23.3%	2773	8.6%	15702	48.9%	25.1%	1514	9.6%	6525	20.3%	12.7%	360	5.5%	0.57
Worcestershire	65175	11.9%	2503	3.8%	56536	86.7%	11.7%	2173	3.8%	1769	2.7%	8.0%	37	2.1%	0.54
York	20316	8.7%	550	2.7%	18060	88.9%	8.9%	507	2.8%	628	3.1%	3.3%	10	1.6%	0.57
National (incl. all LAs)	6505275	15.2%	261069	4.0%	4512620	69.4%	14.1%	184642	4.1%	503656	7.7%	12.8%	13906	2.8%	0.67

All-LA SEMH Table

The following pages report results across all LAs (with equivalent national statistics for comparison) for SEMH identification, focusing specifically on the combined Black Caribbean and Mixed White & Caribbean (BCRB/MWBC) group as previously described.

What this table tells you:

- 1) The first set of columns report the total number of pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of pupils entitled to FSM in the LA overall, the number of pupils identified with SEMH in the LA, and the incidence of SEMH identification in the LA.
- 2) The second set of columns reports the number of White British pupils in the LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of White British pupils in the LA the percentage of White British pupils entitled to FSM, the number of White British pupils identified with SEM, and the incidence amongst White British pupils of SEMH identification.
- 3) The third set of columns reports the number of BCRB/MWBC pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of pupils in the LA that this group constitutes, the percentage of pupils in this group entitled to FSM, the number of pupils in this group identified with SEMH, the incidence of SEMH identification amongst pupils in this group in the LA, and the Risk Ratio (relative to White British pupils) of identification with SEMH.

This facilitates comparisons across LAs for these ethnic group categories, and comparisons between LAs and the national equivalent statistics.

As a quick-start guide for looking at the data for specific LAs in this table, the distribution of risk ratios across all LAs is as follows:

	BCRB/MWBC
Total LAs	152
N<10 in ethnic group with SEMH	39
Reported Risk Ratios*	113
LAs with RR <= 0.75	0
LAs without apparent disproportionality	29
LAs with RR >= 1.33	84

**Recall that Risk Ratios are only reported when the number of pupils in an ethnic group with SEN identification is 10 or more.*

From this, it is apparent that there is some variation across LAs; pupils in the BCRB/MWBC group are over-represented in the majority of LAs, not disproportionately represented in about a fourth of LAs for which results were reported, and not under-represented in any LAs.

When looking at the table, you may want to consider: Does the RR for your LA suggest over-representation ($RR > 1.33$), no disproportionality, or under-representation ($RR \leq 0.75$) for these groups for SEMH in particular for BCRB/MWBC pupils? How does this compare to the above distribution over all LAs?

Table 9: SEMH All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Black Caribbean & Mixed White & Caribbean</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in LA)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in group)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in group)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
Barking and Dagenham	33132	20.0%	1141	3.4%	8719	26.3%	30.4%	553	6.3%	1609	4.9%	29.3%	109	6.8%	1.07
Barnet	43852	16.0%	1286	2.9%	13286	30.3%	11.3%	519	3.9%	1516	3.5%	28.0%	114	7.5%	1.93
Barnsley	27405	20.6%	948	3.5%	25248	92.1%	20.5%	891	3.5%	99	0.4%	34.3%	11	11.1%	3.15
Bath and North East Somerset	21450	8.7%	563	2.6%	18466	86.1%	8.5%	487	2.6%	349	1.6%	19.8%	28	8.0%	3.04
Bedford	22091	12.1%	535	2.4%	12661	57.3%	9.8%	347	2.7%	1116	5.1%	24.0%	47	4.2%	1.54
Bexley	35179	12.0%	947	2.7%	20963	59.6%	12.7%	708	3.4%	939	2.7%	17.4%	43	4.6%	1.36
Birmingham	158994	28.3%	4241	2.7%	49808	31.3%	25.8%	1960	3.9%	11831	7.4%	36.7%	699	5.9%	1.50
Blackburn with Darwen	22285	16.7%	608	2.7%	10658	47.8%	18.9%	463	4.3%	51	0.2%	25.5%	x	--	--
Blackpool	16560	25.6%	679	4.1%	14866	89.8%	26.7%	636	4.3%	118	0.7%	33.9%	12	10.2%	2.38
Bolton	39894	17.6%	1142	2.9%	25810	64.7%	16.5%	957	3.7%	320	0.8%	24.1%	15	4.7%	1.26
Bournemouth	18818	13.1%	426	2.3%	14076	74.8%	14.0%	359	2.6%	255	1.4%	25.9%	13	5.1%	2.00
Bracknell Forest	14242	8.6%	315	2.2%	11254	79.0%	9.4%	271	2.4%	192	1.3%	18.8%	7	--	--
Bradford	78243	19.3%	2851	3.6%	34305	43.8%	18.3%	1596	4.7%	1232	1.6%	25.9%	81	6.6%	1.41
Brent	38225	14.0%	840	2.2%	2697	7.1%	14.3%	121	4.5%	3650	9.5%	25.4%	217	5.9%	1.33
Brighton and Hove	27601	14.1%	1068	3.9%	20769	75.2%	14.4%	897	4.3%	489	1.8%	24.7%	31	6.3%	1.47
Bristol, City of	46034	21.1%	1532	3.3%	29296	63.6%	19.7%	1022	3.5%	2397	5.2%	36.9%	186	7.8%	2.22
Bromley	39314	10.1%	1094	2.8%	25172	64.0%	9.3%	726	2.9%	2368	6.0%	20.2%	116	4.9%	1.70
Buckinghamshire	65865	6.6%	1178	1.8%	44355	67.3%	5.5%	816	1.8%	1921	2.9%	17.5%	102	5.3%	2.89
Bury	24889	15.2%	644	2.6%	18594	74.7%	13.6%	547	2.9%	386	1.6%	25.4%	17	4.4%	1.50
Calderdale	29233	14.4%	770	2.6%	22125	75.7%	13.0%	676	3.1%	385	1.3%	18.7%	15	3.9%	1.28
Cambridgeshire	70514	9.8%	1825	2.6%	55186	78.3%	10.1%	1538	2.8%	794	1.1%	24.4%	23	2.9%	1.04
Camden	17336	27.8%	592	3.4%	3863	22.3%	24.2%	195	5.0%	1022	5.9%	37.8%	62	6.1%	1.20
Central Bedfordshire	33583	9.4%	933	2.8%	28233	84.1%	8.9%	786	2.8%	768	2.3%	16.7%	38	4.9%	1.78
Cheshire East	42748	8.4%	722	1.7%	37862	88.6%	8.3%	663	1.8%	345	0.8%	19.7%	8	--	--
Cheshire West and Chester	39766	11.3%	932	2.3%	36406	91.6%	11.4%	870	2.4%	165	0.4%	9.7%	6	--	--
City of London	176	24.4%	9	--	38	21.6%	7.9%	x	--	6	3.4%	66.7%	x	--	--
Cornwall	60692	11.9%	1715	2.8%	56290	92.7%	12.0%	1606	2.9%	275	0.5%	18.5%	13	4.7%	1.66
Coventry	43435	19.4%	1240	2.9%	23011	53.0%	19.7%	835	3.6%	1345	3.1%	29.3%	83	6.2%	1.70
Croydon	45929	20.4%	1471	3.2%	13248	28.8%	19.8%	565	4.3%	7313	15.9%	28.8%	392	5.4%	1.26
Cumbria	56065	10.2%	1152	2.1%	52793	94.2%	10.5%	1111	2.1%	91	0.2%	14.3%	4	--	--
Darlington	13572	17.5%	468	3.4%	11948	88.0%	18.0%	433	3.6%	70	0.5%	24.3%	4	--	--
Derby	34155	17.9%	1073	3.1%	20741	60.7%	17.5%	749	3.6%	1386	4.1%	26.6%	69	5.0%	1.38
Derbyshire	87889	13.2%	2841	3.2%	81848	93.1%	13.2%	2673	3.3%	803	0.9%	23.8%	44	5.5%	1.68
Devon	81099	13.3%	3467	4.3%	74608	92.0%	13.5%	3253	4.4%	326	0.4%	25.8%	32	9.8%	2.25
Doncaster	37669	17.6%	827	2.2%	32170	85.4%	17.9%	757	2.4%	284	0.8%	20.8%	8	--	--
Dorset	45771	13.0%	1326	2.9%	41869	91.5%	12.9%	1234	2.9%	237	0.5%	25.7%	13	5.5%	1.86
Dudley	40055	16.9%	989	2.5%	30855	77.0%	15.2%	813	2.6%	1370	3.4%	28.8%	71	5.2%	1.97
Durham	57713	19.9%	1699	2.9%	55024	95.3%	20.1%	1639	3.0%	119	0.2%	28.6%	9	--	--
Ealing	40831	16.1%	1262	3.1%	6199	15.2%	12.6%	255	4.1%	2641	6.5%	27.8%	248	9.4%	2.28

Table 9: SEMH All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Black Caribbean & Mixed White & Caribbean</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in LA)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in group)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in group)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
East Riding of Yorkshire	37908	11.9%	624	1.6%	35345	93.2%	11.9%	599	1.7%	118	0.3%	19.5%	x	--	
East Sussex	56896	13.2%	1386	2.4%	49180	86.4%	13.0%	1232	2.5%	523	0.9%	26.6%	24	4.6%	
Enfield	45573	18.8%	1630	3.6%	8992	19.7%	16.3%	428	4.8%	3869	8.5%	24.5%	294	7.6%	
Essex	171466	11.1%	4040	2.4%	143717	83.8%	11.2%	3547	2.5%	2492	1.5%	20.5%	80	3.2%	
Gateshead	22613	17.3%	600	2.7%	20357	90.0%	17.1%	566	2.8%	42	0.2%	16.7%	x	--	
Gloucestershire	71237	10.2%	1618	2.3%	60326	84.7%	10.0%	1418	2.4%	1249	1.8%	23.8%	63	5.0%	
Greenwich	31881	19.6%	922	2.9%	10644	33.4%	24.6%	470	4.4%	1888	5.9%	26.7%	77	4.1%	
Hackney	27041	33.0%	1107	4.1%	4259	15.8%	18.4%	167	3.9%	3847	14.2%	45.0%	316	8.2%	
Halton	16300	28.5%	510	3.1%	15381	94.4%	28.7%	484	3.1%	84	0.5%	27.4%	x	--	
Hammersmith and Fulham	15307	22.6%	565	3.7%	4142	27.1%	16.2%	169	4.1%	1567	10.2%	36.9%	124	7.9%	
Hampshire	153538	8.9%	3693	2.4%	134531	87.6%	9.0%	3361	2.5%	1150	0.7%	16.2%	50	4.3%	
Haringey	30434	22.0%	1111	3.7%	5766	18.9%	8.7%	192	3.3%	3599	11.8%	32.0%	310	8.6%	
Harrow	28671	11.0%	572	2.0%	3565	12.4%	12.4%	107	3.0%	1460	5.1%	21.2%	105	7.2%	
Hartlepool	12113	23.9%	324	2.7%	11416	94.2%	24.0%	307	2.7%	16	0.1%	31.3%	x	--	
Havering	32773	12.3%	357	1.1%	22059	67.3%	12.7%	278	1.3%	1307	4.0%	17.7%	21	1.6%	
Herefordshire	19958	9.1%	604	3.0%	17812	89.2%	9.2%	562	3.2%	67	0.3%	20.9%	x	--	
Hertfordshire	148782	8.7%	4045	2.7%	106780	71.8%	8.7%	3191	3.0%	3712	2.5%	16.9%	186	5.0%	
Hillingdon	39407	15.5%	720	1.8%	14033	35.6%	16.4%	364	2.6%	1629	4.1%	24.4%	54	3.3%	
Hounslow	32490	15.6%	1344	4.1%	6902	21.2%	20.5%	527	7.6%	1021	3.1%	26.9%	79	7.7%	
Isle of Wight	14227	13.9%	458	3.2%	13203	92.8%	14.2%	431	3.3%	100	0.7%	16.0%	4	--	
Isles of Scilly	235	2.6%	5	--	184	78.3%	2.2%	x	--	x	0.9%	0.0%	x	--	
Islington	19300	31.9%	708	3.7%	5221	27.1%	31.0%	197	3.8%	1901	9.8%	40.7%	159	8.4%	
Kensington and Chelsea	10017	21.6%	303	3.0%	2057	20.5%	16.9%	57	2.8%	779	7.8%	31.8%	66	8.5%	
Kent	183547	12.1%	4988	2.7%	149663	81.5%	12.7%	4409	2.9%	1931	1.1%	18.0%	83	4.3%	
Kingston upon Hull, City of	31432	25.1%	752	2.4%	25840	82.2%	26.3%	670	2.6%	80	0.3%	37.5%	3	--	
Kingston upon Thames	19072	9.0%	332	1.7%	8877	46.5%	8.5%	195	2.2%	432	2.3%	24.1%	19	4.4%	
Kirklees	55687	20.6%	1163	2.1%	34046	61.1%	18.1%	878	2.6%	1864	3.3%	36.0%	79	4.2%	
Knowsley	16164	32.5%	606	3.7%	15126	93.6%	33.1%	570	3.8%	69	0.4%	34.8%	x	--	
Lambeth	29364	26.3%	1109	3.8%	4106	14.0%	15.9%	130	3.2%	6078	20.7%	36.1%	420	6.9%	
Lancashire	144891	14.1%	2901	2.0%	117789	81.3%	14.1%	2616	2.2%	1031	0.7%	19.5%	30	2.9%	
Leeds	93823	17.5%	2762	2.9%	63515	67.7%	16.3%	1909	3.0%	2524	2.7%	28.8%	192	7.6%	
Leicester	44625	19.1%	1270	2.8%	12939	29.0%	29.6%	678	5.2%	1456	3.3%	31.7%	108	7.4%	
Leicestershire	80348	8.2%	1339	1.7%	66605	82.9%	8.4%	1201	1.8%	1187	1.5%	14.8%	44	3.7%	
Lewisham	33307	20.3%	847	2.5%	7314	22.0%	20.1%	194	2.7%	7063	21.2%	26.6%	325	4.6%	
Lincolnshire	85738	12.8%	2082	2.4%	74994	87.5%	13.5%	1901	2.5%	473	0.6%	22.4%	11	2.3%	
Liverpool	53960	27.4%	1791	3.3%	41423	76.8%	26.5%	1470	3.5%	431	0.8%	46.4%	27	6.3%	
Luton	32414	17.2%	910	2.8%	7742	23.9%	18.4%	349	4.5%	2163	6.7%	25.5%	138	6.4%	
Manchester	65210	27.8%	2156	3.3%	25252	38.7%	31.4%	1181	4.7%	3064	4.7%	35.1%	209	6.8%	
Medway	35756	13.6%	1491	4.2%	27343	76.5%	14.2%	1282	4.7%	735	2.1%	21.4%	43	5.9%	

Table 9: SEMH All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Black Caribbean & Mixed White & Caribbean</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in LA)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in group)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in group)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
Merton	21986	15.9%	766	3.5%	7024	31.9%	17.5%	311	4.4%	1563	7.1%	27.7%	115	7.4%	1.66
Middlesbrough	18350	31.0%	653	3.6%	13793	75.2%	31.6%	571	4.1%	96	0.5%	42.7%	6	--	--
Milton Keynes	36500	11.4%	860	2.4%	21545	59.0%	11.9%	657	3.0%	978	2.7%	16.3%	28	2.9%	0.94
Newcastle upon Tyne	30490	25.0%	913	3.0%	21600	70.8%	27.0%	803	3.7%	98	0.3%	22.4%	x	--	--
Newham	47827	21.7%	1673	3.5%	2835	5.9%	39.6%	292	10.3%	2446	5.1%	33.6%	193	7.9%	0.77
Norfolk	93903	13.5%	3087	3.3%	81313	86.6%	13.7%	2808	3.5%	524	0.6%	24.8%	22	4.2%	1.22
North East Lincolnshire	19673	17.9%	323	1.6%	18179	92.4%	18.5%	311	1.7%	64	0.3%	21.9%	x	--	--
North Lincolnshire	20691	14.2%	406	2.0%	17912	86.6%	14.6%	382	2.1%	51	0.2%	25.5%	x	--	--
North Somerset	24895	9.9%	678	2.7%	22368	89.8%	10.0%	622	2.8%	186	0.7%	20.4%	11	5.9%	2.13
North Tyneside	24077	14.8%	582	2.4%	22029	91.5%	14.9%	559	2.5%	60	0.2%	25.0%	x	--	--
North Yorkshire	67652	7.6%	1352	2.0%	61992	91.6%	7.7%	1276	2.1%	300	0.4%	13.7%	5	--	--
Northamptonshire	93159	13.0%	2269	2.4%	71098	76.3%	13.1%	1910	2.7%	2202	2.4%	26.0%	96	4.4%	1.62
Northumberland	36031	13.3%	1346	3.7%	34231	95.0%	13.5%	1294	3.8%	94	0.3%	23.4%	7	--	--
Nottingham	35040	26.2%	1386	4.0%	17118	48.9%	29.8%	792	4.6%	3350	9.6%	35.3%	225	6.7%	1.45
Nottinghamshire	93984	12.7%	1700	1.8%	81044	86.2%	13.0%	1533	1.9%	1626	1.7%	18.8%	44	2.7%	1.43
Oldham	35816	19.5%	819	2.3%	19967	55.7%	16.8%	579	2.9%	581	1.6%	26.0%	24	4.1%	1.42
Oxfordshire	74436	9.3%	2210	3.0%	57076	76.7%	8.6%	1769	3.1%	1406	1.9%	24.7%	100	7.1%	2.29
Peterborough	29317	15.9%	701	2.4%	15482	52.8%	17.8%	513	3.3%	585	2.0%	26.5%	19	3.2%	0.98
Plymouth	30735	18.1%	1507	4.9%	27220	88.6%	18.3%	1406	5.2%	195	0.6%	28.2%	15	7.7%	1.49
Poole	15923	10.4%	612	3.8%	13818	86.8%	10.6%	564	4.1%	121	0.8%	24.0%	7	--	--
Portsmouth	21935	18.8%	686	3.1%	17073	77.8%	19.8%	617	3.6%	218	1.0%	22.9%	10	4.6%	1.27
Reading	16583	15.3%	624	3.8%	7583	45.7%	17.0%	396	5.2%	984	5.9%	36.1%	80	8.1%	1.56
Redbridge	42397	17.0%	1033	2.4%	6095	14.4%	14.9%	236	3.9%	2275	5.4%	31.6%	142	6.2%	1.61
Redcar and Cleveland	17540	20.5%	769	4.4%	16662	95.0%	20.4%	728	4.4%	53	0.3%	28.3%	x	--	--
Richmond upon Thames	21349	8.6%	547	2.6%	12852	60.2%	7.4%	383	3.0%	570	2.7%	21.9%	38	6.7%	2.24
Rochdale	29288	20.7%	645	2.2%	18498	63.2%	19.5%	534	2.9%	204	0.7%	36.8%	7	--	--
Rotherham	36032	17.1%	881	2.4%	29845	82.8%	16.6%	777	2.6%	268	0.7%	19.8%	16	6.0%	2.29
Rutland	4892	5.1%	73	1.5%	4504	92.1%	5.2%	69	1.5%	40	0.8%	7.5%	x	--	--
Salford	28375	21.7%	1069	3.8%	21091	74.3%	22.0%	896	4.2%	312	1.1%	24.4%	17	5.4%	1.28
Sandwell	45416	23.1%	1610	3.5%	21308	46.9%	25.3%	977	4.6%	3431	7.6%	31.0%	220	6.4%	1.40
Sefton	32517	15.7%	649	2.0%	30069	92.5%	15.9%	615	2.0%	110	0.3%	27.3%	x	--	--
Sheffield	64006	19.6%	1724	2.7%	42466	66.3%	16.1%	1191	2.8%	2196	3.4%	34.1%	113	5.1%	1.83
Shropshire	32237	9.6%	643	2.0%	29612	91.9%	9.6%	601	2.0%	204	0.6%	18.6%	6	--	--
Slough	22733	11.6%	754	3.3%	3992	17.6%	17.4%	267	6.7%	673	3.0%	23.5%	56	8.3%	1.24
Solihull	31226	14.5%	932	3.0%	23317	74.7%	14.0%	736	3.2%	1448	4.6%	29.4%	61	4.2%	1.33
Somerset	59688	10.4%	1917	3.2%	54021	90.5%	10.5%	1755	3.2%	294	0.5%	15.0%	15	5.1%	1.57
South Gloucestershire	32888	9.0%	810	2.5%	28089	85.4%	8.7%	697	2.5%	610	1.9%	24.6%	26	4.3%	1.72
South Tyneside	17393	21.1%	556	3.2%	15848	91.1%	21.1%	517	3.3%	35	0.2%	25.7%	x	--	--
Southampton	26380	18.8%	1142	4.3%	17494	66.3%	21.4%	959	5.5%	491	1.9%	33.4%	30	6.1%	1.11

Table 9: SEMH All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Black Caribbean & Mixed White & Caribbean</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in LA)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in group)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with SEMH in group)</i>	<i>SEMHI Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
Southend-on-Sea	23237	13.2%	532	2.3%	17527	75.4%	13.9%	460	2.6%	359	1.5%	22.3%	13	3.6%	1.38
Southwark	32807	23.9%	1119	3.4%	6621	20.2%	20.8%	260	3.9%	4136	12.6%	33.3%	239	5.8%	1.47
St. Helens	21510	17.9%	767	3.6%	20414	94.9%	18.2%	739	3.6%	82	0.4%	22.0%	9	--	--
Staffordshire	99876	10.6%	1724	1.7%	88773	88.9%	10.6%	1599	1.8%	1114	1.1%	20.2%	30	2.7%	1.50
Stockport	34225	13.5%	1071	3.1%	28387	82.9%	13.1%	940	3.3%	513	1.5%	18.9%	33	6.4%	1.94
Stockton-on-Tees	24526	19.7%	706	2.9%	21730	88.6%	19.1%	673	3.1%	56	0.2%	26.8%	x	--	--
Stoke-on-Trent	30677	22.2%	853	2.8%	22067	71.9%	22.6%	726	3.3%	404	1.3%	40.3%	24	5.9%	1.81
Suffolk	82794	12.6%	1842	2.2%	69669	84.1%	12.6%	1635	2.3%	1290	1.6%	21.7%	50	3.9%	1.65
Sunderland	32842	21.7%	1088	3.3%	30231	92.0%	22.0%	1056	3.5%	58	0.2%	29.3%	4	--	--
Surrey	126564	7.5%	3330	2.6%	96893	76.6%	7.4%	2748	2.8%	1597	1.3%	15.7%	74	4.6%	1.63
Sutton	28224	11.6%	766	2.7%	14816	52.5%	13.2%	555	3.7%	1031	3.7%	21.2%	40	3.9%	1.04
Swindon	27468	12.7%	939	3.4%	20359	74.1%	13.4%	819	4.0%	455	1.7%	25.7%	21	4.6%	1.15
Tameside	30254	19.8%	734	2.4%	23875	78.9%	19.2%	650	2.7%	276	0.9%	31.9%	12	4.3%	1.60
Telford and Wrekin	23148	16.3%	802	3.5%	18883	81.6%	16.9%	721	3.8%	456	2.0%	25.9%	22	4.8%	1.26
Thurrock	22661	14.6%	594	2.6%	14979	66.1%	16.6%	469	3.1%	537	2.4%	22.3%	19	3.5%	1.13
Torbay	15510	16.9%	847	5.5%	14093	90.9%	17.5%	802	5.7%	101	0.7%	27.7%	8	--	--
Tower Hamlets	33842	38.5%	1313	3.9%	3199	9.5%	43.9%	325	10.2%	1162	3.4%	47.8%	120	10.3%	1.02
Trafford	31731	10.3%	724	2.3%	21976	69.3%	9.4%	566	2.6%	861	2.7%	17.0%	32	3.7%	1.44
Wakefield	41367	14.9%	1266	3.1%	35894	86.8%	15.2%	1168	3.3%	217	0.5%	19.8%	9	--	--
Walsall	38721	21.8%	649	1.7%	24372	62.9%	22.6%	488	2.0%	1630	4.2%	30.0%	35	2.1%	1.07
Waltham Forest	34168	17.7%	1433	4.2%	5815	17.0%	14.5%	301	5.2%	3512	10.3%	25.8%	294	8.4%	1.62
Wandsworth	24561	18.6%	1204	4.9%	6532	26.6%	14.8%	343	5.3%	2805	11.4%	32.3%	323	11.5%	2.19
Warrington	26913	10.5%	723	2.7%	23802	88.4%	10.7%	671	2.8%	136	0.5%	15.4%	3	--	--
Warwickshire	65410	9.1%	1682	2.6%	53878	82.4%	9.3%	1459	2.7%	936	1.4%	20.0%	43	4.6%	1.70
West Berkshire	20712	7.3%	388	1.9%	17509	84.5%	6.7%	334	1.9%	363	1.8%	21.5%	17	4.7%	2.46
West Sussex	94292	8.5%	2775	2.9%	77620	82.3%	8.5%	2395	3.1%	853	0.9%	17.6%	52	6.1%	1.98
Westminster	17440	28.5%	857	4.9%	2363	13.5%	17.6%	116	4.9%	960	5.5%	29.6%	84	8.8%	1.78
Wigan	39700	14.7%	1217	3.1%	36676	92.4%	14.4%	1134	3.1%	152	0.4%	24.3%	10	6.6%	2.13
Wiltshire	55866	7.8%	1474	2.6%	49314	88.3%	7.9%	1343	2.7%	609	1.1%	14.1%	27	4.4%	1.63
Windsor and Maidenhead	16960	6.4%	448	2.6%	11128	65.6%	5.9%	337	3.0%	248	1.5%	17.7%	12	4.8%	1.60
Wirral	39877	18.4%	1436	3.6%	36642	91.9%	19.0%	1373	3.7%	180	0.5%	23.9%	10	5.6%	1.48
Wokingham	20641	5.8%	471	2.3%	14456	70.0%	5.4%	364	2.5%	409	2.0%	15.2%	21	5.1%	2.04
Wolverhampton	32091	23.3%	820	2.6%	15702	48.9%	25.1%	483	3.1%	3565	11.1%	36.6%	157	4.4%	1.43
Worcestershire	65175	11.9%	1882	2.9%	56536	86.7%	11.7%	1670	3.0%	759	1.2%	23.1%	38	5.0%	1.69
York	20316	8.7%	534	2.6%	18060	88.9%	8.9%	497	2.8%	81	0.4%	23.5%	4	--	--
National (incl. all LAs)	6505275	15.2%	181013	2.8%	4512620	69.4%	14.1%	134939	3.0%	176431	2.7%	28.4%	10392	5.9%	1.97

All-LA ASD Table

The following pages report results across all LAs (with equivalent national statistics for comparison) for ASD identification, focusing specifically on the combined Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and Asian Other) group as previously described.

What this table tells you:

- 1) The first set of columns report the overall number of pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of pupils with FSM entitlement in each LA overall, the number of pupils identified with ASD in each LA, and the total incidence of ASD identification in each LA overall.
- 2) The second set of columns reports the number of White British pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of White British pupils in the LA, the percentage of White British pupils entitled to FSM, the number of White British pupils identified with ASD, and the incidence amongst White British pupils of identification with ASD.
- 3) The third set of columns reports the number of Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Asian Other) pupils in each LA (Y1-11, ages 5-16), the percentage of pupils in the LA that this group constitutes, the percentage of pupils in this group entitled to FSM, the number of pupils in this group identified with ASD, the incidence of ASD identification amongst pupils in this group, and the Risk Ratio (relative to White British pupils) of identification with ASD.

This facilitates comparisons across LAs for these ethnic group categories, and comparisons between LAs and the national equivalent statistics.

As a quick-start guide for looking at the data for specific LAs in this table, the distribution of risk ratios across all LAs is as follows:

	Asian (as defined above)
Total LAs	152
LAs with N<10 in ethnic group with ASD	58
LAs with Reported Risk Ratios*	94
LAs with RR <= 0.75	79
LAs without apparent disproportionality	12
LAs with RR >= 1.33	3

**Recall that Risk Ratios are only reported when the number of pupils in an ethnic group with SEN identification is 10 or more.*

From this, it is apparent that there is some variation across LAs; pupils in the Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and Asian Other) group are under-represented in most LAs, not disproportionately represented in about one-eighth of LAs with reported RRs, and over-represented in three LAs.

When looking at the table, you may want to consider: Does the RR for your LA suggest over-representation ($RR > 1.33$), no disproportionality, or under-representation ($RR \leq 0.75$) for these groups for ASD in particular for Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and Asian Other) pupils? How does this compare to the above distribution over all LAs?

Table 10: ASD All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Any other Asian)</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in LA)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in group)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in group)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
Barking and Dagenham	33132	20.0%	381	1.1%	8719	26.3%	30.4%	109	1.3%	6462	19.5%	11.6%	49	0.8%	0.61
Barnet	43852	16.0%	609	1.4%	13286	30.3%	11.3%	197	1.5%	5401	12.3%	11.3%	56	1.0%	0.70
Barnsley	27405	20.6%	330	1.2%	25248	92.1%	20.5%	306	1.2%	127	0.5%	33.1%	x	--	--
Bath and North East Somerset	21450	8.7%	312	1.5%	18466	86.1%	8.5%	279	1.5%	333	1.6%	4.2%	x	--	--
Bedford	22091	12.1%	286	1.3%	12661	57.3%	9.8%	188	1.5%	3363	15.2%	15.2%	22	0.7%	0.44
Bexley	35179	12.0%	695	2.0%	20963	59.6%	12.7%	475	2.3%	2377	6.8%	6.7%	24	1.0%	0.45
Birmingham	158994	28.3%	2806	1.8%	49808	31.3%	25.8%	1433	2.9%	59523	37.4%	26.1%	641	1.1%	0.37
Blackburn with Darwen	22285	16.7%	127	0.6%	10658	47.8%	18.9%	63	0.6%	9733	43.7%	13.5%	56	0.6%	0.97
Blackpool	16560	25.6%	151	0.9%	14866	89.8%	26.7%	135	0.9%	300	1.8%	11.3%	3	--	--
Bolton	39894	17.6%	366	0.9%	25810	64.7%	16.5%	285	1.1%	8609	21.6%	13.5%	34	0.4%	0.36
Bournemouth	18818	13.1%	267	1.4%	14076	74.8%	14.0%	225	1.6%	561	3.0%	5.7%	x	--	--
Bracknell Forest	14242	8.6%	220	1.5%	11254	79.0%	9.4%	198	1.8%	801	5.6%	2.6%	5	--	--
Bradford	78243	19.3%	795	1.0%	34305	43.8%	18.3%	480	1.4%	33325	42.6%	19.4%	224	0.7%	0.48
Brent	38225	14.0%	447	1.2%	2697	7.1%	14.3%	38	1.4%	11222	29.4%	6.8%	87	0.8%	0.55
Brighton and Hove	27601	14.1%	291	1.1%	20769	75.2%	14.4%	229	1.1%	961	3.5%	12.1%	8	--	--
Bristol, City of	46034	21.1%	651	1.4%	29296	63.6%	19.7%	432	1.5%	3524	7.7%	16.6%	37	1.0%	0.71
Bromley	39314	10.1%	596	1.5%	25172	64.0%	9.3%	410	1.6%	2055	5.2%	4.1%	20	1.0%	0.60
Buckinghamshire	65865	6.6%	692	1.1%	44355	67.3%	5.5%	516	1.2%	10544	16.0%	8.6%	63	0.6%	0.51
Bury	24889	15.2%	208	0.8%	18594	74.7%	13.6%	169	0.9%	3388	13.6%	16.5%	13	0.4%	0.42
Calderdale	29233	14.4%	236	0.8%	22125	75.7%	13.0%	191	0.9%	4649	15.9%	19.1%	24	0.5%	0.60
Cambridgeshire	70514	9.8%	922	1.3%	55186	78.3%	10.1%	748	1.4%	2574	3.7%	5.7%	22	0.9%	0.63
Camden	17336	27.8%	250	1.4%	3863	22.3%	24.2%	67	1.7%	3395	19.6%	28.3%	38	1.1%	0.65
Central Bedfordshire	33583	9.4%	547	1.6%	28233	84.1%	8.9%	481	1.7%	717	2.1%	6.6%	6	--	--
Cheshire East	42748	8.4%	355	0.8%	37862	88.6%	8.3%	320	0.8%	741	1.7%	6.2%	4	--	--
Cheshire West and Chester	39766	11.3%	526	1.3%	36406	91.6%	11.4%	473	1.3%	522	1.3%	5.9%	10	1.9%	1.47
City of London	176	24.4%	7	--	38	21.6%	7.9%	3	--	58	33.0%	22.4%	x	--	--
Cornwall	60692	11.9%	713	1.2%	56290	92.7%	12.0%	672	1.2%	223	0.4%	4.9%	x	--	--
Coventry	43435	19.4%	1015	2.3%	23011	53.0%	19.7%	748	3.3%	8391	19.3%	14.9%	87	1.0%	0.32
Croydon	45929	20.4%	735	1.6%	13248	28.8%	19.8%	274	2.1%	6881	15.0%	11.5%	78	1.1%	0.55
Cumbria	56065	10.2%	651	1.2%	52793	94.2%	10.5%	621	1.2%	387	0.7%	6.7%	4	--	--
Darlington	13572	17.5%	206	1.5%	11948	88.0%	18.0%	181	1.5%	336	2.5%	14.0%	8	--	--
Derby	34155	17.9%	467	1.4%	20741	60.7%	17.5%	331	1.6%	5995	17.6%	15.9%	49	0.8%	0.51
Derbyshire	87889	13.2%	1164	1.3%	81848	93.1%	13.2%	1074	1.3%	915	1.0%	6.2%	7	--	--
Devon	81099	13.3%	847	1.0%	74608	92.0%	13.5%	784	1.1%	476	0.6%	5.3%	4	--	--
Doncaster	37669	17.6%	602	1.6%	32170	85.4%	17.9%	550	1.7%	1073	2.8%	13.5%	12	1.1%	0.65
Dorset	45771	13.0%	749	1.6%	41869	91.5%	12.9%	668	1.6%	391	0.9%	6.1%	x	--	--
Dudley	40055	16.9%	386	1.0%	30855	77.0%	15.2%	319	1.0%	3984	9.9%	15.9%	20	0.5%	0.49
Durham	57713	19.9%	722	1.3%	55024	95.3%	20.1%	685	1.2%	392	0.7%	8.7%	8	--	--
Ealing	40831	16.1%	416	1.0%	6199	15.2%	12.6%	80	1.3%	11562	28.3%	11.9%	85	0.7%	0.57

Table 10: ASD All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	<i>Overall</i>				<i>White British</i>					<i>Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Any other Asian)</i>					<i>Risk Ratio</i>
	<i>N (pupils)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in LA)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in group)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in group)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
East Riding of Yorkshire	37908	11.9%	287	0.8%	35345	93.2%	11.9%	272	0.8%	164	0.4%	2.4%	x	--	
East Sussex	56896	13.2%	762	1.3%	49180	86.4%	13.0%	665	1.4%	1054	1.9%	7.3%	10	0.9%	
Enfield	45573	18.8%	572	1.3%	8992	19.7%	16.3%	114	1.3%	3703	8.1%	12.6%	35	0.9%	
Essex	171466	11.1%	2128	1.2%	143717	83.8%	11.2%	1820	1.3%	4053	2.4%	4.9%	41	1.0%	
Gateshead	22613	17.3%	302	1.3%	20357	90.0%	17.1%	266	1.3%	472	2.1%	15.5%	5	--	
Gloucestershire	71237	10.2%	470	0.7%	60326	84.7%	10.0%	401	0.7%	1942	2.7%	6.1%	5	--	
Greenwich	31881	19.6%	629	2.0%	10644	33.4%	24.6%	262	2.5%	2604	8.2%	12.0%	33	1.3%	
Hackney	27041	33.0%	389	1.4%	4259	15.8%	18.4%	66	1.5%	3256	12.0%	30.7%	38	1.2%	
Halton	16300	28.5%	217	1.3%	15381	94.4%	28.7%	207	1.3%	45	0.3%	6.7%	x	--	
Hammersmith and Fulham	15307	22.6%	296	1.9%	4142	27.1%	16.2%	54	1.3%	1123	7.3%	18.3%	23	2.0%	
Hampshire	153538	8.9%	1233	0.8%	134531	87.6%	9.0%	1121	0.8%	4319	2.8%	4.4%	19	0.4%	
Haringey	30434	22.0%	564	1.9%	5766	18.9%	8.7%	92	1.6%	1828	6.0%	21.4%	38	2.1%	
Harrow	28671	11.0%	352	1.2%	3565	12.4%	12.4%	77	2.2%	13191	46.0%	7.8%	123	0.9%	
Hartlepool	12113	23.9%	127	1.0%	11416	94.2%	24.0%	120	1.1%	274	2.3%	17.2%	x	--	
Havering	32773	12.3%	245	0.7%	22059	67.3%	12.7%	176	0.8%	1830	5.6%	7.8%	7	--	
Herefordshire	19958	9.1%	155	0.8%	17812	89.2%	9.2%	144	0.8%	92	0.5%	0.0%	x	--	
Hertfordshire	148782	8.7%	1956	1.3%	106780	71.8%	8.7%	1500	1.4%	11189	7.5%	6.1%	93	0.8%	
Hillingdon	39407	15.5%	637	1.6%	14033	35.6%	16.4%	290	2.1%	9910	25.1%	9.1%	123	1.2%	
Hounslow	32490	15.6%	420	1.3%	6902	21.2%	20.5%	151	2.2%	10026	30.9%	9.2%	81	0.8%	
Isle of Wight	14227	13.9%	235	1.7%	13203	92.8%	14.2%	227	1.7%	111	0.8%	6.3%	x	--	
Isles of Scilly	235	2.6%	4	--	184	78.3%	2.2%	3	--	x	--	0.0%	x	--	
Islington	19300	31.9%	196	1.0%	5221	27.1%	31.0%	67	1.3%	1717	8.9%	31.2%	11	0.6%	
Kensington and Chelsea	10017	21.6%	125	1.2%	2057	20.5%	16.9%	31	1.5%	374	3.7%	19.8%	8	--	
Kent	183547	12.1%	3671	2.0%	149663	81.5%	12.7%	3173	2.1%	6594	3.6%	4.2%	58	0.9%	
Kingston upon Hull, City of	31432	25.1%	369	1.2%	25840	82.2%	26.3%	326	1.3%	478	1.5%	16.7%	x	--	
Kingston upon Thames	19072	9.0%	331	1.7%	8877	46.5%	8.5%	207	2.3%	3614	18.9%	7.6%	36	1.0%	
Kirklees	55687	20.6%	302	0.5%	34046	61.1%	18.1%	221	0.6%	14803	26.6%	21.0%	37	0.2%	
Knowsley	16164	32.5%	246	1.5%	15126	93.6%	33.1%	229	1.5%	223	1.4%	8.1%	x	--	
Lambeth	29364	26.3%	522	1.8%	4106	14.0%	15.9%	75	1.8%	1342	4.6%	22.7%	8	--	
Lancashire	144891	14.1%	1745	1.2%	117789	81.3%	14.1%	1547	1.3%	15773	10.9%	13.9%	101	0.6%	
Leeds	93823	17.5%	587	0.6%	63515	67.7%	16.3%	422	0.7%	11152	11.9%	16.1%	48	0.4%	
Leicester	44625	19.1%	306	0.7%	12939	29.0%	29.6%	154	1.2%	19234	43.1%	10.7%	63	0.3%	
Leicestershire	80348	8.2%	649	0.8%	66605	82.9%	8.4%	571	0.9%	5978	7.4%	4.9%	19	0.3%	
Lewisham	33307	20.3%	1091	3.3%	7314	22.0%	20.1%	258	3.5%	2065	6.2%	13.2%	45	2.2%	
Lincolnshire	85738	12.8%	1263	1.5%	74994	87.5%	13.5%	1182	1.6%	891	1.0%	3.3%	4	--	
Liverpool	53960	27.4%	1086	2.0%	41423	76.8%	26.5%	922	2.2%	2020	3.7%	20.2%	22	1.1%	
Luton	32414	17.2%	307	0.9%	7742	23.9%	18.4%	130	1.7%	14163	43.7%	16.2%	83	0.6%	
Manchester	65210	27.8%	936	1.4%	25252	38.7%	31.4%	421	1.7%	14348	22.0%	18.2%	153	1.1%	
Medway	35756	13.6%	796	2.2%	27343	76.5%	14.2%	670	2.5%	1677	4.7%	6.1%	17	1.0%	

Table 10: ASD All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	Overall				White British					Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Any other Asian)					Risk Ratio
	<i>N (pupils)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in LA)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in group)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in group)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
Merton	21986	15.9%	231	1.1%	7024	31.9%	17.5%	84	1.2%	4302	19.6%	12.0%	35	0.8%	0.68
Middlesbrough	18350	31.0%	218	1.2%	13793	75.2%	31.6%	177	1.3%	2071	11.3%	17.7%	13	0.6%	0.49
Milton Keynes	36500	11.4%	466	1.3%	21545	59.0%	11.9%	274	1.3%	3977	10.9%	7.5%	40	1.0%	0.79
Newcastle upon Tyne	30490	25.0%	369	1.2%	21600	70.8%	27.0%	277	1.3%	3665	12.0%	15.3%	33	0.9%	0.70
Newham	47827	21.7%	600	1.3%	2835	5.9%	39.6%	43	1.5%	21582	45.1%	18.4%	238	1.1%	0.73
Norfolk	93903	13.5%	1170	1.2%	81313	86.6%	13.7%	1049	1.3%	1156	1.2%	7.5%	10	0.9%	0.67
North East Lincolnshire	19673	17.9%	195	1.0%	18179	92.4%	18.5%	184	1.0%	139	0.7%	10.8%	x	--	--
North Lincolnshire	20691	14.2%	162	0.8%	17912	86.6%	14.6%	146	0.8%	801	3.9%	14.9%	4	--	--
North Somerset	24895	9.9%	177	0.7%	22368	89.8%	10.0%	161	0.7%	305	1.2%	3.3%	x	--	--
North Tyneside	24077	14.8%	173	0.7%	22029	91.5%	14.9%	150	0.7%	526	2.2%	11.2%	5	--	--
North Yorkshire	67652	7.6%	789	1.2%	61992	91.6%	7.7%	722	1.2%	1070	1.6%	5.1%	3	--	--
Northamptonshire	93159	13.0%	1127	1.2%	71098	76.3%	13.1%	900	1.3%	4046	4.3%	8.9%	34	0.8%	0.66
Northumberland	36031	13.3%	411	1.1%	34231	95.0%	13.5%	394	1.2%	463	1.3%	5.6%	x	--	--
Nottingham	35040	26.2%	747	2.1%	17118	48.9%	29.8%	468	2.7%	5869	16.7%	17.7%	67	1.1%	0.42
Nottinghamshire	93984	12.7%	1540	1.6%	81044	86.2%	13.0%	1401	1.7%	2464	2.6%	7.1%	17	0.7%	0.40
Oldham	35816	19.5%	612	1.7%	19967	55.7%	16.8%	414	2.1%	11468	32.0%	22.2%	123	1.1%	0.52
Oxfordshire	74436	9.3%	1070	1.4%	57076	76.7%	8.6%	884	1.5%	4251	5.7%	10.5%	28	0.7%	0.43
Peterborough	29317	15.9%	454	1.5%	15482	52.8%	17.8%	331	2.1%	5182	17.7%	14.8%	29	0.6%	0.26
Plymouth	30735	18.1%	647	2.1%	27220	88.6%	18.3%	607	2.2%	285	0.9%	12.3%	x	--	--
Poole	15923	10.4%	127	0.8%	13818	86.8%	10.6%	110	0.8%	408	2.6%	3.7%	x	--	--
Portsmouth	21935	18.8%	210	1.0%	17073	77.8%	19.8%	176	1.0%	1355	6.2%	9.6%	10	0.7%	0.72
Reading	16583	15.3%	315	1.9%	7583	45.7%	17.0%	197	2.6%	3374	20.3%	9.5%	24	0.7%	0.27
Redbridge	42397	17.0%	364	0.9%	6095	14.4%	14.9%	77	1.3%	21973	51.8%	12.6%	159	0.7%	0.57
Redcar and Cleveland	17540	20.5%	241	1.4%	16662	95.0%	20.4%	231	1.4%	213	1.2%	17.8%	3	--	--
Richmond upon Thames	21349	8.6%	292	1.4%	12852	60.2%	7.4%	185	1.4%	1582	7.4%	10.4%	22	1.4%	0.97
Rochdale	29288	20.7%	564	1.9%	18498	63.2%	19.5%	416	2.2%	7240	24.7%	20.2%	106	1.5%	0.65
Rotherham	36032	17.1%	765	2.1%	29845	82.8%	16.6%	690	2.3%	2779	7.7%	16.9%	34	1.2%	0.53
Rutland	4892	5.1%	30	0.6%	4504	92.1%	5.2%	28	0.6%	46	0.9%	2.2%	x	--	--
Salford	28375	21.7%	247	0.9%	21091	74.3%	22.0%	189	0.9%	793	2.8%	18.3%	4	--	--
Sandwell	45416	23.1%	233	0.5%	21308	46.9%	25.3%	124	0.6%	12597	27.7%	16.5%	39	0.3%	0.53
Sefton	32517	15.7%	547	1.7%	30069	92.5%	15.9%	520	1.7%	303	0.9%	6.6%	x	--	--
Sheffield	64006	19.6%	1285	2.0%	42466	66.3%	16.1%	935	2.2%	7300	11.4%	21.1%	106	1.5%	0.66
Shropshire	32237	9.6%	325	1.0%	29612	91.9%	9.6%	302	1.0%	254	0.8%	5.1%	x	--	--
Slough	22733	11.6%	287	1.3%	3992	17.6%	17.4%	82	2.1%	10759	47.3%	9.1%	98	0.9%	0.44
Solihull	31226	14.5%	777	2.5%	23317	74.7%	14.0%	625	2.7%	3410	10.9%	10.1%	51	1.5%	0.56
Somerset	59688	10.4%	469	0.8%	54021	90.5%	10.5%	427	0.8%	633	1.1%	2.8%	8	--	--
South Gloucestershire	32888	9.0%	386	1.2%	28089	85.4%	8.7%	332	1.2%	956	2.9%	3.8%	10	1.0%	0.88
South Tyneside	17393	21.1%	233	1.3%	15848	91.1%	21.1%	215	1.4%	659	3.8%	20.3%	3	--	--
Southampton	26380	18.8%	257	1.0%	17494	66.3%	21.4%	211	1.2%	3032	11.5%	12.4%	8	--	--

Table 10: ASD All-LA Descriptive Statistics and Risk Ratios (RR), Y1-11 (ages 5-16), 2016

	Overall				White British					Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Any other Asian)					Risk Ratio
	<i>N (pupils)</i>	<i>LA % FSM</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in LA)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% in LA)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in group)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% within group)</i>	<i>N (pupils in LA in group)</i>	<i>% LA pupils in group</i>	<i>% FSM within group</i>	<i>N (pupils with ASD in group)</i>	<i>ASD Incidence (% within group)</i>	
Local Authority															
Southend-on-Sea	23237	13.2%	246	1.1%	17527	75.4%	13.9%	200	1.1%	1477	6.4%	6.1%	4	--	
Southwark	32807	23.9%	730	2.2%	6621	20.2%	20.8%	142	2.1%	1821	5.6%	23.9%	32	1.8%	
St. Helens	21510	17.9%	398	1.9%	20414	94.9%	18.2%	378	1.9%	161	0.7%	1.2%	x	--	
Staffordshire	99876	10.6%	1399	1.4%	88773	88.9%	10.6%	1290	1.5%	3616	3.6%	10.2%	18	0.5%	
Stockport	34225	13.5%	498	1.5%	28387	82.9%	13.1%	422	1.5%	2205	6.4%	12.8%	23	1.0%	
Stockton-on-Tees	24526	19.7%	322	1.3%	21730	88.6%	19.1%	299	1.4%	1287	5.2%	19.0%	9	--	
Stoke-on-Trent	30677	22.2%	214	0.7%	22067	71.9%	22.6%	165	0.7%	4471	14.6%	16.4%	17	0.4%	
Suffolk	82794	12.6%	1076	1.3%	69669	84.1%	12.6%	939	1.3%	1399	1.7%	9.1%	13	0.9%	
Sunderland	32842	21.7%	662	2.0%	30231	92.0%	22.0%	624	2.1%	1266	3.9%	11.2%	11	0.9%	
Surrey	126564	7.5%	2069	1.6%	96893	76.6%	7.4%	1672	1.7%	7972	6.3%	6.1%	91	1.1%	
Sutton	28224	11.6%	423	1.5%	14816	52.5%	13.2%	264	1.8%	5231	18.5%	5.6%	38	0.7%	
Swindon	27468	12.7%	410	1.5%	20359	74.1%	13.4%	341	1.7%	2775	10.1%	6.1%	28	1.0%	
Tameside	30254	19.8%	267	0.9%	23875	78.9%	19.2%	215	0.9%	3304	10.9%	18.2%	24	0.7%	
Telford and Wrekin	23148	16.3%	272	1.2%	18883	81.6%	16.9%	255	1.4%	1425	6.2%	11.8%	5	--	
Thurrock	22661	14.6%	243	1.1%	14979	66.1%	16.6%	163	1.1%	922	4.1%	8.8%	20	2.2%	
Torbay	15510	16.9%	134	0.9%	14093	90.9%	17.5%	127	0.9%	174	1.1%	5.7%	x	--	
Tower Hamlets	33842	38.5%	462	1.4%	3199	9.5%	43.9%	46	1.4%	22213	65.6%	37.8%	283	1.3%	
Trafford	31731	10.3%	293	0.9%	21976	69.3%	9.4%	210	1.0%	4129	13.0%	10.7%	16	0.4%	
Wakefield	41367	14.9%	691	1.7%	35894	86.8%	15.2%	635	1.8%	1571	3.8%	11.0%	9	--	
Walsall	38721	21.8%	364	0.9%	24372	62.9%	22.6%	288	1.2%	8375	21.6%	16.4%	27	0.3%	
Waltham Forest	34168	17.7%	456	1.3%	5815	17.0%	14.5%	81	1.4%	8869	26.0%	16.5%	102	1.2%	
Wandsworth	24561	18.6%	501	2.0%	6532	26.6%	14.8%	152	2.3%	4348	17.7%	14.0%	63	1.4%	
Warrington	26913	10.5%	269	1.0%	23802	88.4%	10.7%	239	1.0%	753	2.8%	7.3%	8	--	
Warwickshire	65410	9.1%	930	1.4%	53878	82.4%	9.3%	819	1.5%	3451	5.3%	3.8%	30	0.9%	
West Berkshire	20712	7.3%	597	2.9%	17509	84.5%	6.7%	522	3.0%	612	3.0%	8.2%	12	2.0%	
West Sussex	94292	8.5%	984	1.0%	77620	82.3%	8.5%	825	1.1%	4276	4.5%	5.4%	41	1.0%	
Westminster	17440	28.5%	192	1.1%	2363	13.5%	17.6%	39	1.7%	2374	13.6%	26.4%	29	1.2%	
Wigan	39700	14.7%	282	0.7%	36676	92.4%	14.4%	263	0.7%	446	1.1%	18.2%	3	--	
Wiltshire	55866	7.8%	965	1.7%	49314	88.3%	7.9%	893	1.8%	756	1.4%	3.6%	x	--	
Windsor and Maidenhead	16960	6.4%	254	1.5%	11128	65.6%	5.9%	184	1.7%	2314	13.6%	7.4%	20	0.9%	
Wirral	39877	18.4%	651	1.6%	36642	91.9%	19.0%	626	1.7%	904	2.3%	5.3%	x	--	
Wokingham	20641	5.8%	472	2.3%	14456	70.0%	5.4%	361	2.5%	2445	11.8%	4.7%	31	1.3%	
Wolverhampton	32091	23.3%	179	0.6%	15702	48.9%	25.1%	106	0.7%	6917	21.6%	12.4%	25	0.4%	
Worcestershire	65175	11.9%	752	1.2%	56536	86.7%	11.7%	669	1.2%	2305	3.5%	9.8%	9	--	
York	20316	8.7%	202	1.0%	18060	88.9%	8.9%	173	1.0%	402	2.0%	3.2%	4	--	
National (incl. all LAs)	6505275	15.2%	86225	1.3%	4512620	69.4%	14.1%	63436	1.4%	674157	10.4%	15.2%	5636	0.8%	

Abbreviations

ASD	Autistic Spectrum Disorder
BCRB	Black Caribbean
FSM	Free School Meals
HI	Hearing Impairment
IDACI	Indicators of Deprivation Affecting Children Index
LA	Local Authority
MLD	Moderate Learning Difficulty
MSI	Multi-Sensory Impairment
MWBC	Mixed White & Black Caribbean
NSA	SEN identification with No Specialist Assessment
OR	Odds Ratio
PD	Physical Disability
PMLD	Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties
RR	Risk Ratio
SEMH	Social, Emotional and Mental Health
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SEND	Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
SLCN	Speech, Language and Communication Needs
SLD	Severe Learning Difficulty
SpLD	Specific Learning Difficulty
VI	Visual Impairment

Technical Appendix

Data used to produce the reports included in this pack come from the England National Pupil Database, including pupil level 2016 January School Census information.

All analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS.

For tables reporting descriptive information (counts and percentages) and RRs, the RRs were straightforwardly calculated by dividing the incidence of a given SEN type within a particular minority ethnic group within a particular LA by the incidence of the same SEN type in the White British group within the same LA.

For LA-specific ORs, the approach to analysis was the same as that described in Part 1 of the full project report (Strand & Lindorff, 2018):

For unadjusted ORs, multinomial logistic regression models were run on only pupil records for the relevant LA, with primary SEN type as the outcome and only ethnic group as a predictor.

For adjusted ORs, additional controls were included to account for other individual pupil background characteristics that might be expected to be associated with the odds of SEN identification. Control variables included:

- Entitlement to a Free School Meal (FSM) (with not entitled to FSM as the reference group)
- Gender (with Girl as the reference group)
- Birth season (Autumn, Spring or Summer; with Autumn as the reference group)
- Year group (with Y1 as the reference group)
- Indicators of Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) score for each pupil's home neighbourhood (normalised; a continuous measure)

A small number of pupil records were excluded from calculations of adjusted ORs due to duplicate records (1090; 0.02% of the total 6,506,365 pupil records) or missing data. The only variable on which data were missing was IDACI (14,660; 0.2% of all pupil records).

In any tables including frequencies (counts), "x" means that a particular figure has been suppressed due to small numbers (See the NPD User Guide, 2018, p36).

References

Strand, S. & Lindorff, A. (2018). *The unequal representation of ethnic minorities for different types of special educational needs: Extent, causes and consequences*. Final report to the ESRC.

DfE (2015). *SEND code of practice: 0 to 25 years*. London: Department for Education.