

Final Report – Equality and Diversity in DfES Statistical Data

Contents

1. Executive Summary
2. Background
3. Aim of report
4. Format of report
5. Methodology
6. Equalities Issues to consider
7. Comments According to Equality & Diversity Issues
 - i) Disability
 - ii) Ethnicity
 - iii) Gender
 - iv) Socio-economic class
8. Recommendations According to Equality & Diversity Issues
 - i) Disability
 - ii) Ethnicity
 - iii) Gender
 - iv) Socio-economic class
9. Comments and Recommendations Mapped According to PSA Targets
10. Over-arching comments
11. Over-arching Recommendations
12. Appendices
 - 1) PSA Targets – full text
 - 2) Data sources and ownership
 - 3) Documents consulted
 - 4) List of interviewees

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report focuses on examining and reviewing information available to track progress against the 2004 spending review DfES PSA targets with regard to equality and diversity issues.
- 1.2 DfES had noted and expressed concern that information as currently analysed has limited capacity to either identify equalities and diversity issues of potential concern, or to evidence the links between the various programmes the data is used to monitor.
- 1.3 Officers identified a need to feel confident that where data is collected which has the potential to be disaggregated according to equality and diversity characteristics, it is reliable and accurate.
- 1.4 Members of the steering group also identified a need to feel confident that the department is doing all it can as regards acknowledging and addressing equality and diversity issues.
- 1.5 Members of the steering group agreed that the report would specifically focus on equalities and diversity issues surrounding disability, ethnicity, gender and socio-economic class.

Scope of the Review

- 1.6 It was agreed that the main focus of the report would examine the following four areas in particular.
- 1.7 First, identify and assess the strategic quality of statistics currently used by DfES in monitoring achievement against 2004 spending review PSA targets in terms of picking up issues to do with equalities and diversity.
- 1.8 Second, assess the capacity of the information currently collected against the PSA targets to identify programme impacts on equality and diversity issues.
- 1.9 Third, make recommendations about how to improve the capacity to identify programme impacts on equality and diversity issues.
- 1.10 Fourth, identify what the dept is already doing well and where it needs to do more in order to ensure that the needs and experiences of vulnerable groups of people are taken into account.
- 1.11 In the first phase of the review interviews were held with key individuals in order to identify the scope of the review, the departmental needs it should address and the kind of recommendations and format that would be most useful.

- 1.12 The second stage of the review examined the available datasets; sample sizes, data collection fields and categories, timings and so on.

Observations

- 1.13 There are significant *potential* impacts across all the targets and these should be acknowledged in order to begin to identify where concerns most need to be addressed. For instance more sophisticated data collection and analysis may well highlight exacerbated links between poverty, disability and attainment thereby suggesting a need for more focussed programming and target setting to address this issue.
- 1.14 Across all Equality & Diversity areas there is a lack of consistency between data sets and variables used.
- 1.15 There are no PSA targets that specifically address disabilities issues or indicate that they should track impact upon disabilities issues.
- 1.16 There is currently no common way of collecting information relating to disability.
- 1.17 Only targets 6, 10 & 14 have been identified as requiring information on ethnicity grounds.
- 1.18 Current ethnicity collection categories confuse criteria and hide a number of issues, for instance categories rooted in racial characteristics (e.g. Black, White) are mixed with nationality criteria (e.g. Chinese) and geographic or regional criteria (e.g. Asian, African, Caribbean).
- 1.19 Nevertheless all datasets collect ethnicity information using the census categories; this is useful in terms of ensuring consistency and comparability across datasets. As those categories used are defined by the census responsibility for addressing issues identified in point 1.18 lie outside the responsibility of the Department.
- 1.20 All data sets contain sufficient information re gender to allow disaggregation on a simple male/female basis. This information is regularly disseminated.
- 1.21 One gender issue not currently addressed is that of trans-gender. There are currently no measures that capture such information. Some thought should be given to where and when it will be appropriate to collect this information, particularly in the light of the Equalities Standard which requires public bodies to demonstrate no discrimination on account of age, sexuality and religion or belief. It is important not to be too over-enthusiastic in collecting data, nevertheless there may well be times in the future where it is appropriate to collect this information. It is recommended that the dept

keeps an eye on developments in this area and is prepared to consult over the best way to do this.

- 1.22 There is at present no single way to identify socio-economic class, a number of different criteria are used including household income levels, areas of deprivation and parental occupation.
- 1.23 The indices of multiple deprivation are a potentially valuable resource in identifying where socio-economic deprivation may be impacting upon programmes and associated targets.
- 1.24 Other datasets that may be considered as regards analysing data for socio-economic issues are ACORN and Experian's MOSAIC. As use of the IMD is more widespread amongst local government IMD should be the dataset generally used to evaluate socio-economic issues in order to facilitate comparability of data analysis.
- 1.25 If postcode data is collected as a matter of course this will leave open the option for analysing results using both ACORN and/or MOSAIC if it was felt to be useful for any particular issue or target. Nevertheless the responsibility lies with the department to decide upon the most appropriate dataset to use as standard.
- 1.26 There is an opportunity to link data collected to the large household surveys carried out by ONS and the Department ought to investigate how to link most effectively to these large surveys and in particular to the Integrated Household Survey currently being developed.
- 1.27 There is a lack of confidence when examining data across programmes when that data is of different kinds (e.g. some is census data from administrative sources and some is survey data with differing sample sizes).
- 1.28 Data sets are owned by different organisations and are produced for a variety of reasons. Monitoring of DfES PSA targets is not usually the reason why the information is produced in the first place, this gives rise to weaknesses when trying to drill down through the data to look at complex issues such as Equality and Diversity issues.
- 1.29 Making more effective use of the data there is, or of improving the data quality, without a commitment to increase resources to that end, is likely to prove problematic as staff currently feel they have insufficient time to keep up with current commitments.
- 1.30 One significant weakness identified is that there are no cross-programme targets. The impact of this is to focus monitoring and evaluation activity towards programme-specific targets and associated data sets.

- 1.31 The problem highlighted above is exacerbated by a lack of networking activity by those working on different programmes and for different directorates within the department.

Recommendations

Data Collection

- 1.32 All targets should incorporate some element of equality and diversity planning at least in the form of a statement of aspiration or intent to measure according to equalities and diversity issues.
- 1.33 A consistent means of defining disability should be adopted across all datasets. This should be in line with census definitions in order to allow for the greatest consistency across datasets owned by different organisations and departments.
- 1.34 Where ethnicity data is or will be collected, census categories should be adopted in order to allow greatest comparability across programmes and datasets.
- 1.35 All future targets should incorporate an element that acknowledges the need to collect data and measure impact across socio-economic classes.
- 1.36 All data sets should collect postcode information for respondents. This postcode information should then be correlated to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation in order to extrapolate socio-economic information.

Data Publication

- 1.37 Where information is analysed and published from administrative and census data it should be routinely disaggregated and published with regard to equality and diversity issues.
- 1.38 Where reports are produced using survey data, information regarding equalities and diversity issues should be routinely published along with, where appropriate, a cautionary note regarding potentially small base numbers.
- 1.39 Where equalities and diversity issues are to be routinely published they should be done so as part of the statistical first release published regarding the various PSA targets.
- 1.40 It is recommended the department has a specific publication examining PSA targets on an equalities and diversity basis.

Links to Research

- 1.41 There needs to be greater clarity about the relationship between the different research activities undertaken by the department, particularly between quantitative data collection and research which gathers qualitative data.
- 1.42 Quantitative data can highlight where there are discrepancies or gaps that need further investigation as regards their cause. Qualitative data can highlight areas for intervention, the effectiveness of which can be measured using quantitative data.
- 1.43 There should be a clear route by which issues highlighted through analysis of quantitative data can be picked up through the qualitative research programme. Similarly there needs to be a clear route whereby issues identified through qualitative research can influence the department's programmes and future data collection.
- 1.44 In order to allow potential problems or issues, including benefits and successes, across programmes to be picked up, an additional set of information should be gathered. If developed the ideal vehicle for this would be the proposed Integrated Household Survey.

Wider Departmental Collaboration

- 1.45 There is a clear need to encourage more cross-directorate working for information sharing.
- 1.46 The information management and sharing project currently being developed should include input from people responsible for other areas of activity and monitoring to ensure that fields are comparable.

Training and Development

- 1.47 A specialised training course should be developed to encourage greater confidence in mixing types of data and methods
- 1.48 A toolkit should be developed in order to help board members better identify those equality and diversity issues which need attention.

2. Background

2.1 This report focuses on examining and reviewing information available to track progress against the 2004 spending review DfES PSA targets with regard to equality and diversity issues.

2.2 The brief for the review stated that:

2.2.1 *The project will help us establish the key areas throughout the system where we need to do further monitoring, look at both the first and second statistical gathering levels and align this with the information collected by our partners.*

2.2.2 *Our aims are to achieve the following;-*

- *a consistent approach to the collection of Equality and Diversity statistics across business delivery;*
- *agreeing the categories we should use in gathering information;*
- *actively support the tracking of data;*
- *a process that is open and robust if a decision is taken **not** to collect a set of information;*
- *minimise the burdens placed on delivery partners with data collection held to the minimum level justifiable;*
- *influencing and getting 'buy in' from front line operational staff;*
- *appropriate quality processes and methodologies in place for gathering the information;*
- *coherent and consistent data which we can analyse and evaluate to inform our strategic development.*

2.3 DfES had noted and expressed concern that information as currently analysed has limited capacity to either identify Equalities and Diversity issues of potential concern, or to evidence the links between the various programmes the data is used to monitor.

2.4 The first phase of the review took the form of a scoping exercise in which interviews were held with key officers from DfES and linked organisations. During these interviews multiple requirements were noted, 2 emerged as main concerns, these being:

2.4.1 A need to feel confident that where data is collected which has the potential to be disaggregated according to equality and diversity characteristics, it is reliable, accurate and that its weaknesses are clearly spelled out and acknowledged, including information about how these weaknesses are addressed.

2.4.2 A need to feel confident that the dept is doing what it can as regards equality and diversity issues and that it has the wherewithal to pick up and address important issues as they emerge from analysis of data and other information.

- 2.5 Significant amounts of work have already been done examining the statistical quality of the datasets used to measure achievement against the PSA targets¹. This report will summarise these where appropriate, but the main focus will be to identify where and why particular data sets need to be broken down according to equalities and diversity issues along with suggestions about how this might be achieved.
- 2.6 This report will also focus on additional, supporting actions that need to be taken to strengthen the department's understanding of Equalities and Diversity issues and where and how these are interfacing with the department's various programmes.

¹ See reports and reviews cited in 'documents consulted' at the end of this report

3. Aim of Report

- 3.1 Following discussions with members of the steering group it was agreed that the main focus of the report would examine the following four areas in particular.
 - 3.1.1 Identify and assess the strategic quality of statistics currently used by DfES in monitoring achievement against 2004 spending review PSA targets in terms of picking up issues to do with equalities and diversity.
 - 3.1.2 To assess the capacity of the information currently collected against the PSA targets to identify programme impacts on equality and diversity issues.
 - 3.1.3 To make recommendations about how to improve the capacity to identify programme impacts on equality and diversity issues.
 - 3.1.4 To identify what the dept is already doing well, to identify what the dept is doing but which could be improved upon and to identify where the dept needs to do more in order to ensure that the needs and experiences of vulnerable groups of people are taken into account.

4. Format of Report

- 4.1 There is a need to be able to show where compounded issues might be at work – i.e. where programmes/individuals may be adversely impacted upon from a number of different angles – ethnicity and social class for example.
- 4.2 In order to make these issues clearer the report will begin by adopting an issues focus rather than directly addressing the strengths and weaknesses of various datasets.
- 4.3 The issue based approach will be followed by a focus on the individual targets, with an analysis of the data sets and potential to extrapolate information about Equalities and Diversity issues in order to more clearly identify more specific concerns with regard to each of the programmes.
- 4.3 It was requested that there should also be a mapping of overall observations and recommendations to the PSA targets and also to the main policy areas of the DfES (i.e. Children, Young People and Families, Schools, Higher Education and Learning and Skills) however this proved to be problematic and clumsy as so many of the observations and recommendations are broadly cross-cutting and require more of an overview than a categorising perspective.

5. Methodology

- 5.1 In the first phase of the review c.20 interviews were held with key individuals in order to identify the scope of the review, the departmental needs it should address and the kind of recommendations and format that would be most useful.
- 5.2 These interviews also identified areas where there was felt to be the greatest difficulty in terms of identifying and monitoring equalities and diversity issues.
- 5.3 Consideration was given to interviewing those within organisations charged with collection of data – for instance local authorities, schools and colleges. It was decided not to do this for the following reasons:
 - i) It had become clear that the scope and focus of the review would be directed towards the operations of the department and how to make most effective use of the data systems currently in use.
 - ii) Including further interviews would have considerably extended the reach of the report and it would risk losing its focus.
 - iii) It would be too complicated to identify all suitable interviewees and carry out interviews within the timescale of the review.
- 5.4 There is scope to carry out further work, complementary to this review, to identify further issues, observations and suggestions as regards equalities and diversity information from those involved at the delivery end of the department's programmes.
- 5.5 The second stage of the review examined the available datasets; sample sizes, data collection fields and categories, timings and so on.
- 5.6 This stage also included an examination of existing reviews and reports regarding the datasets that are currently used by DfES in order to monitor progress against the various PSA targets.
- 5.7 An interim report was produced which was distributed to all members of the steering group for comment and suggestion. These comments and suggestions were subsequently incorporated into the final report.

6. Equalities and Diversity Issues to consider

- 6.1 It is important to bear in mind a number of issues when examining Equalities and Diversity issues, especially when examining these in the context of statistical, quantitative data. These issues are outlined below and form the background context and basic rationale for not advocating too strong an emphasis on statistical validity, i.e. acceptable confidence intervals, tolerances or statistical significance.
- 6.2 A significant problem, particularly when examining data from surveys is that very often, when concerned with representation of people from minority ethnic backgrounds, or those who have a disability, sample sizes are too small to constitute a statistically significant base from which to conduct further analysis.
- 6.3 In order to collect quantitative data a number of variables need to be agreed upon in order to be able to code and quantify responses. In terms of Equalities and Diversity issues these variables are commonly those connected to ethnicity, disability, gender and socio-economic class. One difficulty with this is that categorisation leads to creation of invisible populations/issues – for instance the category of ‘white British’ masks a relatively large population of British Gypsies. Similarly, defining disability as some kind of health or physical impediment disallows inclusion of a large proportion of the population who have literacy difficulties but no physical or health-related disability.
- 6.4 Quantitative data cannot explain the causes or reasons for the results it shows. It is important to bear this in mind when considering equalities issues because there may well be more than one factor underlying the data. This brings problems regarding assumptions about basic shared principles, for instance it is assumed that if one minority ethnic group has far poorer exam results than other groups then the approach is to initiate projects designed to bring attainment to more equal levels, however it may be that the education system itself is not providing the kind of education that is valued.
- 6.5 Further, individuals can have multiple equalities issues – for instance those from minority ethnic backgrounds are also frequently from poor socio-economic backgrounds. When dealing with relatively small base sizes this may impact significantly upon the results. Ensuing from this is the problem that it can be unclear which is the most significant factor underlying the results.
- 6.6 Services and programmes impact upon different people and groups of people differently. It is important to note that this means that not all equalities issues can be dealt with through a single, formulaic approach as the different impacts of services and projects needs to be assessed. Equalities and diversity issues are more frequently a result of the nature of services than a result of the characteristics of people.

- 6.7 Nevertheless we have to recognise necessity for quantitative data for some things – most especially monitoring impacts – and despite the problems associated with such data when examining equalities and diversity issues it can prove useful, particularly as an indicator of areas where there are gaps in knowledge and understanding and opportunities for further development.

7. Comments According to Equality & Diversity Issues

- 7.1 Only PSA targets 1 and 2² (with regard to socio-economic deprivation), 6, 10 and 14 (with regard to race equality) are considered with explicit reference to equalities issues.
- 7.2 Nevertheless there are significant potential impacts across all the targets and there is a need to acknowledge these in order to begin to identify where concerns need to be addressed.
- 7.3 This section examines the current PSA targets and data collected in order to track progress according to different equalities and diversity issues; specifically disability, ethnicity, gender and socio-economic class.

7.3.1 Disability

- 7.3.2 There are no PSA targets that specifically address disabilities issues or indicate that they should track impact upon disabilities issues.
- 7.3.3 Some of the PSA targets are monitored using data that can be disaggregated for disabilities but the means of doing this is not consistent.
- 7.3.4 Many of the PSAs do not have the data to allow disaggregation for disabilities.
- 7.3.5 There is currently no common way of collecting information relating to disability.
- 7.3.6 This is further problematised by there being no single and easily adopted definition of disability. The Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) defines a disabled person as someone who has a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his or her ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.
- 7.3.7 Those measures that are used are not entirely appropriate to the targets and programmes for which the information is being collected/used, for instance in some cases information is collected regarding special educational needs (SEN). This can broadly be considered a measure of disability, however those who have a disability but no special educational needs will not be picked up in this information.
- 7.3.8 Nor are they transferable across all programmes and policy areas.

² See Appendix for a full list of PSA targets

- 7.3.9 However, there are significant difficulties to overcome as regards defining disabilities where children are concerned. For instance, whilst it may be appropriate to ask an adult whether he or she has a long term condition that affects the ability to carry out everyday activities, this is by no means so clear cut with a child.
- 7.3.10 It is possible that the implementation of the Equalities Standard will make a difference here as public organisations are required to monitor more effectively ethnicity and disabilities issues this information will become incorporated as a matter of course in administrative datasets.
- 7.4.1 Ethnicity**
- 7.4.2 Targets 6, 10 & 14 have been identified as requiring information on ethnicity grounds and this information is to be included in the government's annual Race Equality and Community Cohesion Strategy.
- 7.4.3 These are the only targets where this commitment is made, all three relating to educational attainment.
- 7.4.4 Targets where ethnicity is not explicitly addressed may well impact on ethnicity grounds but the hows and whys of this are not clear as appropriate information is not collected.
- 7.4.5 Current collection categories confuse criteria, for instance categories rooted in racial characteristics (e.g. Black, White) are mixed with nationality criteria (e.g. Chinese) and geographic or regional criteria (e.g. Asian, African, Caribbean).
- 7.4.6 Some information is not currently collected and related issues are therefore hidden and not addressed, for example information about Gypsy Travellers is limited.
- 7.4.7 Quantitative data collection is not culture neutral and there may be issues regarding trust and also misunderstanding or misinterpretations that impact upon data collected. Again, Gypsy Travellers provide an illustration, many preferring not to identify them as such (on the occasion that such information is asked) for fear of persecution.
- 7.4.8 Some datasets include information about first or preferred language as an additional field to ethnicity and cultural background. This is becoming increasingly useful as an indicator of particular educational needs.

7.5.1 Gender

- 7.5.2 All data sets contain sufficient information regarding gender to allow disaggregation on a simple male/female basis. This information is regularly disseminated.
- 7.5.3 What is missing is sufficient data on other equalities and diversity issues (namely disability, ethnicity and socio-economic status) to allow cross tabulation and assessment of whether gender is impacting upon progress towards the targets in particular subsections of the population.
- 7.5.4 At present there is sufficient information collected relating to gender to allow confidence that current systems are capable of identifying simple (as opposed to compounded) issues etc.
- 7.5.5 One gender issue not currently addressed is that of trans-gender. There are currently no measures which capture such information.

7.6.1 Socio-economic class

- 7.6.2 Target 1 has been recognised as warranting further analysis and tracking in terms of socio-economic deprivation.
- 7.6.3 Target 2 has clear links to issues around socio-economic deprivation with its focus on household income and child poverty.
- 7.6.4 There is at present no single way to identify socio-economic class, a number of different criteria are used including household income levels, areas of deprivation and parental occupation.
- 7.6.5 Nor is there a clear means by which to track social mobility – for instance, it is not possible to tell where class becomes an attribute of the individual rather than of the individual's parents.
- 7.6.6 Current ways of collecting socio-economic information are not transferable across programmes.
- 7.6.7 The indices of multiple deprivation (IMD) are a valuable resource in identifying where socio-economic deprivation may be impacting upon programmes and associated targets, however there is currently no clear, single way of linking information collected for PSA targets to the IMD unless the target specifically state this should be done (as is the case for Target 1)

8. Recommendations According to Equality & Diversity Issues

- 8.1.1 All targets should incorporate some element of equality and diversity planning at least in the form of a statement of aspiration or intent to measure according to equalities and diversity issues.
- 8.1.2 Where information is analysed and published from administrative and census data it should be routinely disaggregated and published with regard to equality and diversity issues.
- 8.1.3 Where information is produced using survey data information regarding equalities and diversity issues should be routinely published along with a cautionary note regarding potentially small base numbers.
- 8.1.4 Where information about Equalities and Diversity issues is to be routinely published it should be done so as part of the statistical first release published regarding the various PSA targets and also as part of the background information of the department's Annual Report.
- 8.1.5 Further work should be done in collaboration with the Office for National Statistics to develop collection of DfES data through larger surveys, and in particular through the planned Integrated Household Survey – this will allow more effective cross-referencing of multiple issues and links to other information such as quality of housing, parental occupation, family structure, income and spending patterns etc.

8.2 Recommendations specific to disability issues

- 8.2.1 A consistent means of defining disability should be adopted across all datasets. This should be in line with census definitions in order to allow for the greatest consistency across datasets owned by different organisations and departments.
- 8.2.2 This would help to address the problem regarding pupils with disabilities but no Special Educational Needs and avoid what would otherwise be a separate research project in order to identify how many pupils with disabilities were missed out by using SEN as an approximate measure of disability which would be the alternative recommendation.
- 8.2.3 Adopting a single measure in line with census categories would allow tracking over time, however there would still be difficulties with using the census definition of disability where children are concerned. In order to go some way towards overcoming this both disability data and SEN data should be collected and discrepancies between the two fields interrogated.

8.3 Recommendations specific to ethnicity issues

- 8.3.1 Despite problems relating to categories noted above (7.4.5), where ethnicity data is or will be collected, census categories should be adopted in order to allow greatest comparability across programmes and datasets.
- 8.3.2 It is important to recognise that quantitative data is simply a first stage diagnostic tool when it comes to examining issues about ethnicity, rather than a reliable measure of progress or impact.
- 8.3.3 Where ethnicity data is collected this should be included as a matter of course in statistical first releases with, where appropriate, cautions relating to sample size, confidence levels and so on.
- 8.3.4 Issues where data is not collected (e.g. Gypsies and Travellers) and where it would not be practical or appropriate to assess issues on a quantitative basis should be acknowledged along with a statement of intent to examine such issues through other means (e.g. qualitative research).
- 8.3.5 Where possible information should be collected about preferred language/first language as this could well be a greater indicator of cultural differences that categories originating in racial or national characteristics. *(NB this is to be included as a compulsory field in forthcoming PLASC)*

8.4 Recommendations specific to gender issues

- 8.4.1 Where information is available on ethnicity and disability grounds this should regularly and routinely be cross-tabbed with gender to identify where compounded issues might be impacting on progress.
- 8.4.2 Acknowledging that at some point in the future information is likely to be collected about transgender consideration should be given to including an appropriate category on datasets and records for adults.

8.5 Recommendations specific to socio-economic class

- 8.5.1 Targets 1 and 2 should be subject to further analysis according to socio-economic data.
- 8.5.2 All future targets should incorporate an element that acknowledges the need to collect data and measure impact across socio-economic classes.

- 8.5.3 The difficulties of collecting data which refers to a somewhat indefinable category should be acknowledged and detailed.
- 8.5.4 In order to address issues of social mobility and defining socio-economic class across generations and ages, socio-economic class should be clearly identified as an indicator of the circumstances in which an individual might live rather than a quality that an individual has.
- 8.5.5 All data sets should collect postcode information for respondents. This postcode information should then be correlated to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation in order to extrapolate socio-economic information. This information could also be related to both ACORN and MOSAIC data systems and allow for further analysis where appropriate or desirable.
- 8.5.6 Changes in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation should be tracked and correlated to changes in other data collected in order to monitor the possible impact upon those from low socio-economic class backgrounds and the various initiative and programmes overseen by DfES.

9. Comments and Recommendations Mapped According To PSA Targets

9.1.1 Target 1

Improve children's communication, social and emotional development so that by 2008 50% of children reach a good level of development at the end of the Foundation Stage and reduce inequalities between the level of development achieved by children in the 20% most disadvantaged areas and the rest of England.

9.1.2 Data sets used

Foundation Stage Profile (FSP) administrative data.

9.1.3 Comments

With regard to the datasets used, pupils with Special Educational Needs are referred to in order to indicate disabilities issues that might be arising.

9.1.4 It appears that ethnicity/cultural information is not addressed/collected.

9.1.5 Information assessed across a number of variables may be available by cross-matching to PLASC – but this would be time consuming and unlikely to happen on a routine basis. It is planned to match the National Pupil Database (NPD) that contains PLASC with FSP data; and this will be all the more powerful when we are able to collect 100% FSP data at individual level next year , rather than 10% as now.

9.1.6 In order to identify where compounded issues are having a bearing upon progress towards target 1 it is essential to gather information on ethnicity and culture as well as disability grounds. Further, as the majority of people from BME backgrounds are concentrated in deprived areas it is important to be able to identify whether and where ethnicity and cultural factors as opposed to factors concerned with deprivation might be playing a more significant part in terms of achieving this target.

9.2.1 Target 2

As a contribution to reducing the proportion of children living in households where no one is working, by 2008:

- *increase the stock of Ofsted-registered childcare by 10%;*
- *increase the take-up of formal childcare by lower income working families by 50%; and introduce by April 2005, a successful light-touch childcare approval scheme.*

9.2.2 Datasets used

DWP Stock of Childcare (Ofsted)
Households below average income Statistics (HBAI) from the Family Resources Survey (FRS)
Performance information from the Childcare Approval Scheme

9.2.3 Comments

The HBAI information is taken from the FRS, which is owned by DWP, the survey covers c. 24,000 households. In review suggestion was made that information might be disaggregated according to ethnicity. Not clear how far this is to be followed up.

9.2.4 Information is collected as regards disability but it is not clear how DfES uses this information, if at all, for the purposes of monitoring PSA target 2.

9.2.5 Regarding target 2 it is particularly important to gather information on ethnicity grounds as income is a poor measure of various forms of social and cultural capital which may have greater relevance amongst some minority groups than others.

9.2.6 Nevertheless, in order to assess the operation of compounded equalities issues it is also important to gather socio-economic information in order to ascertain which are the most significant variables in explaining the impact of the programme. The most effective way of doing this would be collecting postcode information and matching that to the IMD.

9.3.1 Target 3

Reduce the under-18 conception rate by 50% by 2010 as part of a broader strategy to improve sexual health. (Joint with the Department of Health)

9.3.2 Datasets used

Birth registrations (ONS)
Abortion notifications (ONS)
Mid-year population estimates (ONS)

9.3.3 Comments

Regarding Abortion Notifications the data collected includes ethnicity, postcode and NHS number. However, it is not clear how useful this information is as birth registrations do not collect similar data.

- 9.3.4 The DfES may wish to consider supporting a change of legislation to allow for collection of ethnicity data when births are registered. This would provide valuable data for long term trend analysis and also add value to current data collected such as the Abortion Notifications.
- 9.3.5 However, if the department decides to adopt this course it should acknowledge people's sensitivities about the need to collect such data and the potential uses to which it could be put. It would be advisable to consult with members of a variety of ethnic backgrounds to identify the most appropriate ways to gather such information.
- 9.3.6 If such a course of action is to be followed then due attention should also be given to the categories used (see notes regarding mixing racial, ethnic and nationality information in current census categories – point 1.18 & 7.4.5) and the possibility of some ethnic groups not declaring themselves as such (for instance Gypsies and Travellers).
- 9.3.6 Relevant issues could also be identified by staff at service delivery level were appropriate training given to enable those staff to identify where there appeared to be significant differences between the pregnancy/abortion rates of those from different ethnic or socio-economic backgrounds. Whilst such information would be qualitative rather than quantitative it may well highlight issues that could then be subject to quantitative investigation.
- 9.3.7 Were information released regarding target 3 to include information disaggregated according to ethnicity it may highlight issues that have a cultural motivation, for instance a preference for girls to marry and start their families young (as has been noted amongst Gypsy Travellers for instance). Care needs to be exercised over simply seeing this as a 'culture neutral' target if it does become apparent that some ethnic groups are more likely to have pregnancies under 18 than others.
- 9.3.8 Data should also be collected re socio-economic status in order to identify where this is a factor – it would be especially useful to cross-tab socio-economic status with ethnicity and disability.

9.4.1 Target 4

Halt the year-on-year rise in obesity among children under 11 by 2010 in the context of a broader strategy to tackle obesity in the population as a whole. (Joint with the Department of Health and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport)

9.4.2 Datasets used

Health Survey of England

9.4.3 Comments

The Health Survey of England collects data against both ethnicity and cultural background and also income and occupation/employment status. The sample size in 1997 was 16,000 adults and 4,000 children. I understand that this is a fairly regular sample size.

9.4.4 Target 4 may well engage with a variety of ‘cultures of consumption’ that are, at present, extremely difficult to identify as they are not clearly related to ethnicity, race, poverty and so on.

9.4.5 Information regarding ethnicity, disability and socio-economic class (again, in the form of relationship of respondents to the indices of multiple deprivation) should be routinely collected and published – even if that requires a cautionary note regarding the base size of and sub-samples.

9.5.1 Target 5

Narrow the gap in educational achievement between looked after children and that of their peers, and improve their educational support and the stability of their lives

9.5.2 Datasets used

SSDA903 and OC2

9.5.3 Comments

SSDA903 collects information for ethnicity – there is a field for recording data regarding disability but this has not been used during 2004-05 and 2005-06, it is not clear why this is the case.

9.5.4 It would be most appropriate and effective to first examine proportion of children looked after from various backgrounds that fall within the general area of equalities and diversity issues to determine whether they are disproportionately represented. These same population groups could then be examined in the mainstream data to ascertain whether they show similar impacts as appear to be highlighted from the ‘looked after’ data. This would be more effective than looking at specific issues within what will be a rather small sample. It would otherwise be extremely difficult to tell whether it is wider issues or circumstance-specific issues that are impacting upon the individual as regards this target.

9.5.5 Despite the fact that numbers will be very small it is important to collect information for target 5 on ethnicity. However, there is also a significant dilemma here because many minority cultures practice ‘friends and family’ caring and these people will be missing from any data.

9.5.6 More information is needed about levels of friends and family care, its distribution amongst different ethnic groups, and the ensuing possible numbers missing from this target.

9.5.7 The practice of friends and family care needs to be acknowledged as part of the provision that seeks to ensure all children are adequately and effectively looked after.

9.6.1 Target 6

Raise standards in English and maths in primary education

9.6.2 Datasets used

Results of National Curriculum Key Stage 2 tests

9.6.3 Comments

There is already a commitment to examine data around target 6 according to ethnicity. This needs to be cross-tabbed with socio-economic deprivation in order to ensure that the impact of deprivation can be measured against the impact of ethnicity.

9.6.4 It is known that the majority of the BME population are residents of areas that have high levels of deprivation, unless the contributing factors to educational attainment can be clearly identified as, for instance, cultural or economic, it will not be clear what interventions and policy decisions need to be made.

9.7.1 Target 7

Raise standards in English, maths, ICT and science in secondary education

9.7.2 Datasets used

Results of National Curriculum Key Stage 3 tests

9.7.3 Comments

As with target 6, there is already a commitment to examine data regarding target 7 according to ethnicity. Again, as above, this needs to be cross-tabbed with socio-economic deprivation in order to ensure that the impact of deprivation can be measured against the impact of ethnicity.

9.7.4 It is known that the majority of the BME population are residents of areas that have high levels of deprivation, unless the contributing factors to educational attainment can be clearly identified as, for instance, cultural or economic, it will not be clear what interventions and policy decisions need to be made

9.8.1 Target 8

Improve levels of school attendance

9.8.2 Datasets used

Absence data has previously been collected from schools by Forvus on behalf of the Department, this is now set to change and the data will be picked up by the new Modular School Census.

9.8.3 Comments

Target 8 may well be particularly sensitive to socio-economic impacts and varying social values regarding the value and use of education.

9.8.4 Ethnicity, disability and socio-economic status information have not been collected as the information was collected at a schools level, this will change as a result of changing the data collection method.

9.8.5 The new method of data collection will enable more accurate monitoring of absence levels across ethnic groups. However, without a clear means of identifying socio-economic class at an individual pupil level socio-economic data is still best examined on a school or area basis rather than an individual basis.

9.8.6 Data collected regarding absences should be routinely interrogated to identify possible differences between ethnic groups and also between different socio-economic groups

9.9.1 Target 9

Enhance the take-up of sporting opportunities by 5 to 16 year olds

9.9.2 Datasets used

PE, School Sport and Club Links (PESSCL) Survey

9.9.3 Comments

The PESSCL Survey collects data regarding the targeting of opportunities towards specific ethnic/religious backgrounds, or according to ethnicity or religion as separate rather than combined measures.

9.9.4 Similarly information is collected as regards SEN/disability or SEN or disability as separate rather than combined categories.

9.9.5 Loughborough University carried out an evaluation of the PESSCL project³, however reading the report it is not clear whether the specific exercises targeting pupils from equalities and diversity groups has actually increased their participation, though anecdotal evidence is that this is the case.

9.9.6 Target 9 also needs to pay particular attention to gaining information re both ethnicity and disability as both of these factors (esp. ethnicity cross-tabbed with gender) may identify significant differences in participation rates. However, also need to be wary of collecting too much information and making people feel 'watched'.

9.10.1 Target 10

By 2008, 60% of those aged 16 to achieve the equivalent of 5 GCSEs at grades A to C; and in all schools at least 20% of pupils to achieve this standard by 2004, rising to 25% by 2006 and 30% by 2008.*

9.10.2 Datasets used

SERAP (Schools Examination Results Analysis Project)
Annual School Census

9.10.3 Comments

Previous reviews⁴ of the datasets used by DfES to monitor against PSA targets have highlighted the weakness of datasets used with regard to target 10. These weaknesses have been partially addressed as those now being used are national administrative datasets.

³ See 'documents consulted' at the end of the report.

⁴ A Review of the Data Systems Used by the Department for Education and Skills for their 2003-06 Public Service Agreement Targets. Review of Data Systems Underpinning DfES PSA Targets; Notes on Review of SR2002 Targets

- 9.10.4 SERAP (School Exam Results Analysis Project) database is maintained by Bath University and provides cumulative attainment across a number of qualifications including GCSE, AS, A level, Foundation and intermediate and Advanced GNVQ.
- 9.10.5 As regards equalities and diversity issues it is important to note that there is a possibility that this kind of 'equivalence' target might mask inequalities in achievement, with pupils with 'equalities' issues being channeled into more 'vocational' subject areas.
- 9.10.6 Given the weakness of the datasets identified in previous reviews, particularly with regard to the possibility of double-counting and the absence of an Individualised Learner Record (ILR), this could be a significant, unseen problem and needs to be monitored and the risk assessed now that new datasets are being used. Therefore data collected should be regularly analysed along Equalities and Diversity lines

9.11.1 Target 11

Increase the proportion of 19 year olds who achieve at least level 2 by 3 percentage points between 2004 and 2006, and a further 2 percentage points between 2006 and 2008, and increase the proportion of young people who achieve level 3.

9.11.2 Datasets used

Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) administrative data
School Examination Results Analysis Project (SERAP)
National Information System for Vocational Qualifications (NISVQ)
Individualised Learner Record (ILR) – administrative data

9.11.3 Comments

Since January 2002 it has become a statutory requirement for all maintained primary, middle, secondary and special schools to provide an electronic pupil level school census return. This process is called the pupil level annual school census (PLASC). The third such collection took place in January 2004.

- 9.11.4 As noted above, SERAP is data collected and owned by Bath University. Access to the data is rather problematic for the public, there needs to be more transparency regarding publication/availability of data, and contacts for interested parties.

9.11.5 National Information System for Vocational Qualifications (NISVQ) is a sample survey of approximately 1.5m. Variables are available for age, ethnicity and gender. NISVQ holds information on National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs), Vocationally Related Qualifications (VRQs) and non-regulated Other Vocational Qualifications (OVQs).

9.11.6 The Learning and Skills Council's ILR (Individualised Learner Record) covers enrolments and achievements of learners in FE colleges and Work Based Learning.

9.11.7 Information disaggregated to ethnicity and disability should be routinely published with due regard being taken of the potential for the relevant base sizes to be rather small.

9.11.8 If possible postcode information should also be collected and the results correlated to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation. Such information should also be routinely published.

9.12.1 Target 12

Reduce the proportion of young people not in education, employment or training

9.12.2 Datasets used

ONS/GAD population estimates
Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) and Schools Level Annual School Census (SLASC)
Individualised Learner Record (ILR)
HESA Student Record
Labour Force Survey (LFS)

9.12.3 Comments

ONS population estimates are compiled by the Office for National Statistics compiles and represent annual (mid-year) population estimates for England and Wales. Estimates of the national population are available by sex and year of age. Data are published annually about fourteen months after the mid-year reference date.

9.12.4 The Labour Force Survey is a sample survey of some 60,000 households. Variables used include; Age/Date of Birth, Ethnic Group, Nationality/Country of Birth, Marital status, Sex and Socio-Economic Group.

9.12.5 The Review of the Measurement of Attainment of Young People states, as regards the LFS, that:

1.26 The LFS is a well recognised, independent source, which allows the DfES to measure the progress towards the target for 19 year olds at level 2 with transparency and timeliness. However, issues such as large sampling errors, high proportions of proxy responses and the complexity of capturing the increasing range of qualifications on offer are identified as weaknesses in using this method. These affect its ability to provide a reliable guide to progress including overstating academic attainment. (p20)

9.12.6 These weaknesses in the data will be magnified when considering equalities and diversity issues.

9.12.7 Target 12 warrants a commitment to collect and disseminate equalities and diversity information. As much of the data used is census info from administrative sources it should be possible to do this.

9.13.1 Target 13

Increase the number of adults with the skills required for employability and progression to higher levels of training

9.13.2 Datasets used

ILR
Offender Learning and Skills Unit learner data
Jobcentre Plus learner data
LFS

9.13.3 Comments

Target 13 warrants a similar commitment to collect and disseminate equalities and diversity information. With the development of the information management and sharing project⁵ this should become more possible and every effort should be made to ensure that information is analysed in a way that examines equalities and diversity issues.

9.14.1 Target 14

By 2010, increase participation in higher education towards 50% of those aged 18 to 30 and also make significant progress year on year towards fair access, and bear down on rates of non-completion.

⁵ A project being led by the LSC designed to encourage greater sharing of information regarding post 16 achievement

9.14.2 Datasets used

HESA Student Records
LSC records (Further Education ILR)

9.14.3 Comments

There are some problems with the dataset used to monitor achievement against this target as outlined in the relevant Quality Review which cannot recommend disaggregation to all Equalities and Diversity areas of concern.

9.14.4 Separate desk exercises and research papers should be regularly produced in order to ensure that potential areas of concern as regards Equalities and Diversity issues are identified and addressed.

10. Over-arching comments

- 10.1 The main issue, repeated numerous times in interviews, was the difficulty of examining data across programmes when data is of different kinds (i.e. some is census data from administrative sources and some is survey data with differing sample sizes).
- 10.2 This problem is further exacerbated by the use of data that is owned by different organisations and that is produced for a variety of reasons. Monitoring of DfES PSA targets is not usually the reason why the information is produced in the first place.
- 10.3 A further, related issue, mentioned almost as often as that above, was the difficulty of making more effective use of the data there is, or of improving the data quality, without a commitment to increase resources to that end.
- 10.4 Mainstreaming equalities and diversity issues was also seen to be a problem. If equalities and diversity information is to be acknowledged as some of the central factors in DfES programmes then information needs to be released in a timely fashion and in conjunction with the release of other statistical information.
- 10.5 Clarifying the role of statistical information in planning programmes and projects is crucial in order to make clear where gaps and weaknesses in quantitative data are supplemented by qualitative data.
- 10.6 One of the major issues regarding equalities and diversity is that of inclusion and participation. It is crucial the DfES is as transparent and open as possible in disseminating as much information as is available in order to allow those with the relevant interest and expertise to respond to issues as appropriate.
- 10.7 One frequently identified issue was the speed with which information became available. Because datasets are initially disaggregated at a very broad level and that information released first, it can mean a delay of some months before more fine-grained information is available. This can, crucially, mean that some areas where action is needed do not become apparent until after policy decisions etc have already been made.
- 10.8 As regards plotting impacts across programmes there is a significant difficulty faced in that there are no cross-programme targets. The impact of this is to focus monitoring and evaluation activity towards programme-specific targets and associated data sets.
- 10.9 The difficulty highlighted in point 10.7 is exacerbated by a lack of networking activity by those working on different programmes and for different directorates within the department.

11 Over-arching Recommendations

- 11.1 Where vulnerable groups of people are concerned quantitative data should be viewed as a means of highlighting possible issues and should be supported by qualitative investigations.
- 11.2 There needs to be some clarity about the relationship between the quantitative data collected for targets and monitoring and the qualitative research the dept carries out.
- 11.3 In order to allow potential problems or issues, including benefits and successes, across programmes to be picked up an additional set of information should be gathered which would gather information relevant to all targets.
- 11.4 If developed the ideal vehicle for this would be the proposed Integrated Household Survey being developed by ONS. It is recommended that the Department liaise with ONS to develop an education and skills section for the survey which could incorporate the following information⁶:
 - i) Take up of childcare
 - ii) Attainment of children in household
 - iii) Qualifications of those in household
 - iv) Occupation of those in household
 - v) Age of adults in household when last attending full time education
- 11.5 Such information could also be correlated to other data collected in the survey, for instance income levels, spending patterns, health. It could also be disaggregated across a variety of demographic fields including ethnicity, disability, age and gender.
- 11.6 There is clearly a wealth of expertise within the department and it is recommended that this is made the most of – there is a desire for more cross-directorate working for information sharing and this should be encouraged.
- 11.7 As the Equality Standard begins to impact it is important to ensure that race and disabilities impact assessments are carried out according to the same timescale and in the same way – at present these are done at different times and in different ways.

⁶ This is not intended as an exhaustive list but merely an indication of the type of data it might be useful to collect.

- 11.8 There is a need to ensure that current categorisation of those groups against which equality and diversity data is collected don't create new excluded groups – for instance there is evidence that young, white, working class men are becoming the most disconnected from the education system and the most marginalised, yet this will only be picked up if data is routinely analysed at a very detailed and sophisticated level.
- 11.9 As regards the information management and sharing project, this should include input from people responsible for areas of activity and monitoring beyond the immediate scope of the project (e.g. those engaged with schools projects or children, young people and families) to ensure that fields are comparable. This will allow comparisons and tracking between programmes.
- 11.10 A specialised training course should be developed to encourage greater confidence in mixing types of data and methods. This could possibly be done in partnership with the ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council).
- 11.11 A 'How to' guide for board and/or interested parties explaining how to make the most of the available information could then be produced.
- 11.12 Any 'how to' guide would need to include clear information about the limits of this and how to deal with these limits.
- 11.13 There is a clear need to encourage more cross-directorate working for information sharing. To this end a networking group should be set up with a clear remit and facilitation in the form of chair and administrator.
- 11.14 Wherever possible all statistical information should be made available to interested parties in the public. To this end statistical information should be published via a tabulation tool similar to that being developed by the DWP.
- 11.15 A toolkit should be developed in order to help board members better identify those Equality and Diversity issues which need attention. This was originally intended to be one of the outcomes of this review, however as it was not possible to interview board members it was not possible to identify the most appropriate form that such a toolkit should take.

Appendices

PSA Targets – full text

This appendix sets out Spending Review 2004 objectives and Public Service Agreement (PSA) targets for the Department for Education and Skills, including targets shared with the Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and those previously owned or shared with the Department of Health.

Objective I: Safeguard children and young people, improve their life outcomes and general well-being, and break cycles of deprivation

1. Improve children's communication, social and emotional development so that by 2008, 50% of children reach a good level of development at the end of the Foundation Stage and reduce inequalities between the level of development achieved by children in the 20% most disadvantaged areas and the rest of England. (Sure Start Unit target, joint with the Department for Work and Pensions)
2. As a contribution to reducing the proportion of children living in households where no one is working, by 2008:
 - increase the stock of Ofsted-registered childcare by 10%;
 - increase the take-up of formal childcare by low income working families by 50%; and
 - introduce by April 2005, a successful light-touch childcare approval scheme. (Sure Start Unit target, joint with the Department for Work and Pensions).
3. Reduce the under-18 conception rate by 50%, by 2010, as part of a broader strategy to improve sexual health. (Joint target with the Department of Health).
4. Halt the year-on-year rise in obesity among children under 11 by 2010 in the context of a broader strategy to tackle obesity in the population as a whole. (Joint target with the Department of Health and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport).
5. Narrow the gap in educational achievement between looked after children and that of their peers, and improve their educational support and the stability of their lives so that by 2008, 80% of children under 16 who have been looked after for 2.5 or more years will have been living in the same placement for at least 2 years, or are placed for adoption.

Objective II: Raise standards and tackle the attainment gap in schools

6. Raise standards in English and maths so that:
 - by 2006, 85% of 11-year-olds achieve level 4 or above, with this level of performance sustained to 2008; and
 - by 2008, the proportion of schools in which fewer than 65% of pupils achieve level 4 or above is reduced by 40%.

7. Raise standards in English, maths, ICT and science in secondary education so that:
 - by 2007, 85% of 14-year-olds achieve level 5 or above in English, maths and ICT (80% in science) nationally, with this level of performance sustained to 2008; and
 - by 2008, in all schools at least 50% of pupils achieve level 5 or above in each of English, maths and science.
8. Improve levels of school attendance so that by 2008, school absence is reduced by 8% compared to 2003.
9. Enhance the take-up of sporting opportunities by 5 to 16-year-olds so that the percentage of school children in England who spend a minimum of two hours each week on high quality PE and school sport within and beyond the curriculum increases from 25% in 2002 to 75% by 2006 and to 85% by 2008, and to at least 75% in each School Sport Partnership by 2008. (Joint target with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport).

Objective III: All young people to reach 19 ready for skilled employment or higher education

10. By 2008, 60% of those aged 16 to achieve the equivalent of 5 GCSEs at grades A*-C; and in all schools, at least 20% of pupils to achieve this standard by 2004, rising to 25% by 2006 and 30% by 2008. (This target may be reviewed in the light of recommendations in the Tomlinson report).
11. Increase the proportion of 19-year-olds who achieve at least level 2 by 3 percentage points between 2004 and 2006, and a further 2 percentage points between 2006 and 2008, and increase the proportion of young people who achieve level 3.
12. Reduce the proportion of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) by 2 percentage points by 2010.

Objective IV: Tackle the adult skills gap

13. Increase the number of adults with the skills required for employability and progression to higher levels of training through:
 - improving the basic skill levels of 2.25 million adults between the launch of *Skills for Life* in 2001 and 2010, with a milestone of 1.5 million in 2007; and
 - reducing by at least 40% the number of adults in the workforce who lack NVQ2 or equivalent qualifications by 2010. Working towards this, one million adults in the workforce to achieve level 2 between 2003 and 2006.

Objective V: Raise and widen participation in higher education

14. By 2010, increase participation in higher education towards 50% of those aged 18 to 30 and also make significant progress year on year towards fair access and bear down on rates of non-completion.

Data sources and ownership⁷

Foundation Stage Profile “FSP”

DWP Stock of Childcare (Ofsted)

Households below average income Statistics “HBAI” from the Family Resources Survey “FRS”, (DWP)

Performance information from the Childcare Approval Scheme

Birth registrations (ONS)

Abortion notifications (ONS)

Mid-year population estimates (ONS)

Health Survey of England (DH)

SSDA903 and OC2

Results of National Curriculum Key Stage 2 tests

Results of National Curriculum Key Stage 3 tests

Absence data collected from schools by Forvus on behalf of the Department

PE, School Sport and Club Links “PESSCL” Survey

Schools Examination Results Analysis Project “SERAP” (Bath University)

Pupil Level Annual Schools Census “PLASC”

National Information System for Vocational Qualifications “NISVQ”

ONS/GAD population estimates (ONS)

Schools Level Annual Schools Census “SLASC”

HESA Student Record (HESA)

Labour Force Survey “LFS” (ONS)

Individualised Learner Record “ILR” (LSC)

Offender Learning and Skills Unit learner data (DfES & Home Office)

Jobcentre Plus learner data

⁷ Ownership noted in brackets at end of line where known and where not DfES

Documents consulted

A Review of the Data Systems Used by the Department for Education and Skills for their 2003-06 Public Service Agreement Targets

Annual Report on DfES's PSA targets (www.dfes.gov.uk)

DfES 5 Year Strategy (www.dfes.gov.uk)

DfES Autumn Performance Report 2005

DfES Departmental Report 2004 (www.dfes.gov.uk)

Evaluation of the School Sport Partnership Programme – Loughborough University

Every Child Matters (<http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/>)

Every Child Matters: Outcomes Framework; Disaggregation of PSA targets by ethnicity and disability – April 2005

HEFCE Annual Report (www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs)

LSC Annual Report (www.lsc.gov.uk)

Mainstreaming Race Equality papers (presentations to the board)

Minority ethnic groups – main messages arising from the APA

Minority ethnic groups – main messages arising from the Outcomes Framework

National Statistics Quality Review of the initial Entry Rate into Higher Education

National Statistics Strategic Review of School Workforce Statistics

Opportunity for all (www.dwp.ofa)

Race Equality Scheme - DfES (May 2005)

Reducing Re-offending through Skills and Employment (Green Paper) (www.dfes.gov.uk)

Review of Data Systems Underpinning DfES PSA Targets; Notes on Review of SR2002 Targets

Review of the Measurement of Attainment of Young People

Review of Higher Education Student Statistics

Skills Strategy (www.lsc.gov.uk)

Youth Matters (<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/publications/youth/downloads.shtml>)

14-19 Education and Skills (February 2005) (www.dfes.gov.uk)

List of interviewees

Richard Bartholomew

Linda Barwell

David Betteley

Greg Boone

Malcolm Britton

Audrey Brown

Bob Butcher

Indarjit Dihal

Katie Driver

Margaret Frosztega

Mike Hughes

Bobbie McClelland

Peter Makeham

Tony Moody

Liz Pemberton

Deborah Persaud

Jill Turner

Paul Turner