

GREATER**LONDON**AUTHORITY

# Intelligence Briefing

DMAG Education

## The Lewisham Cluster

## Pilot pan-London School Roll Projections



David Ewens and Ben Corr

DMAG Briefing 2010-04-10

February 2010

ISSN 1479-7879

# **Intelligence Briefing 2010-04-10**

## **March 2010**

### **The Lewisham Cluster Pilot pan-London School Roll Projections**

For further information contact:

David Ewens  
Data Management and Analysis Group  
Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
London SE1 2AA

Telephone: 020 7983 4656

Copyright © Greater London Authority 2010

All maps are Crown Copyright. All rights reserved  
(LA100032379) (2010)

# Contents

## page

1	Introduction and aims. Pilot 1st Stage Pan-London School Roll Projections	1
2	Surplus places and increase in demand for places in the younger age groups schools cater for. Raising school leaving age	9
3	Demand for Places in Primary Schools	11
4	Projections. Key Points	16
5a	Pan-London Projections. Including Academies and CTCs	17
5b	Pan-London Projections. Excluding Academies and CTCs	21
6a	Sub-regional Projections. Including Academies and CTCs	25
6b	Sub-regional Projections. Excluding Academies and CTCs	33
7a	Cluster Projections. Including Academies and CTCs	38
7b	Cluster Projections. Excluding Academies and CTCs	48
8	Conclusions and Points for Further Discussion	54
	Appendix 1. How to use 1 <sup>st</sup> Stage roll projections	57
	Appendix 2. Weightings and ratios	67
	Appendix 3. Terms and conditions under which pupil level data are released for analysis by DCSF	70
	Appendix 4. Borough-borough roll projections, all London boroughs	72
	References	75

The Data Management and Analysis Group (DMAG) helps provide the Greater London Authority (GLA) with its evidence-base. It does so impartially and does not represent the GLA on policy issues. The Briefing should not be read as a statement of GLA policy.

## 1. Key points and context. Pilot 1st Stage Pan-London School Roll Projections

This pan-London Briefing is one of a series which supplement more detailed roll projections provided under contract by DMAG Education to 25 of London's 33 local (education) authorities. It is not an alternative to those projections. The Briefings are aimed at those who have a practical interest in understanding the nature and level of demand for maintained (state) school places in London, and require a systematic evidence-based approach to policy and practice in this field. Part of that demand for places will be for places in Academies, which are schools maintained by central government rather than local authorities. However the data on which the Briefings are based are available for Academies, and projections are given separately (a) for all maintained schools, including Academies, and (b) for maintained schools excluding Academies. Equivalent data are not available for independent schools, and they are not included in the Briefing.

There have been good reasons in the recent past for enhancing understanding of the projected school roll in London. The penultimate chapter of DMAG's *Focus on London 2008*<sup>1</sup> provided information, much of it written in 2007, on education in the capital. The chapter included projections of the primary school roll in the capital, and pointed to a very substantial rise in the number aged 5 to 10 between 2007 and 2011. It should have been self-evident that an increase on the scale projected at the time would almost certainly require additional places in existing schools and, quite possibly, additional schools.

Table 1 is based on the more recent projections included in the pan-London Briefings, and here include Academies. Figures for primary aged pupils compare figures projected for 2018 with 'actuals' in 2005. This is a conservative measure, since the intake of 4 year olds is, depending on the sub-region, projected to peak in approximately 2015. Figures for secondary age pupils compare figures projected for 2018 with 2008 'actuals'. The projected increase is, once again, substantial, and the particularly large rise projected for primary schools will eventual have an impact on the roll in secondary schools.

**Table 1. Change in the London maintained school roll to 2018**

Region	Pupils aged 4, 2005 to 2018	Pupils aged 4 to 10, 2005 to 2018	Pupils aged 11, 2008 to 2018	Pupils aged 11 to 15, 2008 to 2018
North London	+2,485	+15,597	+2,333	+8,257
North East London	+5,301	+35,008	+2,534	+6,982
South East London	+3,855	+20,048	+1,537	-34
South West London	+3,020	+21,585	+1,700	+4,178
West London	+3,344	+20,520	+2,129	+5,405
Totals (London)	+18,005	+112,757	+10,234	+24,788

The roll aged 4 to 10 is projected as being above the 2005 baseline by 2018 in all but two London boroughs. If the City of London, which does not maintain a secondary school, is removed from the calculation, the roll in 2018 aged 11 to 15 will be above the 2008 baseline in all but four boroughs. It is potentially possible that the increase in the secondary roll in the majority of boroughs will result in an 'overspill' into secondary schools in those four boroughs which will bring them into line with increases seen elsewhere in London. The scale of change in London is substantial, and is projected as taking place over a comparatively short space of time.

In addition to projecting the roll in individual London boroughs, the pan-London Briefings also give projections for county districts such as Epsom and Ewell, and unitary authorities such as Thurrock, where these are 'neighbours' of London boroughs. London's boroughs and surrounding districts are shown in Figure 1. A 'neighbour' is any district where there is a significant movement of pupils to and from a London borough. The number of districts for which projections are available is considerable, and a single document with all projections brought together would be prohibitively large. Instead the aim is to provide projections in 33 separate Briefings, with one for each London borough with its neighbours. Table 2 shows the borough Clusters, with country districts and unitary authorities listed as appropriate.

[illegible]

County or  
Unitary Authority

District or  
Borough

**Table 2. District clusters. Each cluster's core LEA is shown in column A, with neighbouring district shown to the right. Neighbouring county districts and unitary authorities (UA) are shown in italics. The name of each county district is preceded by the name of the county followed by a colon, for example "Essex: Epping Forest" and the name of each UA is suffixed by "UA", e.g. "Thurrock UA". Clusters are based evidence of transfers of pupils to and from their home districts to other districts for the purpose of schooling.**

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Core LA	Neighbour 1	Neighbour 2	Neighbour 3	Neighbour 4	Neighbour 5	Neighbour 6	Neighbour 7	Neighbour 8	Neighbour 9
Enfield	Barnet	Haringey	Waltham Forest	H East Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire: Hertsmere	Hertfordshire: St Albans	Hertfordshire: Broxbourne	Hertfordshire: Welwyn Hatfield	Essex: Epping Forest
Waltham Forest	Enfield	Haringey	Hackney	Newham	Redbridge	Essex: Epping Forest			
Redbridge	Waltham Forest	Newham	Barking and Dagenham	Havering	Essex: Brentwood	Essex: Chelmsford	Essex: Epping Forest		
Havering	Redbridge	Barking	Essex: Brentwood	Essex: Basildon	Essex: Chelmsford	Essex: Epping Forest Thurrock UA		Southend UA	
Bexley	Greenwich	Bromley	Kent: Dartford	Kent: Seven Oaks	Medway: UA	Surrey: Tandridge			
Bromley	Greenwich	Lewisham	Croydon	Bexley	Kent: Dartford	Kent: Seven Oaks	Kent: Tonbridge and Malling	Kent: Tunbridge Wells	Surrey: Tandridge
Croydon	Bromley	Lewisham	Southwark	Lambeth	Merton	Sutton	Surrey: Reigate and Banstead	Surrey: Tandridge	
Sutton	Croydon	Merton	Kingston	Surrey: Epsom and Ewell	Surrey: Reigate and Banstead	Surrey: Tandridge			
Kingston	Sutton	Merton	Wandsworth	Richmond	Surrey: Elmbridge	Surrey: Epsom and Ewell	Surrey: Spelthorne	Surrey: Mole Valley	
Richmond	Kingston	Wandsworth	Hammersmith and Fulham	Hounslow	Surrey: Spelthorne	Surrey: Elmbridge			
Hounslow	Richmond	Wandsworth	Hammersmith and Fulham	Ealing	Hillingdon	Surrey: Spelthorne	Surrey: Runnymede Slough UA	Slough UA	
Hillingdon	Hounslow	Ealing	Harrow	Hertfordshire: Three Rivers	Surrey: Spelthorne	Windsor and Maidenhead UA	Buckinghamshire: Chiltern		Buckingham: South Bucks
Harrow	Hillingdon	Ealing	Brent	Barnet	Hertfordshire: Three Rivers	Hertfordshire: Watford	Hertfordshire: Hertsmere		
Barnet	Harrow	Brent	Camden	Haringey	Enfield	Hertfordshire: Hertsmere	Hertfordshire: St Albans	Hertfordshire: Welwyn Hatfield	
Haringey	Enfield	Waltham Forest	Hackney	Islington	Camden	Barnet			
Camden	Haringey	Islington	City of London	Westminster	Brent	Barnet			
Islington	Haringey	Hackney	Tower Hamlets	City of London	Camden				
Hackney	Haringey	Waltham Forest	Newham	Tower Hamlets	City of London	Islington			

**Table 2. District clusters. Each cluster's core LEA is shown in column A, with neighbouring district shown to the right. Neighbouring county districts and unitary authorities (UA) are shown in italics. The name of each county district is preceded by the name of the county followed by a colon, for example "Essex: Epping Forest" and the name of each UA is suffixed by "UA", e.g. "Thurrock UA". Clusters are based evidence of transfers of pupils to and from their home districts to other districts for the purpose of schooling. Continued.**

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Core LA	Neighbour 1	Neighbour 2	Neighbour 3	Neighbour 4	Neighbour 5	Neighbour 6	Neighbour 7	Neighbour 8	Neighbour 9
<b>Tower Hamlets</b>	Hackney	Newham	Greenwich	Lewisham	Southwark	City of London	Islington		
<b>Newham</b>	Waltham Forest	Redbridge	Barking and Dagenham	Greenwich	Tower Hamlets				
<b>Barking and Dagenham</b>	Redbridge	Havering	Newham	Bexley	Greenwich				
<b>Greenwich</b>	Newham	Barking and Dagenham	Bexley	Bromley	Lewisham	Southwark	Tower Hamlets		
<b>Lewisham</b>	Tower Hamlets	Greenwich	Bromley	Croydon	Lambeth	Southwark			
<b>Southwark</b>	City of London	Tower Hamlets	Greenwich	Lewisham	Bromley	Croydon	Lambeth		
<b>Lambeth</b>	Westminster	City of London	Southwark	Lewisham	Bromley	Croydon	Merton	Wandsworth	
<b>Wandsworth</b>	Hammersmith and Fulham	Kensington and Chelsea	Westminster	Lambeth	Merton	Kingston	Richmond		
<b>Merton</b>	Wandsworth	Lambeth	Croydon	Sutton	Kingston	Richmond			
<b>Ealing</b>	Harrow	Brent	Hammersmith and Fulham	Kensington and Chelsea	Hounslow	Hillingdon			
<b>Brent</b>	Barnet	Camden	Westminster	Kensington and Chelsea	Hammersmith and Fulham	Ealing			
<b>Westminster</b>	Camden	City of London	Southwark	Lambeth	Wandsworth	Hammersmith and Fulham	Kensington and Chelsea		
<b>Kensington and Chelsea</b>	Brent	Camden	Westminster	Wandsworth	Hammersmith and Fulham	Ealing			
<b>Hammersmith and Fulham</b>	Brent	Westminster	Kensington and Chelsea	Wandsworth	Richmond	Hounslow	Ealing		

Source: 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008 English Pupil Datasets

Each Cluster Briefing also includes projections for London as a whole, and for the five London sub-regions. Maps within the Briefing provide the reader with an 'at a glance' view of a number of pan-London issues, including the level of pressure on places in the first year of primary schooling.

A key point in the pilot pan-London projections is that, compared to the shire counties, London boroughs are geographically small, with relatively small numbers of pupils. One problem with analyses based on small numbers, is that it can be difficult to tell whether an event is a 'one off', or whether it is part of a wider and persisting trend. Much the same issue arises from small-scale studies based on limited numbers of people in schools or elsewhere, and the pan-London material is intentionally organised to show trends across the capital, which allow individual boroughs to see their own circumstances in perspective. In some cases, a view is given over time, and maps showing potential pressure on reception classes provide a case in point. To summarise points made in more detail later, pressure became noticeable first in London's more affluent south west boroughs, and in districts to the south west of London. It is projected to eventually spread east, not just to other London boroughs, but to districts to the east of London, and with the North East London sub-region likely to experience some of the largest increases in the school roll up to 2018 (see Table 1). This view could not be developed if each borough's projections were only ever seen wholly in isolation and this is, arguably, a good reason for developing and repeating pan-London roll projections.

In 1999 the then Funding Agency for schools produced *Planning Secondary School Places in London 1998 2005*<sup>2</sup>, which focussed on 'the supply of and demand for secondary school places'. This contained roll projections on a borough-by-borough basis, though it did not include projections for county districts (or primary schools). *Planning Secondary School Places in London 1998 2005* also included what are best seen as estimates of 'cross-border pupil mobility'. (This exists where a pupil lives in one borough, but attends a school maintained by another local authority.) However, knowing the number of pupils who live in borough A and attend schools maintained by Boroughs B/C/D and E is, on its own, of limited value especially if what is needed is insight into *why* that movement is taking place. The Cluster Briefings are accompanied by supplementary Tables in EXCEL which include a range of information on the characteristics of those pupils who do, and those who do not, attend schools maintained by local (education) authorities other than their 'home' local authority area. This extends to information on the type of school attended. These are given separately partly to avoid overloading the Briefings, but also to give readers scope to carry out further analyses for themselves.

The emphasis in the Cluster Briefings differs from *Planning Secondary School Places in London 1998 2005* in another respect. That report was written over a decade ago and aimed, as stated above, to provide a 'perspective on the supply of and demand for secondary school places'. This reflects the obligation placed on local authorities by the 1944 Education Act to ensure that the provision of school places is sufficient to meet local demand. The reality concerning the place of roll projections was then, and is now, more complex. At the simplest, building a new school in a part of a local authority area where there is demand for additional places is to be preferred to building a new school in a part of the local authority area where there is no such demand. Similarly, expanding an already popular school in an area where there is a shortage of places, and where numbers of parents are obliged to seek places in another borough, may well have an immediate effect on the total number of pupils on roll in an authority's schools. Where the decision is to expand an unpopular school in an area where significant numbers of pupils also attend out-borough schools, then the local authority may well conclude that the roll will only rise in the longer run, and then only if the school receives intensive support aimed at educational improvement.

This concern with projecting demand for places and school improvement is not hypothetical. *Planning Secondary School Places in London 1998 2005* was published in the 1990's, and that decade saw a considerable emphasis on evidence-based approaches to improving standards in schools. The use of roll projections in school places planning would have taken that into account. Individual local authorities would have undertaken their own initiatives in this field, and London Challenge, founded in 2003 to improve education in the capital, also provided a range of evidence intended to enable schools and likely authorities to compare outcomes across the capital. At the time of writing, output from London Challenge can be found at

<http://fos.dcsf.gov.uk/PDFDownloads/2009/LondonDownloads.aspx>. However, discussion has now been extended to include not only school standards, but also social inclusion. The Office for Standards in Education's (OfSTED) report *School place planning – The influence of school place planning on school standards and social inclusion*, which is available at the time of writing at

[http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Forms-and-guidance/Browse-all-by/\(offset\)/10/\(letter\)/s](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Forms-and-guidance/Browse-all-by/(offset)/10/(letter)/s) provides one case in point.




Expressions such as 'social inclusion' and 'social cohesion' have a meaning at a general level, but can be hard to measure satisfactorily, and there is no universal agreement on what those measures should include. However, at the very least, they require evidence on the characteristics of locally resident pupils and the schools they attend, wherever those schools might be. There is evidence from the 2001 national census for boroughs and for small areas within boroughs, but while those data are generally of high quality, there are areas within London that have changed considerably since 2001. There is also evidence from a series of national sample surveys, which are highly regarded internationally, but are based on samples which are too small to provide a view at borough level. However, the introduction of the National Pupil Dataset (NPD) in 2002, provided a considerable improvement in the data available at local authority level *and* for small areas within local authorities, and those data have been used in the pilot projections. The NPD is updated each year, and provides the single best source of data on the characteristics of pupils and the schools they attend both nationally and in London. A wide range of information is added to NPD data both by adding other datasets available to DMAG Education, and by creating derived variables, such as straight line distance between pupil home and school. Since the resulting datasets held by DMAG Education make use of the NPD, but include a good deal more besides, they are referred to as the English Pupil Datasets (EPD) for the sake of brevity.

Analyses of data from the EPD have been reported in a series of DMAG Education Briefings<sup>3</sup>, and a number of these have a direct bearing on roll projections, school places planning and social inclusion. DMAG Briefing 2008-27 ('Missing Children'), for example, used pupil level data to chart the association between average income at ward level and the percentage of locally-resident pupils not accounted for by the maintained school roll (anywhere). Unsurprisingly, there is an association between higher levels of affluence and a propensity for children to be missing from the maintained school roll. Figure 2 is from the same Briefing, and shows the propensity of pupils in individual age groups from different income brackets to be 'missing' from the maintained school roll. Pupils from the highest income group are most likely to be missing at age 10, after the transfer to secondary schools, and this is likely to reflect movement to independent (private) schools. It is a moot point why some parents find maintained primary schools acceptable, but take a different view of their local maintained secondary schools.

Figure 2 also shows that the propensity for children from the lowest income areas to be missing from maintained schooling is at its highest in the final year of compulsory education, at the end of which public examinations are taken. Those pupils *tend* to have been on roll in schools with less favourable positions in raw score performance Tables, though some schools in that position achieve high retention rates in the final year of compulsory schooling.

Numbers on roll in schools now and in the future will reflect factors such as these, and the more detailed roll projections provided under contract to the 25 'subscribing' boroughs will highlight where further investigation may be needed. The supplementary Tables in EXCEL, which accompany the Briefing, are also based on pupil level data, and are intended to assist to that end, as well as providing information on cross-border mobility. Local authorities already have much of that information for pupils attending the schools each maintains, but not for pupils attending schools in other boroughs. The Tables which accompany the Briefing are for *all* locally resident children attending maintained schools, regardless of which local education authority maintains those schools. Looked at that way, the information amounts to an annually updated census of all locally resident attending any maintained school. Local (education) authorities do not necessarily have that information, and the Tables may well be of interest to others beyond the field of school places planning. Briefings will be circulated to London Borough Chief Executives and Directors of Children's Service, as well as colleagues in local authority education research and education planning. Information for country districts and unitary authorities are likewise based on pupil level data from the EPD, and would not have been available otherwise.

**Figure 2. Percentage within selected income groups on roll in 2004 but with no 2005 record. Pupils of compulsory school age in both years**



Source: DMAG Briefing2006/25 *Social Selection, Social Sorting and Education – 2. 'Missing' children*

**Table 3. London boroughs subscribing to the GLA School roll projection Service, as at 2009**

Subscribing authorities	Non-subscribing authorities
Inner London	Inner London
Camden	City of London
Hackney	Hammersmith and Fulham
Haringey	Tower Hamlets
Islington	Wandsworth
Kensington and Chelsea	
Lambeth	
Lewisham	
Newham	
Southwark	
Westminster	
Outer London	Outer London
Barking and Dagenham	Croydon
Barnet	Havering
Bexley	Richmond upon Thames
Brent	Sutton
Bromley	
Ealing	
Enfield	
Greenwich	
Harrow	
Hillingdon	
Hounslow	
Kingston upon Thames	
Merton	
Redbridge	
Waltham Forest	

\*Note: The City of London has only a small number of locally resident children attending maintained schools, and itself maintains a single 'one form of entry' primary school. It is the exception amongst London local (education) authorities, and arrangements for any future pan-London roll projections would need to take that into account.

Source: DMAG Education

A (large) majority of London boroughs subscribe to the existing GLA School Roll Projection (SRP) Service, but a minority do not and Table 3 lists the subscribing and non-subscribing authorities. *Any* pan-London project is like an arch. It will fall if data from even one borough is missing. Put another way, roll data provided even by the majority of boroughs *could not* sustain the full pilot pan-London school roll projection exercise.

Even if pupil level data released by DCSF were used to fill any gaps that might arise once the majority of boroughs had provided data, it is clear from regular meetings with the 25 authorities which subscribe to the existing GLA SRP Service, that they would not agree to their work being used to provide free roll projections, pan-London or otherwise, to agencies that had made no contribution to the work. This position is unlikely to change.

The use of individual pupil records provided by DCSF to produce the pilot pan-London means that no local authority (or district around London) was asked to provide *any* data for the pilot project. As for what the cost would have been if the pilot had been a wholly local authority funded project, this is indicated by the resource that was brought to bear to provide the pilot pan-London projections as they have developed to date, and that resource is set out in the Conclusion to the Briefing.

## 2. Surplus places and increase in demand for places in the younger age groups school cater for. Getting the balance right, and raising the school leaving age.

There are three key points in this Section

1. A 'spike' in the numbers of pupils needing places in schools' first years can be greater than any surplus places that might exist in those schools. This Section provides clear evidence that spikes can be substantial and arise over a comparatively short period of time.
2. While it *might* be possible to accommodate a 'spike' in demand that arises in a single year in portakabins in school playgrounds, it may well not be possible to accommodate a rise in demand which is sustained over several years in that way. The projections in this Briefing make it clear that high levels of demand for places in primary places *will* continue for several years (and will feed into higher levels of demand for places in secondary schools).
3. Changes in policy can have an impact on the number of pupils on roll. This Section provides evidence of that effect when the raising of the school leaving age from 14 to 15 came into effect in the 1973/74 school year. From 2013, places in education or training will be required for all young people aged 16 at the start of the educational year. From 2015 places in education or training will be required for all young people aged 17 at the start of the educational year. There are good reasons for (a) thinking now about what that might mean for projections of demand for places in secondary schools, (b) improving the linkage between demand for places in schools and in FE and (c) including figures on numbers not in education, employment or training.

The experience in London overall is one of increased numbers of pupils on roll in maintained schools. At the same time, all local authorities in England are required to reduce surplus (empty) school places by, for example, closing 'surplus' schools. Surplus places are measured as the total number of places that might, hypothetically, be used to accommodate pupils. Advice from the Audit Commission on the removal of surplus places is available at the time of writing at

<http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/localgov/audit/childrenandyoungpeople/Pages/schoolplacestool.aspx>

Where schools have surplus places, it will be difficult for local authorities to make a case for the funding needed to open new schools or to create additional places in existing schools. However, circumstances can arise when that position would need to be reviewed, with a concomitant change in policy. *Focus on London 2008* provided evidence on pupil numbers in one borough over more than forty years to illustrate the point that the *trend* in the school roll can differ in different age groups. For example, an increase in the number of 5 year olds can coincide with a decrease in the number of 10 year olds in the same local authority. Surplus places can exist while schools simultaneously find it difficult to find space for additional places for the youngest age group. The example in *Focus on London 2008* focussed on the primary age range, because that was where pressure was likely to be felt, but the same set of circumstances can apply to secondary schools.

Figure 3 illustrates that point further (and introduces a new one), again using data for one London authority for the period 1966 to 2009. Change in the school roll can be gradual, and take place over an extended period of time. However, it can also be large scale and occur abruptly. Abrupt change in the demand for places in the youngest age group a school caters can occur, and can overwhelm whatever surplus places there might be amongst older age groups.

The Figure appears to show that change in the school roll takes place diagonally over time, with a peak in demand for places in a particular age group in one year translating into a peak in demand amongst pupils aged one year older one year later. The same point applies to troughs in demand. Figure 4, which is based on the same data used in Figure 3, provides a bird's eye view of change in a contour chart, and confirms that, with one exception, changes in the roll occur diagonally over time. The fact that schools have surplus places (in some age groups) does not mean that there are surplus places in all age groups. Current measures of school capacity and surplus places taken together can overestimate schools' ability to admit additional pupils to primary school reception classes or to the first year of secondary schooling.

Figure 3. London Borough of Haringey. Pupils aged 4 to 18, 1966 to 2009





Figure 4. Contour chart, London Borough of Haringey. Number of pupils on roll aged 4 to 15, 1966 to 2009



Measures of school capacity need to incorporate measures of the situation of *individual* age groups. While that may be more difficult to achieve than we might suppose, the existing formula does not best meet the particular circumstances found in London recently, and these circumstances could occur elsewhere. That being so, roll projections in the Briefing are *not* set against measures of school capacity,

and readers who need to know whether projected change is gradual or abrupt are advised to consult Table 1 and the more detailed Tables which follow in the Briefing.

A JMI will cater, at least, for seven separate age groups for pupils aged 4 to pupils aged 10. The pilot pan-London projections indicate that the primary roll will be above 2008 numbers for each of the eight years after 2010. This has a bearing on the difficulties schools may face in accommodating additional 4 year olds as they become older. This can be illustrated by the enquiries received on more than one occasion by DMAG Education from colleagues in local authorities who, faced with the need to expand provision in primary schools, have wished to know how many primary schools exist in London which have three forms of entry throughout. (A single form of entry is a cohort of approximately 30 pupils. Two forms of entry are common in London, and three forms of entry would represent a high level of provision.) The evidence is that there are virtually no primary schools which have three forms of entry as standard in all age groups. Some schools have three forms of entry for some age groups, reflecting a temporary surge in demand on a limited number of years, but an ability to accommodate one or two bulge classes is not evidence that a school can ultimately accommodate bulge classes in every age group for the next eight years. Measuring capacity against demand in terms of the situation in individual age groups is, again, essential if surplus places amongst older age groups are not to obscure high levels of demand for places in reception classes, but it is also clearly important if older age groups are to be accommodated in the longer run. These assessments are currently made by local authorities, based on their detailed local knowledge of what existing school buildings can and cannot accommodate in the short and longer term. The pilot pan-London projections *can* be used to assess how many pupils will need to be accommodated in the future, but they *cannot* be used on their own to estimate how many schools will be needed to accommodate them.

Nonetheless, London is well-placed to monitor the situation in reception classes, since the pan-London school admissions system provides better information on parents' applications for a *primary* school place for their children, and on offers of places made, than has been the case in the past. Whether information from the pan-London school admissions system could or should be included any future pan-London roll projections might be a useful point for discussion.

Figure 3 shows a further point about change in the school roll, and this will have a bearing on numbers on roll in the future aged 16 and 17. Figure 3 shows that the number of pupils on roll aged 15 rose abruptly in January 1974 headcount. This reflected an increase in the school leaving age nationally from 14 to 15. Recent changes in national policy will lead to an increase in the 'participation' of 16 year olds by 2013 and of 17 year olds by 2015, where participation means participation in education or training. That education could be in either the school or further education (FE) sector. The projections for the 16 plus age group shown in this Briefing are, like projections for other age groups, based on past trends and it is entirely possible that school 6<sup>th</sup> form numbers will be higher than shown here. There is, therefore good reason for exploring projections for the post-16 group further, including projections for FE, and for including that work within future pan-London projections. The existence of independent school sixth forms means that the numbers of young people slipping through the net after the raising of the participation age cannot be measured simply as

*Numbers in the population minus (numbers on roll in schools and registered in FE)*


Since raising the age of participation in education or training means that either or both will be an entitlement for all young people, information in those not in education, employment or training (NEET) takes on an additional significance. Information of that type is maintained by the Connexions Service, and the part that information might play in future pan-London projections might well be considered, as might the potential value of those projections for the Connexions Service.

### 3. Demand for Places in Primary schools

While projections of numbers aged 16 will be reviewed at a later point, the main pressure in the recent past has been for places in primary schools, and particularly in primary reception classes. These classes are for pupils aged 4, and the rise in demand follows an increase in the number of births, difficulties in the housing market which have dampened the movement of people away from London and, *possibly*, a decline in the take up of places in independent (private) schools during a recession. The details of projected roll change are given in detail in the Table in Appendix 4. This Section (Section 3) maps data to bring out trends across London, and in the districts around London, which may not be evident from the appendix Table.

Figure 5 shows that the ratio of four year olds on roll to the number of locally resident 4 year olds in the majority of London boroughs *increased* between 2005 and 2009, with the whole of southwest London following that pattern. Catchment ratios are projected as falling in central London, though given a sufficient rise in the population this can still lead to an increase in the maintained school roll in that part of the capital.

**Figure 5. Change in Maintained Aged 4 Catchment Ratios 2005 to 2009**




Source: 2005 to 2008 EPD, DCSF 2009 roll figures and DMAG Demographers' London population projections

Figures 6 and 7 give two different views of the difference between the number of pupils aged 4 and the number aged 10 in and around London. The simple subtraction of numbers on roll aged 4 from the number on roll aged 10 shown in Figure 6 shows that districts to the west of London, most west London boroughs and all central London and central north London boroughs had more pupils aged 4 than 10 year old pupils on roll in 2008.


Figure 7 shows those districts where more than 50 per cent of junior and mixed infant (JMI) primary schools have more 4 year olds than 10 year olds on rolls. Districts in these circumstances may well have least room for manoeuvre in the face of an increase in demand for reception classes unless there are so few pupils in older age groups that some classes can be combined to free classrooms for additional classes of four year olds. The majority of JMIs in the majority of London boroughs had more 4 year olds than 10 year olds on roll in 2008, while relatively few county districts and unitary authorities around London faced that risk that situation can bring.



**Figure 6. Number of pupils aged 4 minus the number of pupils aged 10, 2008**



**Figure 7. Districts where more than a half of JMLs have more pupils aged 4 than pupils aged 10 on roll, 2008**



Source: 2008 EPD



There are a number of caveats as far as Figures 6 and 7 are concerned. Firstly, they do not include pupils on roll in separate infant and junior schools, and there is a practical reason for this. Identifying which infant schools were linked to which junior schools, in other words identifying those separate schools which might be viewed as being nearly like 'all in' JMIs in catering for 4 to 10 year olds, would have taken more time than was available. Secondly, Figures 4 and 5 point to a decline in the school roll as pupils age and this might reflect, in part, *assumptions* about the long-standing London-wide experience of families with young children moving away from the capital. From that point of view, lower numbers of 10 year olds than four year olds are exactly what we might expect. However, that view does not take account of inward migration to London and, given the changing ethnic composition of the school roll in London, there is no doubt that inward migration has taken place (See Appendix 1 to DMAG Briefing 2005/31, *Ethnicity and Attainment in Schools*.)

Figures 8 and 9 show projected change in the number of pupils, firstly from 2008 to 2012 and then from 2008 to the later date of 2018. Both Figures show continuing pressure on reception class places in London. Figure 8 shows that pressure on reception class places is more common in London than in the majority of districts around London but that, all other things being equal, pressure will increase in those districts by 2018. Taken together, Figures 6 to 9 point to an increase in pressure on reception class places moving from the more affluent areas in and around the west of London to boroughs in the south east, north and east of London, as well as to a number of districts to the east of London. A second major conclusion of the pan-London project is that there are London-wide trends, which would not be evident where roll projections for individual authorities are seen in isolation. There are good reasons for considering establishing the capacity to produce pan-London roll projections on a continuing basis, not only because of the situation in primary schools, but also because of the possible effect of rising primary school rolls on demand for places in secondary schools.

**Figure 8. Projected change in reception rolls 2008 to 2012**



**Figure 9. Projected change in reception rolls 2008 to 2018**



#### 4. Projections. Key Points

- Section 5 provides projections for London as a whole, and
- Section 6 provides projections for each of five London sub-regions.
- Section 7 provides projections for individual clusters of London boroughs, with county districts and/or unitary authorities included for the relevant outer London boroughs.
- Each of these Sections provides projections for maintained schools including Academies, and for maintained schools excluding Academies separately.

The aim is to move from a general view of trends in London as a whole, through projections for each sub-region, to a picture for each London borough as a whole, set in the context of projections for its neighbours. The final cluster projects are designed to supplement the more detailed projections provided to 25 of London's local (education) authorities in its contracted school roll projection work. Roll projections in the Briefing are based on trends in the school rolls and in part on population projections. Information is provided in the form of graphs, followed by the detailed Tables on which those graphs are based.


Allowing for the points made in Section 3, the London school roll is projected to increase in the primary age range until 2015, and for some age groups, beyond. The increase, shown in more detail in Tables 3 and 4, are substantial, other than for the post 16 age group. The latter is, however, projected to rise by 6,000 on existing trends, which is a not insubstantial number. Whether the capacity exists to meet that increase remains to be seen. Legislation now requires that pupils aged 16 at the start of the educational year will have access to either a place in education, or in work based learning. In short, there is a change in policy, of the type referred to on page 12, which may alter demand for places in schools.

Additionally functions of the Learning and Skills Council (LSC), which has responsibilities for further education (FE), are to be devolved to local authorities in the near future. Taking the last two points together, DMAG has been approached by the LSC to discuss the potential for developing projections for the 16+ age group, including students in the FE sector. FE projections could be developed separately from projections for maintained schools or in association with them. The latter course may well keep costs down through economies of scale, and DMAG is currently exploring the possibilities of using the LSC Individual Learner Record (ILR) dataset to that end.


Section 7 would benefit from addition of text summarising key points. Limitations of resource and time make that impracticable on this occasion.

## 5a. Pan-London Projections. Including Academies


**Figure 10. Projected number of 4 year olds on roll including Academies, and in the population, Greater London**




**Figure 11. Number aged 4 to 10 on roll including Academies, and in the population, Greater London**




**Figure 12. Projected number of 11 year olds on roll including Academies, and in the population**




**Figure 13. Projected number of 11 to 15 year olds on roll including Academies, and in the population, Greater London**



**Figure 14. Projected number of 16 year olds on roll including Academies, and in the population, Greater London**



**Figure 15. Projected number of 16-19 year olds on roll including Academies, and in the population, Greater London**



**Table 4. Projected Rolls, Greater London with Academies**


Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	80,306	242,671	82,308	322,234	564,905	75,601	378,582	32,101	59,965	438,547
2006	79,961	242,044	80,788	322,131	564,175	75,793	378,911	31,879	61,453	440,364
2007	80,543	243,323	80,830	323,840	567,163	75,965	383,348	33,769	64,305	447,653
2008	84,089	244,721	80,151	320,533	565,254	75,194	377,536	34,655	66,247	443,783
2009	86,288	251,221	79,395	317,649	568,870	76,638	377,737	34,485	67,265	445,002
2010	88,783	259,951	79,579	316,570	576,520	75,236	377,175	34,003	66,859	444,034
2011	91,633	267,400	83,492	319,791	587,191	75,056	376,465	34,005	66,450	442,915
2012	95,540	276,487	85,508	324,756	601,243	75,121	376,813	33,675	65,978	442,791
2013	97,318	284,982	87,922	333,219	618,201	74,580	377,008	33,707	65,712	442,720
2014	98,155	291,424	90,703	344,191	635,615	75,163	376,337	34,425	66,408	442,744
2015	98,779	294,552	94,498	355,303	649,854	78,403	379,831	34,044	66,592	446,423
2016	98,985	296,101	96,195	365,903	662,004	80,587	385,015	34,153	66,520	451,535
2017	98,783	296,662	96,958	374,848	671,510	82,908	392,212	34,182	66,636	458,848
2018	98,311	296,089	97,520	381,573	677,662	85,428	402,324	33,799	66,283	468,607

**Table 5. Projected Population. Greater London**


Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	95,136	281,558	91,330	351,274	632,833	86,313	428,191	85,092	336,611	764,801
2005	94,350	280,588	90,795	352,400	632,988	85,021	425,620	83,788	334,747	760,368
2006	94,903	279,020	90,568	353,831	632,852	83,884	421,019	84,238	334,918	755,937
2007	98,486	282,443	90,521	355,131	637,573	84,703	418,054	84,075	335,356	753,411
2008	101,326	289,466	89,793	353,902	643,368	86,549	417,227	83,817	334,541	751,768
2009	104,134	298,469	90,448	354,457	652,926	85,948	417,554	82,714	333,810	751,364
2010	107,437	307,196	93,773	357,771	664,967	86,467	419,873	81,718	331,948	751,821
2011	111,899	317,267	96,209	362,598	679,865	86,461	423,200	81,136	329,754	752,954
2012	113,862	326,993	99,062	372,897	699,890	85,923	424,762	82,195	328,590	753,353
2013	114,870	334,226	102,162	384,417	718,643	86,617	424,901	84,055	329,853	754,754
2014	115,622	337,899	106,283	396,442	734,342	89,639	428,289	83,445	331,169	759,457
2015	115,869	339,880	108,152	407,622	747,502	92,014	433,410	83,961	333,653	767,063
2016	115,629	340,632	109,118	417,090	757,721	94,328	440,651	83,930	335,277	775,928
2017	115,068	340,006	109,769	424,092	764,099	97,016	450,888	83,101	334,234	785,122

## 5b. Pan-London Projections. Excluding Academies

**Figure 16. Projected number of 4 year olds on roll excluding Academies, and in the population, Greater London**




**Figure 17. Projected number of 4 to 10 year olds year olds on roll excluding Academies, and in the population, Greater London**







**Figure 18. Projected number of 11 year olds year olds on roll excluding Academies, and in the population, Greater London**




**Figure 19. Projected number of 11 to 15 year olds year olds on roll excluding Academies, and in the population, Greater London**



**Figure 20. Projected number of 16 year olds year olds on roll excluding Academies, and in the population, Greater London**



**Figure 21. Projected number of 16 to 19 year olds year olds on roll excluding Academies, and in the population, Greater London**



**Table 6. Projected rolls. Greater London excluding Academies**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	80,209	242,363	82,214	321,820	564,183	73,018	368,607	30,738	57,523	426,130
2006	79,859	241,742	80,688	321,726	563,468	72,684	366,162	30,635	59,023	425,185
2007	80,428	243,007	80,713	323,421	566,428	71,448	363,049	32,213	61,364	424,413
2008	83,869	244,117	79,981	319,846	563,963	69,330	352,902	32,395	62,492	415,394
2009	86,058	250,592	79,217	317,006	567,598	70,455	351,251	32,010	62,768	414,019
2010	88,545	259,291	79,400	315,935	575,226	69,236	349,491	31,479	62,050	411,541
2011	91,388	266,718	83,301	319,161	585,879	69,073	347,641	31,489	61,567	409,208
2012	95,287	275,784	85,310	324,097	599,881	69,081	346,758	31,196	61,146	407,904
2013	97,061	284,262	87,719	332,537	616,799	68,599	346,405	31,141	60,835	407,240
2014	97,898	290,693	90,496	343,485	634,178	69,105	345,449	31,823	61,471	406,920
2015	98,521	293,817	94,286	354,579	648,396	72,090	348,512	31,540	61,708	410,220
2016	98,727	295,366	95,980	365,168	660,534	74,020	353,399	31,691	61,737	415,136
2017	98,525	295,928	96,745	374,108	670,036	76,119	360,154	31,795	61,966	422,120
2018	98,052	295,357	97,309	380,831	676,188	78,396	369,665	31,520	61,771	431,436

**Table 7. Projected population Greater London**


Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	95,136	281,558	91,330	351,274	632,833	86,313	428,191	85,092	336,611	764,801
2005	94,350	280,588	90,795	352,400	632,988	85,021	425,620	83,788	334,747	760,368
2006	94,903	279,020	90,568	353,831	632,852	83,884	421,019	84,238	334,918	755,937
2007	98,486	282,443	90,521	355,131	637,573	84,703	418,054	84,075	335,356	753,411
2008	101,326	289,466	89,793	353,902	643,368	86,549	417,227	83,817	334,541	751,768
2009	104,134	298,469	90,448	354,457	652,926	85,948	417,554	82,714	333,810	751,364
2010	107,437	307,196	93,773	357,771	664,967	86,467	419,873	81,718	331,948	751,821
2011	111,899	317,267	96,209	362,598	679,865	86,461	423,200	81,136	329,754	752,954
2012	113,862	326,993	99,062	372,897	699,890	85,923	424,762	82,195	328,590	753,353
2013	114,870	334,226	102,162	384,417	718,643	86,617	424,901	84,055	329,853	754,754
2014	115,622	337,899	106,283	396,442	734,342	89,639	428,289	83,445	331,169	759,457
2015	115,869	339,880	108,152	407,622	747,502	92,014	433,410	83,961	333,653	767,063
2016	115,629	340,632	109,118	417,090	757,721	94,328	440,651	83,930	335,277	775,928
2017	115,068	340,006	109,769	424,092	764,099	97,016	450,888	83,101	334,234	785,122

## Section 6a. Sub-regional Projections. Including Academies and CTCs.


Different agencies divide London into different sub-regions. The sub-regions referred to in the pan-London Briefings are shown in Figure 28, and the sub-regional analysis is included to show whether roll change will take place across London, or be concentrated in one region. Population projection figures are included in a Table after the graphs showing projected school roll change in this Section (6a). They are not repeated at the end of the Section dealing with projections which exclude Academies and CTCs. (They would be the same population projections.) That arrangement is also used in Section 7, which covers local authority cluster projections.

The number of 4 year olds are projected to increase in all London sub-regions, as is the primary school roll as a whole. Academies in London do not usually have primary age pupils on roll, and their presence or absence from the record makes little difference to the projection, and in some sub-regions no difference at all. Over the period covered by the Briefing the secondary roll is projected to increase, initially at a slower rate than the primary roll, but with early growth the North and West sub-regions, followed by an increase in all other regions. The current increase in numbers in primary school reception classes will, eventually, have a bearing on the secondary school roll.


**Figure 22. London's sub-regions**




**Figure 23. Projected number of 4 year olds on roll including Academies, in each London sub-region**




**Figure 24. Projected number of 4 to 10 year olds on roll including Academies, in each London sub-region**




**Figure 25. Projected number of 11 year olds on roll including Academies, in each London sub-region**




**Figure 26. Projected number of 11 to 15 year olds on roll including Academies, in each London sub-region**



**Figure 27. Projected number of 16 year olds on roll including Academies, in each London sub-region**



**Figure 28. Projected number of 16 to 19 year olds on roll including Academies, in each London sub-region**



**Table 8. Sub-regional roll projections including Academies****Sub-region: North**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	17,042	50,775	17,161	66,688	117,463	15,117	75,436	7,363	13,589	89,025
2006	16,802	50,554	16,740	66,630	117,184	15,092	75,399	7,049	13,787	89,186
2007	16,748	50,749	16,657	66,840	117,589	15,305	76,136	7,840	14,718	90,854
2008	17,353	50,773	16,689	66,032	116,805	15,271	75,352	7,972	15,207	90,559
2009	17,626	51,590	16,510	65,486	117,076	15,443	75,670	8,073	15,579	91,248
2010	18,197	53,060	16,413	65,212	118,272	15,151	75,734	7,972	15,644	91,378
2011	18,623	54,286	17,015	65,615	119,901	15,096	75,730	8,012	15,629	91,359
2012	19,296	55,854	17,187	65,761	121,615	15,284	76,188	7,952	15,574	91,762
2013	19,496	57,176	17,754	67,075	124,251	15,177	76,482	7,996	15,564	92,046
2014	19,489	58,062	18,190	68,998	127,060	15,393	76,881	8,175	15,771	92,652
2015	19,523	58,286	18,867	70,960	129,246	16,087	78,230	8,152	15,899	94,129
2016	19,527	58,292	19,071	72,755	131,047	16,515	79,779	8,215	15,971	95,750
2017	19,528	58,316	19,050	73,965	132,281	17,120	81,536	8,304	16,106	97,642
2018	19,527	58,297	19,062	74,763	133,060	17,604	83,609	8,238	16,109	99,718

**Sub-region: North East**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	17,078	52,020	17,992	70,437	122,457	17,081	85,562	5,618	10,409	95,971
2006	17,201	52,086	17,476	70,227	122,313	17,241	86,284	5,323	10,337	96,621
2007	17,592	52,748	17,528	70,779	123,527	17,140	87,400	5,809	10,763	98,163
2008	18,525	53,804	17,401	70,196	124,000	17,079	85,848	6,128	11,403	97,251
2009	18,891	55,581	17,452	69,671	125,252	17,504	86,275	5,921	11,555	97,830
2010	19,502	57,664	17,761	69,962	127,626	17,000	86,140	5,899	11,423	97,563
2011	20,350	59,517	18,860	71,374	130,891	16,989	85,999	5,882	11,364	97,363
2012	21,319	61,985	19,241	73,212	135,196	16,925	85,904	5,823	11,266	97,169
2013	21,786	64,318	19,875	75,638	139,956	16,989	85,814	5,851	11,249	97,063
2014	22,095	66,103	20,749	78,629	144,733	17,250	85,680	5,944	11,358	97,038
2015	22,338	67,136	21,749	81,520	148,656	18,071	86,772	5,797	11,283	98,055
2016	22,470	67,825	22,230	84,514	152,340	18,425	88,212	5,780	11,158	99,370
2017	22,464	68,199	22,543	87,183	155,381	18,933	90,205	5,745	11,098	101,303
2018	22,379	68,241	22,792	89,223	157,465	19,613	92,830	5,762	11,073	103,904

**Sub-region: South East**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	14,259	43,558	14,855	58,540	102,098	14,183	70,913	6,551	11,911	82,824
2006	14,242	43,403	14,507	58,296	101,699	13,989	70,475	6,723	12,638	83,113
2007	14,148	43,031	14,514	58,121	101,152	14,024	70,771	7,016	13,394	84,165
2008	14,694	42,893	14,294	57,284	100,177	13,677	69,180	7,020	13,567	82,747
2009	15,263	43,960	13,900	56,334	100,294	13,766	68,648	6,858	13,476	82,124
2010	15,922	45,771	13,812	55,650	101,421	13,476	67,884	6,798	13,291	81,175
2011	16,422	47,488	14,390	55,705	103,193	13,437	67,222	6,698	13,116	80,338
2012	17,105	49,317	14,949	56,375	105,692	13,419	66,578	6,639	12,961	79,539
2013	17,529	50,910	15,590	58,022	108,931	13,197	65,961	6,567	12,825	78,786
2014	17,787	52,252	16,074	60,232	112,484	13,166	65,261	6,614	12,809	78,070
2015	17,993	53,131	16,736	62,534	115,664	13,658	65,362	6,525	12,755	78,118
2016	18,112	53,703	17,153	64,691	118,394	14,189	66,032	6,567	12,745	78,777
2017	18,148	54,056	17,410	66,468	120,524	14,767	67,241	6,599	12,810	80,051
2018	18,114	54,166	17,611	67,980	122,146	15,214	69,146	6,532	12,777	81,924



**Table 8. Sub-regional roll projections including Academies, continued****Sub-region: South West**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	15,821	47,590	15,751	61,610	109,200	14,389	71,559	5,351	10,116	81,675
2006	15,712	47,420	15,700	61,914	109,334	14,379	71,523	5,558	10,477	82,000
2007	15,664	47,557	15,718	62,180	109,737	14,463	72,513	5,735	10,948	83,461
2008	16,453	47,656	15,525	61,682	109,338	14,277	71,475	6,091	11,520	82,995
2009	16,986	48,934	15,438	61,340	110,274	14,573	71,461	6,030	11,783	83,244
2010	17,263	50,683	15,250	61,007	111,691	14,428	71,475	5,948	11,697	83,172
2011	17,680	51,909	16,149	61,614	113,523	14,383	71,472	5,932	11,594	83,066
2012	18,694	53,610	16,683	62,825	116,436	14,347	71,523	5,910	11,536	83,059
2013	18,937	55,270	16,966	64,400	119,670	14,249	71,652	5,901	11,488	83,140
2014	19,088	56,650	17,382	66,471	123,120	14,137	71,420	6,004	11,578	82,998
2015	19,164	57,106	18,359	68,732	125,838	14,856	71,899	5,930	11,582	83,481
2016	19,144	57,306	18,591	70,664	127,969	15,339	72,710	5,885	11,499	84,209
2017	19,024	57,250	18,743	72,443	129,694	15,657	73,929	5,860	11,447	85,376
2018	18,841	56,928	18,824	73,857	130,785	15,980	75,556	5,755	11,332	86,888

**Sub-region: West**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	16,106	48,728	16,549	64,959	113,687	14,831	75,112	7,218	13,940	89,052
2006	16,004	48,581	16,365	65,064	113,645	15,092	75,230	7,226	14,214	89,444
2007	16,391	49,238	16,413	65,920	115,158	15,033	76,528	7,369	14,482	91,010
2008	17,064	49,595	16,242	65,339	114,934	14,890	75,681	7,444	14,550	90,231
2009	17,521	51,156	16,095	64,817	115,973	15,352	75,683	7,603	14,873	90,556
2010	17,898	52,773	16,344	64,738	117,511	15,181	75,939	7,388	14,804	90,743
2011	18,559	54,199	17,077	65,483	119,682	15,137	76,026	7,480	14,749	90,775
2012	19,125	55,721	17,448	66,582	122,304	15,127	76,565	7,351	14,637	91,202
2013	19,569	57,309	17,736	68,084	125,393	14,964	76,996	7,395	14,586	91,581
2014	19,698	58,357	18,309	69,861	128,218	15,168	76,928	7,672	14,874	91,803
2015	19,759	58,893	18,788	71,557	130,450	15,717	77,342	7,643	15,059	92,402
2016	19,733	58,975	19,149	73,279	132,254	16,117	78,098	7,653	15,092	93,191
2017	19,618	58,841	19,212	74,789	133,630	16,438	79,190	7,625	15,080	94,269
2018	19,450	58,458	19,231	75,749	134,207	17,019	81,086	7,502	14,929	96,015

**Table 9. Sub-regional population projections**

<b>Sub-region: North</b>										
<b>Year (January)</b>	<b>Age Group</b>									
	<b>4</b>	<b>4-6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7-10</b>	<b>4-10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16-19</b>	<b>11-19</b>
<b>2004</b>	20,755	60,512	19,401	73,881	134,393	17,926	87,485	17,449	69,401	156,886
<b>2005</b>	20,649	60,694	19,323	74,453	135,146	17,566	86,798	16,997	68,521	155,318
<b>2006</b>	21,117	61,220	19,449	75,059	136,279	17,370	85,801	16,872	68,615	154,417
<b>2007</b>	21,783	62,112	19,590	75,599	137,711	17,694	85,547	16,728	68,046	153,594
<b>2008</b>	22,209	63,636	19,476	75,716	139,352	18,083	85,591	16,815	67,557	153,148
<b>2009</b>	22,894	65,387	19,868	76,366	141,753	18,045	85,868	16,635	67,302	153,170
<b>2010</b>	23,404	66,839	20,466	77,184	144,022	18,182	86,644	16,344	66,874	153,518
<b>2011</b>	24,217	68,548	20,620	77,287	145,835	18,178	87,739	16,328	66,685	154,424
<b>2012</b>	24,441	70,340	21,488	80,418	150,758	18,204	88,247	16,654	66,561	154,808
<b>2013</b>	24,471	71,446	22,014	82,821	154,267	18,618	88,844	17,011	66,841	155,686
<b>2014</b>	24,536	71,792	22,800	85,087	156,878	19,255	90,097	16,990	67,405	157,502
<b>2015</b>	24,555	71,905	23,028	87,108	159,013	19,601	91,457	17,160	68,209	159,666
<b>2016</b>	24,556	71,985	23,064	88,532	160,517	20,140	93,113	17,278	68,835	161,948
<b>2017</b>	24,546	71,985	23,097	89,486	161,471	20,553	95,154	17,149	68,935	164,089

<b>Sub-region: North East</b>										
<b>Year (January)</b>	<b>Age Group</b>									
	<b>4</b>	<b>4-6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7-10</b>	<b>4-10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16-19</b>	<b>11-19</b>
<b>2004</b>	18,691	54,937	17,970	69,748	124,685	17,458	87,232	17,192	68,603	155,834
<b>2005</b>	18,810	55,353	17,681	69,303	124,656	17,077	86,369	17,020	67,835	154,204
<b>2006</b>	19,062	55,345	17,615	69,104	124,448	16,599	84,779	17,210	67,678	152,457
<b>2007</b>	19,738	56,422	17,624	69,089	125,511	16,646	83,378	17,211	67,974	151,353
<b>2008</b>	20,308	57,904	17,744	68,948	126,853	16,890	82,642	16,841	67,650	150,292
<b>2009</b>	20,945	59,809	18,049	69,698	129,507	16,668	82,313	16,676	67,548	149,861
<b>2010</b>	21,852	61,961	18,735	71,013	132,974	16,870	82,605	16,436	67,065	149,670
<b>2011</b>	22,881	64,547	19,334	72,845	137,393	16,975	83,359	16,182	66,314	149,673
<b>2012</b>	23,400	66,970	19,984	75,096	142,066	17,184	84,129	16,384	66,012	150,141
<b>2013</b>	23,724	68,800	20,840	77,771	146,571	17,475	84,660	16,755	66,112	150,772
<b>2014</b>	23,987	69,911	21,789	80,677	150,589	18,094	85,885	16,570	66,192	152,077
<b>2015</b>	24,124	70,641	22,290	83,475	154,116	18,613	87,400	16,716	66,626	154,026
<b>2016</b>	24,114	70,996	22,608	85,922	156,918	19,173	89,367	16,706	66,844	156,211
<b>2017</b>	24,023	70,993	22,828	87,737	158,730	19,900	91,855	16,785	66,789	158,644

<b>Sub-region: South East</b>										
<b>Year (January)</b>	<b>Age Group</b>									
	<b>4</b>	<b>4-6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7-10</b>	<b>4-10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16-19</b>	<b>11-19</b>
<b>2004</b>	16,296	48,028	15,753	61,239	109,267	15,273	76,246	14,926	58,930	135,176
<b>2005</b>	15,996	48,094	15,578	61,053	109,147	14,919	75,628	14,936	59,296	134,924
<b>2006</b>	15,858	47,266	15,476	60,983	108,249	14,738	74,462	15,134	59,153	133,615
<b>2007</b>	16,289	47,405	15,558	61,073	108,478	14,768	73,632	14,943	59,365	132,997
<b>2008</b>	16,921	48,377	15,311	60,709	109,086	14,974	73,102	14,891	59,353	132,456
<b>2009</b>	17,666	50,148	15,237	60,530	110,678	14,747	72,661	14,612	59,076	131,737
<b>2010</b>	18,243	52,044	15,656	60,770	112,814	14,847	72,725	14,338	58,399	131,123
<b>2011</b>	18,997	54,055	16,242	61,522	115,577	14,931	73,032	14,208	57,771	130,803
<b>2012</b>	19,462	55,798	16,913	63,110	118,909	14,732	73,066	14,280	57,254	130,320
<b>2013</b>	19,757	57,267	17,452	65,260	122,527	14,699	72,884	14,518	57,240	130,125
<b>2014</b>	19,995	58,250	18,156	67,680	125,930	15,083	73,243	14,368	57,314	130,557
<b>2015</b>	20,132	58,917	18,599	69,959	128,877	15,619	74,025	14,469	57,582	131,608
<b>2016</b>	20,178	59,338	18,887	71,834	131,172	16,213	75,258	14,538	57,816	133,074
<b>2017</b>	20,145	59,484	19,109	73,392	132,876	16,696	77,113	14,333	57,630	134,743

**Table 9. Sub-regional population projections (continued)****Sub-region: South West**


Sub Region: South West										
Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	19,808	58,750	19,075	72,850	131,600	17,742	87,748	17,247	67,096	154,844
2005	19,496	58,457	19,109	73,504	131,961	17,476	87,435	17,117	67,528	154,963
2006	19,234	57,370	18,944	73,912	131,283	17,495	87,223	17,236	68,219	155,442
2007	20,193	57,813	18,787	74,098	131,910	17,653	86,795	17,430	68,785	155,579
2008	20,884	59,270	18,520	73,679	132,949	18,116	86,956	17,443	69,062	156,019
2009	21,201	61,162	18,331	73,122	134,284	17,951	87,115	17,166	69,047	156,162
2010	21,742	62,652	19,205	73,375	136,027	18,014	87,532	16,907	68,636	156,169
2011	22,954	64,692	19,828	74,418	139,109	17,885	87,910	16,905	68,144	156,055
2012	23,234	66,645	20,143	76,063	142,708	17,657	88,136	17,123	68,079	156,215
2013	23,420	68,228	20,639	78,272	146,500	17,526	87,735	17,581	68,644	156,379
2014	23,514	68,762	21,716	80,689	149,451	18,276	87,974	17,436	69,017	156,991
2015	23,489	69,002	21,970	82,739	151,741	18,830	88,659	17,508	69,429	158,087
2016	23,342	68,935	22,144	84,633	153,568	19,132	89,817	17,400	69,662	159,479
2017	23,117	68,549	22,235	86,114	154,663	19,572	91,629	17,112	69,197	160,826

**Sub-region: West**


Sub Region: West										
Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	19,586	59,330	19,132	73,556	132,887	17,914	89,479	18,278	72,581	162,061
2005	19,399	57,991	19,103	74,086	132,077	17,983	89,390	17,719	71,568	160,958
2006	19,632	57,820	19,084	74,773	132,593	17,681	88,753	17,787	71,253	160,006
2007	20,483	58,691	18,962	75,272	133,963	17,943	88,703	17,763	71,186	159,889
2008	21,003	60,279	18,742	74,849	135,128	18,486	88,935	17,827	70,919	159,854
2009	21,428	61,962	18,962	74,742	136,704	18,537	89,597	17,625	70,838	160,435
2010	22,196	63,700	19,712	75,429	139,130	18,554	90,367	17,693	70,974	161,340
2011	22,849	65,425	20,186	76,526	141,951	18,492	91,161	17,513	70,840	162,000
2012	23,325	67,239	20,535	78,210	145,449	18,146	91,184	17,754	70,684	161,868
2013	23,497	68,486	21,218	80,293	148,779	18,298	90,777	18,191	71,015	161,792
2014	23,590	69,184	21,821	82,310	151,494	18,930	91,090	18,081	71,240	162,330
2015	23,569	69,415	22,266	84,341	153,756	19,352	91,869	18,108	71,807	163,676
2016	23,438	69,378	22,415	86,169	155,548	19,670	93,095	18,008	72,121	165,216
2017	23,236	68,996	22,500	87,364	156,360	20,295	95,138	17,723	71,683	166,821

## 6b. Sub-regional Projections. Excluding Academies


**Figure 29. Projected number of 4 year olds on roll excluding Academies, in each London sub-region**




**Figure 30. Projected number of 4 to 10 year olds on roll excluding Academies, in each London sub-region**




**Figure 31. Projected number of 11 year olds on roll excluding Academies, in each London sub-region**




**Figure 32. Projected number of 11 to 15 year olds on roll excluding Academies, in each London sub-region**



**Figure 33. Projected number of 16 year olds on roll excluding Academies, in each London sub-region**



**Figure 34. Projected number of 16 to 19 year olds on roll excluding Academies in each London sub-region**



**Table 10. Sub-regional school roll projections excluding Academies****Sub-region: North**

Sub-region: North										
Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	17,042	50,775	17,161	66,688	117,463	14,551	73,653	7,135	13,237	86,890
2006	16,802	50,554	16,740	66,630	117,184	14,525	73,364	6,864	13,403	86,767
2007	16,748	50,749	16,657	66,840	117,589	14,172	72,075	7,459	14,018	86,093
2008	17,289	50,647	16,659	65,912	116,559	13,607	70,268	7,283	14,139	84,407
2009	17,561	51,441	16,476	65,372	116,813	13,661	69,378	7,326	14,213	83,591
2010	18,130	52,878	16,387	65,105	117,983	13,429	68,618	7,145	14,082	82,701
2011	18,554	54,100	16,960	65,481	119,582	13,374	67,791	7,191	13,998	81,789
2012	19,227	55,664	17,130	65,600	121,264	13,552	67,546	7,118	13,928	81,474
2013	19,427	56,984	17,696	66,889	123,872	13,456	67,560	7,090	13,846	81,406
2014	19,420	57,870	18,130	68,778	126,648	13,665	67,799	7,253	14,014	81,812
2015	19,455	58,095	18,806	70,735	128,831	14,279	68,920	7,275	14,162	83,081
2016	19,458	58,101	19,011	72,527	130,628	14,670	70,412	7,358	14,276	84,688
2017	19,459	58,124	18,990	73,735	131,859	15,224	72,140	7,486	14,467	86,607
2018	19,457	58,103	19,002	74,534	132,637	15,653	74,235	7,473	14,535	88,770

**Sub-region: North East**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	17,078	52,020	17,992	70,437	122,457	17,081	85,562	5,618	10,409	95,971
2006	17,201	52,086	17,476	70,227	122,313	17,241	86,284	5,323	10,337	96,621
2007	17,592	52,748	17,528	70,779	123,527	17,036	86,706	5,807	10,761	97,467
2008	18,525	53,804	17,401	70,196	124,000	16,915	85,168	6,092	11,365	96,533
2009	18,891	55,581	17,452	69,671	125,252	17,366	85,512	5,870	11,474	96,986
2010	19,502	57,664	17,761	69,962	127,626	16,865	85,340	5,839	11,322	96,662
2011	20,350	59,517	18,860	71,374	130,891	16,855	85,145	5,824	11,255	96,400
2012	21,319	61,985	19,241	73,212	135,196	16,786	84,933	5,770	11,163	96,096
2013	21,786	64,318	19,875	75,638	139,956	16,853	84,815	5,791	11,148	95,964
2014	22,095	66,103	20,749	78,629	144,733	17,113	84,657	5,886	11,257	95,914
2015	22,338	67,136	21,749	81,520	148,656	17,926	85,735	5,739	11,180	96,915
2016	22,470	67,825	22,230	84,514	152,340	18,276	87,151	5,726	11,060	98,211
2017	22,464	68,199	22,543	87,183	155,381	18,783	89,112	5,693	11,002	100,114
2018	22,379	68,241	22,792	89,223	157,465	19,460	91,689	5,713	10,978	102,668

**Sub-region: South East**

Age Group										
Year (January)	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	14,206	43,385	14,805	58,295	101,680	13,190	66,835	6,113	11,154	77,989
2006	14,187	43,238	14,452	58,057	101,295	12,641	64,765	6,320	11,898	76,663
2007	14,092	42,868	14,453	57,898	100,766	12,307	62,884	6,570	12,568	75,452
2008	14,593	42,583	14,204	56,918	99,501	11,546	59,026	6,454	12,553	71,579
2009	15,158	43,659	13,813	56,015	99,675	11,592	58,367	6,154	12,295	70,661
2010	15,814	45,475	13,726	55,351	100,827	11,388	57,544	6,125	12,035	69,579
2011	16,309	47,182	14,318	55,450	102,632	11,369	56,950	6,007	11,835	68,785
2012	16,989	49,000	14,874	56,136	105,136	11,329	56,371	5,962	11,680	68,051
2013	17,410	50,583	15,513	57,795	108,379	11,124	55,953	5,889	11,546	67,499
2014	17,666	51,918	15,996	60,015	111,933	11,078	55,434	5,948	11,541	66,974
2015	17,871	52,790	16,654	62,311	115,101	11,485	55,516	5,896	11,528	67,044
2016	17,988	53,358	17,069	64,464	117,822	11,895	56,005	5,949	11,560	67,566
2017	18,025	53,709	17,325	66,236	119,946	12,355	56,978	5,975	11,637	68,615
2018	17,991	53,820	17,525	67,742	121,562	12,704	58,518	5,927	11,624	70,142

**Table 10. Sub-regional school roll projections excluding Academies (continued)**

<b>Sub-region: South West</b>										
<b>Year (January)</b>	<b>Age Group</b>									
	<b>4</b>	<b>4-6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7-10</b>	<b>4-10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16-19</b>	<b>11-19</b>
<b>2005</b>	15,821	47,590	15,751	61,610	109,200	13,847	69,375	4,864	9,123	78,498
<b>2006</b>	15,712	47,420	15,700	61,914	109,334	13,840	69,161	5,069	9,542	78,703
<b>2007</b>	15,664	47,557	15,718	62,180	109,737	13,671	68,542	5,201	9,935	78,477
<b>2008</b>	16,453	47,656	15,525	61,682	109,338	13,174	66,624	5,360	10,302	76,926
<b>2009</b>	16,986	48,934	15,438	61,340	110,274	13,353	66,265	5,336	10,429	76,695
<b>2010</b>	17,263	50,683	15,250	61,007	111,691	13,237	66,075	5,263	10,363	76,437
<b>2011</b>	17,680	51,909	16,149	61,614	113,523	13,198	65,833	5,265	10,292	76,125
<b>2012</b>	18,694	53,610	16,683	62,825	116,436	13,156	65,609	5,258	10,270	75,879
<b>2013</b>	18,937	55,270	16,966	64,400	119,670	13,057	65,533	5,235	10,223	75,756
<b>2014</b>	19,088	56,650	17,382	66,471	123,120	12,948	65,124	5,335	10,301	75,425
<b>2015</b>	19,164	57,106	18,359	68,732	125,838	13,575	65,494	5,251	10,291	75,786
<b>2016</b>	19,144	57,306	18,591	70,664	127,969	13,970	66,252	5,256	10,248	76,500
<b>2017</b>	19,024	57,250	18,743	72,443	129,694	14,237	67,274	5,254	10,258	77,532
<b>2018</b>	18,841	56,928	18,824	73,857	130,785	14,508	68,728	5,132	10,157	78,885

<b>Sub-region: West</b>										
<b>Year (January)</b>	<b>Age Group</b>									
	<b>4</b>	<b>4-6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7-10</b>	<b>4-10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16-19</b>	<b>11-19</b>
<b>2005</b>	16,062	48,593	16,505	64,790	113,383	14,349	73,182	7,008	13,600	86,782
<b>2006</b>	15,957	48,444	16,320	64,898	113,342	14,437	72,588	7,059	13,843	86,431
<b>2007</b>	16,332	49,085	16,357	65,724	114,809	14,262	72,842	7,176	14,082	86,924
<b>2008</b>	17,009	49,427	16,192	65,138	114,565	14,088	71,816	7,206	14,133	85,949
<b>2009</b>	17,462	50,977	16,038	64,608	115,585	14,483	71,728	7,324	14,358	86,086
<b>2010</b>	17,835	52,591	16,276	64,508	117,099	14,317	71,914	7,107	14,248	86,162
<b>2011</b>	18,495	54,009	17,014	65,242	119,251	14,276	71,922	7,203	14,188	86,110
<b>2012</b>	19,058	55,525	17,382	66,325	121,849	14,258	72,300	7,087	14,104	86,404
<b>2013</b>	19,500	57,107	17,668	67,815	124,922	14,109	72,544	7,135	14,073	86,617
<b>2014</b>	19,630	58,152	18,240	69,592	127,744	14,302	72,436	7,401	14,359	86,795
<b>2015</b>	19,693	58,690	18,718	71,281	129,971	14,825	72,847	7,379	14,546	87,393
<b>2016</b>	19,667	58,776	19,079	72,999	131,776	15,209	73,579	7,403	14,593	88,172
<b>2017</b>	19,552	58,645	19,145	74,511	133,156	15,520	74,650	7,386	14,602	89,251
<b>2018</b>	19,384	58,265	19,167	75,475	133,740	16,071	76,495	7,275	14,477	90,972




## **7a. Cluster Projections. Including Academies and CTCs**

Constraints of resource and time mean that the Briefing does not include the detailed commentary on cluster projections that might have been hoped for. Population projections are again shown in Tables at the end of Section 7a


Those reading any Briefing for an outer London local authority on the edge of the capital will need to be aware that the population projections for unitary authorities and county districts outside London differ from those for individual London boroughs. The latter are GLA population projections, which take account of factors such as migration. Population projections for the unitary authorities and county districts around London are Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. They are less fine-grained than GLA population projections, and readers will notice that, as a consequence of this, projections for districts around London show change as a series of steps.

The districts around London are shown in Figure 1, and in this Section their names are prefaced with the initial of their county. For example, Epsom and Ewell District is in Surrey, and is listed as S Epsom and Ewell. Broxbourne is in Hertfordshire and is listed as H Broxbourne and so on. While ONS population projections are freely available on the web, they are placed there with a request that numbers in individual age groups are not published. Consequently, the pilot pan-London Briefings do not include population projections by single years of age for districts around London.


**Figure 35. Pupils on roll in the Cluster aged 4 including Academies**




**Figure 36. Pupils aged 4 to 10 on roll in the cluster including Academies**




**Figure 37. Numbers on roll aged 11 in the Cluster including Academies**




**Figure 38. Numbers on roll aged 11 to 15 in the Cluster including Academies**



**Figure 39. Numbers on roll aged 16 in the Cluster including Academies**



**Figure 40. Numbers on roll aged 16 to 19 in the Cluster including Academies**



**Table 11. Cluster roll projections including Academies**

Bromley										
Year January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	3,256	9,919	3,479	13,764	23,683	3,673	17,992	2,450	4,436	22,428
2006	3,239	9,918	3,286	13,570	23,488	3,598	17,897	2,460	4,582	22,479
2007	3,174	9,734	3,366	13,546	23,280	3,540	17,783	2,567	4,681	22,464
2008	3,321	9,735	3,259	13,305	23,040	3,460	17,477	2,566	4,754	22,231
2009	3,377	9,896	3,191	13,066	22,962	3,501	17,321	2,531	4,740	22,061
2010	3,385	10,103	3,151	12,895	22,998	3,403	17,077	2,524	4,703	21,781
2011	3,490	10,269	3,294	12,888	23,156	3,393	16,908	2,474	4,646	21,554
2012	3,604	10,493	3,352	12,992	23,485	3,342	16,734	2,445	4,576	21,310
2013	3,699	10,800	3,362	13,132	23,932	3,308	16,574	2,412	4,518	21,092
2014	3,684	10,985	3,462	13,421	24,406	3,234	16,307	2,429	4,507	20,814
2015	3,679	11,052	3,573	13,690	24,742	3,358	16,230	2,372	4,462	20,692
2016	3,679	11,029	3,667	13,992	25,021	3,416	16,217	2,359	4,404	20,621
2017	3,679	11,019	3,657	14,271	25,290	3,428	16,278	2,314	4,346	20,624
2018	3,676	11,015	3,657	14,465	25,480	3,523	16,468	2,296	4,291	20,759

## Greenwich

Year January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	2,523	7,949	2,671	10,570	18,519	2,428	12,712	1,291	2,517	15,229
2006	2,624	8,056	2,692	10,576	18,632	2,360	12,437	1,341	2,723	15,160
2007	2,670	8,052	2,703	10,682	18,734	2,372	12,433	1,360	2,890	15,323
2008	2,749	7,971	2,675	10,614	18,585	2,218	11,902	1,449	3,003	14,905
2009	2,903	8,228	2,550	10,483	18,711	2,247	11,632	1,374	3,015	14,646
2010	3,207	8,790	2,550	10,334	19,124	2,259	11,421	1,354	2,961	14,382
2011	3,340	9,378	2,654	10,320	19,698	2,235	11,275	1,328	2,900	14,175
2012	3,546	10,011	2,805	10,452	20,463	2,256	11,211	1,317	2,856	14,067
2013	3,634	10,435	3,097	10,997	21,431	2,198	11,191	1,316	2,838	14,029
2014	3,715	10,801	3,228	11,667	22,468	2,242	11,185	1,359	2,875	14,060
2015	3,778	11,031	3,423	12,429	23,460	2,339	11,265	1,380	2,930	14,195
2016	3,816	11,212	3,510	13,124	24,335	2,470	11,499	1,401	2,981	14,480
2017	3,826	11,316	3,591	13,612	24,927	2,700	11,945	1,449	3,054	15,000
2018	3,811	11,332	3,650	14,028	25,360	2,805	12,554	1,463	3,115	15,669

## Lewisham

Year January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	2,871	8,499	2,908	11,195	19,694	2,237	11,445	937	1,651	13,096
2006	2,768	8,456	2,813	11,213	19,669	2,230	11,370	865	1,705	13,075
2007	2,840	8,514	2,741	11,119	19,633	2,289	11,518	995	1,984	13,502
2008	2,987	8,581	2,823	11,029	19,610	2,319	11,205	884	1,915	13,120
2009	3,112	8,946	2,704	10,813	19,759	2,388	11,340	888	1,843	13,183
2010	3,245	9,365	2,782	10,800	20,164	2,292	11,402	879	1,817	13,218
2011	3,504	9,883	2,939	11,024	20,906	2,253	11,470	853	1,778	13,248
2012	3,537	10,310	3,062	11,261	21,572	2,347	11,549	879	1,782	13,330
2013	3,623	10,689	3,193	11,741	22,429	2,278	11,505	884	1,803	13,308
2014	3,695	10,881	3,448	12,395	23,276	2,331	11,453	914	1,841	13,294
2015	3,750	11,093	3,481	12,925	24,018	2,435	11,598	900	1,853	13,451
2016	3,783	11,253	3,565	13,415	24,668	2,549	11,892	903	1,851	13,744
2017	3,791	11,349	3,636	13,847	25,196	2,661	12,211	933	1,882	14,093
2018	3,781	11,381	3,689	14,084	25,465	2,861	12,795	915	1,888	14,683

**Table 11. Cluster roll projections including Academies (continued)****Southwark**

Year January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	2,963	8,979	3,046	11,717	20,696	2,505	12,139	369	644	12,783
2006	2,967	8,800	2,943	11,669	20,469	2,437	12,231	441	764	12,995
2007	2,905	8,791	2,848	11,506	20,297	2,449	12,348	470	845	13,193
2008	2,971	8,686	2,824	11,243	19,929	2,311	12,098	415	776	12,874
2009	3,131	8,846	2,778	10,978	19,825	2,363	11,955	425	784	12,739
2010	3,251	9,187	2,716	10,777	19,964	2,274	11,745	421	784	12,529
2011	3,288	9,497	2,777	10,738	20,235	2,222	11,530	413	775	12,305
2012	3,464	9,826	2,927	10,846	20,672	2,250	11,354	413	768	12,122
2013	3,523	10,092	3,040	11,106	21,199	2,251	11,294	405	759	12,052
2014	3,603	10,398	3,075	11,451	21,849	2,256	11,190	421	769	11,959
2015	3,671	10,602	3,238	11,898	22,500	2,342	11,260	418	776	12,036
2016	3,710	10,782	3,293	12,251	23,033	2,484	11,521	424	782	12,303
2017	3,739	10,919	3,368	12,569	23,489	2,600	11,873	434	796	12,669
2018	3,756	11,011	3,428	12,909	23,920	2,668	12,291	439	808	13,099

**Tower Hamlets**

Year January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	2,851	8,570	2,877	10,931	19,501	2,422	12,743	724	1,473	14,216
2006	2,895	8,532	2,858	11,087	19,619	2,558	12,932	726	1,444	14,376
2007	3,031	8,758	2,760	11,125	19,883	2,685	13,217	796	1,505	14,722
2008	3,075	8,888	2,724	10,982	19,870	2,512	12,813	852	1,672	14,485
2009	3,133	9,114	2,792	10,886	20,000	2,617	12,880	788	1,687	14,566
2010	3,087	9,215	2,869	10,903	20,118	2,584	13,029	764	1,632	14,662
2011	3,186	9,325	2,956	11,129	20,454	2,500	13,049	775	1,612	14,661
2012	3,239	9,431	3,012	11,412	20,843	2,538	12,964	812	1,646	14,610
2013	3,253	9,595	2,968	11,582	21,177	2,640	13,090	807	1,656	14,746
2014	3,362	9,769	3,062	11,772	21,541	2,775	13,247	843	1,699	14,946
2015	3,442	9,971	3,114	11,928	21,898	2,878	13,545	832	1,718	15,264
2016	3,493	10,208	3,127	12,041	22,249	2,956	14,009	833	1,713	15,722
2017	3,515	10,359	3,232	12,300	22,660	2,950	14,428	854	1,732	16,160
2018	3,522	10,438	3,309	12,543	22,981	3,071	14,864	885	1,774	16,638

**Blank page**

**Table 12. Cluster population projections****Bromley**

Year	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	3,480	10,574	3,610	14,379	24,954	3,581	18,429	3,575	13,979	32,408
2005	3,460	10,631	3,588	14,300	24,931	3,620	18,461	3,705	14,367	32,828
2006	3,343	10,173	3,470	13,981	24,155	3,507	17,813	3,841	14,441	32,254
2007	3,486	10,207	3,405	13,835	24,042	3,495	17,654	3,617	14,531	32,185
2008	3,551	10,318	3,388	13,653	23,970	3,504	17,528	3,580	14,538	32,067
2009	3,559	10,532	3,294	13,464	23,996	3,419	17,378	3,521	14,399	31,777
2010	3,670	10,721	3,430	13,425	24,146	3,409	17,204	3,538	14,126	31,331
2011	3,790	10,962	3,497	13,513	24,475	3,344	17,044	3,458	13,966	31,009
2012	3,889	11,282	3,508	13,620	24,902	3,318	16,855	3,441	13,810	30,665
2013	3,874	11,476	3,605	13,905	25,380	3,225	16,553	3,446	13,708	30,261
2014	3,869	11,552	3,719	14,182	25,733	3,342	16,459	3,358	13,527	29,986
2015	3,868	11,532	3,815	14,495	26,027	3,400	16,443	3,337	13,406	29,849
2016	3,868	11,527	3,802	14,784	26,311	3,411	16,509	3,269	13,238	29,747
2017	3,865	11,528	3,800	14,986	26,514	3,505	16,707	3,241	13,049	29,756

**Greenwich**

Year	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	2,992	8,747	2,882	11,327	20,074	2,832	14,291	2,873	11,188	25,479
2005	2,964	8,808	2,862	11,378	20,185	2,804	14,276	2,861	11,307	25,584
2006	3,033	8,911	2,865	11,420	20,331	2,771	14,202	2,848	11,361	25,562
2007	3,134	9,044	2,921	11,437	20,481	2,829	14,120	2,897	11,426	25,545
2008	3,296	9,365	2,894	11,427	20,792	2,837	14,031	2,927	11,476	25,507
2009	3,640	9,973	2,966	11,577	21,550	2,817	14,087	2,861	11,535	25,622
2010	3,792	10,616	3,076	11,853	22,469	2,844	14,241	2,856	11,616	25,857
2011	4,025	11,319	3,233	12,202	23,521	2,922	14,468	2,860	11,630	26,098
2012	4,125	11,792	3,541	12,833	24,625	2,924	14,586	2,943	11,667	26,253
2013	4,218	12,200	3,682	13,505	25,705	2,992	14,700	2,983	11,773	26,474
2014	4,289	12,459	3,892	14,272	26,730	3,080	14,909	2,956	11,853	26,761
2015	4,332	12,662	3,986	14,975	27,637	3,214	15,241	2,954	11,923	27,164
2016	4,343	12,776	4,071	15,467	28,243	3,475	15,750	3,002	11,949	27,699
2017	4,327	12,793	4,126	15,858	28,650	3,590	16,339	2,982	11,890	28,229

**Lewisham**

Year	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	3,557	10,272	3,281	12,336	22,608	3,104	14,849	2,852	11,564	26,413
2005	3,436	10,210	3,247	12,413	22,623	2,884	14,650	2,771	11,334	25,984
2006	3,419	10,159	3,232	12,478	22,637	2,903	14,463	2,807	11,211	25,674
2007	3,491	10,125	3,315	12,640	22,765	2,880	14,238	2,810	11,135	25,373
2008	3,637	10,323	3,212	12,598	22,921	2,999	14,131	2,847	11,149	25,280
2009	3,792	10,669	3,198	12,538	23,207	2,973	13,997	2,794	11,143	25,140
2010	4,096	11,252	3,255	12,556	23,808	2,975	14,079	2,618	10,949	25,028
2011	4,135	11,720	3,383	12,642	24,362	3,041	14,225	2,630	10,777	25,002
2012	4,235	12,138	3,522	12,967	25,105	2,956	14,320	2,621	10,591	24,911
2013	4,319	12,374	3,796	13,599	25,973	2,975	14,395	2,742	10,618	25,013
2014	4,383	12,628	3,852	14,203	26,830	3,052	14,553	2,758	10,801	25,354
2015	4,422	12,826	3,955	14,774	27,600	3,189	14,841	2,792	11,001	25,842
2016	4,431	12,939	4,039	15,252	28,190	3,317	15,125	2,865	11,215	26,340
2017	4,419	12,977	4,103	15,542	28,519	3,555	15,701	2,802	11,257	26,958



**Table 12. Cluster population projections (continued)****Southwark**

Year	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	3,547	10,378	3,321	12,295	22,673	2,932	13,966	2,666	10,851	24,817
2005	3,539	10,465	3,283	12,351	22,816	2,844	13,821	2,664	10,877	24,699
2006	3,531	10,257	3,242	12,605	22,862	2,884	13,953	2,692	10,652	24,605
2007	3,622	10,408	3,270	12,721	23,129	2,933	14,008	2,650	10,650	24,658
2008	3,811	10,707	3,279	12,699	23,406	3,063	14,156	2,687	10,673	24,828
2009	3,958	11,123	3,289	12,721	23,843	3,013	14,222	2,703	10,682	24,903
2010	4,003	11,476	3,379	12,844	24,320	3,030	14,378	2,645	10,654	25,032
2011	4,217	11,866	3,543	13,117	24,983	3,048	14,554	2,660	10,690	25,245
2012	4,288	12,187	3,667	13,494	25,681	3,052	14,697	2,708	10,742	25,438
2013	4,386	12,547	3,715	13,887	26,434	3,063	14,731	2,824	10,886	25,617
2014	4,469	12,792	3,899	14,377	27,169	3,135	14,854	2,806	11,047	25,901
2015	4,516	13,006	3,963	14,773	27,779	3,272	15,058	2,833	11,198	26,256
2016	4,552	13,181	4,058	15,147	28,328	3,378	15,360	2,856	11,367	26,727
2017	4,572	13,296	4,138	15,544	28,840	3,427	15,706	2,842	11,436	27,142


**Tower Hamlets**

Year	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2004	3,072	8,821	2,858	10,504	19,324	2,461	12,467	2,577	10,509	22,976
2005	3,153	8,987	2,788	10,662	19,649	2,491	12,315	2,513	10,366	22,681
2006	3,346	9,334	2,796	10,839	20,173	2,429	12,100	2,472	10,237	22,338
2007	3,434	9,695	2,862	11,008	20,703	2,520	12,046	2,436	10,042	22,088
2008	3,499	10,008	2,940	11,058	21,066	2,662	12,175	2,343	9,797	21,972
2009	3,447	10,126	3,126	11,457	21,583	2,611	12,388	2,332	9,687	22,075
2010	3,557	10,266	3,221	11,914	22,181	2,645	12,606	2,362	9,629	22,235
2011	3,617	10,402	3,289	12,355	22,757	2,723	12,933	2,334	9,568	22,501
2012	3,632	10,590	3,256	12,650	23,240	2,822	13,254	2,430	9,659	22,914
2013	3,754	10,779	3,350	12,797	23,576	2,966	13,465	2,561	9,825	23,291
2014	3,843	10,993	3,403	12,937	23,930	3,025	13,797	2,496	9,916	23,713
2015	3,900	11,240	3,415	13,048	24,288	3,065	14,147	2,510	10,057	24,203
2016	3,925	11,398	3,517	13,302	24,700	3,026	14,402	2,561	10,180	24,582
2017	3,932	11,484	3,595	13,548	25,031	3,114	14,686	2,629	10,269	24,955


**Blank page**

## 7b. Cluster Projections. Excluding Academies


**Figure 41. Numbers on roll in the Cluster aged 4 excluding Academies**




**Figure 42. Numbers on roll in the Cluster aged 4 to 10 excluding Academies**




**Figure 43. Numbers on roll in the Cluster aged 11 excluding Academies**




**Figure 44. Numbers on roll in the Cluster aged 11 to 15 excluding Academies and CTCs**



**Figure 45. Numbers on roll in the Cluster aged 16 excluding Academies and CTCs**



**Figure 46. Numbers on roll in the Cluster aged 16 to 19 excluding Academies and CTCs**



**Table 13. Cluster roll projections excluding Academies****Bromley**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	3,256	9,919	3,479	13,764	23,683	3,673	17,992	2,450	4,436	22,428
2006	3,239	9,918	3,286	13,570	23,488	3,598	17,897	2,460	4,582	22,479
2007	3,174	9,734	3,366	13,546	23,280	3,540	17,783	2,567	4,681	22,464
2008	3,321	9,735	3,259	13,305	23,040	3,460	17,477	2,566	4,754	22,231
2009	3,377	9,896	3,191	13,066	22,962	3,501	17,321	2,531	4,740	22,061
2010	3,385	10,103	3,151	12,895	22,998	3,403	17,077	2,524	4,703	21,781
2011	3,490	10,269	3,294	12,888	23,156	3,393	16,908	2,474	4,646	21,554
2012	3,604	10,493	3,352	12,992	23,485	3,342	16,734	2,445	4,576	21,310
2013	3,699	10,800	3,362	13,132	23,932	3,308	16,574	2,412	4,518	21,092
2014	3,684	10,985	3,462	13,421	24,406	3,234	16,307	2,429	4,507	20,814
2015	3,679	11,052	3,573	13,690	24,742	3,358	16,230	2,372	4,462	20,692
2016	3,679	11,029	3,667	13,992	25,021	3,416	16,217	2,359	4,404	20,621
2017	3,679	11,019	3,657	14,271	25,290	3,428	16,278	2,314	4,346	20,624
2018	3,676	11,015	3,657	14,465	25,480	3,523	16,468	2,296	4,291	20,759

**Greenwich**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	2,523	7,949	2,671	10,570	18,519	2,428	12,712	1,291	2,517	15,229
2006	2,624	8,056	2,692	10,576	18,632	2,185	11,804	1,341	2,723	14,527
2007	2,670	8,052	2,703	10,682	18,734	2,192	11,725	1,360	2,890	14,615
2008	2,749	7,971	2,675	10,614	18,585	2,064	11,173	1,449	3,003	14,176
2009	2,903	8,228	2,550	10,483	18,711	2,093	10,736	1,373	3,013	13,750
2010	3,207	8,790	2,550	10,334	19,124	2,105	10,399	1,335	2,940	13,339
2011	3,340	9,378	2,654	10,320	19,698	2,082	10,213	1,269	2,826	13,039
2012	3,546	10,011	2,805	10,452	20,463	2,100	10,142	1,250	2,739	12,881
2013	3,634	10,435	3,097	10,997	21,431	2,046	10,124	1,255	2,707	12,831
2014	3,715	10,801	3,228	11,667	22,468	2,088	10,117	1,309	2,754	12,872
2015	3,778	11,031	3,423	12,429	23,460	2,177	10,190	1,340	2,828	13,019
2016	3,816	11,212	3,510	13,124	24,335	2,300	10,406	1,371	2,901	13,307
2017	3,826	11,316	3,591	13,612	24,927	2,514	10,819	1,428	2,996	13,815
2018	3,811	11,332	3,650	14,028	25,360	2,612	11,374	1,453	3,078	14,452

**Lewisham**

Year (January)	Age Group									
	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	2,871	8,499	2,908	11,195	19,694	2,030	10,415	782	1,328	11,743
2006	2,768	8,456	2,813	11,213	19,669	1,864	9,621	719	1,410	11,031
2007	2,840	8,514	2,741	11,119	19,633	1,923	9,740	794	1,641	11,381
2008	2,934	8,431	2,783	10,881	19,312	1,739	8,938	655	1,492	10,430
2009	3,056	8,798	2,673	10,710	19,508	1,766	9,023	582	1,350	10,373
2010	3,187	9,216	2,750	10,720	19,937	1,709	8,973	608	1,296	10,269
2011	3,442	9,726	2,913	10,972	20,698	1,681	8,916	596	1,279	10,195
2012	3,475	10,147	3,035	11,222	21,369	1,760	8,830	621	1,297	10,127
2013	3,559	10,520	3,164	11,708	22,228	1,710	8,801	597	1,291	10,092
2014	3,630	10,708	3,417	12,366	23,075	1,752	8,784	618	1,300	10,084
2015	3,683	10,918	3,450	12,895	23,813	1,829	8,906	618	1,312	10,218
2016	3,716	11,075	3,534	13,385	24,461	1,914	9,143	627	1,325	10,468
2017	3,724	11,170	3,604	13,818	24,987	1,996	9,382	654	1,360	10,742
2018	3,714	11,201	3,657	14,054	25,255	2,146	9,826	647	1,377	11,204

**Table 13. Cluster roll projections excluding Academies (continued)****Southwark**

Southwark

	Age Group									
Year (January)	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	2,963	8,979	3,046	11,717	20,696	1,926	9,947	149	323	10,270
2006	2,967	8,800	2,943	11,669	20,469	1,839	9,824	233	411	10,235
2007	2,905	8,791	2,848	11,506	20,297	1,486	7,967	261	457	8,424
2008	2,971	8,686	2,824	11,243	19,929	1,123	5,969	179	330	6,299
2009	3,131	8,846	2,778	10,978	19,825	1,147	5,895	132	290	6,185
2010	3,251	9,187	2,716	10,777	19,964	1,104	5,782	136	262	6,045
2011	3,288	9,497	2,777	10,738	20,235	1,078	5,664	138	258	5,922
2012	3,464	9,826	2,927	10,846	20,672	1,091	5,564	145	266	5,830
2013	3,523	10,092	3,040	11,106	21,199	1,092	5,533	146	273	5,805
2014	3,603	10,398	3,075	11,451	21,849	1,096	5,483	158	286	5,769
2015	3,671	10,602	3,238	11,898	22,500	1,134	5,514	162	299	5,813
2016	3,710	10,782	3,293	12,251	23,033	1,204	5,641	170	311	5,952
2017	3,739	10,919	3,368	12,569	23,489	1,260	5,812	179	326	6,138
2018	3,756	11,011	3,428	12,909	23,920	1,292	6,015	185	340	6,355

**Tower Hamlets**

Power Hobbies										
	Age Group									
Year (January)	4	4-6	7	7-10	4-10	11	11-15	16	16-19	11-19
2005	2,851	8,570	2,877	10,931	19,501	2,422	12,743	724	1,473	14,216
2006	2,895	8,532	2,858	11,087	19,619	2,558	12,932	726	1,444	14,376
2007	3,031	8,758	2,760	11,125	19,883	2,685	13,217	796	1,505	14,722
2008	3,075	8,888	2,724	10,982	19,870	2,512	12,813	852	1,672	14,485
2009	3,133	9,114	2,792	10,886	20,000	2,617	12,880	788	1,687	14,566
2010	3,087	9,215	2,869	10,903	20,118	2,584	13,029	764	1,632	14,662
2011	3,186	9,325	2,956	11,129	20,454	2,500	13,049	775	1,612	14,661
2012	3,239	9,431	3,012	11,412	20,843	2,538	12,964	812	1,646	14,610
2013	3,253	9,595	2,968	11,582	21,177	2,640	13,090	807	1,656	14,746
2014	3,362	9,769	3,062	11,772	21,541	2,775	13,247	843	1,699	14,946
2015	3,442	9,971	3,114	11,928	21,898	2,878	13,545	832	1,718	15,264
2016	3,493	10,208	3,127	12,041	22,249	2,956	14,009	833	1,713	15,722
2017	3,515	10,359	3,232	12,300	22,660	2,950	14,428	854	1,732	16,160
2018	3,522	10,438	3,309	12,543	22,981	3,071	14,864	885	1,774	16,638

**Blank page**



## 8. Conclusions and Points for Further Discussion

This Section brings together key themes from the pilot pan-London project, and provides stakeholders with a series of points of reference which may be of use in continuing discussion of the projected demand for education places in London.

Few would argue that there has been an increase in demand for primary school places in London or that, all other things being equal, an increase in demand for primary school places would be followed by an increase in demand for secondary school places. The pilot pan-London projections indicate that the recent high level of demand for primary school places is not a one-off blip in a particular year, but on current trends will continue in the majority of London boroughs for the next 10 years.

The pattern of increase has not taken place across all London boroughs and surrounding districts simultaneously. The increase in pressure on primary school places happened earlier in London than in the surrounding districts, and earlier in the more affluent boroughs in the west of London and districts to the west of London than elsewhere. The projections however also confirm that by 2018, Enfield, Greenwich, Barking and Dagenham, and Redbridge and districts to the east of London, will also have experienced some of the largest increases in demand for reception class places. There are London trends, which will have an impact on the majority of boroughs though at different points in time. One point in favour of continuing with some form of pan-London roll projections is precisely to identify those sorts of trends before the situation in a London borough becomes one of crisis management.

It will fall to individual local authorities to use their detailed knowledge of individual schools to determine whether increases in demand for school places can be accommodated within schools as they are. This will be based in part on answers to questions such as 'can a primary school resource room be pressed into temporary service as a classroom?', 'can a demountable (portakabin) be put in a school's playground to accommodate a spike in demand?' or 'what will an increase in demand for secondary places imply for the number of laboratories needed in school X or Y?' That detailed local knowledge will be invaluable, and partly because DMAG Education does not have that local expertise, the pan-London project has steered away from charting the projected roll against measures of school capacity. The costs of setting up a single group to amass that level of detailed information for London as a whole would be prohibitively large and for the foreseeable future the most economic arrangement is the current one, where local authorities interpret projections in the light of their local knowledge.

However, there is a case for reviewing the way in which surplus places in schools (and hence capacity) are measured, since some surplus places in older age groups can make it difficult for local authorities to apply for the funding needed to expand provision when there is a sharp and/or sustained increase in demand for places in, for example, primary school reception classes. That review might usefully consider whether capacity and surplus places can be measured on a year group by year group basis. For the present, the pan-London roll projections on their own *do not* 'prove' how many more (or fewer) schools London needs.

The lowest increase in the school roll is projected for the 16 to 19 age group, with a 6,000 increase by 2018 from a 2005 base. However, plans to raise the age of participation, first for young people age 16 at the start of the educational year, and then for young people age 17 at the start of the school year, could change that situation. Schools and further education colleges have a long history of post-16 provision and some young people in those age groups will already be in education or training. The Learning and Skills Council (LSC) has commissioned DMAG Education to project demand for further education amongst locally resident young people in each London borough. This will use Individual Learner Records(ILR) to ensure parity with work based on individual pupil records from the English Pupil Datas, and a second strand of the work will focus on the FE destinations of locally resident young people. This is a one off project, but economies of scale suggest that the work might be done in future in conjunction with pan-London school roll projections. However, some young people will not be in education, employment or training (NEET), and developing a sense of those numbers in each borough might well also have a place in pan-London projections. DMAG Education is currently exploring the possibility of gaining access to existing data in this field.

The suggestion that roll projections need to evolve to take account of policy changes such as raising the age of participation (in education or training) is commonsense. However, the pilot pan-London projections have taken a 'policy neutral' approach. What local or national policy makers hope will follow from a particular policy has not determined what has been included in the projections and no-one, whether from

London boroughs or elsewhere, has attempted to inject those considerations into the present work. A specific example is the likely future popularity of a school which has not yet opened. This is a matter for borough councillors and local government officers.

The 1944 Education Act makes school places planning a statutory responsibility of individual local (education) authorities, and local authorities cannot arbitrarily transfer that responsibility to others (nor can it be assumed by other agencies). Previous discussions of pan-London roll projections have, and distinctly unhelpfully, used the term interchangeably with school places planning. The latter has a policy dimension, and involves value judgements, which roll projections do not. The pilot pan-London projections have not been produced with value laden policy judgements in mind. That sharp distinction between school roll projections and school places planning would need to be maintained in any future pan-London roll projection (or education places projection exercise).

That said, some schools will be more popular than others, and there is considerable research evidence on what makes a school effective and on why parents' select the schools they do.<sup>4</sup> Applying borough level projections to individual schools will require that local knowledge, and local knowledge will be required to interpret projections to take account of social cohesion. The pupil level data used to establish the historic roll at district level also provide the EXCEL Tables which accompany the projections. Taken together, these amount to the single largest body of evidence provided by DMAG Education on locally resident pupils and the schools they attend. Whether that practice continues, is modified or is discontinued will be for others to say.

What is, and is not, provided to subscribing agencies is already set out in a written service level agreement for the GLA SRP Service. It contains a number of points which might well be useful if future discussions take place. This includes the point that, while anyone can make suggestions about the development of the Service, these should be costed. It is also practice that decisions in the GLA SRP Liaison Group are based on consensus, and that options developed in the approach to projections are available to all subscribing boroughs. Taken as a whole, this avoids financially unrealistic, wishful thinking about what might be achieved, and puts a premium on individuals thinking in terms of what will persuade colleagues as a whole rather than simply about particularistic considerations in an individual borough. Those ground rules might usefully apply to future discussions of pan-London school rolls/education places projections.

There is a further lesson to be learned for the workings of that Liaison Group. Colleagues from a number of local authorities which subscribe to the existing GLA school roll projection service have consistently made it clear that they do not support the use of the subscription fee they pay, or the expertise they have brought to bear over several years, to fund projections for non-contributing boroughs (or for that matter being used for any purpose other than that intended). This is one, but not the only reason, why the pan-London projections are based on individual pupil records provided by the DCSF. The pilot projections have been run in parallel with the existing Service but separately from it, and they have not used its data or funding. What position agencies that might support pan-London projections take towards providing information to agencies which do not contribute to its costs will be for others to decide. The prudent assumption for non-participating agencies to make is that they would not have access to output from a pan-London Service.

The pilot projections are pilots, and open to discussion. However, the resource brought to bear in developing them may provide a useful point of reference in future discussions. The costs cited below do not cover either the existing costs of work on roll projections, or the existing costs of input by DMAG's Demography Team and of DMAG's GIS Team. The resource cited is the *additional* resource required to produce the pilot pan-London projections given existing capacity in the GLA. The total resource required by an agency starting from scratch would be considerably higher.

There were three areas where an additional resource was required. The number of projections produced implies a degree of automation, which in turn implies computer programming. This was over and above the skill level needed in existing GLA SRP work, but manageable as an upgrade of that existing capacity. That resource was applied over the course of 12 months. The second resource involved the near full-time attention over a 12 month period of a senior researcher working with pupil level data and on other pan-London tasks. Pupil level data arrive as exactly that, rather than as 'oven ready' Tables suitable for immediate use in pan-London projections. Additionally, while the data have a high level of accuracy, they need to be converted into the format statistical software require (see DMAG Education Guide 2009-1, *A Threshold Guide to Ready Data for Analysis in SPSS*). Further, some of the variables, such as pupil

home district, are not present in the EPD, and need to be added by merging information from other datasets. The third resource was a computer that had been purpose built to work with large pupil datasets. Repeating or developing a pan-London education places projection service would not require that all possible partners signed up for it. However, it is the case that if the three resources mentioned in this paragraph had not been in place in 2009, the pilot project would not have begun. They represent the minimum needed to no more than repeat the existing exercise.

Should there be any discussion of future pan-London projections, this gives rise to 11 recommendations, followed by one observation

1. Discussion and proposals should cover estimates of the costs of implementing proposals, and
2. focus on data, needs, and analyses common to all London boroughs.
3. Data sources should be those which already exist for all local authorities from sources such as DCSF.
4. Future projections would be impartial and
5. with a clear distinction being drawn between projections and education places planning.
6. The role of a user/liaison/steering group which agrees on what access, and on what terms, non-contributing agencies might have to projections or other published material would be considered.
7. The scope for a 'tie in' between school roll and FE projections would be considered.
8. The role of information on NEETS in a pan-London project would also be considered.
9. Evidence referred to in discussions should stand up to scrutiny.
10. A projection method which combines a common core approach, with options that can be applied to projections for all boroughs to take account of factors such as the recent opening or closing of schools, is to be preferred to the application of a single formula without regard to local circumstance.
11. The value of GLA population projections in pan-London education place projections should be recognised.

Any repeat or development of the pilot pan-London project would depend on there being support from external stakeholders. That support would need to be sufficient to ensure that the minimum resource required was in place before the work began. If that level of support does not exist then there is, realistically, no scope for repeating or developing the pilot exercise, or for scenario testing with the existing data.

Pilot pan-London Briefings will be circulated to potential stakeholders for their possible discussion and comment.

## Appendix 1. How to use 1<sup>st</sup> stage roll projections

Much of what follows will be grist to the mill of those experienced in using 1<sup>st</sup> stage roll projections, and it does assume that earlier Sections of the Briefing have been read. The target readers are newly joined planners, statisticians or policy officers, who find they need to work with school roll projection statistics, but are new to them.

Most projections are based on one or both of (a) roll replacement ratios (b) catchment ratios. A roll replacement ratio is the ratio of pupils in a particular age group in one year to the number in an age group one year older one year later. Where these are calculated for number of years, for example, calculating the ratio of 10 year olds in 2006 to 11 year olds in 2007, the ratio of 10 year olds in 2007 to 11 year olds in 2008, the ratio of 10 year olds in 2008 to 11 year olds in 2009 and the ratio of 10 year olds in 2009 to the number of 11 year olds in 2010, provides four ratios. An average of the four figures, if there is an upward trend in the ratios, the ratio for the most recent years, can then be applied to the number of 10 year olds on roll in the current year to project the number of 11 year olds likely to be on roll in the coming year. The ratios automatically take account of cross-border pupil mobility and of movement to and from the independent sector. Where there is a marked change in the ratio over time greater weight can be given to the most representative ratio. For example, if a school opened in 2007, proved immediately successful, and raised the replacement ratio then the 2008/09 ratio would be the best one to use in projecting future rolls. Where there is no marked change, ratios for each of the four years can be given equal weighting, that is an overage can be taken over the four previous years. The weightings used in the pilot pan-London projections are shown in Appendix 2.

For the most part, the ratios will generally change little from year to year for the compulsory school age group, because pupils or that age cannot opt into and out of education at will. Unless they are withdrawn for home education, die, or move to an independent schools, pupils on roll aged 10 in one year will be on roll aged 11 a year later. People do not move home and change school *en masse* and at random, though local policy can have an effect on school choice. However, in the longer run, underlying changes in the number of young people in the population will have an impact on the future school roll. Changes in the birth rate, migration, and the building of new homes, as well as other factors will influence the number of people in the population. At the GLA, population projections are the responsibility DMAG's specialist Demography Team. Once population projections are released to the Education Team, the ratio of numbers on roll to numbers in the population can be calculated in the same way that roll replacement ratios are calculated, and used either in combination with roll replacement ratios, or on their own, to project future school rolls.

The pilot pan-London roll projections are best seen as first stage roll projections. These extrapolate from

- past trends in the actual school roll and
- from population projections which take account of a range of factors such as housing development information provided by London boroughs, migration, and birth rates.

If rolls have remained stable over a number of years then, all other things being equal, the 1<sup>st</sup> stage projections for numbers in individual age groups will be very close to the mark. However, if the local authority's normal experience is that numbers in particular age groups vary from one year to the next then, and again all other things being equal, the authority should expect that the roll will continue to vary in the future. In that situation, the single figure projected in first stage projections for the number in an age group indicates the central tendency in the future roll. Local education authorities should expect that the actual future roll for an age group from year to year will vary as much around that central tendency in the future as it has in the past.

Put another way, local authorities would be advised to work with a 'planning margin', based on the historic record, which allows for the likely variation in the future roll above and below the central tendency. Standard GLA roll projections include a measure of the past variation in the school roll from year to year to inform that process. Attempts to pre-specify what that planning margin should be, which do not take account of the variation in the school roll in the past, are not evidence-based. Where a local authority does not use an evidence-based planning factor *and* has very little room for manoeuvre in terms of the numbers of pupils it can admit to local schools, then it will almost inevitably find itself in difficulty at some point.

The second paragraph uses the term 'all other things being equal', which means that no new factor is introduced which might change the school roll. Figure 3 in the first part of this Briefing used a simple example to confirm that policy interventions, in this case the national raising of the school leaving age, can have an effect. Comparing 1<sup>st</sup> stage roll projections made several years before legislation to raise the school leaving age was introduced in parliament with the actual roll once legislation had come into effect, in order to assess the 'accuracy' of 1<sup>st</sup> stage projections would be a pointless exercise. The effects of policy interventions should be assessed as a matter of course, and then factored into assessments of the 'accuracy' of 1<sup>st</sup> stage roll projections. It also needs to be recognised that policies, whether local or national, can have unintended effects. A statement of policy intent is not itself a measure of policy outcomes.

First stage projections can also be used to assess, as this Briefing has, whether catchment ratios have changed over time, perhaps because of a change in the proportion of pupils attending out-borough or independent schools. Where that change follows a consistent pattern roll projections should have been based on the most recent trend, rather than on an average calculated over several years. (This is one version of the use of 'weightings' referred to in paragraph two of this appendix.) Colleagues in local authorities will wish to consider whether any such trend is one they wish to encourage or discourage.

First stage projections will need to be matched against the physical capacity of schools, with final adjusted figures made accordingly (that is, in 2<sup>nd</sup> stage roll projections). In some instances the question will be whether additional pupils can be admitted. In other circumstances the question will be whether a school should be closed. Limits on how large primary classes can be, without breaking the law, will need to be worked to, and in the case of secondary schools, the capacity of schools to deliver the curriculum in specialist spaces such as science laboratories would also need to be taken into account. Local understanding of what is possible will need to be based on detailed local knowledge of existing school buildings.

Additionally, where a school is its own admissions authority, there will be a need for some discussion of how 1<sup>st</sup> stage projections might apply to them. The framework within which those discussions take place has varied over time, and will quite possibly vary again in the future, but it is almost certain that some form of negotiation will be needed. Successful negotiation will, to use current jargon, require school 'buy in'. Since proposals to vary the number of pupils admitted can have an impact on curricular provision, in which schools understandably regard themselves as experts, if there is no 'buy in' by schools, proposals may well fail.

While some planners may already cover all the responsibilities listed above, it is at least as likely that a number of specialists will be involved. In that situation, clear definitions and understanding of who is responsible for what can help, with a recognition that 'soft', hard to measure, negotiation skills are needed as much as 'hard' statistical skills. First stage roll projections are not an alternative to those skills.

#### *Clearing Away (some of) the Undergrowth. Evaluations of the Effectiveness of Local Policy. Take up of Places at New Schools, and Cross-border Pupil Mobility, Child Yield. Assessing the 'accuracy' of roll projections*

This sub-section sets out to clear away some of the undergrowth around projecting school rolls. To the existing conclusion that

*Final roll = 1<sup>st</sup> stage roll projections + what school capacity allows +/- effects of policy*

We can also add that

*assumptions need to be replaced by understanding of the evidence*

Figures 48 and 50 show that some boroughs have more pupils attending the schools they maintain than there are in the locally resident population attending maintained schools anywhere, including schools maintained by other local (education) authorities. Some of the pupils on roll in schools maintained by those boroughs live elsewhere, that is in other boroughs or districts outside London. Haringey is a case in point as far as primary aged children are concerned and, in the jargon of education administration, it is a net 'importer' of pupils.


Some boroughs have more pupils in the locally resident population who attend maintained schools (anywhere) than there are on roll in schools maintained by the 'home' local (education) authority. Some of the locally resident pupils in those boroughs attend schools maintained by other local (education) authorities. Harrow is a case in point as far as secondary school aged children are concerned and, in the jargon of education administration, it is a net 'exporter' of pupils. Either way, some pupils attend schools maintained by local (education) authorities other than the one whose area they live in. Those pupils are involved in cross-border mobility.

Cross-border mobility can create difficulties for parents who may, in some circumstances, find that places at their preferred 'home' local authority school have been taken by children from a neighbouring borough who live closer to that school. There is little a local authority can do about that immediately, since the law does not allow it to discriminate in favour of its residents as far as school admissions are concerned. However, what is an issue for school places planning is not necessarily a problem with school roll projections, *and it should not be elevated to the status of a catchall excuse for the shortcomings of either.*

GLA projections, whether produced under the standard contract for 25 London boroughs, or as part of the pilot pan-London project, use ratios that automatically register the combined net effect of cross-border mobility and the movement of pupils to and from independent schools. For example, the ratio of 11 year olds on roll in any one year to the number of 10 year olds on roll one year earlier (or vice versa) automatically reflects the movement of pupils to and from other boroughs and to and from the independent sector. In terms of statistical analysis, this approach works particularly well for pupils in the compulsory school age range of 5 to 15, precisely because those children *have* to be in some form of education and because the extent of movement to home education or to no education is limited.

Where the proportion of pupils lost and gained at points such as secondary transfer is stable over several years, cross-border mobility is no obstacle to the accurate projections of schools rolls. Figure 47 shows the percentage point difference between pupils aged 11 to 15 attending out-borough schools in 2002 and 2006. With very few exceptions, the variability in the percentage of pupils attending out-borough schools is small, and differences of this order should not present an obstacle to the production of 'accurate' roll projections. Nonetheless, cross-border mobility can be seen as a general 'problem', but if it is not necessarily a problem for roll projections, what exactly is it a general problem for (other than for an individual parent who cannot get a place for his or her child in the preferred school in the home borough)?

**Figure 47. Percentage point difference, pupil aged 11 to 15 in out-borough schools, 2002 and 2006.**



At one level, cross-border mobility can be represented as evidence of parents' lack of confidence in the effectiveness of local schools, with parents moving their children from bad local authority schools (with

poor raw score attainment results) to good local authority schools (with high raw score attainment results). It is not as simple as that. Figures 49 and 50 show that there is not an exact match between the average level of pupil attainment in a borough and whether a local authority is a net 'importer' of 'exporter' of pupils. Haringey has comparatively low levels of attainment at the end of primary school, but is a net 'importer' of pupils in the primary phase. Harrow has comparatively high levels of attainment at the end of compulsory secondary education, but is a net 'exporter' of secondary age pupils.


Without suggesting that school quality has no bearing on parents' choice of school, other factors *must* also determine school choice and cross-border mobility, though the supplementary Tables confirm that seeking a place at good school outside the home area (borough) is not confined to affluent parents. These factors may include the presence or absence of single sex schools, the number of places available in schools of a particular denomination or indeed in schools as a whole, and the availability of public transport. Each of these points is at least introduced in the supplementary Tables.

Additionally, a comparison of Figures 10 and 12 with Figures 13 to 15 shows the well-known and marked association between (comparatively) low levels of educational attainment and poverty. Low levels of attainment are not simply a matter of badly run schools in badly run boroughs, and the movement of pupils to schools in other areas is not simply a matter of flight from bad schools.

To restate a point, *assumptions* about cross-border mobility, whether to do with their impact on the 'accuracy' of school roll projections or whether as a flag of ineffective schools and boroughs, are best replaced by an understanding of the relevant. The supplementary Tables set out to provide evidence that will support that understanding.



**Figure 48. Locally resident pupils aged 4 to 10 years in each district attending any maintained school minus the number on roll in local maintained schools in 2008**



**Figure 49. Percentage of pupils achieving level 4+ in Key Stage 2 English, 1996, by home ward, 2006**






Figure 50. Locally resident pupils aged 11 to 15 in each district attending any maintained school minus the number on roll in local maintained schools in 2008






Figure 51. Public examination results amongst 15 year olds, by home ward, 2006






**Figure 52. Percentage of pupils attending maintained schools entitled to free school meals by home lower super output area, 2008**




**Figure 53. Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index**





**Figure 54. 2009 child well-being composite index**



In the same way that cross-border pupil mobility can generate more heat than light, the place of child yield can also be misunderstood. Child Yield refers to the number of children likely to move into new developments and need school places. Those numbers are used in discussions with property developers, with a view to the latter contributing to the costs of any additional school provision, included new schools that might be needed. Since the costs of new school buildings is high, those discussions and the information they are based on are important.

Establishing how many children live in what are specifically new developments with different numbers of bedrooms can be established either through desktop research or through surveys in which interviewers collect information on the doorstep on a household-by-household basis. It is sometimes suggested that arrangements for pan-London roll projections should both acquire, and incorporate in calculations, data on child yield. For some, the implication has been that GLA projections do not take account of new developments.

Collecting data on a doorstep basis from individual households could only be expensive if carried out as a stand-alone exercise by, for example, DMAG Education. Interviewers would need to be hired, their activities monitored, the data checked and cleaned, and then analysed and reported. If all new developments in London were monitored in this way annually costs to the user would be prohibitively high. A less costly approach would involve individual local authority staff collecting that information as an adjunct to their normal activities, perhaps through postal surveys. The least costly approach would be for local authority Children's Services staff to be provided with the unit postcodes of new developments grouped by number of bedrooms, and for these to be matched with records of pupils on roll in schools maintained by the borough. That information could then be shared between boroughs to provide estimates of similar developments underway elsewhere.

There are (at least) three problems with any of these approaches.

- Large scale developments, such as the development of the Elephant and Castle, may not be particularly common in London. Hopes that other London boroughs would fund a child yield project for those developments as part of pan-London (or existing GLA) roll projections is simply unrealistic.
- Some developments are small scale, but over time do add to demand for school places. These are best monitored locally.

- GLA population projections already make use of housing development information provided to the GLA by all London boroughs, and GLA population projections are used in GLA school roll projections. A separate count of Child Yield would simply double count additions to the population.

On balance, the most economic way forward is for Children's Services Departments to use their local pupil level data monitor the arrival children in new types of development, taking account of the number of bedrooms, and to share that information across London. Unusual or large-scale developments would then be a matter of individual child yield surveys funded by the borough concerned. Any future pan-London education places projection system should not be expected to fund what is, in this instance, work best carried out by local authorities themselves.

A final point relates to the accuracy of roll projections. The GLA SRP Service routinely monitors the accuracy of the model in use by re-projecting current rolls as if that work were carried out last year and in previous years. Part of the aim is to test the robustness of the model used, and to provide modified projections where that is appropriate. The options applied to projections in the SRP Service therefore evolve over time reflecting changing circumstances, for example, of numbers in the population in London. There may well be a gap between what was projected five years ago, and what was projected more recently.

Does this mean that the projections were inaccurate? An analogy with what happens in practice might be that of a motorist who sets out to drive from London to Oxford to arrive for meeting at a particular time in the afternoon. Once on the open road, the motorist checks the speedometer, and calculates the time of arrival at that speed. If the projected arrival time would be too late, speed can be increased. If the projected arrival time would be too early, speed could be decreased. Was the original calculation 'wrong'? Put that way, the question is simply not sensible. The only way in which the driver could actually test whether the original projected time of arrival was right would be by disregarding where s/he was in the present, and where (and when) s/he wanted to be in the future – which nullifies the whole point of making the projection in the first place. Indeed that approach nullifies the point of making any projections at all!

Projections provide a prompt for action by local government aimed at changing the initially projected outcome. The 'accuracy' of projections needs to be assessed as the difference between the

*Actual current roll and past projection +/- the impact of policy*

In addition to this, the 'accuracy' of projections made at a comparatively distant point in the past can be influenced by developments that were not envisaged when the projections were made. Figure 3 shows the sharp effect of the raising of the school leaving age in the early 1970's. Projections made earlier, before the raising of the school leaving age became a public issue, would have given a far lower number of 15 year olds than Figure 3 shows. Would that lower figure have meant that earlier projections, made presumably at some point in the 1960's, were faulty? Again, put that way, the question is simply not a sensible question to ask.

There is one roll projection method which can, and in London probably would, meet the flawed expectation that the 'accurate' roll projections are those which give the near exact roll figure that applies five years later. This approach relies totally on trends in the school roll. Given the increase in the primary school roll experienced in London, *if no other evidence had been considered are action taken*, schools would simply have filled up with the increased numbers of pupils. The roll would then stabilize. Projections from a stable roll would pointed to more of the same, and that would have been accurate because schools would have continued to be full. This might be satisfying for those who wish the numbers of pupils projected in the past to be exactly the same as the current roll, but it is hardly a realistic way of working with roll projections. GLA pilot pan-London make use of population projections, which themselves make use, as indicated, of factors such as housing developments, migration, and changes in the fertility rate, all of which are updated annually. Assessing the impact of local policy on the school roll is left to others and on balance that dual approach is preferable to short term accuracy bought at the expense of understanding of longer term change.

If, on the other hand, an agency uses exactly the same projection method over several years, and produces the same error by consistently over-estimating or under-estimating the future roll, is this not proof of the level of accuracy of those projections? In reality this is evidence of the need for a change in the method used to reflect changing reality on the ground. Persisting with a single method for projecting

future rolls, when the evidence points to a need for change, is again, not sensible, and the pilot pan-London projections do not take a single one size fits all at all times approach.

Reviewing the relationship between projected rolls and actual rolls can provide a useful way of opening discussion of factors that have brought variation over time and place. This is a dispassionate, but sensible, way of working with evidence. It needs to be continued where it is already taking place or encouraged where it is not. Assessing the impact of policy on roll change would play a part in this but, as the Briefing has emphasised, as far as pan-London projections are concerned, assessments of the impact of policy on the school roll are generally best made locally by those who have a policy role. The alternative of comparing projections made in the past with actual rolls now as a check on supposed accuracy as an end in itself is simply a distraction. If not productive work, it is merely activity.

# Appendix 2. Weightings and ratios

Weightings for each age group													Catchment, Replacement Ratio Methods																			
Age	Age																															
District	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Barking and Dagenham	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0011	0001	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	R
Barnet	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0111	0011	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR
Bexley	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	CR	R	R	R
Brent	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0111	0011	0001	0001	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	R	R
Bromley	0011	0011	0011	0011	0011	0011	0011	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	R	R	R
Camden	0011	0001	0010	0010	0010	0010	0010	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	R	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR
City of London	0111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR
Croydon	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	R	R
Ealing	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	0011	0001	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	R	R	CR	CR	R	R
Enfield	1111	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR
Greenwich	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Hackney	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	R	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Hammersmith and Fulham	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0111	0011	0001	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	R	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	CR	R	R	R
Haringey	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0011	0011	0011	0011	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	R	R
Harrow	1111	1111	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	R	CR	CR	CR	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR
Havering	1111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR
Hillingdon	0001	0111	0111	1111	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0011	0011	0011	0011	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR
Hounslow	0011	0011	0011	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR
Islington	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0111	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Kensington and Chelsea	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR
Kingston upon Thames	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0111	0011	0001	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	R
Lambeth	1111	1111	1111	1111	0111	0011	0001	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1110	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Lewisham	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	0110	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Merton	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Newham	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Redbridge	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0011	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Richmond upon Thames	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	CR
Southwark	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	CR	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Sutton	0111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0011	0001	1111	1111	1111	0011	0001	1111	1111	C	CR	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	R	R	R	CR	CR	R	R
Tower Hamlets	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0011	0001	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	R	R
Waltham Forest	0111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	0011	0011	0001	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	CR	CR	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Wandsworth	0001	0110	0110	0110	0110	0110	0110	0001	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Westminster	0001	0110	0110	0110	0110	0110	0110	0001	0010	0010	0010	0010	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H Broxbourne	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H Dacorum	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H East Hertfordshire	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R

**Weightings and Ratios, continued**

Weightings															Catchment, Replacement Ratio or Combined Ratio																		
Age															Age																		
District	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
H Hertsmere	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H North Hertfordshire	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H St Albans	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H Stevenage	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H Three Rivers	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H Watford	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
H Welwyn Hatfield	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Basildon	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Braintree	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Brentwood	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Castle Point	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Chelmsford	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Colchester	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Epping Forest	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Harlow	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Maldon	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Rochford	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Tendring	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
E Uttlesford	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Thurrock	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Southend on Sea	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Medway	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Ashford	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Canterbury	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Dartford	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Dover	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Gravesham	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Maidstone	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Sevenoaks	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Shepway	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Swale	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Thanet	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Tonbridge and Malling	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
K Tunbridge Wells	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Elmbridge	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Epsom and Ewell	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Guildford	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R

**Weightings and Ratios, continued**

Weightings															Catchment, Replacement Ratio or Combined Ratio																		
Age															Age																		
District	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
S Mole Valley	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Reigate and Banstead	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Runnymede	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Spelthorne	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Surrey Heath	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Tandridge	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Waverley	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
S Woking	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Slough	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Windsor and Maidenhead	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Bracknell Forest	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Wokingham	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
Reading	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
B Aylesbury Vale	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
B Chiltern	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
B South Bucks	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R
B Wycombe	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1111	1234	1111	1111	1111	1111	0001	1111	1111	1111	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R	R	CR	R	R	R



### Appendix 3. Terms and conditions under which pupil level data are released for analysis by DCSF.

The terms are included to provide stakeholders with information on what can and cannot be done with pupil level data released by DCSF. Access is by application, and the terms and conditions listed below continue with a schedule of the variables which the researcher applies for access. A reasonable case for access needs to be made, and applicants can expect that an inadequate case will fail. The individual researcher concerned signs the application, and if the data are released they are released to that researcher. As the terms indicate, data are not released as open access datasets, or as a corporate resource open to anyone in the organisation to which the applicant is attached. DMAG Education is not a gatekeeper to pupil level data, and does not release pupil records. Applications for access should be directed to DCSF.

Text of DCSF terms and conditions

#### "CONFIDENTIALITY DECLARATION

#### CONFIDENTIALITY OF PUPIL / SCHOOLS DATA

#### DECLARATION IN RESPECT OF DATA PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES ANALYTICAL SERVICES DIRECTORATE

1. I understand that the information described in the schedule to this declaration includes individual pupil/school data to which confidentiality restrictions apply.
2. After receiving the information from the Analytical Services Directorate (DCSF) I will use it only for the purpose specified in the schedule. I will ensure that it is not used for any other purpose without seeking further written permission.
3. I have read the statement of the procedures adopted by the Analytical Services Directorate (DCSF) to protect the confidentiality of individual pupil/schools data. I confirm that in any use I make of the data provided by the DCSF I will follow these procedures, both in letter and spirit, to the maximum extent that they apply.
4. I will not allow any other person(s) access to the data without the written permission of the Analytical Services Directorate (DCSF) and where such permission is given I will ensure that the other person(s) are fully aware of the procedures to be followed and that they comply with them.
5. I will consult the Analytical Services Directorate (DCSF) in writing before taking any step that could put at risk the confidentiality or security of the data.
6. I will not publish any of the data or results based on analysis of the data without the written approval of the Analytical Services Directorate (DCSF).
7. I will identify all relevant legislation, protocols, codes of practice and ethical guidelines, and comply with them. I will provide evidence that any necessary ethical approval for processing data has been obtained.
8. Should aggregate or anonymised data be supplied to me, I will not attempt to establish the identity of any individual pupil or school to which the data relates. I understand that under no circumstances will permission be given for the identification of individual students.
9. I agree not to contact any school identified through the data supplied to me. In special circumstances (for example to create a sample frame or to identify schools with distinctive outcomes) I understand that permission to make such contacts may be granted. If I wish to obtain permission to do this I will state clearly below the work I will carry out and its justification.

10. When my use of the information is complete I will (please indicate):
- return the information to the Analytical Services Directorate (DCSF)
  - supply the Analytical Services Directorate (DCSF) with some certification of the information having been destroyed."

#### Appendix 4. Borough-by-borough roll projections, all London boroughs

Borough	4-10													
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Barking and Dagenham	16,401	16,338	16,651	16,797	17,071	17,692	18,487	19,581	20,640	21,704	22,759	23,715	24,433	24,968
Barnet	23,803	23,641	23,715	23,811	23,996	24,443	24,924	25,083	26,070	27,203	28,133	28,940	29,484	29,794
Bexley	19,506	19,441	19,208	19,013	19,038	19,172	19,196	19,502	19,942	20,485	20,944	21,337	21,622	21,921
Brent	20,616	20,815	21,147	21,281	21,665	22,031	22,595	23,126	23,768	24,319	24,633	24,919	25,167	25,204
Bromley	23,683	23,488	23,280	23,040	22,963	22,998	23,156	23,484	23,930	24,405	24,742	25,021	25,291	25,481
Camden	10,313	10,249	10,329	10,202	10,323	10,475	10,577	10,741	10,867	11,035	11,188	11,308	11,408	11,515
City of London	200	205	202	208	211	216	220	222	224	224	228	228	226	228
Croydon	27,597	27,335	27,238	26,883	26,930	27,164	27,444	28,032	28,881	29,802	30,573	31,185	31,727	32,228
Ealing	23,339	23,303	23,886	23,882	24,191	24,630	25,237	25,977	26,768	27,383	27,820	28,103	28,190	28,150
Enfield	25,057	25,134	25,463	25,582	25,749	26,223	26,876	27,609	28,415	29,111	29,556	29,862	29,934	29,891
Greenwich	18,519	18,632	18,734	18,585	18,710	19,124	19,698	20,463	21,433	22,468	23,460	24,336	24,927	25,360
Hackney	15,918	15,912	15,871	15,606	15,547	15,602	15,674	15,829	15,925	16,132	16,241	16,367	16,430	16,433
Hammersmith and Fulham	8,629	8,543	8,627	8,536	8,529	8,626	8,730	8,806	8,904	9,031	9,172	9,299	9,392	9,441
Haringey	19,465	19,480	19,513	19,278	19,259	19,280	19,433	19,790	20,226	20,633	21,008	21,332	21,680	22,008
Harrow	16,649	16,629	16,747	16,682	16,762	16,977	17,203	17,525	17,992	18,448	18,833	19,187	19,484	19,689
Havering	18,936	18,575	18,337	18,274	18,174	18,213	18,257	18,449	18,736	19,179	19,538	19,938	20,285	20,648
Hillingdon	21,243	21,204	21,338	21,371	21,582	21,687	21,973	22,352	22,830	23,308	23,706	24,058	24,410	24,564
Hounslow	16,776	16,753	16,959	16,895	17,024	17,419	17,786	18,355	18,962	19,541	20,064	20,436	20,678	20,823
Islington	13,068	12,909	12,701	12,482	12,336	12,290	12,258	12,286	12,336	12,381	12,375	12,345	12,313	12,339
Kensington and Chelsea	6,435	6,398	6,454	6,287	6,224	6,144	6,158	6,163	6,168	6,187	6,218	6,256	6,308	6,335
Kingston upon Thames	10,439	10,504	10,519	10,402	10,535	10,704	10,928	11,255	11,618	12,037	12,376	12,596	12,735	12,848
Lambeth	17,722	17,837	17,993	18,045	18,312	18,560	18,872	19,103	19,349	19,617	19,777	19,856	19,964	19,963
Lewisham	19,694	19,669	19,633	19,610	19,758	20,165	20,906	21,572	22,430	23,274	24,019	24,668	25,197	25,465
Merton	12,481	12,660	12,767	12,802	12,956	13,221	13,561	14,073	14,621	15,107	15,527	15,807	15,974	16,022
Newham	26,940	26,817	27,120	27,017	27,125	27,467	27,971	28,682	29,651	30,666	31,515	32,359	33,059	33,540
Redbridge	21,448	21,559	21,915	22,170	22,590	23,290	24,222	25,322	26,544	27,622	28,381	29,099	29,651	29,881
Richmond upon Thames	11,928	12,168	12,297	12,444	12,696	12,840	13,008	13,372	13,739	14,153	14,419	14,693	14,942	15,112
Southwark	20,696	20,469	20,297	19,929	19,827	19,963	20,235	20,671	21,198	21,849	22,501	23,033	23,487	23,920
Sutton	13,680	13,448	13,384	13,315	13,237	13,307	13,463	13,795	14,181	14,615	14,965	15,294	15,479	15,625
Tower Hamlets	19,501	19,619	19,883	19,870	19,999	20,117	20,455	20,843	21,178	21,541	21,899	22,250	22,659	22,982
Waltham Forest	19,031	19,200	19,419	19,664	20,078	20,632	21,282	22,098	22,986	23,796	24,334	24,753	25,066	25,220
Wandsworth	15,353	15,382	15,539	15,447	15,608	15,895	16,246	16,803	17,282	17,790	18,197	18,541	18,873	18,985
Westminster	9,839	9,859	9,997	9,844	9,868	9,960	10,159	10,276	10,414	10,567	10,746	10,895	11,031	11,081

#### Appendix 4. Borough-by-borough roll projections (continued)

Borough	11-15													
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Barking and Dagenham	10,720	10,908	10,990	10,793	10,878	10,815	10,646	10,518	10,499	10,574	10,782	11,133	11,656	12,191
Barnet	16,853	16,771	16,879	16,709	16,639	16,629	16,545	16,602	16,582	16,730	17,248	17,773	18,332	19,003
Bexley	16,625	16,540	16,689	16,498	16,401	16,237	16,038	15,731	15,398	15,125	15,010	14,902	14,934	15,039
Brent	13,505	13,709	14,213	14,148	14,164	14,236	14,302	14,556	14,694	14,763	15,008	15,260	15,438	15,815
Bromley	17,992	17,897	17,783	17,477	17,321	17,078	16,909	16,733	16,574	16,307	16,230	16,217	16,278	16,468
Camden	7,349	7,413	7,531	7,457	7,439	7,444	7,447	7,527	7,682	7,851	8,040	8,254	8,457	8,620
City of London*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Croydon	18,996	18,840	18,959	18,482	18,209	18,058	17,845	17,824	17,941	18,080	18,265	18,421	18,689	18,941
Ealing	13,544	13,756	14,112	14,126	14,235	14,350	14,351	14,484	14,613	14,660	14,701	14,778	14,967	15,260
Enfield	18,669	18,677	18,694	18,467	18,430	18,419	18,335	18,345	18,229	18,010	18,003	18,107	18,433	18,865
Greenwich	12,712	12,437	12,433	11,902	11,631	11,421	11,275	11,211	11,191	11,185	11,265	11,499	11,946	12,555
Hackney	6,986	6,946	6,986	7,098	7,322	7,392	7,542	7,579	7,621	7,751	7,982	8,203	8,495	8,791
Hammersmith and Fulham	5,736	5,546	5,593	5,411	5,315	5,241	5,267	5,336	5,393	5,442	5,548	5,653	5,760	5,852
Haringey	10,803	10,887	11,190	11,045	11,098	11,112	11,135	11,302	11,569	11,849	12,170	12,468	12,683	12,886
Harrow	10,834	10,850	10,930	10,720	10,683	10,664	10,615	10,626	10,611	10,530	10,575	10,658	10,782	11,078
Havering	15,404	15,460	15,550	15,395	15,431	15,410	15,349	15,202	14,991	14,718	14,607	14,526	14,639	14,807
Hillingdon	15,045	15,099	15,171	15,029	14,952	15,073	15,027	15,004	14,951	14,794	14,685	14,753	14,918	15,264
Hounslow	13,416	13,266	13,490	13,291	13,382	13,425	13,551	13,675	13,878	13,904	13,992	14,120	14,413	14,853
Islington	7,666	7,717	7,784	7,634	7,675	7,657	7,660	7,757	7,735	7,695	7,763	7,864	8,001	8,192
Kensington and Chelsea	3,032	3,004	3,019	2,956	2,957	2,949	2,911	2,883	2,856	2,835	2,833	2,877	2,913	2,962
Kingston upon Thames	7,490	7,412	7,428	7,366	7,337	7,360	7,394	7,409	7,421	7,412	7,452	7,551	7,694	7,899
Lambeth	7,496	7,708	8,112	8,303	8,683	8,900	9,114	9,321	9,348	9,376	9,541	9,765	9,919	10,166
Lewisham	11,445	11,370	11,518	11,205	11,341	11,401	11,471	11,549	11,505	11,453	11,597	11,892	12,211	12,794
Merton	7,933	7,937	7,965	7,836	7,874	7,901	7,928	7,992	8,062	8,056	8,119	8,282	8,513	8,826
Newham	17,484	17,623	17,915	17,666	17,818	17,778	17,855	17,889	17,805	17,706	17,886	18,051	18,352	18,860
Redbridge	15,881	16,037	16,352	16,210	16,313	16,312	16,390	16,442	16,455	16,442	16,793	17,127	17,543	18,180
Richmond upon Thames	7,299	7,163	7,185	6,924	6,762	6,730	6,784	6,775	6,849	6,899	6,966	6,999	7,076	7,182
Southwark	12,139	12,231	12,348	12,098	11,955	11,746	11,529	11,354	11,293	11,190	11,260	11,521	11,873	12,290
Sutton	12,802	12,945	13,151	13,105	13,241	13,321	13,211	13,091	12,944	12,627	12,495	12,488	12,608	12,826
Tower Hamlets	12,743	12,932	13,217	12,813	12,880	13,029	13,049	12,964	13,089	13,247	13,544	14,008	14,428	14,864
Waltham Forest	13,330	13,324	13,376	12,971	12,953	12,798	12,710	12,889	12,973	12,998	13,158	13,366	13,588	13,931
Wandsworth	9,543	9,518	9,713	9,459	9,358	9,209	9,211	9,167	9,189	9,138	9,286	9,388	9,541	9,812
Westminster	7,110	6,988	7,072	6,942	7,065	7,085	7,063	7,075	7,066	7,000	7,024	7,111	7,133	7,248

\* Reflecting the small number of locally resident children attending maintained schools, The City of London does not maintain a secondary school,

#### Appendix 4. Borough-by-borough roll projections (continued)

Borough	16-19													
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Barking and Dagenham	1,650	1,723	1,847	1,928	1,958	1,949	1,966	1,915	1,907	1,935	1,934	1,925	1,908	1,935
Barnet	4,061	4,074	4,304	4,309	4,258	4,213	4,233	4,280	4,280	4,357	4,446	4,535	4,628	4,600
Bexley	2,663	2,864	2,994	3,119	3,095	3,026	3,016	2,979	2,908	2,818	2,734	2,727	2,732	2,674
Brent	3,595	3,642	3,678	3,721	3,796	3,825	3,822	3,798	3,794	3,878	3,913	3,872	3,871	3,855
Bromley	4,436	4,582	4,681	4,754	4,740	4,704	4,647	4,577	4,518	4,508	4,462	4,404	4,347	4,292
Camden	2,438	2,536	2,604	2,604	2,627	2,602	2,596	2,567	2,530	2,530	2,565	2,592	2,620	2,651
City of London*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Croydon	1,726	1,742	1,924	2,385	2,591	2,543	2,487	2,461	2,438	2,466	2,509	2,551	2,567	2,549
Ealing	2,308	2,283	2,307	2,408	2,488	2,517	2,550	2,510	2,478	2,506	2,532	2,533	2,507	2,464
Enfield	3,467	3,467	3,702	3,596	3,606	3,601	3,527	3,452	3,452	3,498	3,486	3,427	3,376	3,358
Greenwich	2,517	2,723	2,890	3,003	3,015	2,961	2,901	2,857	2,838	2,876	2,929	2,981	3,055	3,115
Hackney	475	457	534	599	617	631	641	660	671	671	668	671	671	669
Hammersmith and Fulham	1,251	1,238	1,238	1,247	1,289	1,262	1,217	1,216	1,235	1,259	1,284	1,327	1,371	1,383
Haringey	1,340	1,498	1,809	2,217	2,614	2,737	2,739	2,694	2,673	2,720	2,764	2,809	2,852	2,865
Harrow	25	33	34	15	27	26	26	25	25	26	25	25	25	24
Havering	1,159	1,148	1,152	1,196	1,179	1,161	1,162	1,153	1,132	1,111	1,085	1,081	1,055	1,012
Hillingdon	3,016	3,190	3,369	3,385	3,481	3,393	3,355	3,308	3,259	3,292	3,338	3,317	3,287	3,242
Hounslow	3,257	3,319	3,347	3,284	3,303	3,291	3,283	3,268	3,265	3,378	3,433	3,481	3,477	3,406
Islington	317	341	323	340	329	327	329	324	332	339	337	336	339	340
Kensington and Chelsea	488	509	509	490	490	490	496	509	529	535	534	536	542	555
Kingston upon Thames	2,106	2,167	2,297	2,315	2,324	2,305	2,254	2,253	2,277	2,299	2,316	2,337	2,339	2,296
Lambeth	603	702	723	829	828	816	823	823	839	848	829	808	791	765
Lewisham	1,651	1,705	1,984	1,915	1,842	1,817	1,778	1,782	1,802	1,840	1,852	1,851	1,881	1,888
Merton	632	682	673	624	669	670	664	656	648	665	670	656	643	637
Newham	944	667	703	745	707	699	697	689	704	714	706	700	701	695
Redbridge	4,483	4,607	4,788	5,018	5,171	5,140	5,077	5,035	5,035	5,066	4,990	4,894	4,859	4,819
Richmond upon Thames**	15	2	15	7	8	8	8	8	8	9	10	10	10	10
Southwark	644	764	845	776	784	783	775	768	760	768	776	782	796	808
Sutton	3,185	3,216	3,303	3,361	3,368	3,362	3,397	3,392	3,333	3,314	3,262	3,170	3,146	3,091
Tower Hamlets	1,473	1,444	1,505	1,672	1,686	1,633	1,611	1,647	1,656	1,699	1,718	1,714	1,733	1,774
Waltham Forest	700	748	768	844	853	844	851	826	814	833	848	846	843	839
Wandsworth	1,849	1,966	2,013	1,999	1,996	1,988	1,957	1,946	1,945	1,993	1,999	2,024	2,046	2,047
Westminster	1,491	1,414	1,442	1,542	1,528	1,535	1,565	1,596	1,625	1,654	1,633	1,597	1,616	1,626

\* Reflecting the small number of locally resident children attending maintained schools, The City of London does not maintain a secondary school,

\*\*Richmond upon Thames operates a Tertiary system, in which pupils transfer to, what is at the time of writing, the FE Sector at the end of compulsory schooling.

## References

- 1 Gareth Piggott (Ed) *Focus on London 2008* Greater London Authority, Data Management and Analysis Group. 2008
- 2 The Funding Agency for Schools. *Planning Secondary School Places in London 1998 2005* London 1999
- 3 David Ewens *Cross-border pupil Mobility. An analysis of the 2002 London Pupil Dataset* DMAG Briefing 2003/24  
 David Ewens *Moving home and Changing school – 1. Widening the analysis of pupil mobility* DMAG Briefing 2005/32  
 David Ewens *Social Selection, Social Sorting and Education – 1. Who goes where? Maintained schools which are, and maintained schools which are not, their own admissions authorities* DMAG Briefing 2006/25  
 David Ewens *Social Selection, Social Sorting and Education – 2: 'Missing' Children* DMAG Briefing 2008-27.
- 4 For example see  
 Michael Barber *How to do the impossible. A guide for politicians with a passion for education* Institute of Education, University of London, 1996  
 Robert Cassen and Geeta Kingdon *Tackling Low Educational Achievement* Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2007  
 Carol Taylor Fitz-Gibbon *Monitoring Education. Indicators, Quality and Effectiveness* Cassell, 1996  
 John MacBeath, Brian Boyd, Jim Rand and Steve Bell *School Speak for Themselves. Towards a Framework for Self-evaluation* National Union of Teachers, 1996  
 John MacBeath with Michael Schratz, Denis Meuret and Lars Jakobsen *Self-evaluation in European Schools. A Story of Change* RoutledgeFalmer 2000  
 John MacBeath and Peter Motrimore (Eds) *Improving School Effectiveness* Open University Press, 2001  
 John MacBeath, John Gray, Jane Cullen, David Frost, Susan Steward and Sue Swaffield *Schools on the Edge. Responding to Challenging Circumstances* Paul Chapman Publishing, 2007  
 Peter Mortimore, Pamela Sammons, Louise Stoll, David Lewis and Russell Ecob *School Matter. The Junior Years* Paul Chapman Publishing, 1995  
 Peter Mortimore *The Road to Improvement. Reflections on School Effectiveness* Swets and Zeitlinger, 1998  
 Peter Mortimore and Geoff Whitty *Can school improvement overcome the effects of disadvantage?* Revised edition, Institute of Education, University of London, 2000  
 Michael Rutter, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimore and Jane Ouston *Fifteen Thousand Hours. Secondary Schools and their effects on Children* Open Books, 1979  
 Pam Sammons, Josh Hillman and Peter Mortimore *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools. A review of school effectiveness research* Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) 1995  
 Pam Sammons *School Effectiveness. Coming of Age in the Twenty-first Century* Swets and Zeitrlinger, 1999  
 Stephen J. Ball *Class Strategies and the Education Market. The middle classes and social advantage* RoutledgeFalmer, 2003  
 Tim Butler with Garry Robson *The Middle Classes and the Re-making of Inner London* Berg 2003  
  
 Simon Burgess, Ellen Greaves, Anna Vignoles and Deborah Wilson *What Parents Want: School preferences and school choice* The Centre for Market and Public Organisation, October 2009.

## Recent Briefings from the GLA Data Management and Analysis Group

### – DMAG

2008-04	<u>Council Tax Analysis</u>	Elizabeth Williams
2008-05	<u>A Profile of Londoners by Country of Birth</u>	Lorna Spence
2008-08	<u>Greater London Authority Constituency Profiles</u>	Elizabeth Williams & Caroline Hall
2008-09	<u>Family Resources Survey 2005/06: Results for London</u>	Lovedeep Vaid
2008-10	<u>London Borough Migration 2001-06</u>	John Hollis
2008-15	<u>2001 Census Profiles: Black Caribbeans in London</u>	Richard Cameron
2008-17	<u>Lone Parents on Income Support by Ethnic Group</u>	Lovedeep Vaid
2008-19	<u>2008 Elections results summary</u>	Gareth Piggott
2008-21	<u>Indices of Deprivation 2007: A London perspective</u>	Rachel Leaser
2008-22	<u>London Ward Level Summary Measures for the Indices of Deprivation 2007</u>	Rachel Leaser
2008-24	<u>2001 Census: Ethnic Group Migration Structures (as used in Model)</u>	Baljit Bains and Ed Klodawski
2008-26	<u>London Council By-Election Results, May 2006 to July 2008</u>	Gareth Piggott
2008-27	<u>Social Selection, Social Sorting and Education; "Missing" Children</u>	David Ewens
2008-28	<u>Summary of Social Trends 2008</u>	Elizabeth Williams
2008-29	<u>Children in Benefit Families 2007</u>	Lovedeep Vaid
2008-30	<u>Londoners and the Labour Market: Key Facts</u>	Lorna Spence
2008-31	<u>Child Poverty In London: 2008 Update</u>	Social Exclusion Data Team
2008-33	<u>Paycheck 2008</u>	Lovedeep Vaid
2008-34	<u>Background Poverty Profiles</u>	Lovedeep Vaid
2009-01	Claimant Count Model 2009: Technical Note	Social Exclusion Data Team
2009-02	GLA 2008 Round Demographic Projections	John Hollis and Jessica Chamberlain
2009-03	Greater London Demographic Review 2007	John Hollis
2009-04	Census Information Note 2009-1	Eileen Howes
2009-05	Census Information Note 2009-2	Eileen Howes
2009-06	2001 Census Consortium and Information Scheme	Eileen Howes
2009-07	2009 European Election Results for London	Gareth Piggott
2009-08	GLA 2008 Round Ethnic Group Population Projections	Ed Klodawski
Also		
DMAG	A Threshold Guide to Readyng Data for Analysis in SPSS:	
Education	Quantitative analysis and Elizabeth David, the English	
Guide	National Pupil Dataset, a hidden variable, the Julian	D.C. Ewens
2009-01	Calendar and more	

A full list of DMAG Briefings is available to internal customers through the GLA Intranet; otherwise please contact [dmag.info@london.gov.uk](mailto:dmag.info@london.gov.uk) A CD containing PDF versions of the Briefings, or in some instances hard copies, can be provided.

## Contact details for the Data Management and Analysis Group

**John Hollis (020 7983 4604)** is the **Demographic Consultant** responsible for the work of the **Demography, Education and Social Exclusion Teams**, and particularly for demographic modelling.

[john.hollis@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.hollis@london.gov.uk)

**Eileen Howes (020 7983 4657)** is responsible for the work of the **Census, SASPAC and General Statistics Teams** and particularly for census analysis. [eileen.howes@london.gov.uk](mailto:eileen.howes@london.gov.uk)

**Gareth Baker (020 7983 4965)** is the **GIS Manager** with responsibility for leading work on GI including strategy, the development of data holdings, analysis and dissemination. [gareth.baker@london.gov.uk](mailto:gareth.baker@london.gov.uk)

**Steve Forgan (020 7983 4185)** is the **London Analyst Support Site (LASS) Manager** and is responsible for data exchange & analysis projects for crime reduction in London. [stephen.forgan@london.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.forgan@london.gov.uk)

**Kelly Rump (020 7983 4655)** is the **Business Coordinator**. [kelly.rump@london.gov.uk](mailto:kelly.rump@london.gov.uk)

---

### **Demography Team**

**Baljit Bains (020 7983 4613)** is responsible for the analysis of ethnic demography, including ethnic group demographic projections. [baljit.bains@london.gov.uk](mailto:baljit.bains@london.gov.uk)

**Jessica Chamberlain (020 7983 4347)** is responsible for ward level projections, the Demography Extranet and borough liaison. [jessica.chamberlain@london.gov.uk](mailto:jessica.chamberlain@london.gov.uk)

**Ed Klodawski (020 7983 4694)** specialises in ethnicity and health issues. His post is joint with the London Health Observatory. [edmund.klodawski@london.gov.uk](mailto:edmund.klodawski@london.gov.uk)

### **Education Team**

**David Ewens (020 7983 4656)** is responsible for education research and statistical analysis. [david.ewens@london.gov.uk](mailto:david.ewens@london.gov.uk)

### **Social Exclusion Team**

**Rachel Leeser (020 7983 4696)** is responsible for deprivation indicators, ad-hoc surveys and the Social Exclusion Data Users Group. [rachel.leeser@london.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.leeser@london.gov.uk)

**Richard Walker (020 7983 4699)** is responsible for social exclusion data analysis and research) [Richard.walker@london.gov.uk](mailto:Richard.walker@london.gov.uk)

---

Please use the above descriptions in deciding whom to contact to assist you with your information needs.