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## 1. Summary

This ad-hoc notice provides information on the Department for Education scheme to provide free period products to schools and colleges in England. It covers the period from 20 January 2020, when the scheme launched, until the end of December 2020.

## Take-up of the scheme

Almost half of eligible organisations had made at least one order by the end of December 2020. The number of organisations who had ordered increased steadily between January and March but remained constant during April and May when school and college opening was restricted due to the coronavirus pandemic. The number of organisations who had ordered began to increase again in June as schools and colleges began reopening fully.

16,698 orders had been placed by the end of December.
The total value of orders placed by the end of December was $£ 2,791,000$ which is $48 \%$ of the total spend cap for all organisations. This is lower than expected but we expect that this is largely due to school and college opening being restricted for a large proportion of the time that the scheme has been running.

## Variation by characteristics of organisation

Post 16 organisations were most likely to have made an order (79\%) and alternative provision organisations were least likely to have made an order (38\%). Secondary schools were more likely to have ordered than primary schools (76\% compared to 41\%).

Larger organisations were more likely to have ordered and those with higher levels of disadvantage were slightly more likely to have ordered.

## Percentage of spend cap spent

There was a wide variation in the percentage of the spend cap spent across organisations. $22 \%$ of organisations had spent less than half of their spend cap, $40 \%$ had spent between $50 \%$ and $89 \%$ of their spend cap, and $38 \%$ had spent over $90 \%$ of their spend cap.

Secondary schools, post 16 organisations and larger organisations were more likely than other types of organisation to have spent less than half of their spend cap.

## Types of product ordered

Almost all organisations who had ordered bought some pads and over a third bought some tampons. Pads accounted for two-thirds of all products ordered and tampons accounted for most of the rest.

The vast majority of organisations who had ordered bought standard products and 35\% bought environmentally friendly or reusable products. $70 \%$ of all products ordered were standard products and 30\% were environmentally friendly or reusable products.

## 2. Introduction

The Period Products scheme was launched on 20 January 2020 to ensure that no learner misses out on education due to their period. It enables schools and colleges ${ }^{1}$ in England to provide free period products for learners in their place of study.

The scheme covers all state-funded schools and 16 to 19 education organisations in England who have female learners in year 5 (aged 9 or 10 years) or above. Each eligible organisation was allocated a maximum amount of spend (a 'spend cap') between January 2020 and December 2020. This amount is based on $35 \%$ of the number of learners in the organisation ${ }^{2}$ whose legal gender is female and who, based on age, are likely to have started their periods. $35 \%$ is an assumed take-up rate, reflecting the fact that not all learners will have a need for products all of the time. A minimum spend cap of $£ 16$ has been set $^{3}$ to allow all organisations to order a reasonable range of products.

The scheme is delivered by Personal Hygiene Services Limited (phs). Organisations order online from a range of products and the products are delivered directly to the organisation free of charge. Organisations can order at any point in the year and are encouraged to wait until their stocks are running low before re-ordering. Smaller organisations are expected to make up to two orders within the year, while larger organisations are expected to order more frequently.

Schools are able to select from a wide range of period products, varying in type, size and brand. They do not need to order the same products throughout the year. Products available include:

- period pads
- environmentally friendly period pads
- reusable period pads
- applicator tampons
- non-applicator tampons
- menstrual cups

We receive regular management information from phs on the number and value of orders placed and the type of products ordered. This release presents a summary of that information covering the period from 20 January 2020, when the scheme launched, until the end of December 2020.

## 3. Take-up of the period products scheme

Almost half of eligible organisations had made at least one order by the end of December 2020 ( 9,702 out of 20,327 organisations). The number of organisations who had ordered

[^0]increased steadily between January and March but remained constant during April and May when school and college opening was restricted due to the coronavirus pandemic. The number of organisations who had ordered began to increase again in June as schools and colleges began reopening fully (figure 1).

Figure 1: Number and percentage of organisations who have placed at least one order, 2020


The number of orders placed follows a similar pattern (figure 2 ) and 16,698 orders had been placed by the end of December. This is an average of 1.7 orders per ordering organisation. Almost three-quarters of organisations (7,203-74\% of those that had ordered) made a single order during 2020.

Figure 2: Number of orders placed, 2020


The total value of orders placed by the end of December was $£ 2,791,000$ which is $57 \%$ of the total spend cap for those organisations who had ordered and $48 \%$ of the total spend cap for all organisations. This is lower than expected but we expect that this is largely due to school opening being restricted for a large proportion of the time that the scheme has
been running, though we encouraged organisations to support learners at home during term time.

The total value of orders increased steadily between January and March but increased much more slowly between March and August when school opening was restricted and during the summer holiday period. The total value of orders increased considerably once organisations reopened to all learners in September (figure 3).

Figure 3: Total value of orders placed, 2020


## 4. Variation by characteristics of organisation

## Organisation type

Table 1 shows the breakdown of orders and spend by organisation type. This shows that post 16 organisations were most likely to have made an order (79\%) and alternative provision organisations were least likely to have made an order (38\%). Secondary schools were more likely to have ordered than primary schools (76\% compared to 41\%).

Table 1: Orders and spend by organisation type

| Organisation Type | All organisations |  | Ordering organisations |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of organisations | Percentage who ordered | Average spend cap | Average spend | Spend as \% of spend cap |
| Primary schools | 15,094 | 41\% | £17 | £13 | 76\% |
| Secondary schools ${ }^{4}$ | 3,330 | 76\% | £1,376 | £796 | 58\% |
| Special schools | 1,085 | 40\% | £81 | £62 | 76\% |
| Post-16 | 428 | 79\% | £3,586 | £1,917 | 53\% |
| Alternative provision | 390 | 38\% | £68 | £56 | 83\% |

[^1]Primary schools have the lowest average spend (£13) but those who have ordered have spent over three-quarters ( $76 \%$ ) of their spend cap. This reflects the fact that most primary schools have a low spend cap due to low numbers of pupils assumed to be menstruating.

In contrast, post 16 organisations have the highest average spend $(£ 1,917)$ but this represents only $53 \%$ of their spend cap. This reflects the fact that these tend to be larger organisations.

## Academy status

Table 2 shows the breakdown of orders and spend by academy status for primary and secondary schools. This shows that sponsor led primary academies and primary free schools were slightly more likely to have ordered than local authority (LA) maintained primaries or primary converter academies.

However, for secondary schools, the converse is true - sponsor led secondary academies and secondary free schools were slightly less likely to have ordered than LA maintained secondaries or secondary converter academies. This may reflect differences in the average size of secondary schools of different types - sponsor led secondary academies have a slightly lower average spend cap and secondary free schools have a much lower average spend cap than other types of secondary school.

There was little difference between different types of school in the proportion of the spend cap spent for either primary or secondary schools.

Table 2: Orders and spend by academy status

| Organisation Type | All organisations |  | Ordering organisations |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of organisations | Percentage who ordered | Average spend cap | Average spend | Spend as \% of spend cap |
| Primary schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| LA maintained | 9,776 | 41\% | £17 | £13 | 76\% |
| Academy converter | 3,750 | 40\% | £18 | £13 | 75\% |
| Academy sponsor led | 1,457 | 45\% | £17 | £13 | 77\% |
| Free schools | 111 | 49\% | £17 | £13 | 78\% |
| Secondary schools ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| LA maintained | 776 | 78\% | £1,346 | $£ 807$ | 60\% |
| Academy converter | 1,556 | 79\% | £1,595 | £903 | 57\% |
| Academy sponsor led | 740 | 74\% | £1,153 | £672 | 58\% |
| Free schools | 255 | 61\% | £519 | £317 | 61\% |

## Spend cap

Table 3 shows the differences in likelihood of ordering and spend by spend cap. This shows a clear increase in likelihood of having ordered with increasing spend cap -40\% of

[^2]organisations with a spend cap of $£ 16$ had made an order compared to $97 \%$ of those with a spend cap of $£ 2000$ or more.

There is also a clear decline in the proportion of the spend cap spent as the spend cap increases - organisations with a spend cap of $£ 16$ had spent an average of $77 \%$ of their spend cap while those with a spend cap of $£ 2000$ or more had spent an average of $56 \%$ of their spend cap.

Table 3: Orders and spend by spend cap

| Spend cap | All organisations |  | Ordering organisations |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of organisations | Percentage who ordered | Average spend cap | Average spend | Spend as \% of spend cap |
| £16 | 12,480 | 40\% | £16 | £12 | 77\% |
| $£ 16.01$ to $£ 25$ | 2,224 | 44\% | £19 | £15 | 76\% |
| $£ 25.01$ to £100 | 1,636 | 47\% | £42 | £32 | 76\% |
| $£ 100.01$ to £1000 | 1,625 | 63\% | £586 | £372 | 64\% |
| $£ 1000.01$ to $£ 2000$ | 1,654 | 77\% | £1,446 | $£ 796$ | 55\% |
| £2000.01 + | 708 | 97\% | £3,328 | £1,878 | 56\% |

## Levels of disadvantage

Table 4 shows the differences in likelihood of ordering and spend by the percentage of pupils eligible for pupil premium ${ }^{6}$ in the organisation. This information is not available for 695 organisations ${ }^{7}$. Organisations with lower levels of pupil premium were slightly less likely to have ordered period products than those with higher levels of pupil premium. The scheme aims to provide products to all learners who need them, including those who have forgotten products, come on their period unexpectedly, or cannot afford products so it is not surprising that we see only small differences by pupil premium levels.

There is very little difference in the proportion of the spend cap spent according to the pupil premium level of the school.

Table 4: Orders and spend by percentage of pupils eligible for pupil premium

| Pupil premium band ${ }^{8}$ | All organisations |  | Ordering organisations |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of organisations | Percentage who ordered | Average spend cap | Average spend | Spend as \% of spend cap |
| Very Low | 3,855 | 40\% | £278 | £161 | 58\% |
| Low | 3,513 | 46\% | £405 | £238 | 59\% |
| Medium | 3,947 | 49\% | $£ 467$ | £270 | 58\% |
| High | 4,213 | 51\% | £441 | £261 | 59\% |
| Very High | 4,104 | 50\% | £357 | £211 | 59\% |

[^3]
## 5. Geographical variation

Table 5 shows the breakdown of orders and spend by region. Organisations in the East of England were most likely to have made an order (52\%) and those in the North East were least likely to have made an order (44\%).

Organisations in the East Midlands and South West had the lowest average spend (£260) while those in London had the highest average spend ( $£ 332$ ). However, this difference reflects differences in the average size of schools and colleges (as illustrated by the differences in average spend cap) between these areas.

Organisations in London and the South East had spent the lowest proportion of their spend cap ( $54 \%$ ) while those in the East Midlands had spent the highest proportion (62\%).

Table 5: Orders and spend by region

|  | All organisations <br> Number of <br> Percentage <br> who ordered |  | Ordering organisations <br> Average <br> spend cap | Average <br> spend | Spend as \% <br> organisations cap |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Region | 1,053 | $44 \%$ | $£ 486$ | $£ 276$ | $57 \%$ |
| North East | 3,114 | $46 \%$ | $£ 460$ | $£ 268$ | $58 \%$ |
| North West | 2,159 | $45 \%$ | $£ 489$ | $£ 289$ | $59 \%$ |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | 1,910 | $49 \%$ | $£ 420$ | $£ 260$ | $62 \%$ |
| East Midlands | 2,188 | $50 \%$ | $£ 520$ | $£ 312$ | $60 \%$ |
| West Midlands | 2,287 | $52 \%$ | $£ 458$ | $£ 265$ | $58 \%$ |
| East of England | 2,440 | $50 \%$ | $£ 613$ | $£ 332$ | $54 \%$ |
| London | 2,969 | $46 \%$ | $£ 575$ | $£ 310$ | $54 \%$ |
| South East | 2,207 | $46 \%$ | $£ 452$ | $£ 260$ | $58 \%$ |
| South West |  |  |  |  |  |

There is considerable variation by local authority. Organisations in Manchester and Enfield were most likely to have ordered ( $66 \%$ ) and those in Hartlepool were least likely to have ordered (28\%).

Organisations in Knowsley had the lowest average spend (£121) while those in Southend-on-Sea had the highest average spend (£679). However, this again reflects differences in the average size of schools and colleges between these areas.

Organisations in Bury had spent the lowest proportion of their spend cap (29\%) while those in Halton and Dudley had spent the highest proportion (84\%). See annex A for a full breakdown of results by local authority.

## 6. Percentage of spend cap spent

As seen earlier, the organisations that had ordered had spent an average of 57\% of their spend cap. However, there was a wide variation in the percentage of the spend cap spent across organisations. $22 \%$ of organisations had spent less than half of their spend cap,
$40 \%$ had spent between $50 \%$ and $89 \%$ of their spend cap and $38 \%$ had spent over $90 \%$ of their spend cap.

There were considerable differences in the proportion of the spend cap spent by organisation type (see table 6). Secondary schools and post 16 organisations were much more likely than other types of organisation to have spent less than half of their spend cap, though this may be because their spend caps tend to be higher.

Table 6: Percentage of spend cap spent by organisation type

| Organisation Type | Number of <br> organisations <br> who ordered | Spent up to 49\% <br> of their spend <br> cap | Spent 50\% to <br> $89 \%$ of their <br> spend cap | Spent 90\% or <br> more of their <br> spend cap |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Primary schools | 6,240 | $12 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Secondary schools | 2,547 | $44 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Special schools | 431 | $15 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| Post 16 | 337 | $46 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Alternative provision | 147 | $12 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $58 \%$ |

There were also considerable differences in the proportion of the spend cap spent by size of spend cap amongst those that ordered (see table 7). Organisations with a larger spend cap were more likely to have spent less than half of their spend cap while those with a small spend cap were more likely to have spent over $90 \%$ of their spend cap.

Table 7: Percentage of spend cap spent by spend cap of those that ordered

| Spend cap | Number of <br> organisations <br> who ordered | Spent up to 49\% <br> of their spend <br> cap | Spent 50\% to <br> 89\% of their <br> spend cap | Spent 90\% or <br> more of their <br> spend cap |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $£ 16$ | 4,964 | $11 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| $£ 16.01$ to $£ 25$ | 979 | $14 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| $£ 25.01$ to $£ 100$ | 772 | $19 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| $£ 100.01$ to $£ 1000$ | 1,020 | $35 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| $£ 1000.01$ to $£ 2000$ | 1,279 | $49 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| $£ 2000.01+$ | 688 | $45 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

## 7. Types of products ordered

Table 8 shows a breakdown of the products ordered by type. Almost all organisations who ordered bought some pads (only 38 organisations didn't buy any pads) and over a third ( $36 \%$ ) bought some tampons. Only $7 \%$ of organisations who ordered bought other types of product. Similarly, almost all organisations who ordered bought standard products (97\%) and $35 \%$ bought reusable or environmentally friendly products.

Pads accounted for two-thirds (66\%) of all products ordered ${ }^{9}$, while tampons accounted for most of the rest ( $32 \%$ ). $70 \%$ of all products ordered were standard products and $30 \%$ were environmentally friendly or reusable products.

[^4]Table 8: Types of products ordered

| Type of product | Number of <br> organisations <br> who ordered | Percentage of <br> all ordering <br> organisations | Number of <br> packets ordered | Percentage of <br> all packets <br> ordered |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pads | 9,664 | $100 \%$ | 458,023 | $66 \%$ |
| Tampons | 3,487 | $36 \%$ | 221,656 | $32 \%$ |
| Other | 718 | $7 \%$ | 9,477 | $1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Standard | 9,438 | $97 \%$ | 483,551 | $70 \%$ |
| Eco-friendly/reusable | 3,435 | $35 \%$ | 205,605 | $30 \%$ |

## 8. Types of products ordered by characteristics of organisation

Table 9 shows the types of product ordered by type of organisation. This shows that most organisations, regardless of type, ordered some pads. Most post-16 organisations and many secondary schools and alternative provision organisations also ordered some tampons. Primary and special schools were much less likely to order tampons. $45 \%$ of post-16 organisations and $21 \%$ of secondary schools ordered other types of product.

Similarly, most organisations, regardless of type, ordered some standard products. Post16 organisations and secondary schools were more likely than other types of organisation to order environmentally friendly or reusable products.

Table 9: Types of products ordered by organisation type

| Organisation Type | Pads | Tampons | Other | Standard | Eco-friendlyl <br> reusable |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Primary schools | $100 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Secondary schools | $99 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Special schools | $100 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Post 16 | $99 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| Alternative provision | $97 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $29 \%$ |

Table 10 shows the types of product ordered by spend cap. This shows that most organisations, regardless of spend cap, ordered some pads. The likelihood of ordering other types of product increases with the spend cap. However, this may reflect differences between types of organisation by spend cap (that is, organisations with a low spend cap tend to be primary or special schools who were less likely to order products other than pads).

Similarly, most organisations, regardless of spend cap, ordered some standard products. The likelihood of ordering environmentally friendly and reusable products increases with the spend cap. However, as above this may reflect differences between types of organisation by spend cap.

Table 10: Types of products ordered by spend cap

| Spend cap | Pads | Tampons | Other | Standard | Eco-friendlyl <br> reusable |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $£ 16$ | $100 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| $£ 16.01$ to $£ 25$ | $100 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| $£ 25.01$ to $£ 100$ | $99 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| $£ 100.01$ to $£ 1000$ | $99 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| $£ 1000.01$ to $£ 2000$ | $99 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| $£ 2000.01+$ | $100 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $81 \%$ |

## Annex A: Orders and spend by local authority

Table 11: Orders and spend by local authority ${ }^{10}$

| Local authority | All organisations |  | Ordering organisations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of organisations | Percentage who ordered | Average spend cap | Average spend | Spend as \% of spend cap | Total spend |
| Barking and Dagenham | 56 | 50\% | £895 | £497 | 56\% | £13,916 |
| Barnet | 118 | 47\% | £646 | £423 | 65\% | £23,460 |
| Barnsley | 91 | 47\% | £431 | £322 | 75\% | $£ 13,772$ |
| Bath and NE Somerset | 73 | 34\% | £622 | £324 | 52\% | £8,042 |
| Bedford | 71 | 59\% | £546 | £396 | 73\% | £16,588 |
| Bexley | 79 | 54\% | £435 | £288 | 66\% | £12,286 |
| Birmingham | 398 | 55\% | £559 | £335 | 60\% | £73,332 |
| Blackburn with Darwen | 70 | 54\% | £481 | £246 | 51\% | £9,299 |
| Blackpool | 46 | 54\% | £579 | £343 | 59\% | £8,520 |
| Bolton | 131 | 52\% | £407 | £266 | 65\% | £18,120 |
| Bournemouth, Christchurch \& Poole | 86 | 56\% | £681 | £270 | 40\% | £13,003 |
| Bracknell Forest | 38 | 42\% | £493 | £199 | 40\% | £3,176 |
| Bradford | 208 | 47\% | £534 | £383 | 72\% | £37,442 |
| Brent | 74 | 54\% | £519 | £299 | 58\% | £11,948 |
| Brighton and Hove | 67 | 48\% | £754 | £530 | 70\% | £17,045 |
| Bristol City of | 137 | 55\% | £422 | £278 | 66\% | £20,947 |
| Bromley | 93 | 53\% | £770 | £418 | 54\% | £20,603 |
| Buckinghamshire | 193 | 58\% | £432 | £198 | 46\% | £22,164 |
| Bury | 81 | 36\% | £755 | £220 | 29\% | £6,415 |
| Calderdale | 97 | 56\% | £428 | £202 | 47\% | £10,973 |
| Cambridgeshire | 246 | 51\% | £428 | £249 | 58\% | £31,240 |
| Camden | 67 | 37\% | £1,308 | £528 | 40\% | £13,089 |
| Central Bedfordshire | 65 | 49\% | £460 | £240 | 52\% | £7,644 |
| Cheshire East | 160 | 40\% | £522 | £287 | 55\% | £18,368 |
| Cheshire West \& Chester | 163 | 49\% | £320 | £188 | 59\% | £15,016 |
| Cornwall | 274 | 31\% | £591 | £372 | 63\% | £31,598 |
| Coventry | 119 | 58\% | £434 | £255 | 59\% | £17,600 |
| Croydon | 108 | 46\% | £610 | £380 | 62\% | £18,878 |
| Cumbria | 295 | 36\% | £397 | £236 | 59\% | £25,063 |
| Darlington | 41 | 29\% | £877 | £569 | 65\% | £6,765 |
| Derby | 90 | 59\% | £486 | £279 | 57\% | £14,815 |
| Derbyshire | 351 | 42\% | £345 | £181 | 52\% | £26,683 |
| Devon | 364 | 45\% | £356 | $£ 234$ | 66\% | £38,329 |
| Doncaster | 123 | 47\% | £452 | £309 | 68\% | £17,863 |
| Dorset | 127 | 55\% | £424 | £322 | 76\% | £22,492 |
| Dudley | 109 | 44\% | £777 | £653 | 84\% | £31,318 |
| Durham | 256 | 41\% | £307 | £183 | 60\% | £19,208 |
| Ealing | 89 | 47\% | £539 | £362 | 67\% | £15,142 |
| East Riding of Yorkshire | 137 | 36\% | £472 | £248 | 52\% | £12,231 |
| East Sussex | 182 | 47\% | £462 | £291 | 63\% | £24,892 |
| Enfield | 93 | 66\% | £438 | £235 | 54\% | £14,424 |

10 City of London and Isles of Scilly are not shown as they have a very small number of schools.

| Local authority | All organisations |  | Ordering organisations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of organisations | Percentage who ordered | Average spend cap | Average spend | Spend as \% of spend cap | Total spend |
| Essex | 513 | 53\% | $£ 474$ | £273 | 58\% | £74,226 |
| Gateshead | 82 | 48\% | £506 | £225 | 45\% | £8,856 |
| Gloucestershire | 290 | 47\% | £394 | £245 | 62\% | £33,394 |
| Greenwich | 87 | 36\% | £607 | £311 | 51\% | £9,741 |
| Hackney | 77 | 53\% | £503 | £330 | 66\% | £13,467 |
| Halton | 62 | 34\% | £572 | £481 | 84\% | £10,139 |
| Hammersmith and Fulham | 57 | 40\% | £584 | £330 | 56\% | £7,524 |
| Hampshire | 426 | 42\% | £679 | £324 | 48\% | £57,970 |
| Haringey | 80 | 44\% | £532 | £255 | 48\% | £8,976 |
| Harrow | 59 | 47\% | £776 | £515 | 66\% | £14,281 |
| Hartlepool | 40 | 28\% | £550 | £405 | 74\% | £4,536 |
| Havering | 69 | 58\% | £477 | £281 | 59\% | £11,246 |
| Herefordshire | 103 | 50\% | £343 | £268 | 78\% | £13,802 |
| Hertfordshire | 468 | 47\% | £526 | £255 | 48\% | £56,090 |
| Hillingdon | 90 | 63\% | £577 | £240 | 42\% | £13,608 |
| Hounslow | 72 | 54\% | £692 | £403 | 58\% | £15,669 |
| Isle of Wight | 53 | 47\% | £471 | £346 | 73\% | £8,619 |
| Islington | 69 | 39\% | £327 | £167 | 51\% | £4,494 |
| Kensington and Chelsea | 37 | 49\% | £451 | £216 | 48\% | £3,916 |
| Kent | 576 | 48\% | £512 | £315 | 62\% | £87,091 |
| Kingston upon Hull | 99 | 53\% | £529 | £400 | 76\% | £20,988 |
| Kingston upon Thames | 50 | 50\% | £915 | £433 | 47\% | £10,825 |
| Kirklees | 162 | 53\% | £514 | £253 | 49\% | £21,723 |
| Knowsley | 62 | 37\% | £248 | £121 | 49\% | £2,776 |
| Lambeth | 89 | 45\% | £419 | £223 | 53\% | £8,931 |
| Lancashire | 604 | 41\% | $£ 405$ | £220 | 54\% | £54,481 |
| Leeds | 279 | 33\% | £629 | £335 | 53\% | £30,843 |
| Leicester | 106 | 57\% | £628 | £400 | 64\% | £24,168 |
| Leicestershire | 279 | 60\% | £332 | £256 | 77\% | £42,854 |
| Lewisham | 85 | 56\% | £414 | £242 | 58\% | £11,519 |
| Lincolnshire | 346 | 50\% | £382 | £218 | 57\% | £37,714 |
| Liverpool | 162 | 54\% | £439 | £227 | 52\% | £19,858 |
| Luton | 57 | 63\% | £514 | £299 | 58\% | £10,737 |
| Manchester | 185 | 66\% | £451 | £336 | 74\% | £41,026 |
| Medway | 90 | 42\% | £933 | £468 | 50\% | £17,690 |
| Merton | 55 | 51\% | £411 | £291 | 71\% | £8,163 |
| Middlesbrough | 59 | 42\% | £625 | £316 | 51\% | £7,830 |
| Milton Keynes | 85 | 54\% | £649 | £359 | 55\% | £16,478 |
| Newcastle upon Tyne | 90 | 47\% | £961 | £389 | 40\% | £16,455 |
| Newham | 94 | 52\% | £732 | £401 | 55\% | £19,601 |
| Norfolk | 368 | 47\% | £388 | £272 | 70\% | £47,045 |
| North East Lincolnshire | 61 | 41\% | £557 | £318 | 57\% | £7,953 |
| North Lincolnshire | 76 | 41\% | £456 | £219 | 48\% | £6,824 |
| North Somerset | 73 | 51\% | £540 | £238 | 44\% | £8,861 |
| North Tyneside | 72 | 57\% | £329 | £212 | 64\% | £8,700 |
| North Yorkshire | 358 | 38\% | £310 | £187 | 60\% | £25,439 |


| Local authority | All organisations |  | Ordering organisations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of organisations | Percentage who ordered | Average spend cap | Average spend | Spend as \% of spend cap | Total spend |
| Northamptonshire | 298 | 42\% | £485 | £296 | 61\% | £37,047 |
| Northumberland | 112 | 59\% | £332 | £238 | 72\% | £15,727 |
| Nottingham | 106 | 58\% | £547 | £371 | 68\% | £22,809 |
| Nottinghamshire | 313 | 46\% | £428 | £254 | 59\% | £36,571 |
| Oldham | 106 | 58\% | £496 | £303 | 61\% | £18,628 |
| Oxfordshire | 291 | 38\% | £503 | £236 | 47\% | £26,097 |
| Peterborough | 78 | 51\% | £603 | £266 | 44\% | £10,581 |
| Plymouth | 97 | 56\% | £426 | £233 | 55\% | £12,657 |
| Portsmouth | 50 | 52\% | £626 | £358 | 57\% | £9,308 |
| Reading | 49 | 41\% | £361 | £181 | 50\% | £3,636 |
| Redbridge | 74 | 57\% | £720 | £313 | 43\% | £13,202 |
| Redcar and Cleveland | 60 | 42\% | £409 | £279 | 68\% | £7,031 |
| Richmond upon Thames | 53 | 60\% | £461 | £262 | 57\% | £8,332 |
| Rochdale | 88 | 55\% | £456 | £288 | 63\% | £13,939 |
| Rotherham | 112 | 49\% | £580 | £447 | 77\% | £24,531 |
| Rutland | 21 | 43\% | £368 | £254 | 69\% | £2,294 |
| Salford | 101 | 37\% | £510 | £172 | 34\% | £6,428 |
| Sandwell | 114 | 60\% | £515 | £247 | 48\% | £16,895 |
| Sefton | 100 | 46\% | £519 | £327 | 63\% | $£ 15,042$ |
| Sheffield | 164 | 56\% | £487 | £226 | 46\% | £20,756 |
| Shropshire | 148 | 48\% | £336 | £181 | 54\% | £12,858 |
| Slough | 46 | 63\% | £750 | £536 | 72\% | £15,533 |
| Solihull | 75 | 56\% | £776 | £398 | 51\% | £16,716 |
| Somerset | 219 | 48\% | £433 | £228 | 53\% | £23,967 |
| South Gloucestershire | 109 | 51\% | £448 | £229 | 51\% | £12,730 |
| South Tyneside | 58 | 53\% | £396 | £223 | 56\% | £6,855 |
| Southampton | 65 | 55\% | £510 | £369 | 72\% | £13,192 |
| Southend-on-Sea | 50 | 50\% | £996 | £679 | 68\% | £16,975 |
| Southwark | 101 | 49\% | £443 | £234 | 53\% | £11,581 |
| St. Helens | 71 | 41\% | £707 | £451 | 64\% | £13,129 |
| Staffordshire | 337 | 47\% | £442 | £236 | 53\% | £37,380 |
| Stockport | 107 | 65\% | £345 | £235 | 68\% | £16,344 |
| Stockton-on-Tees | 79 | 30\% | £572 | £253 | 44\% | £5,996 |
| Stoke-on-Trent | 92 | 41\% | £597 | £402 | 67\% | £15,163 |
| Suffolk | 317 | 63\% | £326 | £189 | 58\% | £37,745 |
| Sunderland | 104 | 39\% | £697 | £482 | 69\% | £19,550 |
| Surrey | 320 | 49\% | £628 | £290 | 46\% | £45,472 |
| Sutton | 56 | 54\% | £889 | £477 | 54\% | £14,424 |
| Swindon | 81 | 53\% | £428 | £176 | 41\% | £7,556 |
| Tameside | 96 | 53\% | £417 | £313 | 75\% | £15,925 |
| Telford and Wrekin | 70 | 41\% | £587 | £388 | 66\% | £11,136 |
| Thurrock | 54 | 48\% | £369 | £236 | 64\% | £6,117 |
| Torbay | 44 | 41\% | £892 | £579 | 65\% | £10,445 |
| Tower Hamlets | 93 | 56\% | £777 | £293 | 38\% | £15,259 |
| Trafford | 88 | 53\% | £561 | £274 | 49\% | £12,779 |
| Wakefield | 129 | 47\% | £476 | £239 | 50\% | £14,491 |


| Local authority | All organisations |  | Ordering organisations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of organisations | Percentage who ordered | Average spend cap | Average spend | Spend as \% of spend cap | Total spend |
| Walsall | 107 | 54\% | £586 | £343 | 59\% | £19,819 |
| Waltham Forest | 77 | 42\% | £810 | $£ 467$ | 58\% | £15,103 |
| Wandsworth | 79 | 43\% | £507 | £191 | 38\% | £6,488 |
| Warrington | 87 | 38\% | £540 | £209 | 39\% | £6,910 |
| Warwickshire | 217 | 42\% | £637 | £372 | 58\% | £33,904 |
| West Berkshire | 75 | 52\% | $£ 403$ | $£ 163$ | 40\% | £6,357 |
| West Sussex | 260 | 40\% | £693 | £357 | 52\% | £37,128 |
| Westminster | 59 | 53\% | £852 | £529 | 62\% | £16,542 |
| Wigan | 134 | 36\% | £556 | £262 | 47\% | £12,639 |
| Wiltshire | 232 | 42\% | £399 | £207 | 52\% | £20,170 |
| Windsor and Maidenhead | 46 | 37\% | £888 | £422 | 48\% | £7,182 |
| Wirral | 115 | 44\% | £621 | £449 | 72\% | £22,719 |
| Wokingham | 57 | 46\% | £403 | £286 | 71\% | £7,499 |
| Wolverhampton | 102 | 49\% | £522 | $£ 313$ | 60\% | £15,644 |
| Worcestershire | 197 | 57\% | £427 | £260 | 61\% | £29,195 |
| York | 63 | 52\% | £702 | £399 | 57\% | £13,071 |
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[^0]:    1 Referred to as 'organisations' throughout this ad-hoc notice.
    2 Spend caps were based on learner numbers reported in the Autumn 2019 School Census for organisations that completed it and DfE forecasts of 2019-20 learner numbers for those that didn't. We assume that 5\% of 9 year olds, 10\% of 10 year olds, $20 \%$ of 11 year olds, $50 \%$ of 12 year olds, $75 \%$ of 13 year olds, $95 \%$ of 14 year olds and $100 \%$ of those aged 15 or over are menstruating.
    3 Any organisation with a calculated spend cap below this level will have their spend cap increased to $£ 16$.

[^1]:    4 Including all-through schools

[^2]:    5 Three secondary City Technology Colleges (CTC) are not shown.

[^3]:    6 Based on pupil premium allocations for the financial year beginning 1 April 2020.
    7 Including 404 post-16 organisations, 180 special schools, 62 alternative provision organisations and 49 mainstream schools. In most cases, information is not available because pupil premium is not available in that type of organisation. 8 Pupil premium bands are defined as follows: Less than $10 \%=$ Very low, $10 \%$ to $15 \%=$ Low, $16 \%$ to $23 \%=$ Medium, $24 \%$ to $37 \%=$ High and $38 \%$ + = Very High

[^4]:    9 Note that packets vary in the number of products they contain. This does not take account of differences in number of products per packet.

