

1. Topic of assessment

EIA title:	Schools funding changes 2015/16
-------------------	---------------------------------

EIA author:	David Green Senior Principal Accountant (Schools Funding)
--------------------	---

2. Approval

	Name	Date approved
Approved by¹	P-J Wilkinson	7 Oct 2014

10

3. Quality control

Version number	1	EIA completed	
Date saved	7 10 14	EIA published	

4. EIA team

Name	Job title (if applicable)	Organisation	Role

¹ Refer to earlier guidance for details on getting approval for your EIA.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

5. Explaining the matter being assessed

<p>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</p>	<p>Proposed changes to school funding for 2015/16</p>
<p>What proposals are you assessing?</p>	<p>The proposals are for the allocation of £22m of additional Dedicated Schools Grant, which is available to spend on schools and pupils in 2015/16. We propose that:</p> <p>£10m of the growth funding is used to support the budget for high cost special educational needs (SEN) pupils (approx 5,400 in Surrey in Jan 2014). This is necessary in order to replace existing one off SEN funds which will no longer be available in 2015/16 and to meet the estimated impact of inflation and growth in population, The alternative would be to share this funding among schools;</p> <p>It is proposed that the remaining £12m is allocated to primary and secondary schools on a per pupil basis</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt this funding can only be spent for purposes falling within the Schools Budget designated by the DfE (ie schools and school related services)</p> <p>We also propose an increase in the funding for primary schools which initially have low levels of SEN which see significant increases in the number of pupils with SEN during the course of the year. This follows concerns expressed by a number of small schools over the financial impact of increases in the number of pupils with statements during the year. It will benefit around 50 schools at an estimated cost of £200,000. Schools are normally expected to meet the first £6,000 of additional costs for pupils with statements of SEN and this can be a significant challenge for small schools.</p>
<p>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</p>	<p><u>£10m additional High needs funding:</u> The additional High Needs funding should enable the council to meet projected growth in demand for placements for high need SEN pupils ie those whose provision costs more than £10,000. These pupils may be in maintained schools, academies, non maintained or independent special schools. The funding will also help to maintain specialist support services for those pupils, such as speech and language therapy and peripatetic support teachers. A proportion of these pupils will qualify as disabled.</p> <p>If the council does not allocate £10m of the additional DSG to the SEN budget, the council would need to consider whether to reduce SEN spending by £10m or whether to fund the £10m from council tax</p> <p><u>Allocation of £12m to schools on a per pupil basis</u> This affects pupils (and staff) in mainstream (primary and secondary) schools</p> <p>This is new money and thus allocating it in this way does not mean reducing funding for any specific schools or categories. But by</p>

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

	<p>allocating it on pupil numbers, rather than on specific indicators of need, we have recognised the limitations of the additional needs data we may use to distribute funding and the need to ensure that all schools have a reasonable level of core funding. This will help those pupils with additional needs not falling into any of the categories which we are legally allowed to fund.</p> <p><u>Changes to SEN funding in primary schools:</u> affects (benefits) schools where the level of deprivation (measured by free school meals) and the level of low attainment are relatively low but where the number of high need SEN pupils is relatively high. This should particularly assist schools with a high incidence of SEN not associated with low prior attainment or deprivation-which may well include disability related SEN</p>
--	---

10

6. Sources of information

Engagement carried out
<p>The proposals were discussed with the Schools Forum. This is a statutory body composed mainly of headteachers and governors of primary, secondary and special schools, elected by schools in each sector, and academy representatives elected by that sector. The proposals were also circulated to individual mainstream schools and published on the council’s website for a month during September. The proposals received clear majority support from school respondents on a 44% response rate (170 schools) and were supported by the Schools Forum</p>
Data used
<p>In recommending how the £12m additional funding allocated to all schools was distributed among those schools, we have had regard to data published by the DfE which shows that Surrey spends a relatively high proportion of funding on deprivation (11.4% vs national median of 7.8%) As a consequence, the level of basic funding in Surrey for pupils without additional needs is relatively low compared to other authorities. We saw the allocation of growth funding on pupil numbers, while preserving existing funding levels for deprivation, low prior attainment and EAL, as an acceptable balance in the circumstances. Our information on the incidence of protected characteristics in schools is limited in that we are largely dependent on the DfE census (which doesn’t collect this sort of data)</p>

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

. Impact of the new/amended policy, service or function

7a. Impact of the proposals on residents and service users with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic ²	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
Age	Proposals affect school and pupil funding-age range 3-25 Unlikely to be any impact beyond that age range No significant differential impact expected within that age range	See previous column	
Disability		Not providing the additional funding for SEN could put at risk services to disabled pupils	Because some pupils with high cost SEN qualify as disabled
Gender reassignment	Unlikely to be relevant	Unlikely	School pupils
Pregnancy and maternity	Unlikely	Unlikely	School pupils
Race	Unlikely	Unlikely,	Proposal is neutral towards race/ethnicity
Religion and belief	Unlikely	Unlikely	Not a characteristic relevant to SEN nor allowed in funding schools
Sex	Unlikely	Unlikely	Except perhaps if differential in % SEN (check)
Sexual orientation	Unlikely	Unlikely	Not a characteristic relevant to SEN nor allowed in funding schools
Marriage and civil partnerships	N/a	N/a	School pupils

² More information on the definitions of these groups can be found [here](#).

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Carers ³	Unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral approach
---------------------	----------	----------	------------------

NB Legislation limits the factors we may use to distribute funding to mainstream schools for pupils other than those with SEN where meeting their additional needs costs more than £6000 each. In particular there is no indicator which measures the incidence of additional needs which are not related to deprivation or to low prior attainment (such as hearing/sensory impairment). Thus it is important that the basic per pupil funding of schools is maintained at an adequate level.. The only indicator linked to protected characteristics which we are allowed to use in the funding formula is English as an Additional Language (where there is some overlap with race). We do not have school level data on incidence of any of the protected characteristics apart from race (or disability to the extent to which it overlaps with SEN).

³ Carers are not a protected characteristic under the Public Sector Equality Duty, however we need to consider the potential impact on this group to ensure that there is no associative discrimination (i.e. discrimination against them because they are associated with people with protected characteristics). The definition of carers developed by Carers UK is that 'carers look after family, partners or friends in need of help because they are ill, frail or have a disability. The care they provide is unpaid. This includes adults looking after other adults, parent carers looking after disabled children and young carers under 18 years of age.'

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

7b. Impact of the proposals on staff with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
Age	<p>The impact on staff will depend on how the funding is distributed across schools. Individual schools have the legal right to decide how the funding is spent and thus they have a duty to ensure that in making staffing and spending choices they do not discriminate against individuals with protected characteristics</p>		
Disability			
Gender reassignment			
Pregnancy and maternity			
Race			
Religion and belief			
Sex			
Sexual orientation			
Marriage and civil partnerships			
Carers			

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change
None	The consultation did not identify any adverse impact of the proposals on protected groups.

9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
No need identified at this point			

10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
None identified	

11. Summary of key impacts and actions

Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis	Consultation with schools and analysis of national and local funding data
Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics	None significant if proposals are implemented Risks to pupils with SEN/disability could arise were the transfer of additional funding to high needs SEN
Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA	None so far-no issues identified in consultation which require a review

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts	
Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated	