

Equality Impact Assessment Guidance and Template

1. Topic of assessment

EIA title:	Schools funding changes 2016/17: Proposed changes in deprivation funding
-------------------	--

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

2. Approval

	Name	Date approved
Approved by ¹		

3. Quality control

Version number		EIA completed	
Date saved	16 Oct 2015 3 05pm	EIA published	

4. EIA team

Name	Job title (if applicable)	Organisation	Role
David Green	Senior Principal Accountant	Surrey County Council	Schools funding lead
Flora Wilkie	Strategy and Policy Development Officer	Surrey County Council	Co-ordination and analysis
Jo Holtom	Strategy and Policy Development Senior Manager	Surrey County Council	Input on SEND Strategy and programme

5. Explaining the matter being assessed

What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?	Proposed changes to school funding for 2016/17, (Changes in deprivation funding)
What proposals are you assessing?	Whether <u>the proportion of Surrey's funding formula allocated on deprivation should remain at 10.8% , or whether it should be reduced to 7.79% (in line with the national median)</u> . Schools face a real terms reduction in funding in 2016/17 and a reduction in deprivation funding will tend to concentrate the impact of that reduction in the more deprived schools, rather than spreading it more widely. Individual schools will need to decide where cuts are made if they lose funding, and it will be up to them to ensure that the cuts do not disproportionately disadvantage priority groups. The consultation follows pressure from a significant minority of schools to reduce the proportion of funding allocated by Surrey based on deprivation. They

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

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

7

	<p>argue that the level of funding for the least deprived schools has reached a point where those schools are at risk of no longer delivering an adequate basic curriculum (although there is no consensus on what this is and the evidence supplied by such schools has been limited).</p>
<p>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</p>	<p>Schools and school pupils and staff In particular, any movement of funding away from high deprivation schools is likely to impact on support provided to disadvantaged pupils or to those with additional needs in those schools. While ultimately it would be the schools' decisions how to make the cuts which would be required, the higher the proportion of such pupils and the greater the cuts faced by those schools, the more likely is it that such pupils cannot be protected.</p> <p>Changes would be subject to a maximum loss of 1.5% of average funding per pupil per year.</p>

6. Sources of information

<p>Engagement carried out</p>
<p>The proposals were developed with a working group of the Schools Forum and were then discussed with the Schools Forum in June and July. 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. It also includes representatives of parents of children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) . The proposals were then included in a consultation paper sent to all schools and available on our web site in early September and the results of that consultation were considered by the Schools Forum on 1 October. The Schools Forum supported a reduction in deprivation funding to 7.79% of total funding. A preliminary Call for Evidence was circulated to all schools in June order to gather evidence of the impact of deprivation funding, particularly in those schools with highest deprivation. This generated many examples of additional activities needed, or needed more, in high deprivation school, but no consensus over the differential financial impact.</p>
<p>Data used</p>
<p>Schools were ranked for deprivation based largely on free meals data. Deprivation was also compared with data on low prior attainment, English as an Additional Language (EAL), under-attaining ethnic groups and SEN incidence. (See table at end of this assessment).</p> <p>We also looked at comparisons of school funding with other LAs, and at comparisons of the deprivation attainment gap between Surrey and other LAs (See consultation paper for more information)</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
<p>Age</p> <p>Page 85</p>	<p>Proposals affect school and pupil funding-age range 3-15 Unlikely to be any impact beyond that age range No significant differential impact expected within that age range Proposals will not move funding between primary and secondary</p>	<p>Proposals affect school and pupil funding-age range 3-15 Unlikely to be any impact beyond that age range No significant differential impact expected within that age range Proposals will not move funding between primary and secondary</p> <p>Without additional resources, the range of interventions offered by schools may be narrowed and lack of interventions at an earlier age could increase problems further down the line.</p>	<p>.</p>
<p>Disability</p>	<p>Unlikely</p>	<p>There is currently a correlation between schools with high levels of pupils with SEN and with high deprivation. Without additional resources, schools may be less able to make additional interventions. This will cause continuing pressure on special schools further down the line.</p> <p>With reduced resources, the largest impact will be on pastoral staff which will impact inclusive schools and early help.</p>	<p>Disability is more likely to occur in areas of greater poverty. 22% of children living in families with a disabled member live in income poverty compared with 16% of children in families with no disabled member (ODI Indicator C1).</p> <p>Legislation limits the factors we may use to distribute funding to mainstream schools for pupils unless they have SEN and 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</p>

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

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

			impairment)
Gender reassignment	Unlikely	Unlikely	
Pregnancy and maternity	Unlikely	Without additional resources for schools, support may not be available. For pregnant pupils, increased support is needed to ensure a family is able to access qualifications..	National evidence suggests that teenagers are more likely to become pregnant if they live in poor urban areas and thus schools in deprived areas will have a higher proportion of such pupils. Teenage mothers are also 20% more likely to have no qualifications compared to an older mother.
Race	Possibly	Yes, there is a prevalence of ethnic minorities within schools with higher levels of deprivation. Schools are currently experiencing increased pressure with Gypsy, Roma and Travellers and this is likely to further increase without sufficient resource. Reduced funding for schools with a higher incidence of ethnic minorities could therefore have a negative impact on support offered to these groups	The proportion of pupils with EAL and of under attaining ethnic minorities is highest within the 20% most deprived schools, particularly in the primary sector. The only indicator directly 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).
Religion and belief	Unlikely	Unlikely	
Sex	Unlikely	Boys are statistically more likely to have statements of special educational needs than girls SEN is more prevalent in schools with higher deprivation, and thus reducing funding for those schools may have a greater impact on boys than girls	Boys are nearly three times more likely than girls to have statements in Surrey. (JSNA Chapter: SEN)
Sexual orientation	Unlikely	Schools in deprived areas may have reduced capacity to support pupils who experience mental health issues as a result of bullying and social exclusion.	Identity-related stigma contributes to an increased risk of Bullying and social exclusion – 34% of LGBTQ young people are estimated to have experienced homophobia whilst in school and domestic abuse. It is recognised that these experiences can have a negative impact on mental health (which may in turn

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

			lead to income deprivation) and that there is a higher incidence of self harm suicidality amongst lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender young people than the wider youth population (Council of Europe).
Marriage and civil partnerships	N/a	N/a	
Carers³ Page 87	Unlikely	If schools make cuts, it could impact on provision for groups with additional needs – shown in evidence - and this could have a negative impact on the carers. There is also a significantly high number of unknown young carers in Surrey’s schools and there could be less support for them in schools.	There are 272,800 children and young people aged 0-19 in Surrey, 67,300 are 10-14 years old; and 69,000 are 15-19 years old. (ONS: Surrey). Of these, 5,631 have statements of educational need and 21,540 are on SEN support. These children will all have parent/guardian carers which will experience the impact. Many of these will be ill, disabled or otherwise economically inactive and thus many pupils who are carers are likely to qualify for deprivation funding.

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	Unlikely	Unknown at this stage	<p>At this stage it is not possible to identify which staff may be at risk as a result of budget reductions in individual schools. Decisions to make individual staff redundant would be a matter for individual schools, which would be expected to have regard to equalities considerations before making any such decision.</p> <p>As above</p>
Disability	Unlikely	<p>If individual schools do decide to make redundancies there is a risk of disproportionate affect on disabled workers who may find it difficult to make alternative travel arrangements to new employment.</p> <p>Reduced budgets may result in increased workloads which may increase levels of stress and poor emotional wellbeing.</p> <p>Increased workloads may reduce the potential for flexible working.</p>	
Gender reassignment	Unlikely	Unknown at this stage.	
Pregnancy and maternity	Unlikely	This is possible if individual schools decide to make redundancies.	
Race	Unlikely	Unknown at this stage	
Religion and belief	Unlikely	Unknown at this stage	

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Sex	Unlikely	Possible, particularly if redundancies are made in front line support staff roles where there is typically a higher proportion of female staff.	
Sexual orientation	Unlikely	Unknown at this stage.	
Marriage and civil partnerships	Unlikely	Unknown at this stage.	
Carers	Unlikely	Reduced budgets may lead individual schools to increase workloads and this may reduce the level of flexibility available in working which could adversely impact on carers.	

Page 89 NOTE For all impacts on staff: This proposal moves funding between schools but does not affect the total funding allocated to mainstream schools. Therefore the changes are likely to affect the need for redundancies in individual schools, but significant numbers of redundancies are likely in some schools even if the changes are not made. Individual schools will need to consider the impact of changes on staff with protected characteristics, and have regard to their legal duties, when selecting staff for redundancy.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

7 8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change
None	

9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
All	Impact will be reviewed as part of annual review of schools funding formula	Summer/autumn 2016 (for 2017/18) and annually thereafter	PJ Wilkinson/ D Green
Redundancy disproportionately affecting staff with protected characteristics	Schools will need to have regard to equalities requirements if selecting staff for redundancy-eg age, maternity, caring responsibilities	Ongoing	

10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected

11. Summary of key impacts and actions

Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis	Call for evidence on impact of deprivation on schools, study of School Census, ONS and similar local and national data
Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics	Possible reduction in additional support for pupils with disabilities, SEN, EAL/ethnic minorities and carers (Depending on school level decisions)
Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA	None as yet
Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts	Annual review of impact
Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated	Uncertain as the impact will depend on decisions by individual schools

This page is intentionally left blank