

1. Topic of assessment

EIA title:	Changes to local schools formula funding: 2017/18: How to delegate to individual schools £0.862m of funding currently held centrally for school improvement
-------------------	---

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

2. Approval

	Name	Date approved
Approved by¹	Liz Mills	9 Nov 2016

3. Quality control

Version number		EIA completed	
Date saved		EIA published	

4. EIA team

Name	Job title (if applicable)	Organisation	Role
David Green	Senior Principal Accountant	Surrey County Council CSF Finance	

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

Equality Impact Assessment Template

12 5. Explaining the matter being assessed

<p>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</p>	<p>£0.862m of existing centrally managed funding for school improvement is being delegated to schools from April 2017. The issue under consideration is how this funding is to be distributed among individual schools.</p>																																				
<p>What proposals are you assessing?</p>	<p>£0.862m of Dedicated Schools grant funding is currently held centrally for school improvement purposes. The bulk of the funding is spent on schools according to assessed need for school improvement support, although some is spent to provide universal school improvement services to all schools. Government policy does not see a future role for the LA in commissioning and funding school improvement support in future and thus this funding must be delegated to schools. Schools were consulted on two proposals for delegating this funding to individual schools from April 2017. A majority of schools, and the Schools Forum, supported delegation on the basis of pupil numbers, rather than an alternative option partially using deprivation indicators..</p> <p>The authority is only allowed to use a limited range of factors (specified by the Department for Education) to delegate funding to schools. For example, race is not a permissible indicator for funding purposes.</p> <p>By way of context the average funding delegated to average sized primary and secondary schools under the two options is shown below</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 1142 1356 1545"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>100%Pupil nos Recommended</th> <th>50%PN+50% FSM Alternative</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Average primary size</td> <td>287</td> <td>£</td> <td>£</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Median deprivation (6%)</td> <td>£</td> <td>1,609</td> <td>1,444</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Upper quartile depriv(9.8%)</td> <td>£</td> <td>1,609</td> <td>1,849</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10th percentile depriv(16.7%)</td> <td>£</td> <td>1,609</td> <td>2,554</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Avg secondary size (exc post 16 pupils)</td> <td>937</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Median depriv (6.5%)</td> <td>£</td> <td>6,814</td> <td>6,563</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Upper quartile depriv (10.5%)</td> <td>£</td> <td>6,814</td> <td>8,505</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10th percentile depriv13.8%)</td> <td>£</td> <td>6,814</td> <td>10.107</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It can be seen that the difference between the two methods for a high deprivation secondary school is small. of the order of £3,300 compared to a total budget of £4m-5m for a medium sized secondary school.</p>			100%Pupil nos Recommended	50%PN+50% FSM Alternative	Average primary size	287	£	£	Median deprivation (6%)	£	1,609	1,444	Upper quartile depriv(9.8%)	£	1,609	1,849	10th percentile depriv(16.7%)	£	1,609	2,554	Avg secondary size (exc post 16 pupils)	937			Median depriv (6.5%)	£	6,814	6,563	Upper quartile depriv (10.5%)	£	6,814	8,505	10th percentile depriv13.8%)	£	6,814	10.107
		100%Pupil nos Recommended	50%PN+50% FSM Alternative																																		
Average primary size	287	£	£																																		
Median deprivation (6%)	£	1,609	1,444																																		
Upper quartile depriv(9.8%)	£	1,609	1,849																																		
10th percentile depriv(16.7%)	£	1,609	2,554																																		
Avg secondary size (exc post 16 pupils)	937																																				
Median depriv (6.5%)	£	6,814	6,563																																		
Upper quartile depriv (10.5%)	£	6,814	8,505																																		
10th percentile depriv13.8%)	£	6,814	10.107																																		

Equality Impact Assessment Template

Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?	<p>The proposals will affect the level of funding available to individual schools, and thus will affect the pupils and staff in those schools. There is also likely to be an indirect impact on parents and families through their experience of the schools..</p> <p>The proposals affect HOW the funding is distributed to schools. They do not affect the total sum distributed to schools.</p> <p>As the funding is (and indeed must be) delegated to individual schools, it will be for individual schools to determine how the funding is spent and how to make any necessary savings in such a way as to minimise the impact on equality priority groups.</p> <p>Schools will lose out if they had previously been supported by the central budget or if they would have been eligible in the future had the central budget still existed. The losers will in general be schools which were rated Requires Improvement or below (grades 3-5) by OFSTED in their most recent inspection. The specific schools in this category will vary over time but those currently in this position have a higher average level of deprivation than Surrey schools as a whole and also a slightly higher proportion of pupils identified as SEN and pupils with EAL).</p>
---	---

6. Sources of information

Engagement carried out
<p>The proposals were shared with the elected Schools Forum (which includes representatives of schools/academies and of parent groups) and were circulated to all Surrey state maintained schools and published on the Surrey County Council website.</p> <p>Schools Forum supported distribution of this funding on pupil numbers, as did ¾ of the schools which expressed a view during the wider consultation.</p>
Data used
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial data analysis is largely taken from the School Census and DfE schools funding dataset.

Equality Impact Assessment Template

7. 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	None- the same amount will be distributed to each of the primary and secondary sectors under both methods- as this is schools funding no other age range is involved																						
Page 256 Disability		Possible but small	Data not directly available on disability. Incidence of deprivation and SEN are both higher in the schools currently graded 3-5 than the county average (Jan 2016, although incidence of statutory plans is not (NB We could target low prior attainment funding instead but have concerns over the stability of the data and of the tests used. Key data Jan 2016 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Pri all</th> <th>Sec all</th> <th>Pri 3-5</th> <th>Sec 3-5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>%FSM</td> <td>7.56%</td> <td>7.01%</td> <td>12.10%</td> <td>13.23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%SEN</td> <td>12.73%</td> <td>13.05%</td> <td>14.71%</td> <td>18.41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% statement/EHCP</td> <td>1.82%</td> <td>1.86%</td> <td>1.94%</td> <td>1.70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Pri all	Sec all	Pri 3-5	Sec 3-5	%FSM	7.56%	7.01%	12.10%	13.23%	%SEN	12.73%	13.05%	14.71%	18.41%	% statement/EHCP	1.82%	1.86%	1.94%	1.70%
	Pri all	Sec all	Pri 3-5	Sec 3-5																			
%FSM	7.56%	7.01%	12.10%	13.23%																			
%SEN	12.73%	13.05%	14.71%	18.41%																			
% statement/EHCP	1.82%	1.86%	1.94%	1.70%																			
Gender reassignment	Unlikely	Unlikely	School pupils																				
Pregnancy and maternity	Unlikely	Unlikely	No data																				
Race			The average incidence of EAL and non-British ethnicity is marginally higher in those primary schools																				

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

Equality Impact Assessment Template

			currently graded 3-5 than in Surrey primary schools as a whole No clear distinction in secondary Key data Jan 2016 <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pri all</td> <td>Sec all</td> <td>Pri 3-5</td> <td>Sec 3-5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%EAL</td> <td>12.88%</td> <td>10.61%</td> <td>16.49%</td> <td>11.29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%ethnic min</td> <td>24.98%</td> <td>21.28%</td> <td>27.62%</td> <td>19.71%</td> </tr> </table>		Pri all	Sec all	Pri 3-5	Sec 3-5	%EAL	12.88%	10.61%	16.49%	11.29%	%ethnic min	24.98%	21.28%	27.62%	19.71%
	Pri all	Sec all	Pri 3-5	Sec 3-5														
%EAL	12.88%	10.61%	16.49%	11.29%														
%ethnic min	24.98%	21.28%	27.62%	19.71%														
Religion and belief			No data available															
Sex	Unlikely	Unlikely																
Sexual orientation	Unlikely	Unlikely	No data available															
Marriage and civil partnerships	Unlikely	Unlikely	School pupils															
Carers³			No direct evidence but generally understood that they are often in lower income families															

Page 257

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

Protected	Potential positive	Potential negative	Evidence
-----------	--------------------	--------------------	----------

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

characteristic	impacts	impacts	
Age			<p>It will be for individual schools to determine how they manage any changes in staffing as a result of budget changes. As this proposal distributes additional funding to schools it will not by itself force staffing changes in schools.</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	

9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
Possible differential impact on high need schools Currently schools which are Requires Improvement or below have higher % on FSM and higher % with SEN. However, the difference at school level between the two options being considered is only small, and should be considered in the context of the overall proportion of funding allocated to schools on the basis of deprivation in Surrey. This is in line with national levels.	Continue to monitor attainment gaps and similar indicators for priority groups and how funding targeted to SEN and deprivation compares to other local authorities	Annual review	Attainment- Assistant Director Schools and Learning (LM) Funding-CSF finance team (DG)

10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
There will be an overall loss of funding to individual schools currently eligible for assistance from the central budget (which in general have above average needs) because total funding will be distributed across all	

Equality Impact Assessment Template

<p>12 schools rather than to a small number of them, this is an impact of delegation, rather than of the method of delegation and hence the LA cannot itself avoid it. However, it MAY be mitigated by additional assistance funded by DfE through regional schools commissioners (details TBC)</p>	

11. Summary of key impacts and actions

Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis	School census data analysis Consultation with schools and Schools Forum
Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics	The two methods of distributing funding under discussion have a differential effect on schools with high levels of deprivation, which also have above average incidence of SEN and EAL and non British ethnicity. However, the variation between the two funding methods is only small
Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA	None
Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts	None yet, but will monitor impact
Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated	Overall impact of delegation on those schools which currently receive large allocations of targeted funding Cannot be mitigated by LA because continued central funding appears inconsistent with govt policy