

1. Topic of assessment

EIA title:	Changes to local schools formula funding: 2017/18 Redistribution of £1.3m existing sixth form funding across other year groups
-------------------	---

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>Government legislation requires Surrey to reduce the funding of sixth forms in schools by £1.3m and to distribute this to schools in another way. Two methods of redistributing this funding were considered</p>												
<p>What proposals are you assessing?</p>	<p>£1.3m of Surrey's Dedicated Schools Grant funding is currently distributed to schools based on the number of sixth form pupils. This supplements direct funding of sixth forms by the Education Funding Agency, which is the main source of sixth form funding. From 2017/18 the government will no longer allow funding to be distributed in this way and therefore the £1.3m must be distributed to schools by another method. The Schools Forum recommended distribution of this funding to secondary schools based on year 7-11 pupil numbers. The Schools Forum considered, and rejected, an alternative option to distribute the funding across both primary and secondary schools</p> <p>The average impact of the two options on primary schools, 11-16 schools and 11-18 schools is summarised below and the impact of the proposals should be considered in that context:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="375 972 1382 1122"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Proposed</th> <th>Alternative</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Average primary</td> <td>0</td> <td>+2,490</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average 11-16 secondary</td> <td>+21,000</td> <td>+9,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average 11-18 secondary</td> <td>-16,000</td> <td>-31,200</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>11-16 secondary schools (ie secondary schools without sixth forms) would gain under both options. The only losers under either option would be those secondary schools with sixth forms, so the key issue to be considered is whether the transfer of funding to the primary sector would disadvantage equalities priority groups compared to retaining all of the funding within the secondary sector.</p> <p>The agreed proposals will be implemented from April 2017.</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. There is no mechanism available to retain funding within the 16-18 age group.</p>		Proposed	Alternative	Average primary	0	+2,490	Average 11-16 secondary	+21,000	+9,200	Average 11-18 secondary	-16,000	-31,200
	Proposed	Alternative											
Average primary	0	+2,490											
Average 11-16 secondary	+21,000	+9,200											
Average 11-18 secondary	-16,000	-31,200											
<p>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</p>	<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 may also be an indirect impact on parents and families, through changes in the level of support offered by 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, whether pupils, staff or others.</p>												

Equality Impact Assessment Template

	<p>The proposal does not change the total funding available to all schools, but only the distribution among schools.</p>
--	--

. Sources of information

Engagement carried out
<p>The proposal has been shared with the elected Schools Forum (which includes representatives of schools/academies and of parent groups) and was circulated to all Surrey state maintained schools and published on the Surrey County Council website from 16 September-4 October, which was the longest period consistent with DfE and Cabinet deadlines. The proposed option is that supported by Schools Forum.</p>
Data used
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial data analysis is largely taken from the School Census. The council has limited data on the incidence of specific equality priority groups in individual schools.

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	There will be some differential impact on primary and secondary age groups., no impact outside 4-15 age group	. There will be some differential impact on primary and secondary age groups., no impact outside 4-15 age group	
Disability	Small	Small	No data is available on the number of pupils in individual schools with a disability In Jan 2016 an average of 12.73% of mainstream primary pupils were classified as having SEN compared to 13.05% of secondary pupils 1.82% of primary pupils had statutory plans compared to 1.86% of secondary pupils. Therefore conclude that there is little evidence that either option would have a greater effect on children with SEND than the other.
Gender reassignment	Unlikely		No data is available on the incidence within Surrey schools
Pregnancy and maternity	N/a (school pupils)	N/a (school pupils)	
Race	Small	Small	A quick analysis suggests that the incidence of pupils with EAL and the incidence of non British ethnicity are both marginally higher in primary schools ie EAL 12.88% primary, 10.61% secondary, ethnic minorities 24.98% primary 21.28% secondary No attempt has been made for this purpose to identify impact on specific racial or language groups which might be seen as more disadvantaged than others. NB

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

Equality Impact Assessment Template

			Formula funding may be targeted on EAL (but only in a specific way) but not on ethnicity.
Religion and belief	N/a	N/a	No reason to assume that impact would differ between primary and secondary
Sex	N/a	N/a	
Sexual orientation	Unlikely	Unlikely	No data available
Marriage and civil partnerships	N/a	N/a	School pupils 4-15
Carers³			No data available

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

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
Age			The preferred option will mean a smaller reduction in funding for secondary schools, and thus should reduce the need for redundancies compared to the alternative. However, this should be seen in the context of overall budgets for 11-18 schools of the order of £4m-£7m. It would be for the individual schools to ensure that their redundancy and career development processes did not discriminate against
Disability			

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

Gender reassignment			staff with protected characteristics
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 made as a result of the EIA as no significant relative impact identified	

9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
No significant impact identified			

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	School census data analysis Consultation with all Surrey state maintained schools and with Surrey Schools Forum
Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics	None identified at present
Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA	N/a

Equality Impact Assessment Template

12

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