

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

1. Topic of assessment

EIA title	Schools funding formula proposals for 2019/20: Changes to notional SEN budgets
EIA author	David Green

2. Approval

	Name	Date approved
Approved by	Liz Mills	18 October 2018
Version number	001	EIA completed
Date saved	18 October 2018	EIA published

3. Quality control

Version number	001	EIA completed	
Date saved	18 October 2018	EIA published	

4. EIA team

Name	Job title	Organisation	Team role
David Green	Senior Principal Accountant	Surrey County Council	
Julie Stockdale	SEND & School Organisation Strategic Lead	Surrey County Council	

5. Explaining the matter being assessed

What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?	<p>The notional SEN budget is the amount which schools are expected to spend from their budget share on SEN (although it is neither ring-fenced nor an upper limit). It is not additional funding. The LA is legally required to define a notional SEN budget but may choose how it is defined.</p> <p>The proposal is to change the definition to reflect movements in the underlying formula factors as Surrey's local formula is moved towards the government's National Funding Formula (NFF).</p>
What proposals are you assessing?	<p>Surrey's notional SEN budget is defined as a proportion of basic per pupil funding plus a proportion of deprivation funding plus a proportion of low prior attainment funding. Under the NFF, deprivation funding for Surrey schools is being reduced, while low prior attainment funding is increasing. The proposal is that the deprivation and low prior attainment components of the notional SEN budget should change in proportion to the deprivation and low prior attainment funding in the main formula, subject to there being no increase in notional SEN funding per pupil. In practice this means that a school with high incidence of low prior attainment, but low deprivation, will be expected to find more funding towards SEN from its own budget. The actual notional SEN funding rates will be set in January based on October 2018 school census data.</p> <p>The changes will affect how much funding each school is expected to set aside as SEN funding. It will only affect the overall funding of a school where the school is eligible for additional SEN funding because the cost of self funding the first £6000 per EHCP exceeds the threshold set for the purpose, which is defined in terms of "level 2" notional SEN funding (i.e. notional SEN funding which depends on deprivation or low prior attainment). A school where the notional SEN funding is higher under the new method is less likely to receive additional SEN funding. This is reasonable as the school will have received an increase in formula funding.</p>
Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?	<p>The proposals affect schools' budgets, however the impact on individual staff and pupils will be a matter for individual schools. It is a school's responsibility to make appropriate provision for pupils with SEN regardless of the amount of funding within the notional SEN budget.</p> <p>.</p>

6. Sources of information

Engagement carried out

Proposals for changes to the schools funding formula were published in a consultation paper which was sent to all schools and was available on the council's website, during September. 198 responses were received from schools, a response rate of 50.5%

The consultation responses were discussed with Surrey's elected Schools Forum on 28 September 2018

Data used

Data is largely drawn from the school census and from LA records of the number of "high needs" pupils. Data on many of the equality priority groups is not available for schools.

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	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
Age	Unlikely	Unlikely	
Disability	Minimal	Minimal, see comments above	<p>Impact was calculated at individual school level Modelling shows that while a small numbers of schools (7) would see a loss of additional SEN funding as a result of this proposal, only seven will lose more than they gain in formula funding (on technicalities) and only one of these will lose more than £1,100. This school would lose around £2400 and has below average incidence of ethnic minority pupils and SEN pupils.</p> <p>NB Actual impact will depend on next year's data NB2 This assumes no change in additional SEN funding (separate proposal)</p>
Gender reassignment	No data	No data	
Pregnancy and maternity	No data	No data	
Race	Unlikely	Possible but marginal	See comments above
Religion and belief	No data	No data	
Sex	Unlikely	Unlikely	

Sexual orientation	No data	No data	
Marriage and civil partnerships	No data	No data	
Carers (protected by association)	No data	No data	

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

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
Age			
Disability			
Gender reassignment			
Pregnancy and maternity			No school loses a significant sum under these proposals after taking into account increases in the main funding formula allocations So any impact on staff will be minimal.
Race			
Religion and belief			
Sex			

Sexual orientation			
Marriage and civil partnerships			
Carers (protected by association)			

8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change
None required	

9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
None required			

10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

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

¹¹ 11. Summary of key impacts and actions

Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis	Analysis of school census data and consultation with schools and with the Schools Forum
Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics	No school suffers significant losses under this proposal hence no negative impact
Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA	None
Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts	
Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated	