

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Annex 4

## 1. Topic of assessment

<b>EIA title:</b>	SCHOOLS FORMULA FUNDING CHANGES 2014/15
-------------------	-----------------------------------------

<b>EIA author:</b>	David Green Senior Principal Accountant (Schools Funding),CSF Finance Team, CAE
--------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 2. Approval

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date approved</b>
<b>Approved by<sup>1</sup></b>	P-J Wilkinson	2.10.13

## 3. Quality control

<b>Version number</b>		<b>EIA completed</b>	
<b>Date saved</b>		<b>EIA published</b>	

## 4. EIA team

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title (if applicable)</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Role</b>

12

<sup>1</sup> Refer to earlier guidance for details on getting approval for your EIA.

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 5. Explaining the matter being assessed

<p><b>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</b></p>	<p><b>Changes are proposed to the method by which funding is allocated to schools, in order to comply with new legislation</b></p> <p>Schools budgets must be calculated according to a formula developed by the LA but the factors which the LA may use within that formula are restricted by legislation. The legislation is changing for 2014/15 and this review concerns the changes proposed by the LA in response to the changes in legislation, plus a few other changes in response to local needs. The changes are, in general, relatively minor.</p> <p>The authority is responsible for the distribution of budgets to schools. Headteachers and governors have freedom to determine how those budgets are spent. Therefore this review is concerned solely with the allocation process. The authority's scope for monitoring schools' spending choices and performance is limited by legislation. Indeed part of this funding goes to Academies, over which the LA has no powers of monitoring at all.</p> <p>There is a separate process for the allocation of funding to special schools, which is not considered by this review, and which is linked to pupil need as identified in their statements.</p> <p>Schools budgets are funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant, the level of which will, at best, be frozen in cash per pupil in 2014/15. Therefore the proposals must be implemented within current resources.</p> <p>The 2013/14 formula budget for primary and secondary schools is £543m (including Academies) Budget for 2014/15 is expected to be similar</p>
<p><b>What proposals are you assessing?</b></p>	<p>There are a number of specific proposals. The main ones are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*changes in the lump sum (flat rate per school)</li> <li>* whether to fund casual admissions</li> <li>* whether to provide additional funding to rural schools</li> <li>* how much funding to distribute for pupils with low level SEN</li> <li>* whether to provide additional funding for schools with temporary falls in numbers</li> </ul> <p>The authority's choice of indicators is closely constrained by the new legislation. In particular, the data used to distribute funding must be taken from a dataset provided by DfE, and may not use any indicators of pupil characteristics other than those specified above</p>
<p><b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b></p>	<p>The proposals will affect children and staff within schools and parents/carers of those children.</p> <p>The proposals will affect the services which schools are able to provide and the staff they are able to employ, although decisions as to which services will be provided and which staff are employed will be made by individual schools. The proposals will not directly and immediately affect the distribution of school places in Surrey or the criteria for admission to those places and thus should not have any immediate direct impact on access to services. However, by undermining the viability of some schools, the proposals may in time</p>

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

	make it less convenient for parents and pupils in some areas to access schools because schools in some areas may close and the alternatives offered may not be convenient for them
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 6. Sources of information

<b>Engagement carried out</b>
The proposals were published on the Council's website during the first week of September and printed copies were sent to all schools and to teacher association and trade union representatives. Prior to this, proposals were discussed by the statutory Schools Forum, made up of headteachers and governors and representatives of unions and Diocesan bodies. 158 responses were received by the closing deadline (44% of schools) The outcome of the consultation was considered by the Schools Forum before being reported to elected members.
<b>Data used</b>
We have looked at such data as we have on the School Census and on the county's EMS system as to the distribution of children with EAL/underattaining ethnic minorities and travellers. We have no data on the distribution among schools of other protected groups.

12

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

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

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

Protected characteristic <sup>2</sup>	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	Limited Some of the options may disadvantage secondary schools with a relatively high proportion of key stage 4 pupils	Limited Some of the options may disadvantage secondary schools with a relatively high proportion of key stage 4 pupils	<p>Services funded are largely restricted to 4-18s            No specific evidence is available on impact on other groups However, schools have powers to provide “community focused” activities such as childcare (including pre school) or parent education. Schools facing budget reductions may need to reduce their activities in such areas. This would be a decision for individual schools</p> <p>See also notes after table 7b, below</p>
<b>Disability</b>	Only to the extent that it is linked to SEN We are proposing additional funding for schools with a high incidence of SEN where this is not recognised by deprivation and prior attainment indicators	Should be none	
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	No	No	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	No	No	
<b>Race</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
<b>Religion and belief</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
<b>Sex</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	

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

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
----------------------------------------	----------	----------	--

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

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	Unlikely	Possible, in that some schools may need to make redundancies for which older staff may be targeted-school decision Risk whenever funding is reduced to any school	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.
<b>Disability</b>	Unlikely	Not directly-school decision	
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
<b>Race</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
<b>Religion and belief</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
<b>Sex</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	Unlikely	Unlikely	

NOTE It is important to note that the proposals are for the allocation of resources to schools. The LA does not directly control how those resources are used by schools (although as a last resort the LA could suspend financial delegation or impose an interim executive board on a school which was grossly breaching its legal requirements). Therefore the LA's main concern is to protect resources allocated by reference to protected groups and the resources allocated to those schools recognised as having high levels of need.

The specific changes which are most likely to impact on vulnerable groups are as follows:

- \* Changes in flat rates (increase in flat rates for secondary schools)  
This will benefit a number of small secondary schools which are also undersubscribed and thus are likely to attract a high proportion of casual admissions (because they have the vacancies)-in which recent immigrants and travellers may be overrepresented
- \* Restoration of funding for pupil mobility (casual admissions)-again should benefit same groups
- \* increased targeted funding for schools with high levels of SEN –will benefit vulnerable pupils but not specifically named priority groups as such.

None of the recognised protected characteristics listed above can be directly targeted by the funding formula apart from age (and then only between 3-19) and race (and only then as EAL or not). So the only funding influence we have is via deprivation/SEN and EAL. From 2013/14 to 2014/15 no change is proposed to the value or definition used for funding EAL.

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change
No issues arose during the consultation which concerned impact on priority groups	n/a

## 9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
None of the changes proposed affect factors which directly support protected groups	n/a	n/a	
Reduction in services offered by schools to pupils or staff with protected characteristics in response to budget reductions	Guidance to and monitoring of schools		
	Annual review of all funding factors with possibility of making changes in future years	Annual process	DG

12

## 10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
Cannot be sure at this stage-depends on decisions by individual schools	Any in principle

## 11. Summary of key impacts and actions

<b>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</b>	Consultation with school reps and use of School census and other data available within SCC
--------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

<b>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</b>	None anticipated at this stage
<b>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</b>	None yet identified as required
<b>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</b>	None at present
<b>Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated</b>	None definite Depends on how schools respond to the changes in funding

**Be sure to review the checklist in Annex 2 before submitting your EIA for approval and publication.**

## Further guidance

If you need more advice and guidance, you may find the following sources useful:

- [Government Equality Office: Equality Act guidance](#)
- [Equality and Human Rights Commission: \*Guidance on the Equality Duty\*](#)
- [Equality and Human Rights Commission: \*Making fair financial decisions\*](#)
- [Equality and Human Rights Commission: \*Meeting the Equality Duty in policy and decision making\*](#)
- [TUC: \*Equality Toolkit\*](#)