

EIA Title: Schools Funding Formula 2022/23: Impact of proposed level of minimum funding guarantee and lump sum

Question	Answer
Did you use the EIA Screening Tool? (Delete as applicable)	No

1. Explaining the matter being assessed

Question	Answer
What policy, function or service change are you assessing?	Schools funding formula 2022/23. The specific proposals considered here are (a) to set the level of the minimum funding guarantee, for schools where the average increase in funding per pupil from 2021/22 to 2022/23 is small, at the highest affordable level, (b) to make a small increase in the level of the lump sum
Why does this EIA need to be completed?	The level of the minimum funding guarantee (the minimum average increase in funding per pupil from year to year) and of the lump sum are two of the most important variables in the schools funding formula, which determines the level of funding allocated to individual primary and secondary schools. Neither is directly linked to the incidence of protected characteristics but it is possible that choices on the level of either could have a disproportionate impact on schools with a high incidence of pupils in protected groups. Legally the management of budget shares is delegated to individual schools. Thus it is for individual schools to decide how to deploy their resources and in so doing to have regards to the needs of protected groups. But in allocating funds to schools we recognise that their spending decisions are affected by the total funding available.
Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?	Schools and pupils and staff in schools. The proposals will affect the level of funding of individual schools

17

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
<p>How does your service proposal support the outcomes in the Community Vision for Surrey 2030?</p>	<p>Everyone benefits from education, skills and employment opportunities which help them succeed in life</p>
<p>Are there any specific geographies in Surrey where this will make an impact?</p> <p>(Delete the ones that don't apply)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County-wide
<p>Briefly list what evidence you have gathered on the impact of your proposals</p>	<p>We have estimated funding allocations at individual school level using a range of scenarios and have compared them with data on incidence of ethnic minorities (as a proxy for race), children with special educational needs and disabilities (as a proxy for disability) and pupils eligible for free school meals (as a proxy for deprivation) and with DfE data on staff characteristics. The data which we have used is largely taken from the school census or from DfE data sets eg workforce census. We do not have data on the incidence in schools of most of the other protected characteristics.</p> <p>We consulted all individual mainstream schools in September 2021 via a consultation paper and we provided illustrations of impact to individual schools. There were 195 responses to the consultation paper (49.6% of eligible schools)</p>

17

2. Service Users / Residents

There are 10 protected characteristics to consider in your proposal. These are:

1. Age including younger and older people
2. Disability
3. Gender reassignment
4. Pregnancy and maternity
5. Race including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality
6. Religion or belief including lack of belief
7. Sex
8. Sexual orientation
9. Marriage/civil partnerships
10. Carers protected by association

Though not included in the Equality Act 2010, Surrey County Council recognises that socio-economic disadvantage is a significant contributor to inequality across the County and therefore regards this as an additional factor.

Therefore, if relevant, you will need to include information on this. Please **refer to the EIA guidance** if you are unclear as to what this is.

Age

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	Both of these proposals affect children between the ages of 4-16 only. The funding can only be spent on this age group.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Neither

Page 380

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
None	N/a	n/a	N/a	N/a

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	There are other issues within the schools funding formula (eg transfer of funds to support SEN) but as above they will only affect children aged 4-16

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	N/a

Equality Impact Assessment

Disability

Question	Answer			
<p>What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?</p>	<p>We do not hold data on disability as such for school children. We have considered data on special educational needs as the nearest proxy we hold Data on the impact of the two proposals on schools with different levels of SEND is summarised below.</p>			
	<p>Proportion of schools receiving additional funding under the minimum funding guarantee in 2021/22</p>			
		Primary	Secondary	
	all schools	32.89%	19.64%	
	Above average for EHCPs	37.58%	21.43%	
	Above upper quartile for EHCPs	48.00%	28.57%	
	Top 10% for EHCPs	44.70%	42.86%	
	Above average for %SEN	46.98%	28.57%	
	Above upper quartile for %SEN	53.33%	28.57%	
	Top10% for %SEN	71.10%	42.86%	
<p>This suggests that a higher proportion of schools with high levels of SEND benefit from the minimum funding guarantee and therefore will benefit from the proposal to set the minimum funding guarantee at the highest affordable level.</p>				
	(No transfer to high needs)		(With transfer to high needs-recommended)	
% gaining from lump sum increase	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
all schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.09%	23.21%
Above average for EHCPs	32.43%	39.29%	27.03%	21.43%
Above upper quartile for EHCPs	28.38%	50.00%	25.68%	14.29%
Above average for %SEN	29.73%	39.29%	5.68%	39.29%
Above upper quartile for %SEN	20.27%	57.14%	17.57%	57.14%

Question	Answer
	<p>This data shows that in general primary schools with a high incidence of SEN benefit less than others from an increase in the lump sum, whereas the reverse applies for secondary schools. However, possible smaller benefit to those primary schools this has to be considered against the need to do what we can to support small schools and thus reduce the risk of school closures in rural communities. An increase in the lump sum is the only way in which the council can assist small schools within the significant constraints imposed by the schools funding legislation apart from the few, very small schools benefiting from sparsity funding. The increase proposed in the lump sum is similar to the increase proposed for other formula factors, it is just that it maintains the Surrey lump sum at a higher level than would be provided under the national funding formula. Small rural schools provide opportunities for children with SEND and disabilities to be educated locally. There is a legal presumption against the closure of rural schools.</p>
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>Proposed changes to minimum funding guarantee are in general beneficial to schools with high incidence of SEND. Proposed changes to the lump sum are beneficial to small schools; the incidence of SEN in small secondary schools is higher than for the sector as a whole but for small primary schools it is lower.</p>

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
As above	As above	Uneven distribution of benefits will be accepted given the aim of seeking to maintain the viability of small schools and the limited tools available for this purpose within the funding legislation.	n/a	N/a

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
<p>What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of</p>	<p>The proposals to transfer funding from schools to high needs SEND block will also tend to have an adverse impact on the formula budget shares of schools with a high incidence of SEND, although the reallocation of the funds transferred in this is designed to directly benefit them.</p>

Question	Answer
<p>Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why</p>	<p>As above there may be negative relative impacts at school level It will be for individual schools to avoid negative impacts on individuals.</p>

Gender reassignment

Question	Answer
<p>What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?</p>	<p>This data is not available for school pupils</p>
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>Unknown</p>

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
None	N/a	n/a	N/a	N/a

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	N/a.

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	N/a

Page 384

Pregnancy /maternity

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	N/a (school pupils)
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	N/a

Equality Impact Assessment

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
None	N/a	n/a	N/a	N/a

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	N/a.

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	N/a

Race including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality

Question	Answer	
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	The table below shows the proportion of schools receiving additional funding under the Minimum Funding Guarantee	
	All schools	Primary 32.89% Secondary 19.64%
	Schools with:	
	above average non British	34.90% 21.43%
	above upper quartile non British	32.00% 35.71%
	top 10% non British	43.20% 57.14%
Above average non white	37.58% 21.43%	
Above upper quartile non white	37.33% 35.71%	
Top10% for non white	42.10% 42.86%	

Question	Answer																																		
	<p>The table shows that the proportion of schools with above average incidence of non British and non white ethnicity benefiting from the minimum funding guarantee is higher than the proportion of all schools thus benefiting.</p> <p>The table below shows the proportion of schools gaining funding from an increase in lump sum, with and without a transfer of funding to the high needs (SEND) block.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="470 462 1736 925"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">% gaining from lump sum</th> <th colspan="2">(No transfer to high needs)</th> <th colspan="2">(With transfer to high needs)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Primary</th> <th>Secondary</th> <th>Primary</th> <th>Secondary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>all schools</td> <td>37.16%</td> <td>23.21%</td> <td>32.55%</td> <td>23.21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>above average non British</td> <td>23.13%</td> <td>21.43%</td> <td>19.05%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>above upper quartile non British</td> <td>24.66%</td> <td>14.29%</td> <td>17.81%</td> <td>14.29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average non white</td> <td>22.82%</td> <td>21.43%</td> <td>18.92%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile non white</td> <td>21.33%</td> <td>14.29%</td> <td>16.22%</td> <td>14.29%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In general the proportion of schools with a high proportion of ethnic minorities benefiting from an increase in lump sum is smaller than the proportion of schools as a whole benefiting. This is partly because many of the smallest schools are small village schools. However, we think the aim to seek to maintain the viability of the smallest schools justifies the lower benefit for others.</p>	% gaining from lump sum	(No transfer to high needs)		(With transfer to high needs)		Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	all schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.55%	23.21%	above average non British	23.13%	21.43%	19.05%	21.43%	above upper quartile non British	24.66%	14.29%	17.81%	14.29%	Above average non white	22.82%	21.43%	18.92%	21.43%	Above upper quartile non white	21.33%	14.29%	16.22%	14.29%
% gaining from lump sum	(No transfer to high needs)		(With transfer to high needs)																																
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary																															
all schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.55%	23.21%																															
above average non British	23.13%	21.43%	19.05%	21.43%																															
above upper quartile non British	24.66%	14.29%	17.81%	14.29%																															
Above average non white	22.82%	21.43%	18.92%	21.43%																															
Above upper quartile non white	21.33%	14.29%	16.22%	14.29%																															
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>Proposed changes to minimum funding guarantee are in general beneficial to schools with higher incidence of ethnic minorities (on the basis of available data) whereas proposed increases to the level of lump sum are not.</p>																																		

Page 386

Equality Impact Assessment

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
As above	As above	It is proposed that the possible uneven distribution of benefits is accepted in view of the aim to seek to maintain the viability of small schools and the limited alternative options		

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	N/a

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	As above

Religion including belief or lack of belief

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	Data not held for school pupils

Question	Answer
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	Not known

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
None	N/a	n/a	N/a	N/a

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	n/a.

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	n/a.

Sex

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	In Jan 2021 the proportion of girls among year R-11 in 80% of primary schools was between 45-54% and in secondary schools was between 45-53%. There are only two single sex mainstream schools. Thus we don't think the range of variation in the proportion of girls and boys among mainstream schools is significant enough to justify further analysis.

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	N/a

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
None	N/a	n/a	N/a	N/a

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	N/a.

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	N/a

Sexual orientation

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	Unlikely to be of significant relevance to school pupils

Question	Answer
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	N/a

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
None	N/a	n/a	N/a	N/a

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	n/a.

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	n/a

Marriage/civil partnership

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	Not relevant as proposals only concern school pupils
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	N/a

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
None	N/a	n/a	N/a	N/a

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	n/a

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	n/a

Carers (protected by association)

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	While some school pupils will be carers we do not have any data on how many there are
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	N/a

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
None	N/a	n/a	N/a	N/a

Page 392

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	N/a

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	N/a

Economic deprivation

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer																																												
<p>What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?</p>	<p>The table below shows that in general schools with high incidence of deprivation (as measured by eligibility for free school meals (FSM) were more likely to be on minimum funding guarantee in 2021/22 and thus to benefit from a higher level of minimum funding guarantee.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="568 309 1621 528"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Minimum Funding Guarantee</u></th> <th>Primary</th> <th>Secondary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>all schools</td> <td>32.89%</td> <td>19.64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average FSM deprivation</td> <td>46.98%</td> <td>32.14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile FSM deprivation</td> <td>68.00%</td> <td>50.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>top 10% deprivation</td> <td>76.30%</td> <td>42.86%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The table below shows the proportion of schools with high incidence of economic deprivation which would benefit from an increase in the lump sum, both with and without a transfer of funds to the high needs block. In this case the proportion of high deprivation primary schools gaining is lower than the proportion of all primary schools gaining, but the reverse applies to secondary schools. This reflects the fact that a number of smaller secondary schools have relatively high incidence of deprivation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="568 788 1823 1241"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">(No transfer to high needs)</th> <th colspan="2">(With transfer to high needs)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Primary</th> <th>Secondary</th> <th>Primary</th> <th>Secondary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>% of schools gaining from lump sum protection)</u></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>all schools</td> <td>37.16%</td> <td>23.21%</td> <td>32.55%</td> <td>23.21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average for deprivation</td> <td>31.54%</td> <td>39.29%</td> <td>28.19%</td> <td>39.29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile for deprivation</td> <td>21.33%</td> <td>35.71%</td> <td>20.00%</td> <td>35.71%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Minimum Funding Guarantee</u>	Primary	Secondary	all schools	32.89%	19.64%	Above average FSM deprivation	46.98%	32.14%	Above upper quartile FSM deprivation	68.00%	50.00%	top 10% deprivation	76.30%	42.86%		(No transfer to high needs)		(With transfer to high needs)		Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	<u>% of schools gaining from lump sum protection)</u>					all schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.55%	23.21%	Above average for deprivation	31.54%	39.29%	28.19%	39.29%	Above upper quartile for deprivation	21.33%	35.71%	20.00%	35.71%
<u>Minimum Funding Guarantee</u>	Primary	Secondary																																											
all schools	32.89%	19.64%																																											
Above average FSM deprivation	46.98%	32.14%																																											
Above upper quartile FSM deprivation	68.00%	50.00%																																											
top 10% deprivation	76.30%	42.86%																																											
	(No transfer to high needs)		(With transfer to high needs)																																										
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary																																									
<u>% of schools gaining from lump sum protection)</u>																																													
all schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.55%	23.21%																																									
Above average for deprivation	31.54%	39.29%	28.19%	39.29%																																									
Above upper quartile for deprivation	21.33%	35.71%	20.00%	35.71%																																									
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>Again the proposal to set the minimum funding guarantee as high as possible is generally beneficial to schools with above average incidence of deprivation. The proposal to increase the lump sum is relatively beneficial to deprived secondary schools, but not to deprived primary schools</p>																																												

Page 393

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Inconclusive	As above	Uneven distribution of benefits will be accepted in order to assist small schools	N/a	N/a

Question	Answer
<p>What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of</p>	No

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	As above

3. Staff

Age

Question	Answer																																																					
<p>What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?</p>	<p>Some evidence on teacher ages is available from the DFE workforce survey. NB many of the staff affected work in academies, for which the council does not hold staffing data, hence the reliance on DfE data. For teachers we considered the incidence of teachers over 50 and under 30 in schools which benefited from the minimum funding guarantee and from an increase in the lump sum. The impact was inconclusive. Corresponding evidence is not published for support staff.</p> <p>Table below shows the proportion of schools on minimum funding guarantee</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>primary</th> <th>secondary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All schools</td> <td>32.89%</td> <td>19.64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average incidence teachers aged over 50</td> <td>34.23%</td> <td>17.86%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile teachers aged over 50</td> <td>38.67%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average incidence teachers aged under 30</td> <td>30.87%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile teachers aged under 30</td> <td>34.67%</td> <td>28.57%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table below shows the proportion of schools benefiting from an increase in lump sum</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">no transfer to high needs</th> <th colspan="2">with transfer to high needs</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>primary</th> <th>secondary</th> <th>primary</th> <th>secondary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All schools</td> <td>37.16%</td> <td>23.21%</td> <td>32.55%</td> <td>23.21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average incidence teachers aged over 50</td> <td>40.27%</td> <td>14.29%</td> <td>34.23%</td> <td>14.29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile teachers aged over 50</td> <td>48.00%</td> <td>14.29%</td> <td>41.33%</td> <td>14.29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average incidence teachers aged under 30</td> <td>26.17%</td> <td>25.00%</td> <td>24.16%</td> <td>25.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile teachers aged under 30</td> <td>21.33%</td> <td>42.86%</td> <td>20.00%</td> <td>42.86%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		primary	secondary	All schools	32.89%	19.64%	Above average incidence teachers aged over 50	34.23%	17.86%	Above upper quartile teachers aged over 50	38.67%	21.43%	Above average incidence teachers aged under 30	30.87%	21.43%	Above upper quartile teachers aged under 30	34.67%	28.57%		no transfer to high needs		with transfer to high needs			primary	secondary	primary	secondary	All schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.55%	23.21%	Above average incidence teachers aged over 50	40.27%	14.29%	34.23%	14.29%	Above upper quartile teachers aged over 50	48.00%	14.29%	41.33%	14.29%	Above average incidence teachers aged under 30	26.17%	25.00%	24.16%	25.00%	Above upper quartile teachers aged under 30	21.33%	42.86%	20.00%	42.86%
	primary	secondary																																																				
All schools	32.89%	19.64%																																																				
Above average incidence teachers aged over 50	34.23%	17.86%																																																				
Above upper quartile teachers aged over 50	38.67%	21.43%																																																				
Above average incidence teachers aged under 30	30.87%	21.43%																																																				
Above upper quartile teachers aged under 30	34.67%	28.57%																																																				
	no transfer to high needs		with transfer to high needs																																																			
	primary	secondary	primary	secondary																																																		
All schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.55%	23.21%																																																		
Above average incidence teachers aged over 50	40.27%	14.29%	34.23%	14.29%																																																		
Above upper quartile teachers aged over 50	48.00%	14.29%	41.33%	14.29%																																																		
Above average incidence teachers aged under 30	26.17%	25.00%	24.16%	25.00%																																																		
Above upper quartile teachers aged under 30	21.33%	42.86%	20.00%	42.86%																																																		

Question	Answer
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets (which may disproportionately affect staff in some age groups eg recent starters) and the distribution of funding may affect which, and how many, schools will be affected. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Inconclusive	Workforce survey evidence for teacher	n/a	n/a	n/a

Disability

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	This data is not held centrally for school staff.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Unable to identify -insufficient data held	N/a	N/a	n/a	n/a

Equality Impact Assessment

Gender reassignment

Page 397

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	This data is not held for school staff.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	There is no reason to think that staff with this protected characteristic will be disproportionately affected by the proposals, although it would be for individual schools to ensure that specific individuals were not disadvantaged..

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Unable to identify-insufficient data	N/a	n/a	n/a	

Page 398

Pregnancy/maternity

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	This data is not held for school staff.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Insufficient data to identify impact	N/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Race, including ethnicity or national origin, colour or nationality

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	Limited data is available for school staff from the workforce census

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer																																	
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.</p> <p>The table below shows that schools benefiting from the minimum funding guarantee in 2021/22 generally had a higher incidence of ethnic minority staff than those which did not benefit</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="566 427 1462 874"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Proportion of schools on minimum funding guarantee in 2021/22</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>primary</th> <th>Secondary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All schools</td> <td>32.89%</td> <td>19.64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Schools with</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average incidence of ethnic minority teachers</td> <td>38.93%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile incidence of ethnic minority teachers</td> <td>46.67%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average incidence of ethnic minority support staff</td> <td>34.23%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile incidence of ethnic minority support staff</td> <td>33.33%</td> <td>35.71%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Proportion of schools on minimum funding guarantee in 2021/22				primary	Secondary	All schools	32.89%	19.64%	Schools with			Above average incidence of ethnic minority teachers	38.93%	21.43%	Above upper quartile incidence of ethnic minority teachers	46.67%	21.43%	Above average incidence of ethnic minority support staff	34.23%	21.43%	Above upper quartile incidence of ethnic minority support staff	33.33%	35.71%									
	Proportion of schools on minimum funding guarantee in 2021/22																																	
	primary	Secondary																																
All schools	32.89%	19.64%																																
Schools with																																		
Above average incidence of ethnic minority teachers	38.93%	21.43%																																
Above upper quartile incidence of ethnic minority teachers	46.67%	21.43%																																
Above average incidence of ethnic minority support staff	34.23%	21.43%																																
Above upper quartile incidence of ethnic minority support staff	33.33%	35.71%																																
<p>The table below shows that the impact on schools with higher incidence of ethnic minority staff of increasing the lump sum is inconclusive.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="566 978 1709 1355"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">Without transfer to high needs block</th> <th colspan="2">With transfer to high needs block</th> </tr> <tr> <th>primary</th> <th>secondary</th> <th>primary</th> <th>secondary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>all schools</td> <td>37.16%</td> <td>23.21%</td> <td>32.55%</td> <td>23.21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average for ethnic minority teachers</td> <td>34.9%</td> <td>17.86%</td> <td>28.86%</td> <td>17.86%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile for ethnic min teachers</td> <td>40.00%</td> <td>21.43%</td> <td>32.00%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above average for ethnic minority support staff</td> <td>25.50%</td> <td>21.43%</td> <td>20.81%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above upper quartile for ethnic min support staff</td> <td>24.00%</td> <td>21.43%</td> <td>18.67%</td> <td>21.43%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Without transfer to high needs block		With transfer to high needs block		primary	secondary	primary	secondary	all schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.55%	23.21%	Above average for ethnic minority teachers	34.9%	17.86%	28.86%	17.86%	Above upper quartile for ethnic min teachers	40.00%	21.43%	32.00%	21.43%	Above average for ethnic minority support staff	25.50%	21.43%	20.81%	21.43%	Above upper quartile for ethnic min support staff	24.00%	21.43%	18.67%	21.43%
		Without transfer to high needs block		With transfer to high needs block																														
	primary	secondary	primary	secondary																														
all schools	37.16%	23.21%	32.55%	23.21%																														
Above average for ethnic minority teachers	34.9%	17.86%	28.86%	17.86%																														
Above upper quartile for ethnic min teachers	40.00%	21.43%	32.00%	21.43%																														
Above average for ethnic minority support staff	25.50%	21.43%	20.81%	21.43%																														
Above upper quartile for ethnic min support staff	24.00%	21.43%	18.67%	21.43%																														

Page 401

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
What impacts have you identified?	The proposal is generally beneficial to those schools with high incidence of this particular protected group	n/a	n/a	n/a

Question	Answer
What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of	n/a

Question	Answer
Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why	n/a

Religion or belief, including lack of belief

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	This data is not held for school staff.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	n/a

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Unable to identify as no data held	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Page 403

Sex

Question	Answer
<p>What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?</p>	<p>This data is not held for school staff.</p>
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.</p>

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Insufficient data	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Sexual Orientation

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	This data is not held for school staff.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Unable to identify impact as no data is available	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Marriage and civil partnerships

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	This data is not held for school staff.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Unable to identify as insufficient data held	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Carers (protected by association)

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?	This data is not held for school staff.
Impacts (Delete as applicable)	There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Unable to identify specific impacts as no data is held	m/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Page 407

Socio-economic disadvantage

Question	Answer
<p>What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?</p>	<p>This data is not held for school staff.</p>
<p>Impacts (Delete as applicable)</p>	<p>There is a potential impact in that changes in funding levels may affect scope for promotion or create pressure on staff budgets. Decisions as to which staff are affected would be a matter for individual schools.</p>

Impacts identified	Supporting evidence	How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
Insufficient data held	N/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

4. Amendments to the proposals

CHANGE	REASON FOR CHANGE
None yet	

5. Recommendation

Based your assessment, please indicate which course of action you are recommending to decision makers. You should explain your recommendation below.

17

Outcome Number	Description	Tick
Outcome One	No major change to the policy/service/function required.	
Outcome Two	Adjust the policy/service/function to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers you identified?	
Outcome Three	Continue the policy/service/function despite potential for negative impact or missed opportunities to advance equality identified. You will need to make sure the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You need to consider whether there are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient plans to stop or minimise the negative impact • Mitigating actions for any remaining negative impacts plans to monitor the actual impact. 	x
Outcome Four	Stop and rethink the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination (For guidance on what is unlawful discrimination, refer to the Equality and Human Rights Commission's guidance and Codes of Practice on the Equality Act concerning employment, goods and services and equal pay).	

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Answer
Confirmation and explanation of recommended outcome	This EIA considers two linked decisions. Neither has a direct impact on services to individual pupils but both will have an indirect impact based on the overall budget allocated to the school. The proposed changes to the level of the minimum funding guarantee are in general beneficial to those schools with a high incidence of those protected groups for which data is available. The proposed increase in lump sum is generally not as beneficial to such schools, but is still recommended as it is the only mechanism available within the available funding formula factors, to support small schools not meeting the DfE sparsity criteria. The proposed increase in lump sum has been supported by a lower increase in basic per pupil funding, rather than in additional needs funding. This has less impact on protected groups than almost any other means of funding the increase would have had.

6a. Version control

Version Number	Purpose/Change	Author	Date
0.1	Original	David Green	22 Oct 2021
0.2		Mary Burguieres/David Green	29 Oct 2021

The above provides historical data about each update made to the Equality Impact Assessment. Please do include the name of the author, date and notes about changes made – so that you are able to refer back to what changes have been made throughout this iterative process. For further information, please see the EIA Guidance document on version control.

6b. Approval

Approved by*	Date approved
Head of Service	
Executive Director	
Cabinet Member	
Directorate Equality Group	

EIA Author	
-------------------	--

*Secure approval from the appropriate level of management based on nature of issue and scale of change being assessed.

6c. EIA Team

Name	Job Title	Organisation	Team Role
David Green	Senior Finance Business Partner	Surrey County Council (Resources)	Author

If you would like this information in large print, Braille, on CD or in another language please contact us on:

Tel: 03456 009 009

Textphone (via Text Relay): 18001 03456 009 009

SMS: 07860 053 465

Email: contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank