

		AGENDA ITEM 3
		CYP/14/12
Committee:	Children and Young People Policy and Scrutiny Committee	
Date:	1 May 2012	
<u>Call in of a decision on approving changes to the Essex formula for funding schools (Ref FP/748/01/12)</u>		
Enquiries to:	Graham Redgwell, Governance Officer 01245 430360 or ext. 20360 grahamr@essex.gov.uk	

Councillor Higgins has called in this decision to approve the recommendations made by Schools' Forum to be made to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools (ref: FP/748/01/12). A copy of the decision notice is attached at Appendix A, together with the Notification of Call-In form at Appendix B.

In line with the procedure for handling the call in of a decision, an informal meeting was held on 16 April, and a note of that meeting is attached at Appendix C.

Following the informal meeting, Councillor Higgins confirmed that she did not wish to withdraw the call in, and therefore the matter stands referred to this Committee.

At today's meeting Councillor Higgins will be given the opportunity to make her case for calling in the decision. The Cabinet Member for Schools and the 2012 Olympics will then be given the opportunity to answer the case and seek to justify the proposed decision. The Committee will then have the opportunity to ask questions and decide the course of action.

Action required by the Committee:

Ultimately the Committee must decide what action it will wish to take in this matter. The options that are available to the Committee are set out in Part 20.14 of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules as follows:

- ‘(xiii) Having considered the decision, the Committee may refer it back to the decision taker setting out in writing its concerns or refer the matter to the full Council also with a record of its concerns. Upon a referral to a decision taker, the decision shall be reconsidered within five clear working days amending the decision or not before adopting a final decision.**
 - (xiv) If the Committee does not refer a decision to either the decision taker or the Council, the decision shall take effect at the conclusion of the meeting of the Committee.**
 - (xv) Following consideration of a call-in by the Committee, the Governance Officer will liaise with the Chairman and Group Spokespersons to agree the formal notification of its decision to go to the interested parties and, if the call-in is referred to Council, to agree the wording of the report to Council.**
 - (xvi) If, following a reference of a decision from an Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Council objects to that decision it will be referred to the decision taker together with the Council’s views. The decision taker will reconsider the decision within five clear working days deciding whether or not to amend the decision before implementing it.**
 - (xvii) If the Council does not refer a decision to a decision taker then the decision shall take effect at the conclusion of the meeting of the Council.**
 - (xviii) A request to call in a decision may be withdrawn at any time by those making the request.’**
-

Forward Plan Reference FP/748/01/12

**KEY DECISION TAKEN BY THE CABINET MEMBER FOR
EDUCATION & THE 2012 GAMES**

Originating Officer: Yannick Stupples-Whyley

Ext: 52171

Purpose of Report

To gain agreement on the changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools to enable the calculation of School Budget Shares for 2012/13.

To seek approval for additional financial protection for schools that are adversely affected by the changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools.

Decision:

I approve the recommendations made by Schools' Forum to be made to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools:

- To retain the current Primary / Secondary funding differential of 1:1.31;
- To increase the Primary Lump Sum to £77,448 and decrease the Secondary Lump Sum to £267,231;
- To revise the definition of a small school to less than 90 pupils on roll for an Infant School, to less than 120 pupils on roll for a Junior School and for less than 210 pupils on roll for a Primary School;
- To revise the Small Schools Factor to fund the actual pupils on roll on a sliding scale;
- To remove the Teaching Cost Adjustment factor;
- To deal with the Key Stage 1 Adjustment factor in year,
- To correct the SEN / AEN anomaly;
- To increase the SEN on-cost rate;
- To allocate the identified specific grants through the AEN factor;
- To allocate the identified specific grants through Key Stage Funding; and
- To retain the identified specific grants.

I approve the additional financial protection for schools described below.

Signature	Date
Cabinet Member for Education & The 2012 Games	
Cabinet Member for Children's Services Consultee in agreement	

Purpose of Key Decision and Decision Areas	<p>To report on the outcomes of the School Funding Consultation.</p> <p><u>Decision Areas</u></p> <p>The Decision Maker is asked to approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools; and • The additional protection for schools
Background, Context and Area of County Affected	<p>A review of the Essex Formula for Funding Schools was undertaken in 2010 by the Formula Review Working Group consisting of school members and external consultants. The review was suspended in September 2010 due to the uncertainty of the proposed National Funding Formula. The review was reconvened at the request of the Essex Schools' Forum in September 2011. The Specific Grants Review Group consisting of school members reviewed the previous work of the Formula Review Working Group and from this formed the consultation. Schools' Forum approved consultation and consultation was held with schools from mid November 2011 to early January 2012.</p> <p>In January 2012, the Essex Schools' Forum recommended the following changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase the Primary Lump Sum from £70,260 to £77,448; • To decrease the Secondary Lump Sum from £327,592 to £267,321; • To redefine a small school in the Primary sector as being either an infant school with less than 90

	<p>pupils on roll, a junior school with less than 120 pupils on roll or a primary school with less than 210 pupils on roll;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To change the funding methodology of a small school; • To remove the Teaching Cost Adjustment funding factor from the Formula; • To fund the Key Stage 1 class size adjustment on actual numbers; • To correct the SEN/AEN anomaly; • To increase the on-cost rate for SEN statements to 21%; • To allocate former specific grants associated with deprivation through AEN funding; and • To distribute former specific grants calculated on a per pupil basis through Key Stage Funding. <p>The Local Authority considered the recommendations of the Essex Schools' Forum and other representations made and decided to accept the recommendations of Schools' Forum with two variations.</p> <p>The first variation is to not make any representation to the Secretary of State to exclude Behaviour Improvement and Excellence in Cities funding from the calculation of the minimum funding guarantee.</p> <p>The second variation is for additional financial protection from the County Council so that no school will lose more than 1.5% of their 2011/12 budget share.</p> <p>The revised proposals were consulted with the Essex Schools' Forum on 8th February 2012. Schools' Forum re-recommended the proposed changes made in January 2012. Schools' Forum was against the proposal not to make any reference to the Secretary of State and agreed to note the proposal for additional protection from the County Council.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference for Schools' Forum state that it is a statutory body that must be consulted with on changes to the funding formula. Schools' Forum is an elected body that represents all schools including academies in Essex.</p> <p>The additional financial protection for schools protects schools from losing more than 1.5% of their funding from the changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools. The protection is a fixed pot and is subject to a National Funding Review or any advantageous change in a</p>
--	--

	<p>school's profile. The cost of protection is £3.605 million.</p> <p>Areas of the County Affected</p> <p>All.</p>
Options / Proposals	In order to distribute funding equitably to all pupils Schools' Forum are proposing to change the Essex Formula for Funding Schools.
Conclusions	<p>Schools' Forum has voted in favour of the proposed changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools.</p> <p>Following consultation with schools and representations made, the Local Authority is proposing additional protection for schools.</p>
Relevance to ECC's Corporate Plan and other Strategic Plans	<p>Supporting all strands of Every Child Matters and the Children's and Young Peoples Commissioning Strategy contributes to the following ECC strategic objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling every individual to achieve their ambitions by supporting a world-class education and skills offer in the county.
Internal and External Consultation	The proposed changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools has been consulted with Schools' Forum, Primary and Secondary schools, governors and the Political Leadership Team. Briefings were held with headteachers and consultation meetings were held across the County.
Legal Implications (Monitoring Officer)	<p>The necessary consultations were carried out in accordance with Regulations, and an Equality Impact Assessment of the effect of the proposals has been completed. In the longer term there may be staffing issues for community schools affected by these proposals; the local authority is the employer of staff at community schools.</p> <p>Essex County Council (ECC) has a statutory duty to arrange the SEN provision identified in individual children's statements of Special Educational Needs (SEN). At the moment ECC asks schools to pay for the first five hours of such provision from the schools budget. These proposals will change that to the first twelve and a half hours. Some schools will therefore see a drop in the figure that they receive for statemented pupils.</p>

Finance and Resources Implications (Section 151 Officer).	<p>The proposed changes to the Essex Formula for Funding Schools have no affect on the overall funding for schools. The proposals will distribute funding in a different way to the current funding formula and will result in some schools losing funding and some schools gaining funding. The minimum funding guarantee will protect schools from the majority of the proposed changes. The proposed additional protection will protect schools that are adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>Whilst a national consultation is ongoing about a move towards a national funding formula, it is envisaged that there will still be the need for a local funding formula in the next few financial years.</p>
Human Resource Implications	Changes in school funding may lead to schools needing to make longer term decisions on staffing levels.
Equality Impact Assessment	An Equality Impact Assessment has been conducted. The changes to the Formula for Funding Schools will have impact upon disability, gender and socio-economic inequalities. The impact will be mitigated by additional financial protection for schools that are adversely affected by the changes.
Background Papers	<p>Consultation Document</p> <p>Schools' Forum Report 11th January 2012</p> <p>Minutes of Schools' Forum 11th January 2012</p> <p>Schools' Forum Report 8th February 2012</p> <p>Draft Minutes of Schools' Forum 8th February 2012</p> <p>Equality Impact Assessment Section 1</p> <p>Equality Impact Assessment Section 2</p>

Title of service being assessed	School Funding Formula Review
Directorate	School's Children & Families
Name and role of officer completing this assessment	Terry Reynolds
Contact Telephone Number	01245 436031
Date Assessment Completed	19 th October 2011

1. What are the aims and objectives of this service, policy or function? (e.g. what is the likely impact and the relevance?- State whether this EIA relates to an existing, to a proposed change or new service, policy or function and include whether any changes are linked to an efficiency programme)

The objective of the Formula for Funding Schools is to equitably distribute funding for all Essex pupils. It is prudent to undertake frequent reviews to ensure the current formula is distributing funding equitably and to propose changes where necessary.

A review of the Formula for Funding Schools was undertaken in 2010. The Formula Review Working Group consisted of school representatives who worked with independent consultants. A range of formula distribution factors were reviewed and recommendations for changes to the Formula were made. This EIA is to understand the impact of the revised Funding Formula upon Schools.

Schools' Forum approved the Consultation Paper and the consultation will be held with schools and governors during November and December 2011. The results of the consultation will be presented to Schools' Forum in February 2012 and they will make their recommendations to Cllr Castle of the changes to be made to the Formula.

The key changes that impact upon schools is a change in the way small schools are funded, the correction of the Special Educational Needs / Additional Educational Needs funding anomaly and a change to the methodology of distribution of former specific grants targeted at disadvantage (formerly Excellence in Cities [EiC] and Behaviour Improvement Project [BIP] specific grants which have been mainstreamed in to school budgets).

The proposed changes for small schools include redefining a small school and changing the way small schools are funded. The view of the consultants was that Essex generously funded small schools in comparison with other LAs. The first change is to redefine a small school. Currently any school in the primary sector is defined as a small school if there are fewer than 210 pupils on roll. The revised definition is any Infant school with fewer than 90 pupils, any Junior school with fewer than 120 pupils or any Primary school with fewer than 210 pupils. As a result of the revised definition, 66 schools will no longer be classified as a small school. The second change is to change the way the Small Schools Factor is funded. Currently schools are funded at £209 per pupil for the difference between 210 and the number of pupils on roll. The revised funding methodology funds the number of pupils on roll on a sliding scale, where the smaller the school the greater amount per pupil funding received. The affect of the changes reduces funding for small schools.

The second key change is the correction of the Special Educational Needs / Additional Educational Needs anomaly. In 2008 the new funding formula for pupils with Additional Educational Needs was put in place. As a result of the new formula, an unforeseen anomaly was introduced. In addition to the 5 hours of support delivered through the Key Stage Funding unit, 7.5 hours of support was met through the Additional Educational Needs factor for ALL pupils with Special Educational Needs. However, pupils in receipt of more than 12 hours support have attracted funding for ALL hours in excess of 5 through the Special Educational Needs factor. This represents over funding of 7.5 hours for pupils and students with complex and severe needs and an underfunding of up to 7.5 hours for pupils with Moderate Learning

Difficulties or those on School Action or School Action Plus. The correction moves £4.293 million from Primary Specialist Educational Needs funding to Primary Additional Educational Needs funding and £3.835 million from Secondary Special Educational Needs funding to Secondary Additional Educational Needs funding. Data on outcomes for pupils in these categories show that pupils with statements achieve in line with similar pupils nationally and in statistical neighbour authorities. However, pupils identified as requiring School Action or School Action plus achieve less well than such groups national and in statistical neighbour authorities. The redistribution of funding should enable schools better to meet the needs of this disadvantaged group. High incidence, low level additional needs are strongly co-associated with areas of deprivation.

The third change is the distribution of former Excellence in Cities and Behaviour Improvement Project funds. When these were established they were distributed to specific schools. When they were mainstreamed in 2011 distribution was made on the basis of replicating the cash sums such schools would have received for one year only while a new methodology was agreed. In line with original intentions of the grant, it was agreed that a cash equivalent sum would be distributed using the Additional Educational Needs formula (a proxy indicator for deprivation). This meant that a cash sum would go to all schools on a per pupil basis where pupils met the Additional Educational Needs criteria, rather than to schools that had previously received the grant irrespective of the numbers of pupils meeting the criteria for Additional Educational Needs.

The minimum funding guarantee currently protects schools from losing more than -1.5% per pupil year on year. However the minimum funding guarantee does not cover volatile funding factors such as Special Educational Needs funding and therefore the correction of the Special Educational Needs anomaly could result in schools losing more than -1.5% funding.

The cumulative effect of all of the proposed changes together could result in some small schools losing a substantial percentage of their revenue budget in a single year-on-year change for which they would have had little opportunity to plan.

2a. Which strategic objective does this service support? Please state	2b. Is this service provided under a statutory or discretionary duty? Please state
Enabling every individual to achieve their ambitions by supporting a world class education and skills offer in the county.	Statutory
<p>2c Please state whether this EIA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support a business case development, • provide evidence for scrutiny decisions, • provide evidence to support policy, functions or service reviews and efficiency programmes <p>*Note all papers for presented for scrutiny and business case development require, as a minimum, a supporting Section One EIA form. (screening)</p>	
Support a Key Decision	
3. Describe which policies and/or guidelines control how you deliver the service and who is eligible to receive it?	

Every Local Authority (LA) that has responsibility for education must have a Formula for Funding Schools. Any changes that the LA proposes to make to the Formula must be consulted with schools and Schools' Forum.

4. Now think about how you actually deliver the service, for example how do people find out about your service? How do they access or use it? Most teams have developed processes to allow them to deliver their service efficiently. Describe all processes here:

School Funding is discussed with Schools' Forum and schools are notified of their budget shares annually by 31st March each year. In addition, headteacher meetings are regularly briefed on budget issues and the council's website carries minutes and decisions of Schools' Forum meetings

5. Could anything in the existing/ proposed policy, service or function mean that any group could be excluded or disadvantaged (albeit inadvertently)? To help you make this decision think about the governance and delivery of your service in respect of each of the equality protected characteristics (groups), list below brief notes outlining the negative impacts that the service may have on each group. Determine how detrimental these impacts are in accessing services and/or engaging with ECC. High, Medium or Low impact? E.g. High relevance may allude to Discriminatory actions such as inability to access service or undue difficulty in accessing services.

a. **Race and Culture-** Black, Asian and Minority ethnic groups including Gypsies, Roma and Travellers
No impact

b. **Age-** including older and younger people
No impact

c. **Sexual Orientation-** Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People
No impact

d. **Disabled people**
Formal consultation will determine how this will impact upon children. There are 6,642 pupils with Statements of Special Educational Needs within Essex.

e. **Carers**
Young carers with SEN/ AEN may require additional support.

f. **Gender-** Men and Women
The correction of the Special Educational Needs / Additional Educational Needs anomaly will impact more on males as there are more male pupils (4,957) with a statement of special educational needs than female pupils (1,685).

g **Gender reassignment** – including transgendered people
No impact

<p>h. Pregnancy and maternity No impact</p>
<p>i. Marital Status and Civil Partnership No impact</p>
<p>j. Religion and Belief No impact</p>
<p>k. Addressing Socio- economic and / or health inequalities Will target money at schools where pupils from deprived backgrounds attend based on their actual numbers. The correction of the Special Educational Needs and Additional Educational Needs anomaly will have a positive impact on the majority of schools in Basildon, Colchester, Epping, Harlow and Tendring, a neutral impact on schools in Brentwood, Castle Point and Rochford, where there is a marginal difference between the number of schools positively or negatively impacted, and a negative impact on the majority of schools in Braintree, Chelmsford, Maldon and Uttlesford. Individual schools may have a significant positive or negative impact from the proposal.</p>
<p>6. Your Service may already be meeting the needs of the equality strands in some areas. Please list, group by group, the positive actions you have already taken to address possible inequality.</p>
<p>a. Race and Culture- Black, Asian and Minority ethnic groups including Gypsies, Roma and Travellers</p> <p>Schools receive additional funding outside of their Budget Share for ethnic minority pupils and bi-lingual pupils.</p>
<p>b. Age- including older and younger people N/A</p>
<p>c. Sexual Orientation- Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People N/A</p>
<p>d. Disabled people Schools receive additional funding to make adaptations to enable disabled pupils to have full access to the school curriculum</p>
<p>e. Carers N/A</p>
<p>f. Gender- Men and Women N/A</p>
<p>g Gender reassignment - including transgendered people N/A</p>

<p>h. Pregnancy and maternity N/A</p>
<p>i. Marital Status and Civil Partnership N/A</p>
<p>j. Religion and Belief N/A</p>
<p>k. Addressing Socio- economic and / or health inequalities The Additional Educational Needs factor uses areas of economic disadvantage (based on the IDACI scores and prior attainment) to provide additional revenue to schools with less advantaged pupil cohorts.</p>

Conclusion of section 1: You should now have a clear idea of why your service, policy or function is provided by Essex County Council, you should have spent some time thinking about the equality groups and how your service might impact on them, or perhaps why members of these groups are less able to make the best use of the service. Please give a summary of your conclusions and assess the EIA status as High, Medium or Low. The next stage for a High or Medium EIA is to consider the data you could use to help you to support or dispute your initial conclusions. Think about how you will collect this data and/or how you will check your presumptions by consulting with our communities.

Complete the consultation and data plans below. Identify the sorts of data you need and the questions that you need answer to. If you feel that particular organisations or community/ voluntary groups will be able to help you please list these too.

Summary – High/medium impact – Please proceed to gather further data (if necessary) and all High EIAs need to progress to a section 2 EIA.

Concluding Remarks- The full impact of the changes to the Formula for Funding Schools will be analysed from the data collected from the consultation with Schools and Schools' Forum. It can be seen that that the key formula proposals will have impact upon disabled pupils, gender and socio-economic equalities.

Please submit this form to the equalities team: equalities@essex.gov.uk

Title of service being assessed	School Funding Formula
Directorate	Schools, Children & Families
Name and role of officer completing this assessment	Terry Reynolds
Contact Telephone Number	01245 436031
Date Assessment Completed	8 th February 2012

1. Which equality strands have you included in your data collection/ analysis and consultations?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Race and Culture | <input type="checkbox"/> Gender reassignment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age | <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy and Maternity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> Marital Status and Civil Partnership |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Religion and Belief |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Socio- economic and/ or health inequalities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. rural isolation) |

2. What are the key findings/ observations resulting from the data/ consultations? Please include all findings that demonstrate inequality...You may wish to record inequality issues for additional groups (for example rural isolation, financially disadvantaged etc) please do this using box g.

a. Race and Culture

b. Age

c. Sexual Orientation

d. Disability

Of the consultation responses received 72% of respondents or 14% of total schools were against the proposal to correct the Special Educational Needs and Additional Educational Needs anomaly, as respondents felt that the Additional Educational Needs allocation formula has no relationship with individual children and the proposals severely disadvantage schools with good attainment, low deprivation and a high number of students with statements of special educational needs. The response rate was primarily received from Small Schools from across the County. The financial impact on schools is that the cost of 7.5 hours for each statement to be funded from Additional Educational Needs Funding is £3,307.50.

e. Carers

f.. Gender

Of the consultation responses received 72% of respondents or 14% of total schools were against the proposal to correct the Special Educational Needs and Additional Educational Needs anomaly, as respondents felt that the Additional Educational Needs allocation formula has no relationship with individual children and the proposals severely disadvantage schools with good attainment, low deprivation and a high number of students with statements of special educational needs. The response rate was primarily received from Small Schools from across the County. The financial

impact on schools is that the cost of 7.5 hours for each statement to be funded from Additional Educational Needs Funding is £3,307.50.

g. Gender reassignment

h. Pregnancy and maternity

i. Marital Status and Civil Partnership

j. Religion and Belief

k. Addressing Socio economic and / or health inequalities

Of the consultation responses received 72% of respondents or 14% of total schools were against the proposal to correct the Special Educational Needs and Additional Educational Needs anomaly, as respondents felt that the Additional Educational Needs allocation formula has no relationship with individual children and the proposals severely disadvantage schools with good attainment, low deprivation and a high number of students with statements of special educational needs. The response rate was primarily received from Small Schools from across the County. The financial impact on schools is that the cost of 7.5 hours for each statement to be funded from Additional Educational Needs Funding is £3,307.50.

Of the consultation responses received 46% of respondents or 10% of total schools were against the proposal to redistribute Behaviour Improvement Project and Excellence in Cities funding through the Additional Educational Needs factor, as respondents felt that the Additional Educational Needs Formula is not an appropriate way to distribute the funding. Behaviour Improvement Project and Excellence in Cities funding was targeted at schools in Basildon, Harlow and Tendring. Distributing the funding through the Additional Educational Needs formula will distribute funding to all schools, with 50% of the funding distributed through the IDACI index. The schools currently in receipt of this funding will lose the funding currently received but will gain a smaller allocation through the Additional Educational Needs funding.

l Other (e.g. rural isolation)

Of the consultation responses received 49% of respondents or 9% of total schools were against the redefinition of a small school. Of the consultation responses received 46% of respondents or 9% of total schools were against the proposal to change the way in which small schools are funded as respondents felt that the changes would have a dramatic effect upon small schools.

3. We have a duty to promote equal opportunities and promote good relations between community groups as well as eliminate discrimination. Please list below any opportunities to promote equal opportunities or good community relations within your review area.

Equality Group	Opportunity

4. Adverse impacts and/or inequalities in policy or service delivery that need to be resolved or mitigated. It is likely that you will have more than one possible solution for each issue

a. Race

Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions

b. Age

Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions

c. Sexual Orientation

Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions

d. Disability

Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions
Correction of Special Educational Needs and Additional Educational Needs Anomaly	Financial protection to enable schools time to plan necessary changes.

e Carers

Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions

f. Gender

Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions
Correction of Special Educational Needs and Additional Educational Needs Anomaly	<p>Financial protection to enable schools time to plan necessary changes. Schools that are adversely affected by the changes to the Formula for Funding Schools will receive financial protection as follows:</p> <p>Schools with a loss > -1.5% and < -3% 1 year protection Loss > -3% and < -4.5% 2 years protection Loss > -4.5% and < -6% 3 years protection Loss > -6% and < -7.5% 4 years protection Loss > -7.5% 5 years protection.</p> <p>Additional funding received by schools will be the amount required to ensure the loss in year 1 is no more than -1.5% of 2011/12.</p>

g. Gender reassignment

Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions

h. Pregnancy and maternity

Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions
i. Marital Status and Civil Partnership	
Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions
j. Religion and belief	
Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions
Mainstream Excellence in Cities and Behaviour Improvement Funding for all schools not just schools in Harlow, Basildon and Tendring	Use the minimum funding guarantee to protect schools affected to ensure there is no significant loss of funding. The minimum funding guarantee is statutory and ensures schools lose no more than -1.5% of its previous year's funding with the exception of volatile changes such as SEN funding and declining pupil rolls.
k. Addressing Socio economic and/ or health inequalities	
Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions
l Other	
Adverse Impact and/or inequality	Possible Solutions
Impact on Small Schools	Financial protection to enable schools time to plan necessary changes.

5. You now need to complete the action plan. You need to prioritise the work that needs to be done. If you have found any adverse impact or discrimination that is illegal you must address these immediately and therefore they will be top priority in your action plans. The notes for guidance will help you to prioritise your other actions. If there are areas which you feel need to be looked at in more detail then the resulting action may be an additional EIA focussing on a specific area of concern.

IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Please list the actions that you need to take as a result of this assessment. Directors will need to decide how these actions will be prioritised.

Issue Identified	Issues taken from question 4	Action Required – agreed solution	Name of service /unit/ individual's work plan where action will be included.	Officers responsible – Directorate Lead and Action Lead	Details of Cost – inc. Resource & financial	By when
1 Impact on Small Schools	Loss of funding for small schools	Additional financial protection.	Finance	Lead Yannick Stupples-Whyley Action Lisa Stobbie	£3.6m	Over 5 years
2 Correction of Special Educational Needs and Additional Educational Needs Anomaly	Loss of funding for some schools	Additional financial protection.	Finance	Lead Yannick Stupples-Whyley Action Lisa Stobbie	As above	Over 5 years
3 Allocate Behaviour Improvement Project and Excellence in Cities funding to all schools	Loss of funding for schools in Basildon, Harlow and Tendring	Protect funding through the minimum funding guarantee	Finance	Lead Yannick Stupples-Whyley Action Lisa Stobbie	Funded within the overall resources for schools.	March 2012

4						
5						
6						

Further EIAs Required			
Subject	Planned Date	Lead Officer	Action Officer

This action plan needs to be agreed with your Director and Service Manager and actions included in the appropriate service or unity plans.

Signature of Executive Director/ Director.....

Signature of Service Manager.....