

# SCHOOLS FORUM

THURSDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 2021

At 2.00 pm

by

VIRTUAL MEETING - ONLINE ACCESS, ON [RBWM YOUTUBE](#)

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

### PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
7.	<u>SCHOOL BUDGET CONSULTATION 2022/23</u> To receive the above report.	3 - 22

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Provisional Dedicated Schools Grant & Schools Formula 2022/23
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Stuart Carroll - Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health
Meeting and Date:	Schools Forum 18 November 2021
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel – Executive Director of Children's Services James Norris - Head of Finance Achieving for Children (RBWM)
Wards affected:	All

## REPORT SUMMARY

*The purpose of this report is:*

- 1 *To inform the Schools Forum of the provisional settlement for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) 2022/23 across the four elements of the Schools Block, Central School Services Block, High Needs Block and Early Years Block.*
- 2 *To discuss with the Schools Forum the RBWM proposals for the 2022/23 Schools Formula consultation.*
- 3 *To inform the Schools Forum of the latest position in respect of the School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant for 2022/23 and onwards.*

## 1 DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION

**Recommendation: That the Schools Forum:**

**notes and provides comments on the contents of this report; options for the allocation of headroom and proposed consultation questions**

## 2 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

### 2.1 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

- 2.2 The Government published details of the latest 2022/23 provisional DSG grant settlement in July 2021. The information contained in this report is based on the most up to date information available from the ESFA at the time of writing and reflects the impact of the July 2021 announcements.

### 2.3 BACKGROUND

- 2.4 School Funding is received through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), and is split into four blocks, each with its own formula to calculate the funding to be distributed to each local authority.

- Schools Block – funds mainstream primary and secondary schools through the school formula, and growth funding for new growing schools/bulge classes
- High Needs Block – funds places in special schools, resource units and alternative provision, and top up funding for pupils with EHCPs in all settings including non-maintained, independent, and further education colleges
- Early Years Block – funds nursery schools, nursery classes in mainstream schools, and early year’s settings in the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector through the free entitlement for 2, 3 & 4 year olds
- Central Schools Services Block – funds services provided by the local authority centrally for all schools, such as the admissions service

- 2.5 The Government announced the school funding arrangements for the schools, high needs and central blocks in July 2021..
- 2.6 Arrangements for the early years block are not made until later in the academic year.
- 2.7 The DSG must be deployed in accordance with the conditions of grant and the latest School and Early Years Finance (England) Regulations. Detailed guidance is contained within various operational guidance documents issued by the Education Funding & Skills Agency (EFSA). The latest Operational guidance can be found at the following link:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pre-16-schools-funding-local-authority-guidance-for-2022-to-2023/schools-operational-guide-2022-to-2023>
- 2.8 This report sets out the provisional settlement for 2022/23 and specific considerations for the Schools Funding Consultation.

### **3 DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT FUNDING 2022/23**

- 3.1 The gross provisional DSG notification sent out to local authorities in July 2021 is set out in Table 1.
- 3.2 Table 1 sets out the DSG funding RBWM receives in respect of the schools, central and high needs blocks for 2021/22 compared to the latest provisional allocations for 2022/23.
- 3.3 The March 2022 DSG notification will inform Local Authorities of the final EFSA deduction to be made at source for allocations direct to Colleges and Academy schools. The notification will change the net funding estimate due to RBWM. Table 1 sets out the breakdown of the Provisional DSG for 2022/23 as at July 2021.

**Table 1: Comparison of DSG Block Funding 2021/22 to 2022/23**

<b>Dedicated Schools Grant - Gross</b>						
Block	Current 2021/22 £'000	Provisional 2022/23 £'000	Movement		Note	
			£'000	%		
Schools	98,931	101,915	2,984	3.02%	1	
High Needs	24,516	26,220	1,704	6.95%		
Central Schools Services	1,097	1,040	( 57 )	-5.20%	2	
<b>Sub total</b>	124,544	129,175	4,631	3.72%		
Indicative Early Years	9,697	TBC				
Schools Growth Fund	679	TBC			3	
<b>Gross DSG</b>	134,920					
Recoupment	(62,098)	TBC				
Direct Funding	(2,754)	TBC				
<b>Net DSG</b>	70,068					
Notes	<p>1. Increase in per pupil funding from £4,973 to £5,134 . 3.23% increase                  2. Ongoing central block historic elements funding reduction of 20%                  3. Pupil Growth funding to be set on October 21 data later this year.</p>					

## 4 SCHOOL FUNDING

### School Funding Overview

4.1 In 2022 to 2023, as in previous years, each local authority is to continue to set a local schools funding formula, in consultation with local schools. In July 2021, the DfE published a consultation on proposals for completing reforms of the funding system, whereby individual schools budgets would be set directly through one single national formula, rather than local funding formulae. This consultation proposes that, from 2023/2024, local authorities will be required to bring their own formulae closer to the schools NFF, to smooth the transition. These requirements do not apply in 2022/2023, but local authorities can choose to move their local formulae closer to the NFF in advance of 2023/24.

The schools national funding formula (NFF) has been updated for 2022/23 with new factor values.

4.2 The key changes are:

- The core factors in the NFF ( such as basic per pupil funding, additional needs and deprivation) will increase by 3%.
- The minimum per pupil funding levels (MPPL) will increase by 2%, compared to 2021/22.
- As a result of the 2% uplift in MPPL each primary school will receive at least £4,265 per pupil, and every Secondary school at least £5,525.

### School Funding Guarantees

4.3 In addition to the main factors listed in the formula for schools funding there are two school funding guarantees. All local authorities apply these guarantees unless a decision is made by the authority to consider and request disapplication from the DfE.

4.4 The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) is a per pupil protection to ensure funding between years does not decrease below a certain percentage. A range of 0.5% to 2% per pupils is set by the ESFA. NFF is currently set at 2% and the RBWM local formula at +0.5%.

4.5 The Minimum per pupil level funding (MPPL) is a guarantee that for every pupil on roll the school receives a minimum amount via the pupil led factors within the formula. Table 2 sets out 2022/23 rates per sector. The minimum funding per pupil for primary and secondary is a compulsory factor.

**Table 2: DSG Minimum Per Pupil Funding Levels**

Year Groups	Minimum Per Pupil Funding Levels £
Primary	4,265
KS3	5,321
KS4	5,831

## **RBWM Schools Formula and Consultation Proposals**

- 4.6 Operational guidance advises on the allowable formula factors to be incorporated into the local formula. It states which are optional and those that are compulsory factors.
- 4.7 RBWM along with many other local Authorities, run a local formula and have been working towards changing formula unit rates to move closer to or mirror, the NFF. Each year each local authority consults with the Schools Forum and the individual schools on proposals to change the local formula.
- 4.8 Currently RBWM formula factors are at full NFF and area cost adjustment for all but FSM (Ever6), Secondary IDACI bands A and the lump sum. The lump sum is currently below NFF for both sectors . The majority of the deprivation factors are above NFF (+ ACA). The IDACI 'Band A' and 'Band B' RBWM unit rates for 2021/22 are below NFF + ACA, however these band did not include any eligible children and therefore had no financial impact for the schools.
- 4.9 In consideration of previous Schools Forum decisions it is proposed that consultation with schools will focus on formula changes with the minimum volatility for the financial year 2022/23. The final consultation documents will be sent out later this term to head teachers and governors.
- 4.10 Within this report are details of the proposed changes to the local formula for 2022/23 financial year. Appendice 1 details the updated NFF rates including inflation, the current years formula unit rates for RBWM and the proposed unit rate changes.
- 4.11 In the consultation the proposal is to ask schools 6 in principle questions relating to the minor formula changes. Changes per school on an individual model basis will not be published. With significant changes in pupil numbers between the two counts the APT template pre populated with Oct 2020 data would be misleading. Appendices 1 and 2 detail the current unit rates and proposals for 2022/23 financial year.
- 4.12 The formula changes proposed include; updating the RBWM factors currently on 2021/22 NFF unit rates including Area Cost Adjustment (ACA) to the 2022/23 NFF rates plus ACA. Updating these unit rates should help to ensure that the Minimum per pupil level funding guarantee are met in full. MPPL is a mandatory factor and the minimum amounts listed in table 2 must be met.
- 4.13 Once pupil data sets are updated to reflect the October 2021 Census, and the unit rates updated then first call on 'headroom' is to increase the per school Lump sum for both sectors, to bring the minimum amount up to the published 2022/23 NFF, including ACA. If sufficient funds are available after the cost of Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) and MPPL. This increase will benefit all schools, including those in receipt of MFG top ups. Please see table 3 options A & B.
- 4.14 Second call options for any remaining headroom after increasing the lumps sum to the NFF unit rate for 2022/23, are listed in the table below.

Table 3 Headroom Options

Options	2021-22	2022-23	Increase	Oct 2020 data	2022-23
Use of Headroom Funding	RBWM Unit Rate	Proposed Unit Rate	Movement In Unit Rate	Estimated Total Cost	Published NFF & ACA
	£	£	£	£	£
A) Lump sum per school - NFF	123,965	128,263	4,298	257,910	128,263
B) Lump sum per school - Above NFF	123,965	132,972	9,007	540,441	128,263
C) FSM Ever 6 - Secondary to NFF	908.00	914.65	6.65	8,350	914.65
D) IDACI Band A - Primary to NFF	600.00	676.74	76.74	0	676.74
E) IDACI Band A - Secondary to NFF	840.00	941.09	101.09	0	941.09
F) IDACI Band B - Secondary to NFF	730.15	740.18	10.03	0	740.18

- 4.15 Looked after Children (LAC) formula factor is an optional factor. In recent years the unit rate for this factor has been decreased as RBWM worked towards meeting the NFF expected hard formula, which the implementation of which has been delay for a number of years. Senior officers this year do not propose to change LAC unit rate and LAC is to remain the same level as for 2021/22, to assist schools with the challenges that have arisen since on the pandemic. The 2021/22 consultation outcome responses demonstrated that 92% of schools agreed to maintain 2020/21 rates and schools had reflected on the COVID pandemic expressing this cohort of pupils needed continued additional support

#### Minimum Funding Guarantee

- 4.16 The School funding operational guidance states that Local Authorities can set the minimum funding guarantee (MFG) percentage between +0.5% & to 2.0%. For 2021/22 financial year RBWM consulted on changes to the proposed MFG percentage and received a clear steer from the Schools Forum for the local formula MFG to remain at +0.5%. We are required to consult each year on this element of the formula. In the consultation questions it will state that RBWM proposes to hold MFG at +0.5% for 2022/23 and ask if schools are in agreement.
- 4.17 Currently 5 schools are in receipt of MFG Top ups at a cost of £91,578. Increasing MFG to 2.0% would have increased the cost to an estimated value of £217,500.

#### Appendices

- 4.18 Appendix 1 to this report details the:
- local formula funding factors for 2021/22
  - NFF increases for 2022/23 along with the increases for the Area Cost adjustment (ACA)

- 4.19 Appendix 2 lists the 2022/23 NFF unit rates including ACA, the proposed RBWM local formula unit rates and options for the use of any headroom funding.

## **5 School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant**

- 5.1 The government have recently released a statement and consultation relating to possible changes to the funding arrangements for the School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering grant.
- 5.2 The proposals being consulted on are the removal of the School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant (the Grant), and the making of provision for funding of local authority school improvement activity via de-delegation from budget shares. The government anticipates that this will give more control (via Schools Forums) to school leaders, and will mean that the maintained sector reflects the approach taken by most Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs), supporting the government's "longer-term ambition for all schools to become academies within a strong MAT" so that councils no longer maintain schools.
- 5.3 The consultation is proposing the full removal of the Grant from 1 April 2023, with a 50% reduction from 1 April 2022. The regulations allowing de-delegation would be in place from 1 April 2022. RBWM is currently in receipt of £144,739 grant for the financial year 2021/22. If the grant reduces by 50% for 2022/23 the estimated cost of de delegation for 2022/23, based on the October 2020 maintained pupil numbers, is £10 per pupil.
- 5.4 The consultation can be found at the following link:  
<https://consult.education.gov.uk/simb-grant-team/local-authority-school-improvement-funding-reform/>.
- 5.5 Closing date for all responses is the 26<sup>th</sup> November 2021; Achieving for Children will submit a response on behalf of the Local Authority.

## **6 CONSULTATION**

- 6.1 As part of the consultation a document providing guidance, context and the process for submission will be distributed to all schools by 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2021. The local authority will accept one response per school.
- 6.2 The results of the consultation will be shared at the Schools Forum on the 16<sup>th</sup> December 2021. At this meeting the proposed annual de-delegation funding unit rates will be proposed for agreement.
- 6.3 The final decision to agree the 2022/23 formula funding is the responsibility of the Local Authority officers and Lead Member.
- 6.4 The Local Authority is required to submit the draft Authority Pro-forma Tool (APT) to the Education Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) in January 2022 demonstrating the proposed application of the schools block funding for the 2022/23 financial year.
- 6.5 This formula will be subject to ratification by the Council on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2022.

- 6.6 Proposed questions to be included in the schools consultation document are as follows:

*Question 1:*

It is proposed that the the LAC unit rate is to remain at the same level as for 2021/22. This proposal helps assist schools with the challenges that have arisen since the pandemic. *Do you support the Looked after Children (LAC) formula factor remaining at the current unit rate?*

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Not sure
- d) Comments

*Question 2:*

*Do you agree that headroom funding should be targeted at the school lump sum per school? Increasing the lump sum upto or above NFF level for 2022/23, if sufficient funds are available after meeting the minimum per pupil levels (MPPL).*

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Not sure
- d) Comments

*Question 3:*

*Do you support increasing FSM Ev6 Secondary unit rate to NFF level for 2022/23? If sufficient headroom is available.*

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Not sure
- d) Comments

*Question 4*

*Do you support increasing the IDACI bands A and B unit rates to NFF levels? Ensuring that any children in the most deprived bands will in future be funded at the minimum of NFF. If not, please provide comments.*

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Not sure
- d) Comments

*Question 5:*

*Do you agree that the Minimum Funding Guarantee top up should remain at +0.5%?*

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Not sure
- d) Other rate; please state
- e) Comments

*Question 6 :*

*Would you support the continuation of the School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering service at the current level via de delegation?*

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Not sure
- d) Comments

## **7 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

## **8 RISK MANAGEMENT**

8.1 There are no potential risks arising from this report.

## **9 POTENTIAL IMPACTS**

9.1 Equalities. Equality Impact Assessments are published on the council's website. The Equality Act 2010 places a statutory duty on the council to ensure that when considering any new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure the impacts on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups, have been considered. There are no Equalities. Equality Impact risks arising from this report.

9.2 Climate change/sustainability. There are no climate change/ sustainability risks arising from this report.

9.3 Data Protection/GDPR. There are no data protection/ GDPR risks arising from this report.

## **10 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

- 10.1 This report is supported by the following background documents:
- Schools revenue funding 2021 to 2022 Operational guide (updated July 2021) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pre-16-schools-funding-local-authority-guidance-for-2022-to-2023>

## **11 TIMETABLE FOR IMPEMENTATION**

11.1 The results of the consultation will be shared at the Schools Forum 16<sup>th</sup> December 2021; Council ratification will be requested 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2022 with schools informed of their budget allocation by the 31st March 2022.

## **12 CONSULTATION**

<b>Name of consultee</b>	<b>Post held</b>	<b>Date sent</b>	<b>Date returned</b>
<i>Mandatory:</i>			
<i>Statutory Officers (or deputy)</i>			
Adele Taylor	Executive Director of Resources/S151 Officer	12-11-21	

Emma Duncan	Deputy Director of Law and Strategy / Monitoring Officer	12-11-21	
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance (Deputy S151 Officer)	12-11-21	
Elaine Browne	Head of Law (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	12-11-21	
Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	12-11-21	
<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors</i>			
Duncan Sharkey	Chief Executive	12-11-21	15-11-21
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	12-11-21	
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Children's Services	12-11-21	15-11-21
Hilary Hall	Executive Director of Adults, Health and Housing	12-11-21	15-11-21
<i>Heads of Service</i>			
Nikki Craig	Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT	12-11-21	
Louisa Dean	Head of Communications	12-11-21	

Councillor Stuart Carroll	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health	Consulted on contents on report: Yes
---------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

## REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
For information	No	No

Report Author: James Norris - Head of Finance Achieving for Children (RBWM)
---

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### EqIA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals

#### Essential information

Items to be assessed: (please mark 'x')

Strategy		Plan		Project		Service procedure	X
----------	--	------	--	---------	--	-------------------	---

Responsible officer	James Norris	Service area	Education	Directorate	Achieving for Children
---------------------	--------------	--------------	-----------	-------------	------------------------

<b>Stage 1: EqIA Screening (mandatory)</b>	Date created: 12/11/2021	<b>Stage 2 : Full assessment (if applicable)</b>	Date created :N/A
--	--------------------------	--	-------------------

Approved by Head of Service / Overseeing group/body / Project Sponsor:

*"I am satisfied that an equality impact has been undertaken adequately."*

Signed by (print): James Norris

Dated: 12-11-2021

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### EqlA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals

#### Guidance notes

##### What is an EqlA and why do we need to do it?

The Equality Act 2010 places a 'General Duty' on all public bodies to have 'due regard' to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.
- Advancing equality of opportunity between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.
- Fostering good relations between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.

EqlAs are a systematic way of taking equal opportunities into consideration when making a decision, and should be conducted when there is a new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure in order to determine whether there will likely be a detrimental and/or disproportionate impact on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups. All completed EqlA Screenings are required to be publicly available on the council's website once they have been signed off by the relevant Head of Service or Strategic/Policy/Operational Group or Project Sponsor.

##### What are the "protected characteristics" under the law?

The following are protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010: age; disability (including physical, learning and mental health conditions); gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

##### What's the process for conducting an EqlA?

The process for conducting an EqlA is set out at the end of this document. In brief, a Screening Assessment should be conducted for every new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure and the outcome of the Screening Assessment will indicate whether a Full Assessment should be undertaken.

##### Openness and transparency

RBWM has a 'Specific Duty' to publish information about people affected by our policies and practices. Your completed assessment should be sent to the Strategy & Performance Team for publication to the RBWM website once it has been signed off by the relevant manager, and/or Strategic, Policy, or Operational Group. If your proposals are being made to Cabinet or any other Committee, please append a copy of your completed Screening or Full Assessment to your report.

##### Enforcement

Judicial review of an authority can be taken by any person, including the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) or a group of people, with an interest, in respect of alleged failure to comply with the general equality duty. Only the EHRC can enforce the specific duties. A failure to comply with the specific duties may however be used as evidence of a failure to comply with the general duty.

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### EqIA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals

#### Stage 1 : Screening (Mandatory)

##### 1.1 What is the overall aim of your proposed strategy/policy/project etc and what are its key objectives?

The purpose of this report is :

1. To inform the Schools Forum of the provisional settlement for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) 2022/23 across the four elements of the Schools Block, Central School Services Block, High Needs Block and Early Years Block.
2. To discuss with the Schools Forum the RBWM proposals for the 2022/23 Schools Formula consultation.
3. To inform the Schools Forum of the latest position in respect of the School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant for 2022/23 and onwards.

**1.2 What evidence is available to suggest that your proposal could have an impact on people (including staff and customers) with protected characteristics? Consider each of the protected characteristics in turn and identify whether your proposal is Relevant or Not Relevant to that characteristic. If Relevant, please assess the level of impact as either High / Medium / Low and whether the impact is Positive (i.e. contributes to promoting equality or improving relations within an equality group) or Negative (i.e. could disadvantage them). Please document your evidence for each assessment you make, including a justification of why you may have identified the proposal as “Not Relevant”.**

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### EqlA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals

Protected characteristics	Relevance	Level	Positive/negative	Evidence
Age	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.
Disability	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.
Gender re-assignment	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.
Marriage/civil partnership	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.
Pregnancy and maternity	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.
Race	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.
Religion and belief	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.
Sex	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.
Sexual orientation	No			There is nothing in the report which is considered to impact on this protected characteristic.

**Outcome, action and public reporting**

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### EqIA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals

Screening Assessment Outcome	Yes / No / Not at this stage	Further Action Required / Action to be taken	Responsible Officer and / or Lead Strategic Group	Timescale for Resolution of negative impact / Delivery of positive impact
Was a significant level of negative impact identified?	No		James Norris	Regular reporting to Schools Forum.
Does the strategy, policy, plan etc require amendment to have a positive impact?	No			

17

If you answered **yes** to either / both of the questions above a Full Assessment is advisable and so please proceed to Stage 2. If you answered “No” or “Not at this Stage” to either / both of the questions above please consider any next steps that may be taken (e.g. monitor future impacts as part of implementation, re-screen the project at its next delivery milestone etc).

### Stage 2 : Full assessment

#### 2.1 : Scope and define

**2.1.1 Who are the main beneficiaries of the proposed strategy / policy / plan / project / service / procedure? List the groups who the work is targeting/aimed at.**

--

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD**

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**EqIA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals**

**2.1.2 Who has been involved in the creation of the proposed strategy / policy / plan / project / service / procedure? *List those groups who the work is targeting/aimed at.***

**2.2 : Information gathering/evidence**

**2.2.1 What secondary data have you used in this assessment? *Common sources of secondary data include: censuses, organisational records.***

**2.2.2 What primary data have you used to inform this assessment? *Common sources of primary data include: consultation through interviews, focus groups, questionnaires.***

**Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation**

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### EqlA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

19

**Advance equality of opportunity**

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### EqIA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### EqlA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals

#### Foster good relations

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

21

**2.4 Has your delivery plan been updated to incorporate the activities identified in this assessment to mitigate any identified negative impacts? If so please summarise any updates.**

*These could be service, equality, project or other delivery plans. If you did not have sufficient data to complete a thorough impact assessment, then an action should be incorporated to collect this information in the future.*

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD**

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**EqIA : Provisional DSG 2022/23 & School Funding Proposals**