

NOTICE
OF
MEETING
SCHOOLS FORUM

will meet on

THURSDAY, 21ST OCTOBER, 2021

At 2.00 pm

by

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

TO: MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM

SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES: MAGGIE CALLAGHAN, ISABEL COOKE, SARAH COTTLE, JOHN FLETCHER, AMANDA HOUGH, ANDREW MORRISON, JOOLZ SCARLETT, CATHRIN THOMAS, MARTIN TINSLEY (CHAIRMAN), CHRIS TOMES (VICE-CHAIRMAN) AND MIKE WALLACE.

GOVERNORS: STEPHEN MCCORMAC

NON-SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES: AMANDA DEAN

Karen Shepherd – Head of Governance - Issued: Date Not Specified

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Oran Norris-Browne** Oran.Norris-Browne@RBWM.gov.uk

Recording of Meetings – In line with the council's commitment to transparency the Part I (public) section of the virtual meeting will be streamed live and recorded via Zoom. By participating in the meeting by audio and/or video, you are giving consent to being recorded and acknowledge that the recording will be in the public domain. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES</u> To receive apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any Declarations of Interest.	3 - 4
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes from the previous meeting.	5 - 10
4.	<u>BUDGET MONITORING AND FORECAST 2021/22</u>	11 - 28

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Registerable Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

Any Member with concerns about the nature of their interest should consult the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Non-participation in case of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your DPIs (summary below, further details set out in Table 1 of the Members' Code of Conduct) you must disclose the interest, **not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room** unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted by the Monitoring Officer in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a DPI.

Where you have a DPI on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet Member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it.

DPIs (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her election expenses
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the council.
- Any licence to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the council, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest in the securities of.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
 - a) that body has a place of business or land in the area of the council, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (summary below and as set out in Table 2 of the Members Code of Conduct), you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other Registerable Interests (relating to the Member or their partner):

You have an interest in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:

- a) any body of which you are in general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority*
- b) any body*
 - (i) exercising functions of a public nature*
 - (ii) directed to charitable purposes or*

one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)

Disclosure of Non- Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a DPI) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer) you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –

- a. your own financial interest or well-being;
- b. a financial interest or well-being of a friend, relative, close associate; or
- c. a body included in those you need to disclose under DPIs as set out in Table 1 of the Members' code of Conduct

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied.

Where a matter **affects** your financial interest or well-being:

- a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer, you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other declarations

Members may wish to declare at the beginning of the meeting any other information they feel should be in the public domain in relation to an item on the agenda; such Member statements will be included in the minutes for transparency.

Agenda Item 3

SCHOOLS FORUM

THURSDAY, 15 JULY 2021

PRESENT: Martin Tinsley (Chairman) and Tomes (Vice-Chairman), Joolz Scarlett and Maggie Callaghan

Also in attendance: Councillor John Baldwin, Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra, Councillor Maureen Hunt, Councillor Gurch Singh, Councillor Donna Stimson and Councillor Amy Tisi

Officers: James Norris, Kevin McDaniel, Clive Haines, Alasdair Whitelaw, Helen Huntley, Sarah Ward and David Cook

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Andrew Morrison and Mike Wallace.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes held on 21 January 2021 be approved.

BUDGET OUTTURN AND SCHOOL BALANCES 2020/21

The Forum considered the report regarding the budget outturn and 2020/21 school balances.

James Norris (Head of Finance AFC) introduced the report as an update on the finances of both central school's Dedicated School's Grant (DSG) budgets and maintained school balances over the last financial year of 2021, which ended 31st March 2021. A final deficit position of £766,000 overspend was reported.

The biggest area of overspend was the high needs block, especially a high increase during the 3rd quarter of the financial year. James Norris also informed that towards the end of the financial year there was a change in the funding for the early needs block.

There was an overspend of £441,000, however this was in line with what had been forecasted to be spent over the year. All forecasts were based upon the knowledge that a DSG grant of just over £800,000 would be given, but in March officials were informed that the money would be received in the following financial year instead. A surplus of £808,000 could then be seen for the current financial year, having taken this grant into account.

Over the 2 financial years, the impact of this will be nil and the deficit or surplus is nothing alarming. This would be monitored closely.

Net deficit for financial year was just under £1.791 million, 1.4% over. James Norris then asked the Chairman if there were any questions.

The Chairman asked where the RBWM stood as a borough compared to neighbours, within the South-East. James Norris stated that the RBWM were not in a bad situation compared to neighbours such as Kingston or Richmond. The trajectory that the RBWM was on, showed a potential deficit of 2.6% by the end of the financial year.

The Chairman asked if there was any news from the government on if there were any plans regarding high needs. Kevin McDaniel, Director of Children's Services, informed that there had not been any firm commitments from the government regarding this.

Chris Tomes asked for clarification on the surplus of £808,000 and the overspend of £441,000. James Norris explained with reference to table 1 that once the financial year ends, there would be more transparency visible between the two years.

The Chairman asked if the £808,000 is definite or if the Department of Education (DfE) could change the goal posts. James Norris confirmed that this is in writing, however it is the borough's calculation. Therefore, this figure was an estimate with a 10% threshold either way, as to how much the final figure will be. James Norris said that hopefully over next 6 weeks, a final figure would be hopefully made available.

(Councillor Bhangra joined the meeting)

James Norris informed the forum that a surplus had been seen in the maintained school balances, increasing from 1.5 million to 2.2 million. He noted that it was important to state that some schools were operating with a deficit of 24% of their budgets. Whilst others were in a surplus position of up to 30% of their school budgets. All sectors moved favourably, except the primary area. This was mainly due to in-comparable results. Marginal surplus seen at the end of March 2021.

The Chairman asked at what point does the borough need to begin clawing back money from schools. Kevin McDaniel said that now was the time to start thinking about attempting to claw back money. He insisted that moving money from surplus schools to deficit schools would not be correct, as it would not encourage the correct financial management. Instead supporting deficit schools, whilst levelling off some surplus schools in his opinion would be more suitable.

The Chairman asked Kevin McDaniel what the next steps would be. The Forum were informed that the excess balance decision would need to be a forum decision rather than an official borough decision. Discussions would potentially be needed on guidance of what the money would be used on and where it is obtained from. Only maintained schools would be included within this.

James Norris said that there was a balance of £460,000 which maintained schools had paid into, and this money would be evaluated for its best purpose later in October.

(Councillor Singh joined the meeting)

Councillor Stimson asked if there was the same behaviour every year with regards to budgets. Kevin McDaniel informed that if there was reason to believe poor handling of budgets in schools, then the borough would take action. Kevin McDaniel said there was currently no school on this list.

Resolved unanimously: that the Schools Forum notes the report including the reported variance. Deficit balance carried forward, maintained schools' balances and de-delegated balances as at 31 March 2021.

BUDGET MONITORING AND FORECAST 2021/22

The Forum considered the report that provided a projected financial position for 2021/22.

James Norris stated that there was currently an overspend of around £1.8 million. The borough's deficit position would effectively double by the end of the financial year as it stands. James Norris stated that the current trajectory was not sustainable, and costs would need to

be looked at. This year, the budget allocation was 1.4% and this would increase to around 2.7% of the overall budget.

Kevin McDaniel stated that the RBWM was part of 19 local authorities who make up the South-East and when reviewed in October, data showed projections of all but one having an overspend on high needs, suggesting it is a national issue.

Joolz Scarlett informed the Forum that she had 320 applications for 6 places at her school, showing there was a high demand for high needs places. Kevin McDaniel supported this statement and also added that demand for special school places had increased and not just because of population increases.

Chris Tomes queried whether there were any upcoming financial packages that were in the pipelines from government. Kevin McDaniel stated that there was no news as it stands regarding high needs.

In terms of value for money, Kevin McDaniel informed that the £130 million was a very good amount and should give good value for money.

Joolz Scarlett asked if the borough were able to claw back money, that could be used to spend to save, which would save in the long run. Kevin McDaniel said it would be his desire and James Norris stated that he believed that they could do that using a block transfer, as was seen 2 or 3 financial years ago. This would be subject to the forum's approval. The Chairman stated that this would be a sensible way forward.

Chris Tomes asked if there was any news from national government regarding high needs. Kevin McDaniel reiterated that he was unable to give a definitive answer on a government decision on budgets. He said that they must prepare for the worst still at this time.

(Councillor Hunt joined the meeting)

Resolved Unanimously: that the Schools Forum notes the report including the reported variance, schedule of Risks & Opportunities and the projected deficit balance as at 31 March 2022.

SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL HEALTH FUTURE PROVISION

The Schools Forum considered the report regarding the consultation with Headteachers regarding the provision for Children and Young People (C&YP) with a Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) difficulty.

The Chairman invited Helen Huntley to discuss the increased pressure on the high needs block, including social, emotional, and mental health (SEMH). The aim of the intervention was to reduce permanent exclusion, which so far had been promising with a decrease amongst primary age children.

Permanent exclusions and fix-term exclusions amongst secondary children with SEMH, had been seen to be increasing. Helen Huntley stated that early intervention is extremely important. Arises from children as young as 5 being permanently excluded. SEMH may be harder for teachers to deal with rather than a child with dyslexia for example, as SEMH is so broad.

Helen Huntley referred to the draft statement of intent that a powerful statement of intent from the borough's headteachers.

Appendix 3 was referred to showing what priorities Headteachers thought it was important to target. These came under 3 different headings. These were universal, targeted and specialist services. Helen Huntley then explained what each of these 3 services involved specifically. Helen Huntley also shared her worry for teachers and headteachers own mental health during the pandemic.

The Chairman identified the importance of the issues raised by Helen Huntley and that the financial side of it was also a very real issue.

Joolz Scarlett asked if possible, for the surplus to be included within the autumn proposal and to see what could be done about potentially using some of the money. Chris Tomes supported this idea of including the surplus on the proposal if possible.

Kevin McDaniel thanked Helen Huntley and Alistair Whitelaw and echoed his support for supporting SEMH children. The Chairman and Kevin McDaniel also supported

Joolz Scarlett's proposal of funding at the point of need for individual children, rather than per school. This was due to differing numbers of children requiring additional support per school.

The Chairman also reiterated the pressures that teachers and his staff also are under in recent times.

Councillor Tisi informed that a wide range of things such as teaching and testing needed to be looked at with regards to students and their SEMH, due to pressures placed on them. Councillor Tisi also stated CAMs waiting times have gone from 18 to 30 months, so she fully supported these proposals.

Councillor Stimson stated her thanks for the report and her support for it. Places on record her support for sustainability and clean air, which in turn can also help with mental health.

Joolz Scarlett brings the attention of the members to the pressures league tables put upon mainstream schools and proposes scrapping them as a suggestion.

Kevin McDaniel understood the argument about league tables and was supportive, however he believed it was unrealistic to have them not be published due to newspaper headlines.

Helen Huntley acknowledged the support towards the proposals. Helen Huntley stated that there would be a meeting before the end of the school term between the wellbeing team, the educational psychology team and the inclusion team to look at the agenda and SEMH approach.

In terms of what happens next with the SEMH proposals, Kevin McDaniel says that

Helen Huntley and Clive Haines would:

- What it would look like when put into action?
- Where would it fit into the offer?
- Where does the money come from and how would it be funded?

The Chairman asked for consideration for 2 items to be added to the agenda for the next meeting. These involved a letter from the Headteacher at Wessex and nursery and business rates. The sensitivity of both agenda items needed to be looked at to identify if they were appropriate for the Schools Forum to discuss.

Councillor Tisi referred to a motion passed in November/December 2019 regarding nursery and business rates. Councillor Tisi said there was support from the council, and a letter was written to the national government regarding this matter.

Kevin McDaniel confirmed Councillor Tisi's statement and confirmed a response to the letter that was sent, was indeed received. The Chairman stated that there unfortunately was not a lot more that the Schools Forum could do.

The Chairman ended the Forum by thanking all officers and members for their attendance.

Resolved unanimously: That the Schools Forum notes the report and

- i. Comments on the proposals set out in section 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10.**
- ii. Provides guidance on the potential funding options as set up in 4.2 to allow a further report for 2022/23 budget setting, which sets out recommendations as to how the intervention and provision can be paid for on a sustainable basis.**

The meeting, which began at 2.00 pm, finished at 3.28 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22
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 21 October 2021
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel - Director of Children's Services James Norris - Head of Finance Achieving for Children (RBWM)
Wards affected:	All



REPORT SUMMARY

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Schools Forum with the projected financial position for 2021/22 along with a summary of associated Risks & Opportunities; the projected reserve deficit balance as at 31 March 2022 and an understanding of the financial pressures faced in respect of the Dedicated Schools Grant. Details are set out in sections 2 and 3.
2. The Dedicated Schools Grant has a cumulative deficit position, therefore, it must work to mitigate this pressure including submitting a recovery plan to the Department for Education. The future action is set out in section 4.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 **RECOMMENDATION:** That Schools Forum notes the report including the reported variance, schedule of Risks & Opportunities and the projected deficit balance carried forward as at 31 March 2022.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

2.1 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

- 2.1 The Indicative Settlement for the Royal Borough for 2021/22 (including Academy schools) based on the March 2021 budget notification is £133,912,000. The net retained funding of £69,061,000 consists of £37,513,000 of maintained schools delegated budgets and £31,548,000 central schools budget (including Early Years and High Needs). Delegated budgets are treated as spent as soon as they are delegated, In addition it is expected that there will be a net in-year budget change of £1,008,000 in respect of the Early Years block mainly relating to the receipt of deferred Education Skills Funding Agency funding 2020/21 £672,000 and in year High Need Block adjustment of £336,0000.

- 2.2 The central schools budget has a projected overspend of £1,755,000 for 2021/22. This high level reported adverse variance has remained constant

since the start of the financial year and is planned to be updated based on the new academic year as part of the period 08 November 2021 finance update.

2.3 The material forecast variances are as follows:

- High Needs Block £1,755,000 - increased costs relating to the provision of Independent Special schools and other associated direct support. This forecast is reflective of the activity in 2020/21 along with updates to reflect known changes and the indicative increased volume of Education Health Care Plans. A more informed position will be confirmed in the late autumn following the start of the new academic year when most pupils will be placed within the appropriate educational establishment. In addition to the recent increased demand for services for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities, the COVID-19 pandemic has created additional challenges. These challenges could impact on the progress of some of our most vulnerable pupils. It is highly likely that there will be requests for pupils to repeat an academic year increasing the demand and pressure on this service area and sector.

2.4 The material forecast risks and opportunities are as follows:

- Further to the Cabinet Report, 24th June 2021, in respect of the Windsor expansion programme the latest forecast assumes the schools block growth fund of £679,000 will be fully utilised. Further updates with options will be explored over the coming months; following this review any variance on this budget will be incorporated as appropriate into the monitoring position.

2.5 The ESFA has advised that authorities with a carried forward deficit are no longer permitted to hold earmarked reserves. Programmes of activity previously supported would require a new bid to be recommended by the local authority and approved by Schools Forum. Therefore, the unused earmarked reserves as at 31st March 2021 of £134,000 have been released into the projected position.

2.6 Table 1 sets out the summarised financial position for 2021/22

Table 1 Summarised Financial Position 2021/22

Schools Block Budget	S251 Budget Notification (March 2021)	Less Academy Recoupment & Direct Funding	Net Budget Notification (March 2021)	DfE & Indicative In-Year Budget Changes	Current Budget	Forecast Variance	Current Forecast
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Expenditure							
Schools	99,611	(62,098)	37,513	0	37,513	0	37,513
Central School Services	1,097	0	1,097	0	1,097	0	1,097
Early Years	9,025	0	9,025	672	9,697	0	9,697
High Needs	24,180	(2,753)	21,426	336	21,762	1,755	23,517
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	133,912	(64,852)	69,061	1,008	70,069	1,755	71,824
Funding							
Dedicated Schools Grant	(133,912)	64,852	(69,061)	(1,008)	(70,069)	0	(70,069)
TOTAL FUNDING	(133,912)	64,852	(69,061)	(1,008)	(70,069)	0	(70,069)
NET EXPENDITURE	0	0	0	0	0	1,755	1,755
	Summary					£000	
	Total in year (surplus) / deficit					1,755	
	Balance brought forward DSG general reserve (surplus) / deficit					1,791	
	Add back unused earmarked reserves 31 st March 2021 (surplus) / deficit					(134)	
	Net Projected (surplus) /deficit					3,412	

3. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

3.1 The projected net in-year overspend of £1,755,000 is an adverse movement on the dedicated schools grant general reserve which as at 31st March 2021 was a net deficit of £1,791,000. Incorporating the release of the unused earmarked reserve of £134,000 the revised projected deficit as at 31st March 2022 is £3,412,000.

- 3.2 The projected cumulative deficit for RBWM is 2.5% of the total budget allocation 2021/22.

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The financial implications are set out in sections 2 and 3. The overall impact is a projected carried forward deficit on the Dedicated Schools Grant as at 31 March 2022 of £3,412,000.
- 4.2 This is a national challenge, with many authorities reporting a projected carried forward deficit by 31 March 2022. Those with the most significant balances are entering into a “safety valve” agreement with the DfE where the authority undertakes to reach a positive in-year balance on its Dedicated Schools Grant. The authority undertakes to control and reduce the cumulative deficit in line with the financial plan as submitted and funding assumptions as agreed with the DfE.
- 4.3 Local authorities are required to carry forward overspends to their schools budget either in the immediately following year or the year after.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 There are no potential risks arising from this report, however, the requirement from the DfE is RBWM/AfC will agree a Deficit Management Plan to address the cumulative deficit position in the short to medium term.

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equalities. Equality Impact Assessments are published on the [council's website](https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/council-and-democracy/equalities-and-diversity/equality-impact-assessments). 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. It has been assessed that there are no Equality Impact risks arising from this report. Link to Equality Impact Assessments. <https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/council-and-democracy/equalities-and-diversity/equality-impact-assessments>
- 7.2 Climate change/sustainability. There are no climate change/ sustainability risks arising from this report.
- 7.3 Data Protection/GDPR. There are no data protection/ GDPR risks arising from this report.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

8.1 This report is supported by the following background documents:

- Schools revenue funding 2021/22 Operational guide
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pre-16-schools-funding-local-authority-guidance-for-2021-to-2022>

9. CONSULTATION

9.1 There is no requirement for stakeholder consultation arising from this report.

10. TIMETABLE FOR IMPEMENTATION

10.1 There is no timetable for implementation of any actions arising from this report.

11. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

12. RISK MANAGMENT

12.1 There are no potential risks arising from this report, however, the requirement from the DfE is RBWM/AfC will agree a Deficit Management Plan to address the cumulative deficit position in the short to medium term.

13. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

13.1 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. It has been assessed that there are no Equality Impact risks arising from this report. Link to Equality Impact Assessments. <https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/home/council-and-democracy/equalities-and-diversity/equality-impact-assessments>

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

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

14. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

14.1 This report is supported by the following background documents:

- Schools revenue funding 2021/22 Operational guide
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pre-16-schools-funding-local-authority-guidance-for-2021-to-2022>

15. CONSULTATION

15.1 There is no requirement for stakeholder consultation arising from this report.

16. TIMETABLE FOR IMPEMENTATION

16.1 There is no timetable for implementation of any actions arising from this report.

17. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Cllr Stuart Carroll	Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health	11-10-21	
Duncan Sharkey	Chief Executive	11-10-21	12-10-21
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	11-10-21	
Adele Taylor	Executive Director of Resources/S151 Officer	11-10-21	13-10-21
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Children's Services	11-10-21	12-10-21
Hilary Hall	Executive Director Adults, Health and Housing	11-10-21	
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance	11-10-21	
Elaine Browne	Head of Law	11-10-21	
Emma Duncan	Deputy Director of Law & Strategy / Monitoring Officer	11-10-21	
Nikki Craig	Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT	11-10-21	13-10-21
Louisa Dean	Communications	11-10-21	
Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance	11-10-21	

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 : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

Essential information

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

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

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

Stage 1: EqIA Screening (mandatory)	Date created: 08/10/2021	Stage 2 : Full assessment (if applicable)	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): Kevin McDaniel

Dated: 11/10/2021

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

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

EqlA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

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 overall aim of the report is to provide the Schools Forum with the projected financial position for 2021/22 along with a summary of associated Risks & Opportunities; the projected reserve deficit balance as at 31 March 2022 and an understanding of the financial pressures faced in respect of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

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

EqIA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

Protected characteristics	Relevance	Level	Positive/negative	Evidence
Age	Yes	Low	Positive	This report does impact on pupils within this protected characteristic; however, as school funding is on a formula basis impact has already been considered within previous reports and decision making processes
Disability	Yes	Low	Negative	There will be a Deficit Management Plan developed which may impact on the current range of services provided for pupils within this characteristic. The impact will be continually reviewed and reassessed.
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.

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

Outcome, action and public reporting

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	Continued monitoring and reporting of the Dedicated Schools Grant budgets including development of Deficit Management Plan.	James Norris	Termly reporting to Schools Forum.
Does the strategy, policy, plan etc require amendment to have a positive impact?	No	None		

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).

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

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.

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.

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

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.*

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation

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 : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

Advance equality of opportunity

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

EqIA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

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					

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

EqlA : Dedicated Schools Grant Budget Monitoring and Forecast 2021/22

This page is intentionally left blank