

NOTICE
OF
MEETING
SCHOOLS FORUM

will meet on

THURSDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 2021

At 2.00 pm

by

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

TO: MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM

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

Karen Shepherd – Head of Governance - Issued: 10th November 2021

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 - 8
4.	<u>BUDGET MONITORING AND FORECAST 2021/22</u> To receive the above report.	9 - 26
5.	<u>SOCIAL EMOTIONAL MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE REPORT</u> To receive the above report.	To Follow
6.	<u>WELLBEING SERVICE REPORT</u> To receive the above report.	To Follow
7.	<u>SCHOOL BUDGET CONSULTATION 2022/23</u> To receive the above report.	To Follow

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, 21 OCTOBER 2021

PRESENT: Martin Tinsley (Chairman), Chris Tomes (Vice-Chairman), Isabel Cooke, Joolz Scarlett, Michael Wallace, Sarah Cottle, Andrew Morrison

Also in attendance: Councillor John Baldwin, Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra, Councillor David Cannon and Councillor Gurch Singh

Officers: James Norris, Kevin McDaniel, Clive Haines, David Cook and Oran Norris-Browne

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Maggie Callaghan and John Fletcher.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

MINUTES

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY – that the minutes of the meeting held on the 15th July 2021, be an accurate record.

The Chairman mentioned two discussion points that were made at the last meeting with regards to Wessex Primary School and a letter that had been sent to government. The Clerk agreed to investigate the letter further offline.

The Director of Children's Services (Kevin McDaniel) said with regards to Wessex Primary School, that he would discuss this with the Chairman offline.

BUDGET MONITORING AND FORECAST 2021/22

The Schools Forum considered the report regarding the budget monitoring and forecast for 2021/22.

The Chairman invited the Head of Finance for Achieving for Children (James Norris) to introduce the report to the forum.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children said that the report set out the projected variants coming into the financial year and it identified the level of balances and the deficit. He added that this showed the pressures that the authority was facing.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children referred to section 2.1 of the report, which showed the financial summary and set out the indicative budget for the current financial year of £133,912,000. He added that the estimated early years block grant claw back from the previous year was still being assessed by the ESFA and should be available in November 2021. He also added that the budget was allocated last year and the majority of it had already been spent in the previous financial year. He reiterated that this result would simply be correcting an error in the early years pupil data from the previous year.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children said that the current position for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for the current financial year was a £1.755 million overspend. He

estimated that there would be more updated forecast presented to the Schools Forum in November 2021, and it would provide a good understanding as to what the finances currently were.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children said that there had been one change in accounting treatment, that a previously unearmarked reserve within the Dedicated Schools Grant of £134,000 could no longer be held separately due to the deficit and that the two balances had to be aggregated together.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children asked the forum to direct their attention to section 3.1 of the report, which stated an overall projected deficit as of 31st March 2022 as being £3.412 million. He said that this was made up of a brought forward deficit of £1.791 million, the in-year projected deficit of £1.755 million and the release of the previously discussed £134,000. He then added that the £3.412 million represented 2.5% of the total budget allocation 2021/22.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children stated that a deficit management plan needed to be drawn up and submitted to the Department for Education (DfE) between the Local Authority and the Schools Forum, with a sign off also required by the RBWM's Chief Finance Officer.

The Chairman asked if the borough stood reasonably compared to neighbouring authorities. The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children said that he had comparisons for Richmond and Kingston and that Richmond reported a predicted deficit of 4% and Kingston reported 7%. He added that this was favourable, as the borough's stood at 2.5%.

The Chairman asked the Director of Children's Services on how this compared to the rest of the South-East.

The Director of Children's Service replied by saying that 3 years ago, the local deficit was zero and that increased to 1% 2 years ago and 2.5% in the previous year. He said that this was rapidly catching up to the South-East average of between 5-6%. He also added that some authorities with the largest deficits were able to enter an arrangement with the Department for Education called safety valve funding. The aim of this being to prevent the deficit from increasing.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children added that the indicative projection for the next financial year showed another £1.7 million overspend, which meant the deficit by March 2023, would be in the region of £5 million.

The Chairman referred to the previous forum meeting where it was discussed that any surplus budgets could be used to claw back some money and offset some of financial difficulties faced by the authority. He added that this would be unpopular, but potentially necessary.

The Director of Children's Service acknowledged that this would be unfair on schools who managed a successful budget and to penalise them would not be welcomed by all in the forum. Additionally, it was not permissible to clawback funds from academies. He added that the price inflation that was being seen, was mainly due to increased staffing costs, especially for the high needs block as more families were now requesting specialist schools and out of borough schools.

The Director of Children's Service put this into perspective for the forum by saying that top ups for children going into schools ranged from £5000 to £17,000, whereas many of the out of borough placements were running at £35,000 to £80,000 a year. He stated that by keeping children in the first bracket, this would assist in managing the budget better.

The Director of Children's Service said that 3 years ago, the forum had allocated money for a Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) intervention from a reserve, which had seen a

positive impact. He added that there was no funding for this in the next financial year. A separate report would follow at the next Schools Forum to present future options for delivering the SEMH service.

Mike Wallace asked if the role to negotiate package deals with key specialist providers had been seen to have had an impact in the local authority and if the role was continuing.

The Director of Children's Service said that an expanded commissioning team had been recruited for both high needs and social care placements. He added that results so far suggested that it was having a slight impact on price, but this was patchy and was dependant on school settings. He admitted that it was an important role to maintain, however the role needed repurposing and on its own it would not make the biggest impact in budget savings.

The Chairman asked if projects such as the Rainbow Centre in Dedworth were the types of projects that needed to be rolled out more, to keep children within the borough.

The Director of Children's Service stated that the ambition of those primary units was to keep children within the borough, both reducing the cost to the borough and keeping the children closer to their local communities. He added that the units were very good but noted that they must be managed carefully to ensure their usefulness was maximised.

The Chairman asked if there were any plans for more of these. The Director of Children's Service confirmed that there were principle plans for 2 more units, however the funding would come from the high needs block and therefore an assessment would need to be carried out on whether they would add value.

Joolz Scarlett acknowledged that this issue was a national one and that mainstream schools needed to be more inclusive. She added that the Covid-19 pandemic had not helped the situation and that demand was completely outweighing the availability of places.

The Chairman asked Sarah Cottle if she had seen a difference to children with high needs entering the nursery setting. Sarah Cottle confirmed this and said that the current year especially had shown children from all over the UK coming into this setting at a very young age, each with varying plans.

The Chairman asked if there was an update on works carried out about using the information provided, to plan for the future.

The Director of Children's Service said that the Covid-19 pandemic led to a lower number of school places than originally forecast and therefore there were no further updates to provide at this time. He did add that the lower intake of children, would likely lead to a lower budget being provided next year.

The Chairman asked if the downward trend seen in 2018 regarding this issue was likely to continue.

The Director of Children's Service said that in Windsor it was down slightly, however Maidenhead had seen a greater decrease than originally projected. He added that it was unclear currently if this was due to a reduce in migration due to the UK leaving the EU or if it was down to the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Mike Wallace said that it was important to ensure that the resource provisions were fit for purpose and that each high need was identified as being able to be managed by this provision successfully. The Chairman added that value for money could also prove to be difficult with falling numbers in both Windsor and Maidenhead.

The Chairman asked if Andrew Morrison had seen similar things at a secondary level. Andrew Morrison confirmed this and said that so many provisions were required for many different

high needs. He observed that not all high needs could be addressed in the borough, and some children would still have to attend schools outside of the borough.

Both Chris Tomes and Isabel Cooke agreed with Andrew Morrison's assessment of the situation.

The Director of Children's Service also agreed with Andrew Morrison's statement and said that some existing provisions may have to be stopped to prioritize areas that would make the biggest difference. He added that the National Funding Formula for both the main school's budget was 2% and the high needs block was an 8% increase. The local borough was only to be receiving closer to 7% for the high needs block, due to having a lower deprivation compared to other boroughs.

The Chairman asked how the local authority would inform parents of why certain provisions were to end. The Director of Children's Service said that services that were identified as being underutilised, would need to be looked at how they could be run differently.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children said that the Schools Budget Consultation would come out on the 22nd November 2021, with the results being brought to the Schools Forum in December 2021. He asked forum members to engage with this process and to similarly encourage their cluster groups to do the same.

The Director of Children's Service asked the Chairman if it was possible for volunteers from the forum to engage in a meeting before the next forum meeting to provide some early guidance on tough decisions that needed to be made. The Chairman confirmed a willingness to participate.

The Director of Children's Service said that a meeting was needed out of the public domain with a range of schools to discuss the options that were available. The Chairman confirmed this.

The Head of Finance for Achieving for Children said that the next forum meeting on the 18th November 2021 should go ahead, with a purpose of discussing the upcoming consultation at that time.

The Chairman thanked all forum members and officers for their attendance.

The meeting, which began at 2.00 pm, finished at 2.45 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

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 18 November 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 Deficit Management Plan to the Department for Education. The future action is set out in section 5.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION

1.1 RECOMMENDATION: That Schools Forum:

i) notes the report including the reported variance, schedule of Risks & Opportunities and the projected deficit balance carried forward as at 31 March 2022.

ii) provides comments on the recommendations of the Deficit Management Plan working party, as set out in section 5.

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 £336,000.

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.

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 reported 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					1,925	
	Add back unused earmarked reserves 31 st March 2021 (surplus) / deficit					(134)	
	Net Projected (surplus) / deficit					3,546	

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 £1,925,000. Incorporating the release of the unused earmarked reserve of £134,000 the revised projected deficit as at 31st March 2022 is £3,546,000.

3.2 The projected cumulative deficit for RBWM is 2.6% 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 £3,546,000.
- 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. ESFA guidance states that DSG deficits should not be covered from the general fund or other grants but that over time they should be recovered from DSG income.

5. Deficit Management Plan

- 5.1 As previously reported, it is a requirement for any local authority that has an overall deficit on its DSG account at the end of the financial year, or whose DSG surplus has substantially reduced during the year, to co-operate with the Department for Education (DfE) in handling that situation.
- 5.2 As proposed at the Schools Forum 21 October 2021 a Deficit Management Plan working party was established. Their recommended key themes to be explored were as follows:
- expansion of the local offer within the Borough
 - increased local partnerships incorporating working with neighbouring authorities
 - improved commissioning arrangements including greater focus on annual reviews and unit costings
- 5.3 A review of the financial and non-financial impact will be undertaken and reported to the appropriate Schools Forum.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

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

7. RISK MANAGMENT

- 7.1 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.

8. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 8.1 Equalities. Equality Impact Assessments are published on the [council's website](#). It has been assessed that there are no Equality Impact risks arising from this report.
- 8.2 Climate change/sustainability. There are no climate change/ sustainability risks arising from this report.
- 8.3 Data Protection/GDPR. There are no data protection/ GDPR risks arising from this report.

9. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 9.1 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>

10. CONSULTATION

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

11. TIMETABLE FOR IMPEMENTATION

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

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Statutory Officers (or deputy)</i>	
Adele Taylor	Executive Director of Resources/S151 Officer	08-11-21	
Emma Duncan	Deputy Director of Law and Strategy / Monitoring Officer	08-11-21	
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance (Deputy S151 Officer)	08-11-21	
Elaine Browne	Head of Law (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	08-11-21	

Karen Shepherd	Head of Governance (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	08-11-21	09-11-21
<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors</i>			
Duncan Sharkey	Chief Executive	08-11-21	09-11-21
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	08-11-21	
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Children's Services	08-11-21	09-11-21
Hilary Hall	Executive Director of Adults, Health and Housing	08-11-21	09-11-21
<i>Heads of Service</i>			
Nikki Craig	Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT	08-11-21	
Louisa Dean	Head of Communications	08-11-21	

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: For information	Urgency item? No	To Follow item? 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: 08/11/2021	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: 08/11/2021

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.

In addition, the report sets out the recommendations of the Deficit Management Plan working party to address the budget deficit position.

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 : 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

23

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

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					

24

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