

## Equality Impact Report – West Sussex Small Schools Proposals

Title of report	Equality Impact Report
Date of implementation	April 2020

<b>1. Background</b>	
1.1	<p>In October 2018 the <a href="#">School Effectiveness Strategy 2018 - 2022</a> was adopted by the County Council following public consultation. It sets out the objectives for school organisation and the criteria against which schools should be assessed in order to meet the objectives. Implementation of the strategy will help ensure that in West Sussex:</p> <p><i>“Primary schools will be of a sufficient size to be viable in the future, offer a high quality and broad curriculum, attract pupils from the local community and provide strong outcomes for children”.</i></p> <p>The school effectiveness strategy also states <i>that:</i></p> <p><i>“where schools are identified as being at risk, they need to consider options for change. These could include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Consulting on amalgamating or merging two or more schools to become an all-through primary school.</i></li> <li><i>• Consulting on expanding the age range of a group of schools so each becomes all-through primary schools.</i></li> <li><i>• Consulting on federating two or more schools.</i></li> <li><i>• Finally, consulting on closing a school.”</i></li> </ul> <p>1.2 Analysis by the County Council in 2018 identified around 25 schools which, when measured against the criteria set out in the School Effectiveness Strategy, were considered at risk in relation to their ability to meet the requirements set out above.</p> <p>1.3 Discussions and workshops were held with Head Teachers and Chairs of Governors in the localities where the schools were identified as vulnerable. The outcome of the analysis was reviewed and discussions were initiated with some of the schools on options for the future such as merger, federation, relocation or closure. A number of schools have subsequently progressed discussions and some have made steps towards federation.</p> <p>1.4 Due to specific circumstances of five of these schools, an impact assessment was conducted between April and June 2019. Rumboldswyke was included following an Ofsted inspection which rated the school as inadequate. The options for the future of the school are very limited following this judgement.</p> <p>Following conclusion of the impact assessment work a consultation process was undertaken to assess views on options for change at the following schools:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clapham and Patching CE Primary School, Clapham, Worthing</li> <li>• Compton and Upmarden CE School, Compton, Chichester</li> </ul>

- Rumboldswyke CE Infants School, Chichester
- Stedham Primary School, Stedham, Midhurst
- Warninglid Primary School, Warninglid, Haywards Heath

This led to preliminary decisions being prepared for the five schools endorsed by a decision of the Cabinet in January 2020. That led to a further period of consultation on specific proposals up to early March 2020. The outcome of this second period of public consultation led to the development of final proposals for consideration by the Cabinet in April 2020.

The following applies generally to small schools in terms of the impact of their constraints on the overall quality of education and their capability in terms of the requirements for the optimum resources to provide a broad curriculum and meet the needs of a full range of educational expectations for pupils:

- Nationally small schools are finding it difficult to operate and provide a quality of education within the resources they can afford with the number of small schools halving over the last 18 years from 11,500 in 2000 to less than 5,500 in 2018;
- Low pupil numbers have led to a paring of costs and staffing to a core with mixed age classes and limited additional classroom support staff;
- It is difficult to manage learning in mixed age classes and to attract newly qualified teachers (NQTs) with future NQT arrangements being skewed against their recruitment to small schools, thereby adding to small school running costs;
- Mixed age classes can have up to 7 development years difference among the teaching group. Research into teaching in mixed age classes indicates that achievement in cognitive skills is often lower than that in single age classes;
- Headteachers of very small schools often have significant teaching commitment reducing time for strategic leadership and management of the school;
- Very small schools often have a higher proportion of SEND pupils and low numbers of PPG. This provides increasing challenge in being able to cover needs effectively;
- Sustaining high standards in very small schools is challenging and it is not unusual for schools to be volatile in their Ofsted inspections;
- Small schools have limited breadth of experience among staff to deliver the breadth and depth of curriculum required to meet the demands of the Ofsted Inspection Framework 2019
- The challenges of the new Ofsted inspection framework (2019), along with responsibilities for pupils' mental health and wellbeing (2018) as well as responsibilities for the delivery of Relationships and Sex Education curriculum (2020) from 2020 increase pressures on small schools with limited capacity;
- Evidence shows that it is becoming increasingly difficult to secure leadership in very small schools with headteacher salaries often being lower than that of deputy headteachers in large schools. It is not unusual for headships of small schools to be difficult to recruit to;
- Very small schools are prone to attract in year admissions of vulnerable pupils due to their surplus capacity which adds pressure on teachers to adapt and also on pupil mobility;

These factors provide an educational context to the public sector equality duty related to the proposals.

### **Public Sector Equality Duty**

The Equality Act (2010) mandates a duty for public bodies to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;

- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.

To meet this duty authorities are required to analyse the impact of proposed policies, strategies and action plans which may have implications for those within the protected groups.

In this Equality Impact Assessment, we evaluate the impact on West Sussex Small Schools to anticipate and address the requirements of the duty. The protected groups are defined by reference to:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race (including, ethnic origin, nationality)
- Religion or belief (including lack of belief)
- Sex/Gender
- Sexual orientation

Data was collated in relation to the population of the areas to help inform the impact work focusing on the schools most significantly affected.

Relevant to the public sector equality duty is an awareness of the numbers of pupils with particular health and educational needs.

ETHNICITY										
FULL SURVEY RESPONSES			CLAPHAM		COMPTON		RUMBOLDSWHYKE			
Option	Total	Percent of All	Total	Percent of All	Total	Percent of All	Total	Percent of All		
White	871	88.34%	106	86.18%	368	86.59%	138	84.66%		
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	6	0.61%			3	0.71%	1	0.61%		
Asian/any other mixed/multiple ethnic background	2	0.20%					1	0.61%		
Asian/Asian British	4	0.41%			1	0.24%	2	1.23%		
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	3	0.30%	1	0.81%	1	0.24%				
Other ethnic group	1	0.10%					1	0.61%		
Prefer not to say	99	10.04%	16	13.01%	52	12.24%	20	12.27%		
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES	986		123		425		163			
AGE GROUPS										
FULL SURVEY RESPONSES			CLAPHAM		COMPTON		RUMBOLDSWHYKE			
Option	Total	Percent of All	Total	Percent of All	Total	Percent of All	Total	Percent of All		
12 or under	43	4.36%	1	0.81%	11	2.59%	1	0.61%		
13-16	7	0.71%			6	1.41%	1	0.61%		
17-24	32	3.25%	4	3.25%	11	2.59%	5	3.07%		
25-44	367	37.22%	40	32.52%	142	33.41%	66	40.49%		
45-64	326	33.06%	45	36.59%	154	36.24%	47	28.83%		
65 plus	148	15.01%	20	16.26%	73	17.18%	28	17.18%		
Prefer not to say	63	6.39%	13	10.57%	28	6.59%	15	9.20%		
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES	986		123		425		163			

**January Census numbers on roll by SEND provision****SEND PROVISION - Summary Total - Rumboldswkiye**

	Numbers				% of total			
SEND PROVISION	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016	2017	2018	2019
Number of EHCP/Statement	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of SEN Support	21	27	15	8	18.9%	23.7%	16.3%	11.1%
Number of SEN (all)	21	27	15	8	18.9%	23.7%	16.3%	11.1%
Number with No SEND need	90	87	77	64	81.1%	76.3%	83.7%	88.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>72</b>				

**SEND PROVISION - Summary Total - Stedham**

	Numbers				% of total			
SEND PROVISION	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016	2017	2018	2019
Number of EHCP/Statement	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of SEN Support	10	15	11	15	13.0%	16.9%	13.8%	17.2%
Number of SEN (all)	10	15	11	15	13.0%	16.9%	13.8%	17.2%
Number with No SEND need	67	74	69	72	87.0%	83.1%	86.3%	82.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>87</b>				

**SEND PROVISION - Summary Total - Warninglid**

	Numbers				% of total			
SEND PROVISION	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016	2017	2018	2019
Number of EHCP/Statement	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of SEN Support	6	10	14	16	9.1%	17.9%	28.6%	41.0%
Number of SEN (all)	6	10	14	16	9.1%	17.9%	28.6%	41.0%
Number with No SEND need	60	46	35	23	90.9%	82.1%	71.4%	59.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>39</b>				

**SEND PROVISION - Summary Total - Compton and Up Marden CofE Primary**

	Numbers				% of total			
SEND PROVISION	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016	2017	2018	2019
Number of EHCP/Statement	1	0	1	0	1.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%
Number of SEN Support	16	19	14	27	16.5%	23.8%	16.9%	31.8%
Number of SEN (all)	17	19	15	27	17.5%	23.8%	18.1%	31.8%
Number with No SEND need	80	61	68	58	82.5%	76.3%	81.9%	68.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>85</b>				

**SEND PROVISION - Summary Total - Clapham and Patching**

	Numbers				% of total			
SEND PROVISION	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016	2017	2018	2019
Number of EHCP/Statement	4	4	5	8	6.7%	6.0%	9.6%	12.9%
Number of SEN Support	13	13	12	21	21.7%	19.4%	23.1%	33.9%
Number of SEN (all)	17	17	17	29	28.3%	25.4%	32.7%	46.8%
Number with No SEND need	43	50	35	33	71.7%	74.6%	67.3%	53.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>62</b>				

Source: January school censuses 2016-2019

## 'Race and ethnicity' related issues

The largest ethnic group in West Sussex is White British (88.9%) and the largest minority ethnic group is White other (2.9%) followed by Asian/Asian British (1.7%). Minority groups are largely concentrated in Crawley and in coastal towns such as Bognor Regis, Littlehampton and Worthing and not in the rural areas where the majority of small schools are located..

Ethnic group by geography, census 2011, count (percentage of total pop)

Ethnic Group	West Sussex	Adur	Arun	Chichester	Crawley	Horsham	Mid Sussex	Worthing
<b>Total Population</b>	806,892	61,182	149,518	113,794	106,597	131,301	139,860	104,640
<b>White British</b>	717,551 (88.9%)	56,843 (92.9%)	137,024 (91.6%)	105,841 (93%)	76,888 (72.1%)	121,020 (92.1%)	126,341 (90.3%)	93,594 (89.4%)
<b>White other (inc. Irish)</b>	38,948 (4.8%)	1,820 (2.9%)	8,094 (5.4%)	4,481 (3.9%)	8,292 (7.7%)	5,042 (3.8%)	6,677 (4.7%)	4,542 (4.3%)
<b>Mixed/ multiple ethnic groups</b>	12,155 (1.5%)	886 (1.4%)	1,502 (1%)	1,092 (0.9%)	3,098 (2.9%)	1,774 (1.3%)	1,967 (1.4%)	1,836 (1.7%)
<b>Asian/ Asian British</b>	28,334 (3.5%)	1,058 (1.7%)	2,116 (1.4%)	1,617 (1.4%)	13,825 (12.9%)	2,585 (1.9%)	3,761 (2.6%)	3,372 (3.2%)
<b>Black/ African/ Caribbean/ Black British</b>	7,146 (0.8%)	313 (0.5%)	538 (0.3%)	518 (0.4%)	3,469 (3.2%)	651 (0.4%)	788 (0.5%)	869 (0.8%)
<b>Other ethnic group</b>	2,758 (0.3%)	262 (0.4%)	244 (0.1%)	245 (0.2%)	1,025 (0.9%)	229 (0.1%)	326 (0.2%)	427 (0.4%)

Source: ONS, 2011

Ethnic disproportionality, if not addressed through appropriate provision can result in unequal future outcomes, and this issues is increasingly salient as the BAME population in England continues to grow. A key recommendation of this report is that LAs, multi-academy trusts and schools must have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty requirements and should monitor ethnic disproportionality and achievement.

There has not been any particular expected impact or outcome from the current proposals for this aspect of the duty. The consultation has not altered this assessment.

The proposals would not require further attention to this area of possible impact.

### 2. Describe any negative impact for customers or residents.

For the majority of the protected characteristics no identifiable impact has been identified.

It is obvious that the proposals have a specific impact on a group defined by age – but not in a way any other school based policy or decision would do. It is inevitable that any decision about school planning will affect a defined age group. It is not concluded that these proposals require different approaches as a result.

The specific element of the proposals which have required particular focus for the equality duty has been the implications for children with Education Health and Care Plans (EHCP) and those with defined Special Educational Needs or Disability (SEND).

All of the planning has taken into account the pupils falling into these groups so as to understand

- their current and future needs
- the decisions that have led to attendance at the current school
- the implications for disruption to current provision
- the need to seek and plan alternative provision
- the impact upon the physical and emotional wellbeing of the pupils
- The ability of alternative provision to meet their needs
- The action required to ensure safe and effective transition.
- The need to avoid or mitigate any identified adverse impact on these pupils both as a group and as individuals.

These factors have informed the appraisal of the proposals as the specific individuals are known and their individual needs understood. Their parents and carers and the other groups representing their interests have engaged in the consultation and have been enabled to set out fully the concerns which have particular impact upon these factors. Those have helped inform the final proposals.

### **3. Describe any positive effects which may offset any negative impact.**

The proposals for specific schools have been informed by and plans adjusted to take account of the needs of individuals within the defined group (primarily those with EHCP or SEND). In particular the transition and planning for pupils affected by the possible closure of Clapham and Patching school has been adjusted as indicated in the final form of the proposals.

More generally the proposals support the County Council's aspirations to be placed in the top quarter of performing Councils within three years, in terms of children's attainment. Great strides are being made towards this by working in partnership with schools and parents and these proposals are integral to helping achieve high performing and financially sustainable schools for everyone in West Sussex that benefit the children and communities for years to come. Accordingly the needs of future generations of pupils as well as those immediately affected for a short period have informed the decisions.

### **4. Describe whether and how the proposal helps to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation.**

Care has been paid to understand and plan for the transition of pupils with EHCP and SEND to alternative provision and to anticipate the impact on the individuals concerned.

No specific concerns for adverse impact in terms of harassment or victimisation is indicated. The need to avoid specific discrimination of groups specifically affected has informed the plans for individuals and the schools they currently attend. The proposals are integral to helping achieve high performing and financially sustainable schools for everyone in West Sussex.

### **5. Describe whether and how the proposal helps to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.**

It is considered that the overall aims of the proposals against the objectives set out in the background above and within the context of the impact of small school constraints also set out above will achieve significant benefits for advancing equality of opportunity.

**6. Describe whether and how the proposal helps to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.**

As in 5 above. The constraints of the small schools in question have been fully set out above and the proposals are aimed at removing the adverse impact of those constraints.

**7. What changes were made to the proposal as a result? If none, explain why.**

In so far as required during the process any changes have been incorporated into the developing and the final proposals.

**8. Explain how the impact will be monitored to make sure it continues to meet the equality duty owed to customers and say who will be responsible for this.**

This impact Assessment and the consultation process on options has provided a reference point to ensure that careful attention is made to the impact on pupils in protected groups - especially those referred to in this document and ensure that their interests are kept in mind as proposals are implemented.

**To be signed by a Director or Director to confirm that they have read and approved the content.**

**Name**



Paul Wagstaff

**Date**

15 April  
2020

**Your position**

Director of Education and Skills