Equality Impact Report – West Sussex Small Schools Consultation on Proposals for Change

Title of report	Equality Impact Report
Date of implementation	September 2019
EIR completed by	
Name:	James Richardson
Tel:	0330 222 3727

1. Background

1.1 In October 2018 the <u>School Effectiveness Strategy 2018 - 2022</u> 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 these objectives. Implementation of the strategy will help ensure that in West Sussex:

"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".

The school effectiveness strategy also states *that:*

"where schools are identified as being at risk, they need to consider options for change. These could include:

- Consulting on amalgamating or merging two or more schools to become an all-through primary school.
- Consulting on expanding the age range of a group of schools so each becomes all through primary schools.
- Consulting on federating two or more schools.
- Finally, consulting on closing a school."
- 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.
- 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, most notably the federation between Amberley Primary School and St James CE Primary School, Coldwaltham.
- 1.4 Due to specific circumstances of five of these schools, an impact assessment was conducted between April and June 2019. The specific circumstances for four of the schools are set out in the impact assessments in the appendix to this report. Rumboldswhyke was included following the recent Ofsted inspection which rated the school as inadequate. The options for the future of the school are very limited following this judgement. The school has to either academise or close. Discussion has taken place with the Regional Schools

Commissioner (RSC) and Diocese and both are accepting that academisation of a school of the size of Rumboldswhyke would not be a feasible option. In addition the financial outlook for this school is challenging and school enrolment continues to fall – currently 52 pupils from 120 capacity (2 classes).

During the period 7 October 2019 – 25 November 2019 a public consultation on options, which included a public meeting at each school, was held for each of the five schools.

Following conclusion of the impact assessment work a consultation process was undertaken to assess views on options for change at the following schools:-

- Clapham and Patching CE Primary School, Clapham, Worthing
- Compton and Upmarden CE School, Compton, Chichester
- Rumboldswhyke CE Infants School, Chichester
- Stedham Primary School, Stedham, Midhurst
- Warninglid Primary School, Warninglid, Haywards Heath

Equality duty

The Equality Act (2010) mandates a duty within 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 the equalities duty set by the Equality Act (2010), authorities are required to analyse the impact of proposed policies, strategies and action plans across all of the protected groups.

In this Equality Impact Assessment, we evaluate the impact on West Sussex Small Schools to anticipate and avoid any discriminatory or negative consequences for a particular group, on the grounds of:

- 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

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		RUMBO	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	-	

The following applies "generally" to small schools:

- 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 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;

Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL SEND SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	2016 0 21 21 90 111	Num 2017 0 27 27 87 114	2018 0 15 15 77 92 Summar	2019 0 8 8 64 72	2016 0.0% 18.9% 18.9% 81.1% - Stedha	% of 2017 0.0% 23.7% 23.7% 76.3%	total 2018 0.0% 16.3% 16.3% 83.7% total 2018	2019 0.0% 11.1% 11.1% 88.9%
SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL SEND SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	2016 0 21 21 90 111 PROVI 2016 0 10 10 67	Num 2017 0 27 27 87 114 SSION - Num 2017 0 15 15	2018 0 15 15 77 92 Summar bers 2018 0 11	2019 0 8 8 64 72 y Total	2016 0.0% 18.9% 18.9% 81.1% - Stedha	% of 2017 0.0% 23.7% 23.7% 76.3%	2018 0.0% 16.3% 16.3% 83.7%	0.0% 11.1% 11.1%
Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL SEND SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	0 21 21 90 111 PROVI	0 27 27 87 114 SSION - Num 2017 0 15	0 15 15 77 92 Summar bers 2018 0	0 8 8 64 72 y Total	0.0% 18.9% 18.9% 81.1% - Stedha	2017 0.0% 23.7% 23.7% 76.3%	2018 0.0% 16.3% 16.3% 83.7%	0.0% 11.1% 11.1%
Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL SEND SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	21 21 90 111 PROVI	27 27 87 114 SSION - Num 2017 0 15	15 15 77 92 Summar bers 2018 0	8 8 64 72 y Total	18.9% 18.9% 81.1% - Stedha	23.7% 23.7% 76.3% m % of	16.3% 16.3% 83.7%	11.1%
Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL SEND SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	21 90 111 PROVI 2016 0 10 10	27 87 114 SSION - Num 2017 0 15 15	15 77 92 Summar bers 2018 0	8 64 72 y Total	18.9% 81.1% - Stedha	23.7% 76.3% m % of	16.3% 83.7% total	11.1%
Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL SEND SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	90 111 PROVI 2016 0 10 10 67	87 114 SSION - Num 2017 0 15	77 92 Summar bers 2018 0	64 72 y Total	81.1% - Stedha 2016	76.3% m % of	83.7% total	
SEND PROVISION SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	PROVI 2016 0 10 10 67	114 SSION - Num 2017 0 15 15	92 Summar bers 2018 0 11	72 y Total 2019	- Stedha	m % of	total	88.9%
SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	2016 0 10 10 67	SION - Num 2017 0 15	Summar bers 2018 0	y Total	2016	% of		
SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	2016 0 10 10 67	Num 2017 0 15 15	2018 0 11	2019	2016	% of		
SEND PROVISION Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	2016 0 10 10 67	Num 2017 0 15 15	2018 0 11	2019	2016	% of		
Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	0 10 10 67	2017 0 15	2018 0 11					
Number of EHCP/Statement Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	0 10 10 67	0 15 15	0			2017	2019	
Number of SEN Support Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	10 10 67	15 15	11	0	0.0%		2018	2019
Number of SEN (all) Number with No SEND need TOTAL	10	15			0.070	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number with No SEND need TOTAL	67	_	11	15	13.0%	16.9%	13.8%	17.2%
TOTAL		74	11	15	13.0%	16.9%	13.8%	17.2%
	77		69	72	87.0%	83.1%	86.3%	82.8%
SEND P		89	80	87				
JENU P	SEND PROVISION - Summary Total - Warninglid							
Numbers % of total								
SEND PROVISION 2	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%
TOTAL	66	56	49	39	30.310	02.170	72.170	07.070
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%
TOTAL	97	80	83	85				
CELLA DOCUM	TCTON			1 01.1		0 . 1:		
SEND PROVISION - Summary Total - Clapham and Patching								
CENT BOOKETON	Numbers % of total				2010			
	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%
TOTAL	60	67	52	62				
Source: January school censuses	2016-2	2019						

- 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 well being (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;

'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 a 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	Adur	Arun	Chichester	Crawley	Horsham	Mid	Worthing
Etillie Group	Sussex	Addi	Aluii	Cincilestei	Clawicy	11013114111	Sussex	worthing
Total	806,892	61,182	149,518	113,794	106,597	131,301	139,860	104,640
Population								
White British	717,551	56,843	137,024	105,841	76,888	121,020	126,341	93,594
	(88.9%)	(92.9%)	(91.6%)	(93%)	(72.1%)	(92.1%)	(90.3%)	(89.4%)
White other	38,948	1,820	8,094	4,481	8,292	5,042	6,677	4,542
(inc. Irish)	(4.8%)	(2.9%)	(5.4%)	(3.9%)	(7.7%)	(3.8%)	(4.7%)	(4.3%)
Mixed/	12,155	886	1,502	1,092	3,098	1,774	1,967	1,836
multiple ethnic	(1.5%)	(1.4%)	(1%)	(0.9%)	(2.9%)	(1.3%)	(1.4%)	(1.7%)
groups								
Asian/ Asian	28,334	1,058	2,116	1,617	13,825	2,585	3,761	3,372
British	(3.5%)	(1.7%)	(1.4%)	(1.4%)	(12.9%)	(1.9%)	(2.6%)	(3.2%)
Black/ African/	7,146	313	538	518 (0.4%)	3,469	651	788	869
Caribbean/	(0.8%)	(0.5%)	(0.3%)		(3.2%)	(0.4%)	(0.5%)	(0.8%)
Black British								
Other ethnic	2,758	262	244	245 (0.2%)	1,025	229	326	427
group	(0.3%)	(0.4%)	(0.1%)		(0.9%)	(0.1%)	(0.2%)	(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.

2. Describe any negative impact for customers or residents.

No negative impacts have been identified or are anticipated as a result of the Small Schools consultation review at this stage as no decisions have yet been made and the consultation has yet to commence.

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

The small school organisation 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 consultations 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.

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

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.

As 4 above,

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 4 above.

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

None.

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.

The impact Assessment and consultation process on options will ensure that careful attention is made to the impact of pupils with SEN and ensure that they are not disadvantaged

To be signed by an Executive Director or Director to confirm that they have read and approved the content.						
Name		Date				

Your position		
---------------	--	--