

Appendix 11 – Equality Impact Assessment

For an accessible version of this document contact Surinder.singh@leicester.gov.uk

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Tool:

Title of proposal	Review of Special School Funding Rates
Name of division/service	Social Care and Education
Name of lead officer completing this assessment	Clare Nagle
Date EIA assessment completed	28.01.21
Decision maker	Lead Member
Date decision taken	

EIA sign off on completion:	Signature	Date
Lead officer	C Nagle	28/01/21
Equalities officer	S Singh	28/01/21
Divisional director	T Rees	

Please ensure the following:

- a) That the document is **understandable to a reader who has not read any other documents** and explains (on its own) how the Public Sector Equality Duty is met. This does not need to be lengthy but must be complete and based in evidence.
- b) That available support information and data is identified and where it can be found. Also be clear about highlighting gaps in existing data or evidence that you hold, and how you have sought to address these knowledge gaps.
- c) That the equality impacts are capable of aggregation with those of other EIAs to identify the cumulative impact of all service changes made by the council on different groups of people.

- d) That the equality impact assessment is started at an early stage in the decision-making process, so that it can be used to inform the consultation, engagement and the decision. It should not be a tick-box exercise. Equality impact assessment is an iterative process that should be revisited throughout the decision-making process. It can be used to assess several different options.
- e) Decision makers must be aware of their duty to pay 'due regard' to the Public Sector Equality Duty (see below) and 'due regard' must be paid before and at the time a decision is taken. Please see the Brown Principles on the equality intranet pages, for information on how to undertake a lawful decision-making process, from an equalities perspective. Please append the draft EIA and the final EIA to papers for decision makers (including leadership team meetings, lead member briefings, scrutiny meetings and executive meetings) and draw out the key points for their consideration. The Equalities Team provide equalities comments on reports.

1. Setting the context

Describe the proposal, the reasons it is being made, and the intended change or outcome. Will the needs of those who are currently using the service continue to be met?

In response to cost pressures exerted on the High Needs Block (HNB) of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) the Local Authority (LA) is undertaking a review of the funding in two strands top-ups for pupils with Special Educational Needs in mainstream settings and special schools. This EIA is concerned with the latter strand, special school funding.

The special school funding rates have not been reviewed since 2014 and there is agreement amongst the majority of special schools that funding is not being distributed equitably in line with the need of pupils. The proposal put forward is intended for funding to be distributed equitably based on pupil need for teaching and non-teaching costs. The new funding rates involve a standard level of per pupil funding for non-teaching costs and a teaching rate based on a 6-banded system, which would result in a new revised single weighted average funding rate. Under the proposals the distribution of funding for schools would change.

The schools under review include; Ellesmere College, Keyham Lodge, Millgate School, Nether Hall School, Oaklands School and West Gate School, and does not include Ash Field, the Primary PRU, LPS and the Hospital School. The reasons for not included these schools are as follows: Ash Field as part of an academy has a different reporting timeframe to the maintained schools, they also have an increased range of medical needs which needs to be factored into a consultation. The Primary Pupil Referral Unit and the Leicester Partnership School are funded different as is the Hospital School.

Under these proposals revised unit funding rates will change significantly, with Keyham and Millgate losing 17% and 22% respectively and the remaining schools gaining between 4% and 15%.

The process to consult on these proposals commenced on 2 October, with the consultation originally planned to close 13 November, it was however agreed to extend the timeframe through to 27 November to enable School Forum to meet and hear representation from some of the Special Schools and ask further questions of the LA to provide a formal response to the consultation. Once the consultation closes all evidence will be gathered and reported to the Lead Member for Education, before a report with recommendations are taken the Education Scrutiny Committee in January 2021. Upon the decision made at this committee and formal report with recommendations will be submitted to the Department for Education (DfE) in February 2021. Any formal decision from the DfE will be communicated to schools as soon as possible and the LA will work closely with all schools to deliver any changes to be made to the formal funding arrangements.

2. Equality implications/obligations

Which aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) are likely be relevant to the proposal? In this question, consider both the current service and the proposed changes.

a. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation

- How does the proposal/service ensure that there is no barrier or disproportionate impact for anyone with a particular protected characteristic?
- Is this a relevant consideration? What issues could arise?

The proposal is to deliver changes to funding arrangements across 6 city maintained special schools. The proposal put forward is intended for funding to be distributed equitably based on pupil need for teaching and non-teaching costs.

All schools provision for pupils with disabilities across a wide spectrum of need. There isn't at present a fair and equitable method for funding schools within the funding envelope available within the High Needs Block for special schools.

The proposed changes identify significant changes to funding arrangements for 2 special schools for children and young people with Social Emotional and Mental Health.

The EIA will need to ensure consideration is given to ensure there is no discrimination in relation to age, disability, sex and race as part of the proposed changes.

b. [Advance equality of opportunity between different groups](#)

- How does the proposal/service ensure that its intended outcomes promote equality of opportunity for people?
- Identify inequalities faced by those with specific protected characteristic(s).
- Is this a relevant consideration? What issues could arise?

The aim of the review is to reform the funding rates so as to support the life chances of our most vulnerable children and young people; a fairer funding system will help provide all schools and all areas with the resources needed to provide an excellent education for all pupils.

Initially analysis of the demographics/ equality monitoring information of both staff and pupils across the affected schools will be collated and analysed, in addition to evidence of how schools can continue to meet pupils' needs.

The possible or actual impacts of continuing to provide funding in the same way as it is provided now will be considered as a part of the impact assessment.

Consultation questions have been designed to draw out any potential equality implications along with a better understanding of how the schools might manage the changes were to be agreed will provide a clearer sense of how it might impact on the pupils, teaching staff and non-teaching staff.

c. [Foster good relations between different groups](#)

- Does the service contribute to good relations or to broader community cohesion objectives?
- How does it achieve this aim?
- Is this a relevant consideration? What issues could arise?

We believe that all pupils will benefit from the clearer and fairer distribution of funding.

Proposals for the changes had been worked on initially with the special schools headteacher group (CLASS), specifically to identify teaching costs (banding elements) on the proposals.

Extensive consultation and engagement will take place to gather views from a wide range of stakeholders and communities whether these proposals may have an impact.

A final report will capture all information gathered from the different stakeholder groups, in addition feedback will be provided on the outcome and decisions made to all stakeholders.

3. Who is affected?

Outline who could be affected, and how they could be affected by the proposal/service change. Include people who currently use the service and those who could benefit from, but do not currently access the service.

Those affected will be the Leicester City Council Special Schools under review, including Ellesmere College, Keyham Lodge, Millgate School, Nether Hall School, Oaklands School and West Gate School.

Within these schools the teachers and approximately 1,128 pupils may be affected, with a significant number positively with their school receiving additional funds and approximately 244 pupils where the school may lose funding/resources.

4. Information used to inform the equality impact assessment

- What **data, research, or trend analysis** have you used?
- Describe how you have got your information and what it tells you
- Are there any gaps or limitations in the information you currently hold, and how you have sought to address this? E.g. proxy data, national trends, equality monitoring etc.

Data includes:

- Local Area SEND report Leicester 2019

- Workforce Census 2018
- Census Reports – School 2019
- Local Authority Schools financial data
- Local Authority Schools HR data
- Data provided by the Special Schools, identifying pupils in proposed banding, and data from the Local Authorities Education, Health and Care Plans

Much of the information is available via Leicester Schools extranet, as per schools' statutory returns: these provide details on pupil numbers in schools, in addition primary needs, those eligible and accessing free school meals.

The LA holds records of school budgets for maintained schools therefore details of income and expenditure for each of the schools within the review.

Data on pupils against proposed banding was supplied by schools, as way of implementing a banding system to meet pupils teaching needs. This information is currently being moderated by independent consultants, which may have minor implications on pupil costs, subject to the funding allocations for pupils' bandings.

The Census reports, provides an overview from 2018 on staff within the schools, including BAME. Further information has been received from LA HR data, which breaks down schools staff roles, by gender, ethnicity and age as identified in tables 1 – 4 below

5. Consultation

What **consultation** have you undertaken about the proposal with people who use the service or people affected, people who may potentially use the service and other stakeholders? What did they say about:

- What is important to them regarding the current service?
- How does (or could) the service meet their needs? How will they be affected by the proposal? What potential impacts did they identify because of their protected characteristic(s)?

- Did they identify any potential barriers they may face in accessing services/other opportunities that meet their needs?

The consultation we have undertaken to date (as of 17/11/20):

- Nov/Dec 2019 – Jan 2020 Special School Headteachers (and governing bodies), meetings were held throughout to review pupil banded rates descriptors which were developed and updated during this period
- Jan 2020 – Schools provide details of numbers and pupils for each of the bands, to enable Independent consultants to review and verify consistency in placements of pupils within the bandings against the identified need with pupils EHCP. A report was received in April 2020 with details of the findings from Independent consultants.
- 26/02/20 – With Department for Education.
- 02/10/20 – Consultation formally launched with Special Schools, presentation given to Headteachers
- 02/10/20 – Briefing provided to City Cllrs notifying of the consultation
- 02/10/20 – Communication sent to Schools Forum to notify of the consultation
- 02/10/20 – Letters sent to Chair of Governors of Special Schools to notify of the consultation
- 02/10/20 – Briefing sent to PCF Chair to notify of the consultation launch
- 02/10/20 – Briefing sent to SENDIASS to notify of the consultation launch
- 02/10/20 – Communication sent to all Leicester City Schools via schools extranet communication
- 05/10/20 – Briefing sent to Education unions to notify of the consultation
- 08/10/20 – Meeting held with all available school governors to present and discuss the consultation
- 14/10/20 – Presentation to Parent Carer Forum to explain consultation
- 22/10/20 – Discussion with BMF regarding Consultation
- 3/11/20 – 10/11/20 – Individual meetings with Special School Governing Bodies
- 13/11/20 – Extra Schools Forum meeting to enable discussions

All information submitted to the council will be taken into consideration and presented in a report to the Lead Member for Education before being submitted to the Scrutiny Committee in January 2021 and a final report submitted to the Department for Education.

At the time of writing this current EIA, there are very mixed views from across the Special Schools regarding the proposals

6. Potential Equality Impact

Based on your understanding of the service area, any specific evidence you may have on people who use the service and those who could potentially use the service and the findings of any consultation you have undertaken, use the table below to explain which individuals or community groups are likely to be affected by the proposal because of their protected characteristic(s). Describe what the impact is likely to be, how significant that impact is for individual or group well-being, and what mitigating actions can be taken to reduce or remove negative impacts. This could include indirect impacts, as well as direct impacts.

Looking at potential impacts from a different perspective, this section also asks you to consider whether any other particular groups, especially vulnerable groups, are likely to be affected by the proposal. List the relevant groups that may be affected, along with the likely impact, potential risks and mitigating actions that would reduce or remove any negative impacts. These groups do not have to be defined by their protected characteristic(s).

Protected characteristics

Impact of proposal:

Describe the likely impact of the proposal on people because of their protected characteristic and how they may be affected. Why is this protected characteristic relevant to the proposal? How does the protected characteristic determine/shape the potential impact of the proposal? This may also include **positive impacts** which support the aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations.

Risk of disproportionate negative impact:

How likely is it that people with this protected characteristic will be disproportionately negatively affected? How great will that impact be on their well-being? What will determine who will be negatively affected?

Mitigating actions:

For disproportionate negative impacts on protected characteristic/s, what mitigating actions can be taken to reduce or remove the impact? You may also wish to include actions which support the positive aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations. All actions identified here should also be included in the action plan at the end of this EIA.

a. Age

Indicate which age group/s is/ are most affected, either specify general age group - children, young people working age people or older people or specific age bands

What is the impact of the proposal on age?

The consultation is with 6 Leicester City Council Special Schools who provide education for pupils aged 4 through to 19 years old, Whilst this consultation is unlikely to impact on an individual level, should a reduction in funding take place within two of the schools as proposed, there may be staffing implications and possible placement issues within the schools.

Within schools, there was a workforce of over 700 staff, including a leadership group of 40 people, with over 50% of this number within 2 of the schools who would potentially be impacted by the proposed changes.

Only 4 of the schools have submitted details on staff over the age of 50, with 3.3% - 36% of their staff at this age.

What is the risk of disproportionate negative impact on age?

It is unclear at this stage what the risk of a negative impact would be in relation to age at this stage, as any decisions regarding staff losses would be taken by the schools in order to manage their budgets.

Age is be a relevant characteristic in considering school's duties in their role as an employer but not in relation to pupils.

What are the mitigating actions?

If a decision is taken to reduce funding in the identified schools, work will need to be done to understand the possible impacts on redundancies and staff ages.

b. Disability

If specific impairments are affected by the proposal, specify which these are. Our standard categories are on our equality monitoring form – physical impairment, sensory impairment, mental health condition, learning disability, long standing illness or health condition.

What is the impact of the proposal on disability?

What is the risk of disproportionate negative impact on disability?

The two schools impacted by these proposals provide education for approximately 244 pupils with SEHM, it is unclear at this time what the impact will be until any final decision is made, and if agreed a transition plan and timeline is agreed with the school.

It should be noted one other school in the City provides some SEHM provision, but not to the extent of the two schools who will be significantly affected by these proposals.

What are the mitigating actions?

Further information is needed from the schools regarding the impact on their pupils with SEMH of the proposed changes, which has been requested as part of the consultation process, in terms of the respite provision and leadership costs.

It remains unclear from the proposed funding changes what the impact will be for the pupils within these provisions.

c. Gender reassignment

Indicate whether the proposal has potential impact on trans men or trans women, and if so, which group is affected.

What is the impact of the proposal on gender reassignment?

No impact identified for this equality group.

What is the risk of disproportionate negative impact on gender reassignment?

Not applicable

What are the mitigating actions?

Not applicable

d. Marriage and civil partnership

What is the impact of the proposal on marriage and civil partnership?

No impact identified
for this equality group.

What is the risk of disproportionate negative impact on marriage and civil partnership?

Not applicable

What are the mitigating actions?

Not applicable

e. Pregnancy and maternity

What is the impact of the proposal on pregnancy and maternity?

**No impact identified
for this equality group.**

What is the risk of disproportionate negative impact on pregnancy and maternity?

Not applicable

What are the mitigating actions?

Not applicable

f. Race

Given the city's racial diversity it is useful that we collect information on which racial groups are affected by the proposal. Our equalities monitoring form follows ONS general census categories and uses broad categories in the first instance with the opportunity to identify more specific racial groups such as Gypsies/Travellers. Use the most relevant classification for the proposal.

What is the impact of the proposal on race?

Please see below demographics for school staff (tables 1 & 3) and pupils (table 6), until any final decision is made and further information is received from schools that maybe affected by to proposals it is unclear which of the school would be affected.

We have received communications from Keyham Lodge and Millgate School they may have to make a number of redundancies as a result of the proposed funding cuts.

What is the risk of disproportionate negative impact on race?

As above it is unclear of the risk of negative impact

What are the mitigating actions?

To review race information and data for the schools potentially impacted by the proposals with the schools as part of the formal engagement and review of information when looking at the Respite provision and Leadership costs. Once a decision is taken and any transition period agreed, it will be clearer to understand what mitigations will be required regarding staffing impacts

g. Religion or belief

If specific religious or faith groups are affected by the proposal, our equalities monitoring form sets out categories reflective of the city's population. Given the diversity of the city there is always scope to include any group that is not listed.

What is the impact of the proposal on religion or belief?

It is unclear on the proposals on religion or belief of the staff/pupils at the affected schools

What is the risk of disproportionate negative impact on religion or belief?

This information is yet to be confirmed and needs to be reviewed during further formal discussions with the affected schools

What are the mitigating actions?

To gather information on religion or belief of the staff/pupils at the affected schools as part of the formal discussions

h. Sex

Indicate whether this has potential impact on either males or females

What is the impact of the proposal on sex?

This may have an impact on pupils within Keyham Lodge School, as the school provides education provision for male only pupils, therefore should the school receive reduced funding rates and not be able to manage their budgets, pupils may be moved to other placements within the City or out of area.

What is the risk of disproportionate negative impact on sex?

The risk of a negative impact is yet to be confirmed and will need to be established throughout the consultation process.

What are the mitigating actions?

We would need to understand better the potential impact of the proposals on this group to identify mitigating actions.

Through the consultation process we have requested information on the impacts to pupils from which mitigations can be discussed.

It has also been confirmed if any changes are agreed a transition plan and timeline would be agreed with the schools.

7. Summary of protected characteristics

a. Summarise why the protected characteristics you have commented on, are relevant to the proposal?

The protected characteristics are relevant to this proposal due to reduction in funding proposed my result in redundancies in schools, it is not clear which aspect of the workforce (if any would be affected).

Furthermore, the areas of Disability and Sex are key as the proposals are reviewing Special Schools who make provision for Children and Young People with Disabilities across a wide spectrum of need.

Additionally, one of the two schools which may be impacted by the proposal provides specific provision for boys

Further work is required to understand any impact on race within schools which may be impacted from the proposals

b. Summarise why the protected characteristics you have not commented on, are not relevant to the proposal?

We have not commented on gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, and religion and belief as we believe there are no direct links between the funding reform and these protected characteristics.

8. Other groups

Other groups

Impact of proposal:

Describe the likely impact of the proposal on children in poverty or any other people who we may consider to be vulnerable, for example people who misuse substances, ex armed forces, people living in poverty, care experienced young people, carers. List any vulnerable groups likely to be affected. Will their needs continue to be met? What issues will affect their take up of services/other opportunities that meet their needs/address inequalities they face?

Risk of disproportionate negative impact:

How likely is it that this group of people will be negatively affected? How great will that impact be on their well-being? What will determine who will be negatively affected?

Mitigating actions:

For negative impacts, what mitigating actions can be taken to reduce or remove this impact for this vulnerable group of people? These should be included in the action plan at the end of this EIA. You may also wish to use this section to identify opportunities for positive impacts.

a. Children in poverty

What is the impact of the proposal on children in poverty?

A number of pupils across the city in Special Schools are eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) according to school census – see below appendix from breakdown of these details.

It should be noted 68% of pupils from Millgate and 58% of pupils from Keyham are eligible for FSM

What is the risk of negative impact on children in poverty?

Further work will need to be completed to analyse the risk of negative impact on Children in poverty as a result of the proposals which are under consultation.

What are the mitigating actions?

Work will need to be done prior to any final decision making, with the schools in question to analyse data and information regarding children in poverty that may be impacted by the proposed changes.

b. Other vulnerable groups

What is the impact of the proposal on other vulnerable groups?

No other vulnerable groups identified

What is the risk of negative impact on other vulnerable groups?

Not applicable

What are the mitigating actions?

No further actions required at this stage

c. Other (describe)

What is the impact of the proposal on any other groups?

Not applicable

What is the risk of negative impact on any other groups?

Not applicable

What are the mitigating actions?

Not applicable

9. Other sources of potential negative impacts

Are there any other potential negative impacts external to the service that could further disadvantage service users over the next three years that should be considered? For example, these could include:

- other proposed changes to council services that would affect the same group of service users;
- Government policies or proposed changes to current provision by public agencies (such as new benefit arrangements) that would negatively affect residents;
- external economic impacts such as an economic downturn.

There are possible proposed changes to the council services which may affect some of the services users, this being possible amendments to the Transport Policy, however details are yet tbc.

Government (Department for Education) launched a SEND review in September 2019 and will look at the how the system has evolved since then, how it can be made to work best for all families and ensure quality of provision is the same across the country. Recognising the importance of joined-up support, it will also explore the role of health care in SEND in collaboration with the Department of Health and Social Care.

Timeframes for outcomes and actions from this review are not known at present, however it is anticipated once the consultation closed on 27 November, a full and detailed report will be presented to the Lead member for Education, before recommendations are discussed at a LA Scrutiny committee in March 2021, and a final report submitted to the Department for Education and final decisions made regarding the funding allocations.

10. Human rights implications

Are there any human rights implications which need to be considered and addressed (please see the list at the end of the template), if so please outline the implications and how they will be addressed below:

Protocol 1, Article 2: Right to education

No person shall be denied a right to an education. In the exercise of any functions which it assumes in relation to education and to teaching, the State shall respect the right of parents to ensure such education and teaching is in conformity with their own religious and philosophical convictions.

We do not believe this proposal has any implications on human rights.

11. Monitoring impact

You will need to ensure that monitoring systems are established to check for impact on the protected characteristics and human rights after the decision has been implemented. Describe the systems which are set up to:

- monitor impact (positive and negative, intended and unintended) for different groups
- monitor barriers for different groups
- enable open feedback and suggestions from different communities
- ensure that the EIA action plan (below) is delivered.

If you want to undertake equality monitoring, please refer to our [equality monitoring guidance and templates](#).

It is proposed the impacts will be monitored by the SEND Delivery Board and more broadly by the SEND Improvement Board.

Additionally, it is proposed the LA will continue to work closely and jointly with CLASS Headteachers to monitor the impacts, barriers and facilitate feedback and suggestions from communities in Leicester.

DRAFT

12. EIA action plan

Please list all the equality objectives, actions and targets that result from this assessment (continue on separate sheets as necessary). These now need to be included in the relevant service plan for mainstreaming and performance management purposes.

Equality Outcome	Action	Officer Responsible	Completion date
This EIA will be updated during and following the consultation responses should this be required.	Update EIA during and following closure of the consultation	Clare Nagle	Ongoing
Service users with protected characteristics are not negatively impacted by the proposed changes	Gather further information and data on protected characteristics including Age, Disability, Sex and Race to analyse any potential impacts from the proposed changes	Martin Judson/ Clare Nagle	Ongoing during an agreed transition period to be agreed with the individual schools
Funding increase Netherhall School proposed funding increase of 4% however concern raised this would not meet medical support needs of pupils	To work with the school to quantify and additional funding factor for pupils medical and health support costs	Martin Judson	Anticipated completion date Q1 2021/21
Westgate School proposed funding increase 7%, with this funding it still does not matching current expenditure rates of the schools	To work with the school to look at staffing structure and levels of support	Martin Judson	TBC – The local authority Finance and SEND Support Services Teams will work with the school to review needs

Equality Outcome	Action	Officer Responsible	Completion date
Millgate School – proposed reduction of 22% funding	We would work with Millgate School and Keyham Lodge management teams to address outstanding items and agree any transition plan	Martin Judson	TBC – following the formal discussions
Keyham Lodge– proposed reduction of 8% funding			
Data sources	To add links to data sources where available	Clare Nagle	31/03/21
Religion or belief	Look to gather information on religion or belief of those schools impacted by the proposed changes	Clare Nagle	31/03/21

Appendix A – School Staff Data tables

School	Total School Workforce (Headcount)	Total Number of Classroom Teachers (Headcount)	Total Number of Teachers in the Leadership Group (Headcount)	Total Number of Teachers (Headcount)	Total Number of Teaching Assistants (Headcount)	Total Number of Non Classroom-based School Support Staff, Excluding Auxiliary Staff (Headcount)	Total Number of Auxiliary Staff (Headcount)	Percentage of All Teaching Staff who Work Part-time (%)	Pupil: Teacher Ratio	All Teachers who Are Male (%)	All Teachers from Minority Ethnic Groups (ie Non-white British) (%)	Teachers Aged 50 or over (%)	All Teaching Assistants from Minority Ethnic Groups (ie Non-white British) (%)	All Non-classroom Based School Support Staff from Minority Ethnic Groups (ie Non-white British) (%)	Auxiliary Staff from Minority Ethnic Groups (ie Non-white British) (%)
Nether Hall School	107	14	4	18	46	7	36	38.9	6.7	SUPP	11.1	36.0	21.7	57.1	41.7
Millgate School	109	19	12	31	43	26	9	22.6	3.5	41.8	8.7	0.0	17.6	20.0	25.0
Oaklands School	85	13	4	17	59	6	3	29.4	7.2	SUPP	29.4	0.0	36.2	50.0	33.3
Ellesmere College	163	41	5	46	79	19	19	26.1	6.9	22.2	17.4	24.7	33.3	10.5	21.1
Keyham Lodge School	106	23	10	33	47	22	4	21.2	3.7	50.3	18.2	3.3	25.5	19.0	0.0
West Gate School	146	27	5	32	86	11	17	12.1	5.8	25.4	20.0	18.7	13.4	0.0	25.0

Table 1: School workforce census 2018

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/837753/SWFC_School_LA_Region_Tables_update_Sept.xlsx

School Name	Roles	Gender		Grand Total
		Female	Male	
Ellesmere College	Leadership	7	1	8
	Other Support Staff	31	5	36
	Teacher	35	11	46
	Teaching Assistant	97	15	112
Ellesmere College Total		170	32	202

Keyham Lodge School	Leadership	4	6	10
	Other Support Staff	27	23	50
	Teacher	14	15	29
	Teaching Assistant	17	5	22
<hr/>				
Keyham Lodge School Total		62	49	111
<hr/>				
Millgate School	Leadership	5	6	11
	Other Support Staff	27	18	45
	Teacher	16	9	25
	Teaching Assistant	29	18	47
<hr/>				
Millgate School Total		77	51	128
<hr/>				
Nether Hall School	Leadership	6	1	7
	Other Support Staff	40	4	44
	Teacher	16	1	17
	Teaching Assistant	53	1	54
<hr/>				
Nether Hall School Total		115	7	122
<hr/>				
Oaklands School	Leadership	4		4
	Other Support Staff	11	2	13

	Other Support Staff	2	2		1			3			2	26			36	
	Teacher	2				1		1	3		5	31	1	2	46	
	Teaching Assistant	11	4	3	1	1	1	1	1	2	19	64	1	3	112	
Ellesmere College Total		15	6	3	2	2	1	1	7	1	2	26	129	2	5	202
Keyham Lodge School	Leadership	1						1				8			10	
	Other Support Staff	3				2		4				41			50	
	Teacher	5	1					1		1		20	1		29	
	Teaching Assistant	2								1		19			22	
Keyham Lodge School Total		11	1			2		6		2		88	1		111	
Millgate School	Leadership	1						1				9			11	
	Other Support Staff	4			1	1		2	5		1	31			45	
	Teacher	2							7			16			25	
	Teaching Assistant							1	16	1		28		1	47	
Millgate School Total		7			1	1		4	28	1	1	84		1	128	
Nether Hall School	Leadership	1	1									5			7	
	Other Support Staff	14	1	1	1							27			44	

	Teacher		1									16			17		
	Teaching Assistant	1	14	1	1	1			1	1		34			54		
Nether Hall School Total		1	30	3	2	2			1	1		82			122		
Oaklands School																	
	Leadership											4			4		
	Other Support Staff		4		3							6			13		
	Teacher		2			1	1		1			11		1	17		
	Teaching Assistant	1	14	2	2	1			2	1		35		2	60		
Oaklands School Total		1	20	2	5	2	1		3	1		56		3	94		
West Gate School																	
	Leadership		1						1			4			6		
	Other Support Staff	1	2						1	2		26	1		33		
	Teacher		1		1					1	3	23		1	30		
	Teaching Assistant		7				1	1	1	7	3	78		2	100		
West Gate School Total		1	11		1		1	1	3	10	6	131	1	3	169		
Grand Total		3	94	12	11	7	7	2	1	24	39	7	33	570	4	12	826

Table 3: School staff by role and ethnicity provided by LCC HR December 2020

School Name	Roles	Age					Grand Total
		16-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56+	
Ellesmere College	Leadership		1	4	2	1	8
	Other Support Staff	1	4	4	12	15	36
	Teacher	1	15	16	11	3	46
	Teaching Assistant	10	38	26	20	18	112
Ellesmere College Total		12	58	50	45	37	202
Keyham Lodge School	Leadership		1	6	2	1	10
	Other Support Staff	5	18	13	11	3	50
	Teacher		18	10	1		29
	Teaching Assistant	3	6	3	8	2	22
Keyham Lodge School Total		8	43	32	22	6	111
Millgate School	Leadership		1	7	3		11
	Other Support Staff	3	10	10	15	7	45
	Teacher	5	10	6	2	2	25
	Teaching Assistant	13	14	7	10	3	47

Millgate School Total		21	35	30	30	12	128
Nether Hall School	Leadership			3	2	2	7
	Other Support Staff		13	12	10	9	44
	Teacher		6	6	4	1	17
	Teaching Assistant	5	10	16	16	7	54
Nether Hall School Total		5	29	37	32	19	122
Oaklands School	Leadership			2	2		4
	Other Support Staff		4	5		4	13
	Teacher	3	6	4	4		17
	Teaching Assistant	5	27	8	16	4	60
Oaklands School Total		8	37	19	22	8	94
West Gate School	Leadership			3	3		6
	Other Support Staff	3	6	11	8	5	33
	Teacher		9	10	9	2	30
	Teaching Assistant	21	24	15	21	19	100
West Gate School Total		24	39	39	41	26	169
Grand Total		78	241	207	192	108	826

Table 4: School staff by role and age provided by LCC HR December 2020

Appendix B Pupil Census Data – Autumn 2020

School	NOR Total	FSM Eligible	Universal Infant Free School Meal	UIFSM Taken & FSM Eligible	NOR Year R/F2, 1 & 2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19+	FSM Eligible 5-11 year olds	NOR 5-11 year olds	FSM Eligible 11-15 year olds
Ellesmere College	306	136	15	5	19	0	0	0	3	3	2	10	4	7	14	10	16	17	19	13	13	5	0	43	95	76
Keyham Lodge School	97	63	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	10	17	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	63
Millgate School	113	95	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	12	7	15	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	34	38	68
Nether Hall School	111	41	10	3	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	6	3	4	4	4	0	14	49	18
Oaklands School	101	43	21	8	22	0	0	0	3	6	8	9	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	101	
West Gate School	178	78	13	2	17	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	6	7	6	9	4	6	11	7	4	5	0	32	76	36
Total	906	456	59	18	70	0	0	0	8	13	20	32	24	39	31	52	46	64	68	24	21	14	0	167	361	261

Table 5: Number of pupils receiving free school meals by School

School	Total	African Asian	Bangladeshi	Indian	Pakistani	Other Asian	Black Caribbean	Black Somali	Other Black African	Any Other Black Background	White & Asian	White & Black African	White & Black Caribbean	Any Other Mixed Background	Gypsy/Roma	Irish	Traveller of Irish Heritage	White British	White European	White Other	Chinese	Any Other Ethnic Group	Information Not Obtained	Information Refused	No information recorded
Ellesmere College	306	1	2	44	9	25	1	8	10	6	4	3	2	8	2	1	0	150	6	4		12	7		1
Keyham Lodge School	97					1	1			0	3	1	7	3			1	77		1				1	1
Millgate School	113		1	1			2	1		1	1	3	8	4				87					1		3
Nether Hall School	111	2	5	30	11	5	2	8	6	1	1		2	3	1	1		27	3			1		2	
Oaklands School	101	1	4	20	4	5	1	5	6	2		5	2					24	8	7	3	3			1
West Gate School	178	1	2	27	5	4	3	10	13	6	3	5	3	4				73	10	3		6			
Total	906	5	14	122	29	40	10	32	35	16	12	17	24	22	3	2	1	438	27	15	3	22	8	3	6

Table 6: Pupil Ethnicity by School

Human rights articles:

Part 1: [The convention rights and freedoms](#)

Article 2: [Right to Life](#)

- Article 3:** Right not to be tortured or treated in an inhuman or degrading way
- Article 4:** Right not to be subjected to slavery/forced labour
- Article 5:** Right to liberty and security
- Article 6:** Right to a fair trial
- Article 7:** No punishment without law
- Article 8:** Right to respect for private and family life
- Article 9:** Right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion
- Article 10:** Right to freedom of expression
- Article 11:** Right to freedom of assembly and association
- Article 12:** Right to marry
- Article 14:** Right not to be discriminated against

Part 2: First protocol

- Article 1:** Protection of property/peaceful enjoyment
- Article 2:** Right to education
- Article 3:** Right to free elections