

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00099 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Children's Services Planning & Resources	Lead Officer Name:	Kirsty Wilsdon
		Team:	Property
		Tel:	01324 506605
		Email:	kirsty.wilsdon@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Re-provisioning of the School Estate - Phase 1: School Estate Mothballing	Reference No:	CS12

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	Yes
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
01/10/2018	<p>by re-provisioning the school estate to a best value model. Currently there are a number of schools with a low school roll which have high property costs. Property costs relates to energy, ground maintenance, catering, cleaning, water and rates and charges. Staff costs are not included.</p> <p>There are two primary schools in scope for phase 1 of this project.</p> <p>Both schools have a very low school roll which is not projected to grow in future years and their roll can easily be accommodated in another school within the cluster. In the event that a school is 'mothballed', transport to another catchment school will be provided by the local authority.</p>

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):

--	--

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	419	
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	101	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:		
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:	01/08/2019	
	End Date (if any):	31/07/2020	

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)

A - Quantitative Evidence This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.

Schools 1 Phase 1

- Limerigg Primary School
- Bothkennar Primary School

Pupils on catchment school roll

- Each school has 5 pupils **(10 of total)**

B - Qualitative Evidence This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

Outcomes for pupils who would previously attended the two schools will be monitored and compared against previous years. It is expected that larger school rolls will improve inclusion and may have a positive effect on attainment.

Best Judgement:

Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	No
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	
What gaps in data / information were identified?	Profile of families affected.
Is further research necessary?	Yes
If NO, please state why.	

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Engagement with stakeholders - Communication issued to parents and carers to consult on mothballing the schools. Future meetings will be scheduled.	
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.		
How was the engagement carried out?	What were the results from the engagement? Please list...	
Focus Group	Yes	Communication issued to parents and carers to consult on mothballing the schools - no responses received to date.
Survey	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	Yes	Public meetings will be scheduled. Dates to be confirmed.
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No	
Is further engagement recommended?	Yes	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, public protection etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age				
Disability				
Sex	✓			Both sexes affected: Male: 7 Female: 3
Ethnicity	✓			0 number affected. SEEMIS report
Religion / Belief / non-Belief				
Sexual Orientation				
Transgender				
Pregnancy / Maternity				
Marriage / Civil Partnership				
Poverty	✓			Total of Free Meal Entitled pupils: 0 (info from SEEMIS) No additional costs will be placed on families as transport to another catchment school will be provided by the local authority.
Other, health, community justice, public protection etc.				
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)	No risks identified, it is currently an inefficient service provision.			

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	no protected characteristic groups affected
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	Yes	School transport providers - potential new routes.
Councils	No	
Education Sector	Yes	Positive impact on children's social development and the development of a more efficient service provision.
Fire	No	
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	No	
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Low school rolls may have a negative impact on children's social development	Pupils and Families	Consultations with stakeholders will be undertaken	Gary Greenhorn		
Continue to deliver an inefficient service provision.	Local Community	Consultations with stakeholders will be undertaken	Gary Greenhorn		
Transport requires to be provided to new schools - impacting on additional costs to parents / carers	Parents / Carers	Transport will be provided free to "alternative catchment school"	Gary Greenhorn		

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Are actions being reported to Members?

Yes

If yes when and how ?

Committee Report went to Education Executive on 29 September 2018.

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	Yes	Research into social development benefits of being in larger class groups is thorough and consultation has taken place with stakeholders and no additional costs will be passed onto stakeholders.
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	No	
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>Kirsty Wilsdon</i>	Date:	15/01/2019
------------	-----------------------	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	Yes
------------------------------------	--	-----

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS	Does not impact on protected characteristic groups	
If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA		
If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA		

Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	Yes / No	If YES, please describe:

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA

LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	
MEDIUM	Yes / No	
LOW	Yes	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:		
Signature:	<i>Robert Naylor</i>	Date: 31/01/2019