

## Updated Initial Residents and Service Users Equality Impact Assessment

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| <b>1. Details of function, policy, procedure or service:</b>  |                              |
| Title of what is being assessed: Outline Business Case (OBC): Education and Skills Alternative Delivery Model   |                              |
| Is it a new or revised function, policy, procedure or service?<br>The aim of the project is to implement a revised delivery model for Education and Skills services that will realise the objectives of:  |                              |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieving the budget savings target set by the Council</li> <li>• Maintaining Barnet's excellent education offer</li> <li>• Maintaining an excellent relationship between the Council and schools</li> </ul> |                              |
| Department and Section: Education and Skills  |                              |
| Date assessment completed: 16 June 2014.<br>Reviewed and updated August 2014 (appendix to draft OBC – CELS Committee Sept 2014).<br>Reviewed and updated December 2014 (appendix to final OBC – CELS Committee January 2015).                         |                              |
| <b>2. Names and roles of officers completing this assessment:</b>   |                              |
| Lead officer  | Val White, Lead Commissioner |
| Other groups  |                              |

| <b>3. How are the following equality strands affected?</b> <i>Please detail the effects on each equality strand, and any mitigating action you have taken / required. Please include any relevant data. If you do not have relevant data please explain why / plans to capture data</i> |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| Equality Strand   | Affected?  | Explain how affected  | What action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?  |
| 1. Age  | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/><br>No <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Data for children and young people shows:</p> <p>Age group 5 -10 years 28,881</p> <p>Age group 11- 16 years 25,416</p> <p>There are more primary school aged children in Barnet than secondary school age children</p> <p>The total 5 – 16 year old children and young people both male and female is 54,297.</p> <p>Source GLA 2013 Round Demographic Projections, 2014</p> | The key mitigation is the involvement of head teachers in procurement process to ensure that needs of all pupils are addressed and consultation with schools, governors and parents to ensure that key concerns |

|                      |   |  | are identified and considered.  |
|----------------------|---|--|---|
| <p>2. Disability</p> | <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Data for children and young people shows:</p> <p><b>Disability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The national averages indicate that in Barnet the 5 to 9 and 10 to 14 age cohorts have the highest number of disabled children, followed by the 15 to 19 age cohort. Whilst the 0 to 4 age cohort has the least number of disabled children.</li> <li>•This corresponds with Barnet’s Disabled Children’s Register where 32% are aged 5-9, 29% are aged 10-14, 27% are aged 15-19 and only 12% are aged 4 and under.</li> <li>•There are approximately three times more males than females on Barnet Disabled Children’s Register.</li> <li>•The most frequently occurring needs on the Disabled Children’s Register are speech, language and communication needs affecting 33% of all registered children. The other most frequently occurring disabilities are autistic spectrum disorders (affecting 23%), moderate learning difficulties (affecting 18%) and severe learning difficulties (affecting 17%).</li> </ul> <p>Source: Source: GLA 2012 Round Demographic Projections</p> <p><b>SEN:</b></p> <p>In the School Census completed in January 2013 a total of 52,824 pupils were on Barnet’s school rolls. Of these, 11,471 children were classed as have Special Educational Needs (SEN). This represents approximately 22% of the total school roll population. Disabled pupils are most likely classified as SEN within schools (Special Educational Needs and Disability).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There are more boys than girls with SEN across all age cohorts and SEN type. Overall, 61% of children with SEN are male.</li> <li>•There are more children aged 5-9 and 10-14 with SEN in comparison to the younger and older age cohorts. Of all children with SEN on the schools roll, 39% are aged 5-9 and 40% are aged 10-14.</li> <li>•Girls are less likely to have statements of SEN and more likely to receive School Action support. Of the 4,499 girls with SEN, 9% are statemented</li> </ul> | <p>The key mitigation is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement of head teachers in procurement process to ensure that needs of all pupils are addressed.</li> <li>• Rigorous approach to development of service specifications and KPIs to ensure that the needs of pupils with SEN are addressed</li> <li>• Consultation with parents of children with SEN to understand their concerns and how this can be addressed in any procurement process.</li> </ul> |

|                  |   |   |  |
|------------------|---|---|--|
|                  |   | <p>and 63% receive School Action support. In comparison, 15% of boys with SEN are statemented and 54% receive School Action support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Children with statements of SEN attending out of borough schools tend to be in the older age cohorts - 45% are aged 15-19 and 37% are aged 10-14.</li> <li>•Within Barnet, the highest numbers of children on the school rolls with SEN are concentrated within the Burnt Oak, Colindale and Underhill wards</li> </ul> <p>Source: Schools Census, February 2013</p> <p>The Children and Families Act 2014 introduces a new requirement for councils to develop a coordinated assessment process to develop Education, Health and Care plans for eligible children with special educational needs aged 0-25. Current arrangements to assess and deliver services to support eligible children require cooperation across social care, local authority education services, schools, health and other organisations. Developing an alternative delivery model for education services including SEN services may add to this complexity. However, the current arrangements are managed through agreed processes and decision making arrangements between organisations and services these will continue to apply.</p> |  |
| <p>3. Gender</p> | <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Data for children and young people shows:</p> <p>Female:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Age group 5 -10 years 14,013</li> <li>•Age group 11- 16 years 12,315</li> </ul> <p>Male:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Age group 5 -10 years 14,868</li> <li>•Age group 11- 16 years 13,101</li> </ul> <p>Source GLA 2013 Round Demographic Projections, 2014</p> <p>There are more boys than girls with SEN across all age cohorts and SEN type. Overall, 61% of children with SEN are male.</p>   | <p>There is no evidence to suggest that one gender group will be more affected than the other, however there is a differential in pupils with SEN based on gender.</p> <p>The views of parents with children with SEN have been sought and will be considered as part of the decision making process and any</p> |

|   |  | <p>Girls are less likely to have statements of SEN and more likely to receive School Action support. Of the 4,499 girls with SEN, 9% are statemented and 63% receive School Action support. In comparison, 15% of boys with SEN are statemented and 54% receive School Action support.</p> <p>Source: Schools Census, February 2013</p>   | <p>procurement process.</p>               |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|------|-------|--------|------|-------------------|------|----------|-------|---|--|------|-------|--------|-------|-------------------|-------|----------|-------|--|
| <p>4. Religion</p>                        | <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/><br/>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Christianity is the most common religion in Barnet at 38.7%, although this is proportionately lower than London at 51%. The second highest group are those who have no religion at 21.3% which is comparatively less than London and England. Barnet has the largest Jewish population in London (16.6% compared to 2.1% in London).</p> <p>The proportion of Barnet’s secondary school religious affiliation is broken down:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="488 987 1216 1234"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Religious Affiliation - Secondary Schools</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>69.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jewish</td> <td>8.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Church of England</td> <td>4.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Catholic</td> <td>17.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The proportion of Barnet’s primary school religious affiliation is broken down:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="512 1368 1177 1615"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Religious Affiliation - Primary Schools</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>57.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jewish</td> <td>14.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Church of England</td> <td>16.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Catholic</td> <td>12.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Source Profile of children and young people in Barnet April 2014.</b></p> <p>The breakdown of religion in school does not accord with the breakdown of religion in the wider Barnet population, however this may be due to data collection reasons. There is no evidence to show that the proposal will adversely impact on a particular religious group more than any other or those without a stated religion.</p> | Religious Affiliation - Secondary Schools |  | None | 69.6% | Jewish | 8.7% | Church of England | 4.3% | Catholic | 17.4% | Religious Affiliation - Primary Schools |  | None | 57.6% | Jewish | 14.1% | Church of England | 16.3% | Catholic | 12.0% |  |
| Religious Affiliation - Secondary Schools |  |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| None                                      | 69.6%  |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| Jewish                                    | 8.7%   |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| Church of England                         | 4.3%   |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| Catholic                                  | 17.4%  |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| Religious Affiliation - Primary Schools   |  |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| None                                      | 57.6%  |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| Jewish                                    | 14.1%  |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| Church of England                         | 16.3%  |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| Catholic                                  | 12.0%  |   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |
| <p>5. Sexual</p>                          | <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> /</p>  | <p>Data is unavailable at this point. There is no</p>   |   |  |      |       |        |      |                   |      |          |       |   |  |      |       |        |       |                   |       |          |       |  |

|                        |  |   |   |
|------------------------|--|---|---|
| orientati<br>on        | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                                   | evidence to show that the proposals will adversely impact on people based on their sexual orientation.  |   |
| 6. Gender reassignment | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> /<br>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Data is unavailable at this point. There is no evidence to show that the proposals will adversely impact on people based on gender reassignment.  |   |
| 7. Marital Status      | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> /<br>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | As the services mainly support children and young people, marital status is less likely to be of relevance.<br><br>The services include education welfare services, which support and take enforcement action against parents whose children are not attending school. Information on the family background, including lone parents, is taken into account when making decisions on appropriate action. Decisions to prosecute parents will remain the responsibility of the local authority. | Rigorous approach to development of service specifications and KPIs to ensure that the needs of parents are taken into account when determining any enforcement action. |
| 8. Other key groups?   | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> /<br>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |   |   |

**1. What measures and methods could be designed to monitor the impact of the new policy or service, the achievement of intended outcomes and the identification of any unintended or adverse impact? *Include how frequently monitoring could be conducted and who will be made aware of the analysis and outcomes***

This Equalities Impact Assessment has been reviewed and updated for this stage (updated Outline Business Case). The completion of a more detailed Equalities Impact Assessment will be a fundamental component of the project's decision-making in the next phase in accordance with the LBB Policy and processes.

Equalities should form a key component of any specifications for the alternative delivery model to ensure that those with protected characteristics are protected through the process and this should form a component of any evaluation process.

In addition, a clear set of measureable outcomes and key performance indicators will be developed to ensure outcomes are achieved. Risks are also being reviewed on a regular basis and action taken to mitigate these risks and potential impacts.

## Initial Assessment

| 2. Overall impact   |   |                                       |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Positive Impact<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Negative Impact or Impact Not Known <sup>1</sup><br><input type="checkbox"/>  | No Impact<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Scale of Impact  |   |                                       |
| Positive impact:<br><br>Minimal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/><br>Significant <input type="checkbox"/> | Negative Impact or Impact Not Known<br><br>Minimal <input type="checkbox"/><br>Significant <input type="checkbox"/> |                                       |

The recommended model of a joint venture is likely to maintain and improve levels of service delivery through its capacity and potential to grow services for schools and others to purchase. Through attracting commercial expertise and infrastructure, it is anticipated that sufficient growth could be achieved without the need for service reductions.

The development of a Full Business Case at the next stage will enable a full assessment of the impact. Mitigating action to address any resident concern in relation to the quality of non-traded services will form part of the procurement and contractual negotiations.

| 4. Outcome   |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| No change to decision<br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Adjustment needed to decision<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> | Continue with decision<br><i>(despite adverse impact / missed opportunity)</i><br><br><input type="checkbox"/> | If significant negative impact - Stop / rethink<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> |

| 5. Please give a full explanation for how the initial assessment and outcome was decided  |
|---|
| In seeking to identify and implement an Alternative Delivery Model for the Education and Skills Delivery Unit the Council is seeking to reduce the cost of delivering services and also improve outcomes and performance of the services. |
| <u>Milestone 1: Draft OBC – September 2014 CELS Committee</u>   |
| At this stage of the project (early Assessment phase) the new Delivery Model is not known and   |

<sup>1</sup> 'Impact Not Known' – tick this box if there is no up-to-date data or information to show the effects or outcomes of the function, policy, procedure or service on all of the equality strands.

therefore it is not possible to fully assess the impact (in line with the LBB processes this cannot be completed until the new model is known). Given what is known at the moment and the objectives of the project any impact is anticipated to be positive due to the desire to improve the performance of services, which given the nature of these services such as Special Educational Needs would have a positive impact on those with Disabilities (and due to the over representation in the cohort males).

There is anticipated to be no negative impact on any protected characteristics due to there being no anticipated reduction in service nor any anticipated fundamental change in the mechanism of service delivery and therefore it is anticipated that all those who currently access/receive services will still do so under the alternative delivery model.

#### Milestone 2: Updated OBC – January 2015 CELS Committee

CELS committee in September 2014 decided to further develop the options appraisal on four potential delivery models - In-house, Schools-led social enterprise, Joint venture with schools having a commissioning role and Joint venture with schools having an ownership role.

Alongside consultation with schools, a resident consultation and three focus groups (including a group of parents of children with SEN) have been undertaken in order to gain the views of residents and service users. Their views have been taken into consideration in the analysis and options appraisal which can be seen in the updated OBC. As part of the decision making process the council will fully consider and give due regard to the responses to the consultations and this Equalities Impact Assessment. The consultation noted that there is an appetite to improve services however there are some concerns all of the models (excluding the in-house option) could put more pressure on schools and possible impact on quality, alongside the worry around the motivation of a third party provider and the possible impact on service provision. In addition there were queries raised on the appropriateness of services for SEN and vulnerable pupils being offered by an organisation other than the council, since these are core services requiring knowledge and accountability. These concerns have been taken into consideration during the decision making for the preferred option.

The Initial Residents and Service Users Equality Impact Assessment has been reviewed and updated to take into account the further analysis and development of the potential models which has taken place. A summary of the potential impact for all four models is noted below.

| MODEL  | SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL KEY OUTCOMES / IMPACTS   |
|--|---|
| <b>Model A: In house</b>   | It is anticipated that although there would be some potential growth and changes in services, it is highly likely that there will need to be service reductions in order to deliver the required service savings.   |
| <b>Model B: Schools-led social enterprise</b>                          | It is anticipated that there would be some growth and changes in services however depending on the ability of the business to grow its income sufficiently or quickly enough to offset any of the savings required by the council, it is likely that there would need to be some service reduction. |
| <b>Model C: Joint venture with schools having a commissioning role</b> | It is anticipated that through growth in services and attracting income, this model would maintain and improve service delivery. It is not anticipated that service reductions would be required.   |
| <b>Model D: Joint venture with</b>                                     | It is anticipated that through growth in services and attracting income, this model would maintain and improve service delivery. It is not anticipated that service   |

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| <b>schools having an ownership role</b>  | reductions would be required |
| <p>It is anticipated that for the preferred Joint Venture model any impact would be positive due to the desire to improve the performance of services. There is anticipated to be no negative impact on any protected characteristics due to there being no anticipated reduction in service and therefore it is anticipated that those who currently access/receive services will still do so under the alternative delivery model. However until the next stage when the Business Case is produced, the procurement process is underway and the detailed service specifications are agreed, the impact is not certain.</p> |                              |
| <p>This EIA will be updated in the next project phase (Business Case stage). The procurement process during the next stage will enable a full assessment of the impact and identification of any mitigating actions required.</p>  |                              |