

## Updated Employees Equality Impact Assessment

### Project: Education and Skills Alternative Delivery Model

[This document remains live with information being added at each critical milestone]

<b>Project Owner:</b>	<b>Schools, Skills and Learning Lead Commissioner</b>
<b>Date process started:</b>	<b>9 December 2013</b>
<b>Date process ended:</b>	<b>TBC</b>

<b>This EIA is being undertaken because it is:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> outlined within the equality scheme relevance assessment table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> part of a project proposal submission to the programme management board <input type="checkbox"/> a result of organisation change <input type="checkbox"/> other – please specify:
--	--

#### EIA Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Any Anticipated Equalities Issues at each milestone and identified mitigation
- 3 Monitoring Summary
- 4 Project Milestone Outcomes, Analysis and Actions
- 5 Briefing, Sharing and Learning

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 It is recognised that a significant transformation of services is likely to have an impact upon staff. This impact will be monitored through the completion of an Employee Equalities Impact Assessment; this is a “live” document and will be updated at key milestones throughout the lifespan of the project. The employee data contained within this report remains relevant at this time; however the data will be updated at the next milestone.

As part of the public sector Equality Duty, section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Authority is required to give due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people when carrying out activities.

This EIA will be used to understand the impacts on groups of staff over the period of the Education & Skills project as well as being used as a baseline for any future decision making.

## 1.2 Aims and objectives of the Education and Skills Alternative Delivery Model

A project has been commissioned to assess the best way of delivering Education and Skills services in the future. This must take into account significant savings pressures, maintain the strength of our relationship with schools and maintain or improve the excellent education offer in Barnet.

In order to fully explore available options the project has examined ways in which schools can take control or ownership of part or all of the system and has also considered any benefits of working with a third party provider.

The aim of the project is to implement a revised delivery model for Education and Skills services that will realise the objectives of:

- Achieving the budget savings target set by the Council
- Maintaining Barnet’s excellent education offer
- Maintaining an excellent relationship between the Council and schools

The approach through the assessment phase is:

- **To assess potential delivery models against criteria**, incorporating feedback from consultation in order to identify a recommended model.
- **To develop any procurement documentation** required to deliver the recommended model.
- **To deliver an Outline Business Case (OBC)** which provides detailed analysis and appraisal of potential models, including recommendations.
- **To deliver a final Outline Business Case (OBC)** providing detailed analysis and an appraisal of the preferred option.
- **To develop the recommended model to Full Business Case (FBC)** including complete financial case and implementation plan.

The services in the project scope are:

School improvement

- *Statutory local authority duties to monitor, support and challenge schools*

- *Narrow the gap service (DSG funded)*

Special educational needs (subject to changes being implemented by the Children and Families Act 2014 from 1st September 2014)

- *SEN placements & performance team*
- *SEN Early Support Programme*
- *SEN Transport – commissioning and assessment*
- *Educational psychology team (part traded)*
- *SEN placements (DSG funded)*
- *SEN specialist support service (DSG funded)*

Admissions and sufficiency of school places

- *Pupil place planning*
- *Admissions Service (DSG funded)*

Vulnerable pupils

- *Education welfare service (part traded)*

Post 16 learning

- *14 - 19 service to ensure sufficiency and breadth of supply*
- *Monitoring, tracking and supporting participation*

Traded services within Education and Skills

- *Catering service*
- *Governor clerking service*
- *Barnet Partnership for School Improvement*
- *Newly Qualified Teachers*
- *Educational psychology (part)*
- *Education Welfare Service (part)*
- *North London Schools International Network (NLSIN)*

#### **Draft Outline Business Case – CELS Committee – September 2014.**

An initial Employees Equality Impact Assessment was presented alongside the Draft Outline Business Case to CELS committee in September 2014.

#### **The following options were considered and evaluated in the Draft Outline Business Case:**

- Model A: In-house
- Model B: Outsource
- Model C: Local Authority Trading Company (LATC)
- Model D: Schools-led social enterprise
- Model E: Joint venture with schools having a commissioning role
- Model F: Joint venture with schools having an ownership role

The project team recommended to CELS Committee in September that the three partnership options (social enterprise, joint venture with schools taking an ownership role and joint venture with schools taking a commissioning role) could potentially meet the project objectives and have attracted a reasonable degree of support from schools. The committee decided that the following four models should be considered in the next stage.

- Model: In-house
- Model: Schools-led social enterprise
- Model: Joint venture with schools having a commissioning role
- Model: Joint venture with schools having an ownership role

**Updated Outline Business Case – CELS Committee – January 2015.**

Further work has been undertaken and the four models (In-house, Schools-led social enterprise, Joint venture with schools having a commissioning role and Joint venture with schools having an ownership role) have been reviewed and evaluated in the Updated Outline Business Case which will be presented to CELS committee in January 2015.

The outline business contains the results of consultation with residents, schools and the market together with financial modelling of the options. It recommends that the council pursue a Joint Venture model as the best model to meet the project objectives.

The Joint Venture model focuses on the growth of services which would limit the possibility of staffing reductions, staff will be protected by TUPE and is likely to have a positive impact with regards to increase in training opportunities and employee development alongside the development of services. However, it is clear that any workforce changes could have both a positive or negative impact, especially on the female workforce. Overall, the impact is expected to be positive however it cannot be known with any certainty at this stage. There will be greater clarity on the actual impacts on employees through the procurement process at the stage of contract award, following competitive dialogue. The development of a Full Business Case (FBC) will enable a full assessment of the impact and identification of any mitigating actions required.

**1.2 Description of the critical milestones****Key milestones for the project**

<b>Key dates / milestones</b>	<b>Date</b>
CELS Committee – Approval of OBC	12 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2015
Commence process to establish new model	13 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2015
Issue OJEU	Jan 2015
Bidders Day	Feb 2015
PQQ evaluation and moderation	Feb 2015
Dialogue	March – June 2015
P&R Committee - report	20 <sup>th</sup> July 2015 (TBC)
CELS Committee – Approval of FBC	28 <sup>th</sup> July 2015 (TBC)
Commence formal TUPE consultation	29 <sup>th</sup> July 2015
Evaluation and moderation	August 2015
Preferred bidder selected	August 2015
Mobilisation	October 2015

**1.3 Key Stakeholders**

**Key Stakeholders:**

Members of the Children, Education, Libraries and Safeguarding Committee  
 Lead Commissioner for Schools, Skills and Learning (Sponsor)  
 Director for Education and Skills (Senior Supplier)  
 Education and Skills Management team  
 Strategic Commissioning Board  
 BPSI Steering Group (Heads)  
 Headteachers/schools  
 Education and Skills Staff  
 Trade Unions  
 Residents/Parents

The project has followed a consultation and engagement plan in developing the outline business case.

Staff and Trade Unions have been communicated with, predominantly in the form of information sharing, briefings, updates, questions and answer sessions and follow up documentation.

Once the delivery model is decided upon the appropriate legislation will be followed which will include consultation under the councils collective agreement with the trade unions and supporting staff briefings.

**2. Any Anticipated Equalities Issues at each milestone and identified mitigation**

**2.1 Milestone 1: Draft OBC to CELS committee September 2014:**

For the current stage of project scoping and democratic process, no staff will be affected and there is no known detriment to any group.  
 A full EIA will be produced at Full Business Case stage. Staff will be consulted as part of the process and equality issues/risks will be considered as part of this. As the proposals develop any impact will become clear and mitigating actions will be put in place.

**2.2 Milestone 2: Updated OBC to CELS committee January 2015:**

At this stage of project, with regards to the preferred option of a Joint Venture model, it is viewed that overall the impact would be positive (see section 4 for further detail).

This EIA will be updated in the next project phase (at Full Business Case stage). Staff will be consulted as part of the process and equality issues/risks will be considered as part of this. As the proposals develop any impact will become clear and mitigating actions will be put in place.

**3. Monitoring Summary**

**3.1 Table 1- Employee EIA Profile of the Project**

(This profile is in accordance with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Council will collect this information so far as we hold it)

All numbers replaced by an 'X' have been aggregated to protect personal identification

**Critical Milestones**

	Total LBB Data	Project Initiation	Name Milesto	Name Milestone	Name Mileston
--	----------------	--------------------	--------------	----------------	---------------



Appendix Three – Equalities Impact Assessments

	deaf, partially deaf or hard of hearing)										
	<b>Vision</b> (such as blind or fractional/partial sight. Does not include people whose visual problems can be corrected by glasses/contact lenses)	2	0.1								
	<b>Speech</b> (such as impairments that can cause communication problems)	0	0								
	<b>Reduced physical capacity</b> (such as inability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects, debilitating pain and lack of strength, breath, energy or stamina, asthma, angina or diabetes)	7	0.4	x	x						
	<b>Severe disfigurement</b>	0	0								
	<b>Learning difficulties</b> (such as dyslexia)	3	0.2	x	x						
	<b>Mental illness</b> (substantial and lasting more than a year)	5	0.3								
	<b>Mobility</b> (such as wheelchair user, artificial lower limb(s), walking aids, rheumatism or arthritis)	5	0.3								
	<b>Other Disability</b>	27	1.34	x	x						
	<b>No Disability</b>	168	84.0								
	<b>Not Stated</b>	8									
		268	13.3								
<b>Gender Identity</b>	<b>Transsexual/Transgender</b> (people whose gender identity is different from the gender they were assigned at birth)										
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Pregnant										
	Maternity Leave (current)										
	Maternity Leave (in last 12 months)										
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Christian	851	42.3	163							
	Buddhist	9	0.5	x							
	Hindu	89	4.4	22							
	Jain	4	0.2								
	Jewish	51	2.5	10							
	Muslim	65	3.2	15							

	Sikh	6	0.3	x							
	Other religions	66	3.3	24							
	No religion	298	14.8	49							
	Not stated	165	8.2	51							
	No form returned	30	1.5								
	Atheist	36	1.8								
	Agnostic	25	1.2								
	Humanist	0	0								
	Not Assigned	315	15.7								
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>											
	Heterosexual	124 1	61.7	191	48.5						
	Bisexual	8	0.4								
	Lesbian or Gay	27	1.3	x	X						
	Prefer not to say	345	17.2	x	X						
Not assigned	389	19.4									
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>											
	Married	491	24.4	117	34.8						
	Single	409	20.4	50	14.9						
	Widowed	0	0								
	Divorced	35	1.7	x	x						
	In Civil partnership	0	0								
	Cohabiting	21	1.0								
	Separated	0	0								
Unknown	105 4	52.4									
Not Assigned	0	0									
<b>Relevant and related grievances</b>											
	Formal										
	Upheld										
Dismissed											

### 3.2 Evidence

### 3.3 List below available data and research that will be used to determine impact on different equality groups

HR data provided from CORE HR (August 2014).  
Staff/Stakeholder feedback.

The employee data contained within this report remains relevant at this time; however the data will be updated at the next milestone. For the Full Business Case we shall work with HR to ensure that the equalities data is enhanced.

### 3.4 Evidence gaps

Maternity Leave is not held centrally and will be shared from local records where necessary and as the process continues.

The project is still in the assessment stage, once a final delivery model is confirmed and further work is completed, the evidence gaps will become clearer.

### 3.5 Solution, please explain how you will fill any evidence gaps?



An update to this 'live' EIA will be completed at the key milestones, the next iteration is required after a delivery model has been decided; this will then establish whether further evidence should be gathered.

## 4. Project Milestone Outcomes, Analysis and Actions

### 4.1 Summary of the outcomes at each milestone

#### **Milestone 1: Draft OBC to CELS committee September 2014:**

This is an initial analysis of the EIA for the Education and Skills ADM project and provides baseline figures. As the project develops the EIA will need to be re-assessed.

A Service Users EIA profile has also been completed.

The equality data above is the information available which details the protected characteristics of staff within the Education and Skills cohort, including Barnet staff who are employed in the schools meals service.

As the proposals include the Barnet schools meals service and Special Educational Needs, additional consideration needs to be made as to how these services will operate and whether this will impact on, for example, the take-up of free school meals.

Children's, Education, Libraries and Safeguarding Committee will determine which options the council should explore and at this stage a detailed EIA will be undertaken on the staffing implications of the following services; School improvement, Special educational needs, Admissions and sufficiency of school places, Vulnerable pupils, Post 16 learning and Traded services within Education and Skills.

The councils overall workforce is;

- 66.17% female
- 42.64% of both female and male are over 50 years of age.
- 74.43% of the workforce are white, black and black British

Initial analysis of the Education and Skills equality data indicates;

- 93% of the workforce is female
- 55% of females only are over 50 years of age
- 75% of the workforce is white, black and black British

Given the current make-up of the workforce, whichever option is chosen, the change will have a bigger impact on women than men. The statistics show that 93% of the workforce is female and due regard will be paid to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty. It cannot though be avoided that any changes will affect the female workforce whether this be a positive or negative impact. Mitigation for such effects will be drawn up at a later stage when more detail on the proposals are known and a decision is made to progress from the OBC.

There is no data available on maternity or sexual orientation transgender.

It is essential that the Managing Change Policy is followed and in a legally compliant manner, including with consideration of all aspects of the Equality Act 2010 and other relevant legislation.

Overall, at this stage of the project the new Delivery Model is not known and therefore it is not possible to fully assess the impact (in line with the LBB processes this cannot be completed until the Full Business Case is developed when the new model is known).

**Milestone 2: Updated OBC to CELS committee January 2015:**

As noted in milestone 1 above, given the current make-up of the workforce, whichever option is chosen, the change will have a bigger impact on women than men, whether positive or negative. The statistics show that 93% of the Education and Skills Delivery Unit workforce is female and due regard will be paid to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty. Mitigation includes the continued involvement of staff and TUs during the next stage. Further mitigation will be drawn up at a later stage when more detail on the proposals are known and a decision is made to progress from the OBC to FBC.

In order to assist decision making, a summary of the expected high level employee outcomes / impacts of the four models can be seen in the table below.

Consultation and Engagement has taken place with the four key stakeholder groups: schools; the market; employees and trades unions; and residents and service users.

It is recognised that all four of the options under consideration constitute a significant change that will have an impact on employees. There have been a number of briefing meetings with employees as the outline business case has developed. During November 2014, a further series of meetings were held to allow employees to explore the implications of the four remaining options and also to suggest potential opportunities for improvement. Additional meetings have also taken place with the recognised trades union representatives. Whilst representatives have been keen to support the retention of services in-house, they have also engaged positively in discussions about other models to ensure that issues that may affect their members' interests have been given proper consideration.

Overall it can be seen that there are potential impacts from all four models. The project board are recommending to the CELS Committee that a Joint Venture model is the best model to meet the project objectives and has attracted a reasonable degree of support from schools. As can be seen in the table below, the Joint Venture model focuses on the growth of services which would limit the possibility of staffing reductions, staff will be protected by TUPE and is likely to have a positive impact with regards to increase in training opportunities and employee development alongside the development of services. However, it is clear that any workforce changes could have both a positive or negative impact, especially on the female workforce.

Overall, the impact is expected to be positive however it cannot be known with any certainty at this stage. There will be greater clarity on the actual impacts on employees through the procurement process at the stage of contract award, following competitive dialogue. The development of a Full Business Case (FBC) will enable a full assessment of the impact and identification of any mitigating actions required.

<b>MODEL</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL KEY OUTCOMES / IMPACTS</b>
<b>Model A: In house</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff would remain as local authority employees and be subject to the council's terms and conditions.</li> <li>• Staff would go through a major transformation programme including cultural step-change, performance management and business improvement.</li> <li>• Potential reduction in staffing requirement through the transformation process, either through efficiencies or service reductions. There is also the potential for an increase in staffing in some service areas as the service would aim to grow services and increase income</li> </ul>
<b>Model B: Schools-led social enterprise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff would be transferred to the 'new' company', employees would transfer on their terms and conditions under the TUPE.</li> <li>• Opportunity for investment in upskilling, employee development, asset and systems update.</li> <li>• Potential reduction in staffing requirement through the transformation process however there is also the potential for an increase in staffing in some service areas as the enterprise would aim to grow services and increase income</li> </ul>

<b>Model C: Joint venture with schools having a commissioning role</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff would be transferred to the 'new' company', employees would transfer on their terms and conditions under the TUPE.</li> <li>• Opportunity for investment in upskilling, employee development, asset and systems update.</li> <li>• It is envisaged that there would be no reduction to overall staffing levels and there could be a potential for an increase in staffing as the aim of the model would be to grow services and increase income. However there could be a potential change in service structure and jobs through the transformation process.</li> </ul>
<b>Model D: Joint venture with schools having an ownership role</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff would be transferred to the 'new' company', employees would transfer on their terms and conditions under the TUPE.</li> <li>• Opportunity for investment in upskilling, employee development, asset and systems update.</li> <li>• It is envisaged that there would be no reduction to overall staffing levels and there could be a potential for an increase in staffing as the aim of the model would be to grow services and increase income. However there could be a potential change in service structure and jobs through the transformation process</li> </ul>

#### **4.1.1 Milestone 1: Draft OBC to CELS committee September 2014**

An updated Employee EIA will accompany the final OBC on detailed options in January 2015 to the CELS Committee.

#### **4.1.2 Milestone 2: Updated OBC to CELS committee January 2015**

The initial employee EIA has been updated since the first draft OBC and initial employee EIA was approved at CELS Committee in September 2014.  
An updated Employee EIA will be produced in the next stage and will accompany the Business Case in July 2015 to the CELS Committee with specific detail on the impact on employees.

## **4.2 Actions proposed**

#### **4.2.1 Milestone 1: Draft OBC to CELS committee September 2014**

Equalities should form a key component of any specifications for the alternative delivery model and will form a component of any evaluation process. Post OBC a more detailed equalities analysis will be produced.

#### **4.2.2 Milestone 2: Updated OBC to CELS committee January 2015**

Post the updated OBC to CELS committee in January 2015, a more detailed equalities analysis will be produced and will be used to inform project decisions and the procurement process.

Sections 5 and 6 have been removed from the EIA as they are not appropriate at this stage of the project. If these sections are appropriate in the next stage of the project then they will be completed.

## 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? 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. Reviewed and updated August 2014 (appendix to draft OBC – CELS Committee Sept 2014). 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? 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</b>			
Equality Strand	Affected?	Explain how affected	What action has been taken / or is planned to mitigate impact?
1. Age	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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"/> 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>																					

orientation	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"/> / 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"/> / No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As the services mainly support children and young people, marital status is less likely to be of relevance.  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"/> / 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  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Negative Impact or Impact Not Known <sup>1</sup>  <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact  <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Scale of Impact		
Positive impact:  Minimal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant <input type="checkbox"/>	Negative Impact or Impact Not Known  Minimal <input type="checkbox"/> 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  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Adjustment needed to decision  <input type="checkbox"/>	Continue with decision <i>(despite adverse impact / missed opportunity)</i>  <input type="checkbox"/>	If significant negative impact - Stop / rethink  <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
---	------------------------------

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.

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.