

Prescribed alteration to increase extend the age range of Acresfield Primary School

Evidence based equality analysis

Main aims, purpose and outcomes and how does it fit in with the wider aims of the organisation:

To enable local parents to access good or outstanding early years provision in order to provide their child with the best start in life.

Lead officer: Ric Turnock

Stakeholders: Pupils, Parents, Staff.

Equality analysis is a valuable tool to help embed equality into everything we do

While process is important, equality analysis is essentially about outcomes

Lack of evidence of discrimination is not evidence of a lack of discrimination

It is not acceptable to say that a policy is applied uniformly to all groups and is therefore fair and equal. Applying a policy or procedure consistently may result in differential outcomes for different groups.

For each of the areas below, an assessment needs to be made on whether the policy has a **positive, negative or neutral impact**, and brief details of why this decision was made and notes of any mitigation should be included. Where the impact is negative, this needs to be given a **high, medium or low assessment**. It is important to rate the impact of the policy based on the current situation (i.e. disregarding any actions planned to be carried out in future).

High impact – a significant potential impact, risk of exposure, history of complaints, no mitigating measures in place etc.

Medium impact – some potential impact exists, some mitigating measures are in place, poor evidence

Low impact – almost no relevancy to the process, e.g. an area that is very much legislation led and where the Council has very little discretion

	Neutral	Positive	Negative
Target group / area			
Race and ethnicity (including Gypsies and Travellers; migrant workers, asylum seekers etc.)		The proposal will increase the range of choice available to these groups.	
Disability (as defined by the Equality Act - a person has a disability if they have a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities)		Without this provision individuals with restricted mobility could potentially be faced with longer journeys to access a child's early years entitlement.	
Gender	There is no basis for believing that this proposal will have a gender specific impact.		
Gender identity (gender reassignment)	There is no basis for believing that this proposal will have a specific impact on gender identity.		
Religion and belief		An increase in the supply of early years places in schools without a religious character potentially provides choice for those who do not wish their child to have a faith-based early education and will in some instances remove pressure on places in faith-based settings helping to ensure that those	

		who wish their child to have a faith-based education are able to have that preference met.	
Sexual orientation (including heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual)	There is no basis for believing that this proposal will have a specific impact on those of a particular sexual orientation.		
Age (children and young people aged 0 – 24, adults aged 25 – 50, younger older people aged 51 – 75/80; older older people 81+. The age categories are for illustration only as overriding consideration should be given to needs)		Creating provision in an area with a potential shortfall of provision increases the likelihood of a child being able to access their educational entitlement in their local community.	
Carers		Creating provision at a local school in an area with a potential shortfall of provision reduces the likelihood that parents and carers will have to make extended/multiple journeys to ensure their child(ren)'s attendance at school and nursery.	
Rural communities		This school's catchment includes a rural area. Increasing provision increases the likelihood that children from the rural area will be able to access provision at their nearest	

		school alongside other peers from that community.	
Areas of deprivation	This school does not serve an area of deprivation.		
Human rights	There are no known Human rights issues appertaining to this school or the community it serves.		
Health and wellbeing (consider both the wider determinants of health such as education, housing, employment, environment, crime and transport, as well as the possible impacts on lifestyles and the effect there may be on health and care services)		Creating the ability for children to access their early years entitlement at their local school helps encourage social integration of parents and children with the consequent health benefits this brings.	
Procurement/partnership (if project due to be carried out by contractors/partners etc, identify steps taken to ensure equality compliance)	n/a	n/a	n/a

Evidence (see guidance note for details of what to include here):

Indices of Multiple Deprivation data, consideration of consultation feedback, analysis of patterns of parental preference.

Action plan:

Actions required	Key activity	Priority	Outcomes required	Officer responsible	Review date
None				School Organisation Manager	September 2021

Sign off	
Lead officer:	Ric Turnock
Approved by Tier 4 Manager:	Carolyn Davis
Moderation and/or Scrutiny	
Date: 28 February 2019	Virtual moderation by People Directorate Equality Group
Date analysis to be reviewed based on rating (high impact – review in one year, medium impact - review in two years, low impact in three years)	Three years