

Prescribed Alteration to increase the capacity of Tattenhall Park Primary School through enlargement of the school's premises

Evidence based equality analysis – can include documents, quotes, and web links for photos and videos

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

To maximise the ability of parents to access the school (with an Ofsted grading of Outstanding or Good) of their first preference 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)		Making mainstream schools larger and more accessible will improve options for disabled children.	
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 primary school places in non-faith based schools potentially provides choice for those who do not wish their child to have a faith-based education and will in some instances remove	

		pressure on places in faith-based schools 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 in relation to 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)		Increasing provision in an area with an identified deficit of provision increases the likelihood of a child being able to access their educational entitlement in their local community.	
Carers		Increasing provision in an area with an identified deficit 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.	
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)		Maximising the ability of children to attend their local school by ensuring it has sufficient capacity helps encourage social integration 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)	Not applicable		

Evidence:

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
Monitor impact	Assess impact of expansion on other schools	Medium		Ric Turnock	September 2020 (two years after implementation)

Sign off	
Lead officer:	Ric Turnock
Approved by Tier 4 Manager:	Carolyn Davis
Moderation and/or Scrutiny – People Equality Group	
Date:	27 March 2017
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 – March 2020