

Equality Impact Assessment for Schools – Financial Proposal

Redundancy Process

All questions should be answered – it is not sufficient to mark questions “not applicable”. Cite specific data and consultation evidence wherever possible.

1. Title of the proposal being impact assessed

Redundancy of staff due to restructure – West Tyne Federation of Schools.

2. Date of impact assessment: 7th November 2016

3. Brief description of the proposal

Due to budget linked with falling roll, staff numbers in school need to be reduced.

4. Name(s) and role(s) of governors, senior leadership team and/or local authority officer(s) completing the impact assessment

Judith Meek (Acting Executive Headteacher), Pippa Milburn (Chair of Governors), David Ratcliff, Rev. Benjamin Carter (Governors)

5. Overall, what are the outcomes of the proposal expected to be? (e.g. will it reduce or end particular education provision, reduce an overstaffed curriculum area, maintain Every Child Matters outcomes at reduced cost, outsource previous in-house activities or transfer activities to a different provider?)

To ensure a sustainable budget for the school in forthcoming years

Specific requirements for schools

The protected characteristics for the schools as an education provider (rather than employer) are:

- Disability.
- Gender reassignment.
- Pregnancy and maternity.
- Race.
- Religion or belief.
- Sex.
- Sexual orientation.

Age and being married or in a civil partnership are NOT protected characteristics for the schools provisions.

There are exceptions to enable single-sex schools to admit only pupils of one sex and for schools with a religious character to enable them to have admissions criteria which give preference to members of their own religion.

The categories of people covered by the schools provisions are:

- Prospective pupils (in relation to admissions arrangements).
- Pupils at the school (including those absent or temporarily excluded).
- Former pupils (if there is a continuing relationship based on them having been a pupil at the school).

Maintained schools, including Pupil Referral Units (in England) and Academies, are public authorities and will be subject to the public sector equality duties. Complying with the equality duties will help such schools to meet their obligations under the schools provisions and vice versa.

Impact on service users (including pupils, parents and the community) - disability

Duties which need to be considered:

- promote equality of opportunity between disabled persons and other persons
- eliminate discrimination that is unlawful under the Act
- eliminate harassment of disabled persons that is related to their disabilities
- promote positive attitudes towards disabled persons
- encourage participation by disabled persons in public life; and
- take steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, even where that involves treating disabled persons more favourably than other persons (e.g. the provision of an accessible parking bay near a building, where parking is not available for other visitors or employees.)

Note: "disabled people" includes people with physical, learning and sensory disabilities, people with a long-term illness, and people with mental health problems. You should consider potential impacts on all of these groups.

6. What do you know about usage of the services affected by this proposal by disabled people, about disabled people's experiences of it, and about any current barriers to access?

Do not know

7. Could disabled people be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?

No

8. Could the proposal affect the ability of disabled people to participate in public life? (e.g. by affecting their ability to go to meetings, take up public appointments etc.)

No

9. Could the proposed changes affect public attitudes towards disabled people? (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)

No

10. Could the proposed changes make it more or less likely that disabled people will be at risk of harassment?

No

11. If there are risks that disabled people could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the proposals, are there reasonable steps or adjustments that could be taken to reduce these risks?

No

12. Are there opportunities to create *positive* impacts for disabled people linked to this proposal?

No

Impact on service users (including pupils, parents and the community) - gender

Duties which need to be considered:

- to eliminate unlawful sex discrimination and harassment
- to promote equality of opportunity between men and women

(Note: all references to gender differences below include impacts on people who are changing/have changed gender, and if there is a possibility that people in this group might be specifically affected, you should consider this.)

13. What do you know about gender differences in the usage of the services affected by this proposal, and in users' experiences of it, and about any current gender-related barriers to access?

Do not know

14. Could the proposal have a disproportionate effect on people of a particular gender?

The majority of staff at risk of redundancy are female, which is commensurate with a workforce which is 91% female

15. Could the proposed changes make it more or less likely that people will be at risk of gender-related harassment?

No

16. If there are risks that people of a particular gender could be disproportionately

disadvantaged by the proposals, are there reasonable steps that could be taken to reduce these risks?

No

17. Are there reasonable steps that could be taken to create *positive* impacts on gender-related equality of opportunity linked to this proposal?

No

Impact on service users (including pupils, parents and the community) - race

Duties which need to be considered:

- eliminate unlawful racial discrimination;
- promote equality of opportunity; and
- promote good relations between people of different racial groups.
- (specific duty) Assess and consult on the likely impact proposed policies will have on the promotion of race equality

18. What do you know about racial differences in the usage of the services affected by this proposal, and in users' experiences of it, and about any current race-related barriers to access?

Do not know

19. What consultations (past or current) with people from different racial groups have helped to inform your views on how they may be affected by the proposal?

All affected employees are white British

20. Could people from different racial groups be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?

No

21. Could the proposal affect relations between people from different racial groups?

No

22. If there are risks that people in particular racial groups could be disproportionately disadvantaged by the proposals, are there reasonable steps that could be taken to reduce these risks?

No

23. Are there reasonable steps that could be taken, linked to this proposal, to create *positive* impacts on equality of opportunity for different racial groups, and on relations between different racial groups?

No

Impact on service users (including pupils, parents and the community) - other equalities issues

24. What do you know about the potential for the proposal to have disproportionate impacts on people of different sexual orientations, girls/women who are pregnant or breastfeeding or have young babies, or people with different religions or beliefs?

Do not know

25. What steps can be taken to minimise any potential disproportionate impacts on these groups?

None

26. Are there reasonable steps that could be taken, linked to this proposal, to create *positive* impacts on equality of opportunity for these groups?

No

Impact on service users (including pupils, parents and the community) - human rights

27. Could the proposal impact on human rights? (e.g. the right to respect for private and family life, the right to a fair hearing and the right to education)

No

Impacts on Staff

28. What do you know about the characteristics of staff and potential future employees who may be affected by the proposal, which is relevant to the School's equalities duties? (Include in particular information about disability, gender and race; if possible and relevant, you may also wish to include information about staff with other "protected characteristics" – age, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief, sexual orientation).

See tables showing gender and age ranges below.

	Teachers		Support Staff		Total	
	Number	% of teachers	Number	% of support staff	Number	% of total
Men	x	x	x	x	x	x
Women	4	100%	3	100%	7	100%
Total	4	100%	3	100%	7	100%

--

	Teachers		Support Staff		Total	
	Number	% of teachers	Number	% of support staff	Number	% of total
Under 20	x	x	x	x	x	x
20-29	x	x	x	x	x	x
30-39	1	25%	1	33%	2	28%
40-49	2	50%	x	x	2	28%
50-59	1	25%	1	33%	2	28%
60+	x	x	1	33%	1	14%
Total	4	100%	3	100%	7	100%

All of the staff in the school are white British and therefore no further analysis of race is provided.

29. Describe whether the proposal is likely to represent a particular disadvantage to any specific group with protected characteristics (e.g. because the staff providing this service are disproportionately of one gender or racial group, or because a high proportion of them are disabled). Describe whether the proposed redundancy selection criteria are likely to apply a provision, criterion or practice that is likely to represent a particular disadvantage to a specific group with protected characteristics.

Women will be affected more than men as most of the employees at risk of redundancy are female due to the school having a predominantly female workforce

30. If a discriminatory impact is identified in 29 above, can this be objectively justified i.e. is the proposal a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim, in other words is it appropriate and necessary in all the circumstances?

Yes

- a) Could alternative measures have met the aims of the proposal without having a discriminatory impact?

No

- b) Is the proposal achieving the legitimate aim or is it surpassing the legitimate aim and therefore needs to be adjusted to be proportionate?

Yes, the proposal is achieving the legitimate aim and not surpassing it.

- c) Does the legitimate aim of this proposal outweigh the discriminatory effects of the unfavourable treatment?

Yes

31. Are there any positive steps which could be taken, linked to this specific proposal, to promote the School's positive duties as a public sector employer in any of the areas covered by protected characteristics?

No

Course of Action

32. Based on a consideration of all the potential impacts, tick (✓) one of the following as an overall summary of the outcome of this assessment:

	The EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken.
	The EIA has identified risks or opportunities to promote better equality; the proposal will be adjusted to avoid risks and ensure that opportunities are taken.
✓	The EIA has identified risks to equality which will not be eliminated, and/or opportunities to promote better equality which will not be taken. Acceptance of these is reasonable and proportionate, given the objectives of the proposal, and its overall financial and policy context (including the time available before the School's budget is required to be set).
	The EIA shows that the proposal would lead to actual or potential unlawful discrimination, or would conflict with the School's positive duties to an extent which is disproportionate to the objectives of the proposal. It should not be adopted in its current form.

33. Explain how you have reached the judgement ticked above, and summarise any steps which will be taken to reduce negative or enhance positive impacts on equality.

We are taking all reasonable steps to promote equality within this redundancy process.

Ongoing Monitoring

34. What are your plans to monitor the actual impact of the implementation of the proposal on equality of opportunity? (e.g. once the outcome of the proposal is known then again in 12 months time to inform the next budget setting process)

We will look closely at budget setting and how this is impacting on all employees and take appropriate action to minimise any future and further risks.

Authorisation

35. Name of headteacher and date produced

Mrs Judith Meek – Acting Executive Headteacher, West Tyne Federation of Schools.
7th November 2016

Greenhead Church of England Primary School

Summary of Equality Impact Assessment – Financial Proposal

Proposal:

Redundancy of staff due to restructure

Redundancy of staff due to restructure

Date impact assessment completed:

Error! Reference source not found.Description of proposal:

Due to budget linked with falling roll, staff numbers in school need to be reduced.

School leader(s) and governor(s) involved in assessment:

Judith Meek (Acting Executive Head teacher), Pippa Milburn(Chair of Governors), David Ratcliff, Rev Benjamin Carter (Governors)

Expected outcomes of proposal:

To ensure a sustainable budget for the school in forthcoming years

Summary of impact assessment:

The EIA has identified risks to equality which will not be eliminated, and/or opportunities to promote better equality which will not be taken. Acceptance of these is reasonable and proportionate, given the objectives of the proposal, and its overall financial and policy context (including the time available before the School's budget is required to be set).

Summary explanation:

We are taking all reasonable steps to promote equality within this redundancy process.

Planned monitoring arrangements:

We will look closely at budget setting and how this is impacting on all employees and take appropriate action to minimise any future and further risks.

This summary must be published by the school, for example, on its website. The full equality impact assessment must be available on request to staff, trade union representatives and members of the public.

We will look closely at budget setting and how this is impacting on all employees and take appropriate action to minimise any future and further risks.

