

Equality and Fairer Scotland Impact Assessment - Screening Clackmannanshire Council Budget 2019/20

Title of Policy:	Reduce secondary school pupil week from 27 hours to 25 hours
Service:	Clackmannanshire Council - Education
Team:	N/a

Will the policy have to go to Council or committee for approval	Yes
Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?	Yes
Does it relate to functions that previous involvement activities have identified as being important to particular protected groups?	Yes
Does it relate to an area where the Council has set equality outcomes?	Yes
Does it relate to an area where there are known inequalities?	Yes
Does it relate to a policy where there is significant potential for reducing inequalities or improving outcomes?	Yes

IF YES - Move on to an Equality & Fairer Scotland Assessment

IF NO - Explain why an Equality & Fairer Scotland Assessment is not required

APPROVAL		
NAME	DESIGNATION	DATE
A Pearson	Chief Education Officer	January 2019

NB This screening exercise is not to be treated as an assessment of impact and therefore does not need to be published. However, if you decide not to assess the impact of any policy, you will have to be able to explain your decision. To do this, you should keep a full record of how you reached your decision.

Equality and Fairer Scotland Impact Assessment - Scoping

Purpose of the proposed policy or changes to established policy
<p>The purpose of the change is to ensure that Clackmannanshire Council is able to set a balanced budget, as required by statute, for the year 2019/20.</p>
Which aspects of the policy are particularly relevant to each element of the Council's responsibilities in relation to the General Equality Duty and the Fairer Scotland Duty?
General Equality Duty -
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other prohibited conduct
<p>Minimal Impact</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Advancing equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not
<p>Minimal Impact</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
<p>Minimal Impact</p>
Fairer Scotland Duty -
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reducing inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage
<p>We would need to explore the use of CLD/Third Sector staff to deliver a programme during the some of the 2.5 hour reduction. The impact on families of children with ASN will need to be considered..</p>

To which of the equality groups is the policy relevant?		
Protected Characteristic	Yes/No*	Explanation
Age	Yes	The proposals will impact on young people.
Disability	Yes	There may be impacts on people with disabilities, increased need for parent carer support – additional 2.5 hours.
Gender Reassignment	No	There is no indication at this stage that this protected characteristic would be impacted.
Pregnancy and Maternity	No	There is no indication at this stage that this protected characteristic would be impacted.
Race	No	There is no indication at this stage that this protected characteristic would be impacted.
Religion and Belief	No	There is no indication at this stage that this protected characteristic would be impacted.
Sex	No	There is no indication at this stage that this protected characteristic would be impacted.
Sexual Orientation	No	There is no indication at this stage that this protected characteristic would be impacted.

* Delete as required

What evidence is already available about the needs of relevant groups, and where are the gaps in evidence?

Clackmannanshire has a high number of children with Additional Support Needs, and a higher number of children involved in risky behaviours. Longstanding challenges associated with deprivation impact on some of our communities e.g. in Alloa.

Which equality groups and communities might it be helpful to involve in the development of the policy?

Trades Unions – to understand potential impacts on young people’s learning experiences
Young People including those with disabilities– liaise with Youth Parliament and Youth Council to plan most effective engagement approach.
Parent/Pupil Councils – to understand the impact educational proposals on young people

Next steps

Face to face contacts will be arranged during January 2019 to enable impacts to be better understood. An online consultation will also be available from 9 January 2019.

Equality and Fairer Scotland Impact Assessment - Decision

Evidence findings		
<p>A number of respondents were concerned that the proposals relating to Education would have a high equalities impact on young people, and families already experiencing socio-economic disadvantage. Of particular concern are the proposals on the school estate strategy; reduction in the school week and the home to school transport policy. These proposals have been assessed as high given the significant representations made as part of the budget engagement process.</p>		
Details of engagement undertaken and feedback received		
<p>Significant feedback and representations were received through the budget engagement exercise relating to this proposal. This feedback was reflected in the information made available to Elected Members when setting the 2019/20 budget.</p>		
Decision/recommendation		
<p>Having considered the potential or actual impacts of this policy, the following decision/recommendation is made:</p>		
Tick	<p>Option 1: No major change The assessment demonstrates that the policy is robust. The evidence shows no potential for unlawful discrimination and that all opportunities have been taken to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitoring and review.</p>	
	<p>Option 2: Adjust the policy – this involves taking steps to remove any barriers, to better advance equality or to foster good relations. It may be possible to remove or change the aspect of the policy that creates any negative or unwanted impact, or to introduce additional measures to reduce or mitigate any potential negative impact.</p>	
	<p>Option 3: Continue the policy – this means adopting or continuing with the policy, despite the potential for adverse impact. The justification should clearly set out how this decision is compatible with the Council's obligations under the duty.</p>	
✓	<p>Option 4: Stop and remove the policy – if there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, consideration should be given to stopping the policy altogether. If a policy leads to unlawful discrimination it should be removed or changed.</p>	
Justification for decision		
<p>Option was not included in the budget for 19/20.</p>		
APPROVAL		
NAME	DESIGNATION	DATE
Michael Boyle	Education Business Manager	27/3/19