

<b>Department/Service</b>	Children and Families	<b>Equality Impact Assessment Form Template</b>		
Ref <b>CHI</b>		<b>Officer responsible for the assessment</b>	Fintan Bradley, Head of Strategy, Planning and Performance	
<b>Name of policy procedure function being assessed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under 16 School Transport Policy</li> <li>• Complex Special Needs Transport Policy</li> <li>• Post-16 Transport Policy</li> </ul>	<b>Start date of assessment</b>	March 2011	
Are there any other policies or procedures associated or linked with this one.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Admissions policy</li> <li>• Special Educational Needs policy</li> </ul>		
Briefly describe the aims, objectives and outcomes of the policy / procedure / function		<p>The main objective of the school transport policies are to ensure that statutory obligations for Home to School Transport are met.</p> <p>There are currently 3 separate school transport policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under 16</li> <li>• Post-16</li> <li>• Complex and special needs</li> </ul> <p>These policies aim to ensure that pupils travel in a safe, secure and comfortable environment, so as to arrive at school (or their destination) on time and ready to learn.</p> <p>The policies set out what the local authority will and will not provide in terms of school transport based on identified criteria. The policies identify those pupils entitled to free or subsidised school transport.</p> <p>The proposed changes have been developed in response to the tight financial framework within which Councils are operating and the need to make savings. This has resulted in the need to review all discretionary transport.</p>		

<p>Who is intended to benefit from this policy –procedure – function?</p>	<p>The main users of this policy are children and young people attending denominational schools and post-16 young people (including those with complex needs) attending schools and colleges.</p>
<p>What factors could contribute to or detract from the outcomes?</p>	<p>The results of the public consultation on the proposed changes have impacted on the proposed policy changes.</p>
<p>Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy – procedure- function? (Please consider key equality groups)</p>	<p>The main groups affected by the changes in policy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Children and young people attending denominational schools,</li> <li>- Post-16 mainstream pupils who use school transport to attend school/college</li> <li>- Post-16 complex and special needs pupils who use school transport to attend school/college</li> <li>- Parents of children and young people attending denominational schools and post-16 provision</li> <li>- Headteachers, governors and staff of denominational schools</li> <li>- Managers, and staff of Colleges and other post-16 provision</li> <li>- Neighbouring local authorities</li> <li>- Transport operators</li> </ul>
<p>Who is responsible for the policy – procedure – function?</p>	<p>Cheshire East Children and Families Service is responsible for setting the policy, allocating the budget and commissioning the service</p> <p>Cheshire East Integrated Transport Service delivers transport services.</p>

To take us forward in:

(a) eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;

(b) advancing equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

(c) fostering good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

Please identify any impact (Positive / Negative) this policy, procedure, function or service will have on the following protected characteristics:

Age - Is there an impact?	Yes	No	Comments/Actions:
	√		<p>This policy change will impact on school and college age children, in particular on under 16s who attend denominational schools and over 16s (including those with complex needs) who attend school and college and use Cheshire East transport to get there.</p> <p><b>Under 16s</b>            There are currently 685 under 16s accessing denominational transport. This represents 1.37% of the 5-16 school population. Of these, 224 currently pay for transport and so would be directly affected by the policy change. The breakdown by year group is set out below, along with the numbers within each year group who pay for transport and so would be most affected by the proposed policy change. This trend shows an overall reduction in demand over time for council transport. There is a corresponding increase in the number who pay as those pupils who qualify for free transport under the previous policy are phased out.</p>

		<p>Y11 – 114 pupils (0 pay) Y10 – 104 pupils (2 pay) Y9 - 89 pupils (65 pay) Y8 - 90 pupils (63 pay) Y7 -96 pupils (64 pay) Y6 - 40 pupils (4 pay) Y5 - 38 pupils (1 pays) Y4 - 39 pupils (2 pay) Y3 – 27 pupils (1 pays) Y2 - 13 pupils (6 pay) Y1 - 14 pupils (10 pay) Reception – 9 pupils (6 pay) Year group unknown – 12 pupils</p> <p><b>Post 16 Mainstream</b> There are currently 1003 post-16 pupils accessing transport under this policy that would be affected. Of these, approximately 36% or 361 pupils get free transport, leaving approximately 64% or 642 who pay for transport, so are most likely to be affected by these proposals. The breakdown in year groups is as follows:</p> <p>Y13 – 612 students Y12 – 391 students</p> <p>Out of the 1003 pupils, 79 attend a denominational sixth form.</p> <p><b>Post -16 Complex needs</b> There are currently 167 pupils accessing post-16 SEN transport who would be affected by this policy.</p>
--	--	--

			<p><b>Next steps</b> Recommendations to Cabinet</p> <p>a) From September 2011 raise parental contribution for denominational transport from £299 to £314 per annum this reflects the current rate of 5% inflation.</p> <p>b) From September 2012 withdraw transport to faith primary and secondary schools completely for all new entrants, except for those pupils who would remain 'eligible' for free transport to a faith secondary school under the Education and Inspections Act 2006.</p> <p>c) Cabinet supports the commitment to work with schools, parents and local transport operators to seek to ensure that accessible, affordable, full cost recovery and sustainable travel continues to be available for pupils attending faith schools.</p> <p>d) From September 2011 raise parental contribution for post-16 mainstream transport from £415 to £436 per annum, this reflects the current rate 5% inflation.</p> <p>e) From September 2012 withdraw post-16 mainstream transport completely for all new entrants.</p> <p>f) Remove the proposal to charge for post-16 transport for students with special and complex needs</p>
Carers – Is there an impact?	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>√</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>Parents/carers of the 167 children and young people with complex and special needs will be affected by part of this policy</p>

			<p><b><u>Results of the consultation</u></b>  Of the 909 responses to the consultation questionnaire, 152 responded to say that they had caring responsibilities. A significant number of these respondents had children with complex needs who were in receipt of free transport. A number of these parents expressed the view that the proposed policy of charging for post-16 complex needs would limit the choice for their child and put more pressure of them as carers in terms of time, money and organisation. The importance of safe and reliable transport for their children was stressed by many respondees.</p> <p><b><u>Next steps</u></b>  Recommendation to Cabinet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the proposal to charge for post-16 transport for students with special and complex needs</li> </ul>
Disability - Is there an impact?	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>√</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>This policy will impact on the 167 children with complex needs.</p> <p><b><u>Results of the consultation</u></b>  Of the 909 responses to the consultation questionnaires, 24 stated that they considered themselves disabled. 6 of these were pupils attending special schools and 20 were parents/carers. The issues raised were the same as above, expressing concern that the proposed changes would limit or even remove choice for disabled children.</p>

			<p><b><u>Next steps</u></b></p> <p>Recommendation to Cabinet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the proposal to charge for post-16 transport for students with special and complex needs</li> </ul>
Gender (Including pregnancy and Maternity, Marriage)?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b> √	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>This policy is not expected to impact significantly on gender.</p>
Gypsies & Travellers - Is there an impact?	<b>Yes</b> √	<b>No</b>	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>The proposed changes to denominational transport could possibly impact on gypsies and travellers as some attend the Catholic schools within Cheshire East.</p> <p><b><u>Results of the consultation</u></b> Of the 909 responses to the consultation questionnaire, 3 stated that they belonged to the gypsy/traveller community. None of these stated that they were parents/carers or pupils at relevant schools, so arguably the views of this group were not properly represented through the questionnaire. However, the views of those attending or proposing to attend denominational schools are well represented and it is expected that the issues for this group will be included in the response under religion and belief.</p>
Race – Is there an impact?	<b>Yes</b> √	<b>No</b>	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>The proposed changes to denominational transport may have an impact on the Polish community who are predominantly at Catholic schools.</p>

			<p>Action – translate key documents into Polish</p> <p><b><u>Results of the consultation</u></b></p> <p>With regard to ethnicity of respondents, the vast majority (91%) were ‘white British’, with a small number of ‘white Irish’ and ‘other white’ backgrounds, of which 9 state their ethnicity as being Polish. A very small number of responses were from people of mixed or Asian backgrounds. The views of those attending or proposing to attend denominational schools are well represented and it is expected that the issues for this group will be included in the response under religion and belief.</p>
Religion & Belief- Is there an Impact?	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>√</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>The current under 16 transport policy offers home to school transport to denominational schools where the parent or child adheres to the religion or denomination of that particular school. This is offered free to those on low incomes and is significantly subsidised for others. The proposal to increase the charge for transport from September 2011 and to withdraw subsidised transport from September 2012 is likely to impact on the families who wish to attend denominational schools.</p> <p>Out of the 145 primary, secondary and academy schools in Cheshire East, 43, or nearly 30%, are faith schools, which cater for pupils from Catholic and Church of England backgrounds. The total number of pupils attending faith schools is 8469, which equates to 18% of the total pupils on roll at Cheshire East maintained schools. In addition, some Cheshire East pupils travel to faith schools within neighbouring authorities. Most are transported to St Nicholas High School, Northwich. 253 pupils used school transport to St Nicholas High in 2010-11.</p>

		<p>Only one faith school caters for post 16 education. It is a catholic college and has a sixth form with 204 pupils on roll (based on January 2011). This equates to 7% of the total post 16 pupils in school.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has due regard to parents preference to send their children to faith schools, the intention of the future school transport policy is to bring about equality and align with fair access by providing a statutory only school transport policy, where there is no additional benefit in terms of transport provision or funding to either faith schools, or through routes running to specific schools, but not others.</p> <p>The proposed recommendations to Cabinet discharge the Council's wider obligation to promote equality of opportunity and avoid discrimination.</p> <p>Having noted the above, Officers will work with schools most impacted, particularly with the individual faith groups, to support them in offering capacity building, to enable them to procure their own transport arrangements.</p> <p><b><u>Results of the consultation</u></b></p> <p>A significant number of responses to the consultation questionnaire came from individuals with a religion or belief. 287 or 53% were from Roman Catholics, 156 or 29% from Christian (Church of England and Protestant) and over 5% from other religions. Only 65 or 12% of respondents said they had no religion.</p> <p>There was a widespread perception from respondents, particularly on the part of the Roman Catholic community, that these proposals discriminate against members of the Roman</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Catholic faith. In practice, however, those parents in Cheshire East selecting a school on the grounds of their denomination (currently Roman Catholic and Church of England) currently access transport at a subsidised rate even when this is not the nearest to their home. Other parents choosing schools other than the one nearest to their home on other grounds such as educational standards, specialisation etc. currently have to pay the full cost. This means that there are children attending denominational schools whose parents are paying the full cost of transport, because the school was chosen on grounds other than its denomination. In practice, therefore, the current policy discriminates positively in favour of parents who request that their children attend schools on denominational grounds.</p> <p><b><u>Next steps</u></b></p> <p>Recommendations to Cabinet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• From September 2011 raise parental contribution for denominational transport from £299 to £314 per annum this reflects the current rate of 5% inflation (ie, a reduced increase for 2011-12)</li><li>• From September 2012 withdraw transport to faith primary and secondary schools completely for all new entrants, except for those pupils who would remain 'eligible' for free transport to a faith secondary school under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 (this would ensure that those pupils currently in schools are not impacted by the proposals)</li><li>• Supporting the commitment to work with schools, parents and local transport operators to seek to ensure that accessible, affordable, full cost recovery and sustainable travel continues to be available for pupils attending faith schools</li></ul>
--	--	---

Sexual Orientation -Is there an impact?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b> √	Comments/Actions:  This policy is not expected to have a significant impact on sexual orientation.
Transgender - Is there an impact?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b> √	Comments/Actions:  This policy is not expected to have a significant impact on transgender.
Other socio-economic disadvantaged groups (including white individuals, families and communities) Is there an impact?	<b>Yes</b> √	<b>No</b>	Comments/Actions:  This policy will not impact on low income families in receipt of free school meals as they will continue to receive free transport. However, there may be some families who do not qualify for free transport but who will find the increase in charges and subsequent withdrawal of transport has an impact on them.  <b><u>Results of the consultation</u></b> An analysis of the postcodes of respondents using MOSAIC (a system for classifying UK households) provides an indication of the social groupings of the respondents. The MOSAIC group chosen for each respondent is the most typical one for their postcode, and while we do not know if this is accurate in each case, we can gain a general picture. However, respondents appeared to be mainly from the more affluent groups. A large proportion, 31% of respondents, were from high-income groups C and D, compared to only 24% of Cheshire East's overall population. Middle-income families (groups E and F) are also strongly represented, with 33.4% of respondents from these groups, compared to only 20% of Cheshire East's overall population. Only 9.6% of respondents are from the lower-income

			<p>groups (I, J and K), compared to 21% of Cheshire East's overall population. It may be reasonable to conclude that respondents to this survey are generally more affluent than the average Cheshire East resident.</p> <p><b><u>Next steps</u></b>  The recommendations to Cabinet take account of the need to reduce the impact on low income families by phasing in changes, maintaining free transport for complex needs students and the commitment to work with schools, parents and local transport operators to seek to ensure that accessible, affordable, full cost recovery and sustainable travel continues to be available for pupils attending faith schools.</p>
<p>Please give details of any other potential impacts of this policy (i.e. Poverty &amp; deprivation, community cohesion, environmental)</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>√</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>There could be a negative effect on the environment if parents choose to use their cars to transport their children to school. Some parents are saying that they would move their children to other schools, whereas others would choose to use public transport or transport children in their cars. The majority of Cheshire East children walk to school. However a significant number use their cars. The Council has a duty to promote the use of sustainable travel and transport and encourages this through School Travel Plans. Each school has a plan that sets out how they will encourage the use of sustainable travel by staff, pupils and visitors.</p> <p><b><u>Next steps</u></b>  Recommendation to Cabinet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet supports the commitment to work with schools, parents and local transport operators to seek to ensure that accessible, affordable, full cost recovery and</li> </ul>

			sustainable travel continues to be available for pupils attending faith schools.
Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination in relation to any of the Equality Duties	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b> √	Comments:  Legal advice is that the proposals are not unlawful. Many local authorities have already implemented similar proposals. Although the policy will not unlawfully discriminate, it may have a less favourable impact upon those groups currently receiving free or subsidised transport through the Councils school transport policies.
Does this policy – procedure – function have any effect on good relations between the council and the community	<b>Yes</b> √	<b>No</b>	Comments:  This original proposal would be likely to have a negative impact on relations, particularly with parents/carers of pupils attending or planning to attend a denominational school or post-16 provision. The proposed recommendations to Cabinet take into account the issues raised by interested parties through the consultation and take steps to mitigate these.
Do you require further data/information/intelligence to support decision making?	<b>Yes</b> √	<b>No</b>	Comments:  A public consultation took place between 25 <sup>th</sup> March and 20 <sup>th</sup> May to establish the full impact of the proposed changes on the protected characteristic groups. 909 questionnaires were received and the results from these have been included in this impact assessment.
Please specify any question(s)/issues/concerns/actions identified as a result the assessment. What needs to be done?			Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full impact on protected characteristic groups has been gathered through a consultation process</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet to consider issues and recommendations arising from consultation</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Data Methods/Collection to Support Decision Making</b>		
Please indicate what methods of research, information and intelligence will be/have been used e.g. consultation, reports, comparisons with similar organisations	<b>Internally</b>  Total Transport consultation results  Pre-budget report consultation  Proposed consultation to take place between 25 March 2011 – 20 May 2011  Data analysis – School Census information	<b>Externally</b>  Total Transport consultation results  Pre-budget report consultation  Proposed consultation to take place between 25 March 2011 – 20 May 2011
Please state who will be/who was involved/engaged/consulted	<b>Internal (Staff/Members/Service/Dept)</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated Transport Services</li> <li>• Education services</li> <li>• SEN Assessment and monitoring</li> <li>• SEN Advisors</li> <li>• Parent Partnership Service</li> <li>• Performance, Information &amp; Monitoring Team</li> <li>• School Admissions Team</li> <li>• Legal Team</li> <li>• Finance Team</li> <li>• School Organisation Team</li> </ul>	<b>External (stakeholders/service users/partners)</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headteachers, governors and staff at all academies, primary, secondary and special schools</li> <li>• All parents/carers at schools/colleges in Cheshire East</li> <li>• Managers and staff of post-16 providers</li> <li>• Neighbouring authorities</li> </ul>

Please indicate any significant expected costs & resource requirements for completing the data collection	Printing costs of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proposal document</li> <li>• Frequently asked questions</li> <li>• Questionnaire</li> </ul> Translation costs – documents from English to Polish  Drop-in sessions – venue costs  Analysis of consultation feedback – staff time	
---	--	--

<b>Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) Action Plan: Making Changes</b>					
REF	Action	Responsible Person/s	Action Deadline	Tasks	Progress
	Translate consultation documents into Polish	GB/AA	asap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Contact translation service</li> <li>•Arrange for docs to be put on the web</li> <li>•Alert schools to translation</li> </ul>	All tasks complete May 2011
Please state the date the policy/procedure/function will be reassessed? (generally 1-3 yrs)			Comments/Date:		

Signed (Service Manager) .....

Date.....

Signed (Head of Section) .....

Date.....

Once you have completed this section please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. The Equality and Inclusion Team will convene a quarterly meeting of the Fairness and Inclusion Group (FIG) who will quality check our EIA's to ensure we have considered everyone. We plan to send approximately 2-5% of our completed EIAs Forms to the (FIG).

#### Quarterly Progress and monitoring

REF	Action	Progress	Completed

Once you have completed your progress report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. Make a copy of the progress report template so you can present an update in three months time.

Once you have completed your quarterly progress report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team  
Measuring Impact & Reporting

Ref	Action	Impact	Outcome	Review Date
	The changes that you have made to remove the gaps you have Identified (simply cut and paste these from the action plan).	What has been the overall impact of making the particular changes?  (could include wider community involvement in policy development or greater use of service by diverse communities).	What are the concrete results of having changed your policy or service? Could include improved service use, reductions in complaints or increased satisfaction. These will be based on detailed data and should outline how the changes have brought about improvements for different communities and groups	

Once you have completed your impact report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. The Equality and Inclusion Team will prepare an annual report for Corporate Management Team and Cabinet on our progress.