

Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

Name of Policy/Project/Decision	PRU (Phase 2-Whitefield Centre)-request for approval to invite tenders for work in relation to the Pupil Referral Unit.
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Jeanette Richards
Department/Team	Children's Services
Proposed Implementation Date	5.6.2024-Cabinet Date
Author of the EqlA	Samantha Horrocks
Date of the EqlA	20.5.2024

1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?

Can embed or link to existing report/document in this section

The Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) is a special school catering for 137 secondary age (11-16) pupils with a range of additional educational needs. The PRU operates out of four buildings.

The proposal is to request approval to invite tenders for work in relation to the Pupil Referral Unit, specifically in relation to the PRU's Whitefield Centre.

This relates to Phase 2 of works following the relocation of the main PRU building from Spring Lane to the New Kershaw Centre in February 2024 (Phase 1). Approval is required to proceed to tender to obtain a competitive construction price.

Alongside this, one of the PRU's other buildings, Milltown House has had to be taken out of use because of its condition. The loss of the Spring Lane School site, and limitations to the scope of accommodation available at the NKC has resulted in a shortfall of accommodation available to the PRU, particularly in respect of the delivery of vocational subjects.

The local authority has worked with the leadership team of Spring Lane school, and the Oak Leaning Partnership, which is the proposed sponsor of Spring Lane School, to determine the immediate requirements for accommodation, but also to develop a longer-term estate strategy recognising the changing demands on provision, and the existing fragmented nature of the PRU estate, operating out of four buildings.

Phase 2 is now urgently required, to further expand/ enhance the current provision at the New Kershaw Centre and the Whitefield Centre following the relocation from Spring Lane School. Initially, the focus was on the possible internal reconfiguration of the PRU's existing building in Whitefield. However, time constraints, requiring the accommodation to be available from the autumn term, resulted other options also being considered.

The provision of temporary modular accommodation for the whole school positioned at Whittaker Street, Radcliffe was found to be the only option that could deliver the accommodation that the school require within the timescales available.

Section 2 – Impact Assessment (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?

Employees: **Yes**

Community/Residents: **Yes**

Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **No – the additional accommodation is primarily for use by school pupils, and so the impact will be on pupils on roll at the school, and the staff employed in the school.**

If the answer to all three questions is ‘no’ there is no need to continue with this analysis.

2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation

Documentary Evidence:

Once approval is received to invite tenders for work in relation to the Whitefield Centre the design team will develop the scheme through each of the RIBA stages, with each stage developing the level of detail following client/service user engagement.

The scheme will then be presented for approval, developed to RIBA stage 4 which brings together the detail of the scheme, a programme for its implementation, and detailed costs. These are the culmination of the design process that has looked in detail at the needs of the children and young people attending the school, and those who will attend in the future.

The design process will have regard to the complex needs displayed by many of the children and young people.

Data:

The school currently caters for 137 pupils with a range of additional educational needs. The scheme will provide additional accommodation to serve a further 50 children and young people.

The increase in capacity responds to the Specialist Sufficiency Strategy that recognises the increasing demands within the local population for special school places.

This scheme sits alongside other projects which include the provision of three new Special schools, and also additional Resourced Provision units linked to mainstream schools. All of this is designed to ensure a continuum of high-quality provision to meet the needs of the local population.

Stakeholder information/consultation:

The Phase 2 scheme forms part of a wider Specialist Sufficiency Strategy that has been the subject of extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders.

The strategy forms part of the PSV management plan which is overseen by the PSV Board which brings together key stakeholders.

More specifically, in respect of the PRU, the input of the school leadership team and Oak Learning Partnership and the wider school community has been an essential part of the process to inform design and delivery of the project and to ensure that the proposed modular building responds to the needs of its pupils.

The Leadership Team of the PRU has engaged with its service users throughout, on proposals impacting the location of its provision. The PRU serves pupils from across the borough, and those pupils largely access the provision via transport arranged through the local authority. The change in location is not as critical therefore as with a mainstream school serving a distinct geographical community. Because pupils are provided with transport via the local authority, no family will be disadvantaged in terms of access to the provision.

2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.

- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups? No
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic? No
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic? No
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal? No
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation? No
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)? No
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council? No

2.4 Characteristic	Potential Impacts	Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact	Mitigations to reduce negative impact	Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative
Age	There is no change to the age range of the school.	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Disability	Accessibility to the building to facilities, and to learning	Scheme design	During the design development there has been a focus on accessibility and ensuring the space is welcoming and accessible to all.	Positive
Gender Reassignment	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Marriage and Civil Partnership	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral

Race	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Religion and Belief	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Sex	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Sexual Orientation	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Carers	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Looked After Children and Care Leavers	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Socio-economically vulnerable	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral
Veterans	There is no change that will impact	N/A	N/A	Neutral

Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis

2.5 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date
N/A			

Section 3 - Impact Risk

Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)

Impact x Likelihood = Score			Likelihood			
			1	2	3	4
			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely
Impact	4	Very High	4	8	12	16
	3	High	3	6	9	12
	2	Medium	2	4	6	8
	1	Low	1	2	3	4
	0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0

Risk Level	No Risk = 0	Low Risk = 1 - 4	Medium Risk = 5 – 7	High Risk = 8 - 16
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------



3.2 Level of risk identified	
-------------------------------------	--

3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation	<p>Low Risk-0 No risk as positive amendments have been made during the design stage of the build scheme.</p>
---	--

Section 4 - Analysis Decision (Page 11 of the guidance document)

4.1 Analysis Decision	X	Reasons for This Decision
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed	X	There are no negative impacts from the activity
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		
There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring continual review		

Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager	Paul Cooke	21/05/24	
Responsible Asst. Director/Director	Stephen Holden	21/05/24	
EDI	L. Cawley	21/05/24	

EqlA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details