

Helping to make an impact

Equality Assessment (EA) Form and Guidance Information

INITIAL SCREENING – STAGE 1 (See Guidance information)

As a public authority we need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity.

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a Full Equality Assessment is required.

Name of policy, strategy or function: Schools and Settings Improvement - Proposed reduction in BCC budgets for 2014 -15 for CYPF	Ref: CYPF1113SS
---	------------------------

Responsible Officer: Jane Spilsbury	Role: Lead Officer
Directorate: CYPF	Assessment Date: 18 November 2013

Is this a: Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is this: New or Proposed <input type="checkbox"/> Already exists and is being reviewed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is Changing <input type="checkbox"/>

1. What are the main aims, objectives of the policy, strategy, function or service and the intended outcomes and who is likely to benefit from it

Aims: To secure good or better education for children in all Birmingham schools, ensuring all children achieve their potential and thereby improving their life chances.

Objectives: To improve outcomes for children by ensuring:

- The quality of education in all schools is consistently good or better, as judged by Ofsted outcomes.
- Standards and progress exceeds or is at least in line with national bench marks.
- Safeguarding practices and processes are implemented and monitored to effectively secure our children.

Outcomes: Increased % of schools judged to be good or better by Ofsted.

- Increased no of schools meeting or exceeding standards and progress benchmarks.
- Underperformance is promptly identified and addressed.

Benefits: Increased confidence in local schools and raised aspirations for children by parents and the community

- Increased chances of employment – reduction in youth unemployment.
- Increasing life chances of young people through broadening opportunities to fulfil their potential.

School and Settings Improvement (SSI) structure as at September 2011 consists of a Head of Service and four locality teams – north, south, East and west and central – each led by a Locality Team Leader at grade 7. In addition there are 3.4 Grade 6 School Improvement Officers. There is one colleague on long term sickness absence. The current complement of staff consists of 4 locality leads at grade 7– Senior School Improvement Advisers - and 3.4 grade 6 officers – School Improvement Advisers. One grade 7 is acting up as Acting Head of School Improvement.

Support for school improvement is now coordinated via the School Improvement Group (SIG) which consists of head teacher representatives who are National or Local Leaders of Education (NLE/LLEs). SSI officers work closely in partnership with the SIG and teaching schools to broker support for schools causing concern or in Ofsted categories.

There are currently 10 primary schools and 1 secondary school in special measures, 1 primary school has serious weaknesses and 35 schools judged to ‘require improvement’ by Ofsted.

Primary schools below the floor targets of 60% L4+ combined English and maths at KS2 drastically reduced since September 2011 from 59 to 18 in September 2012 and below all three floor target measures including progress in English and Maths have reduced from 43 in 2011 to 6 in September 2012. However, the DfE (Department for Education) have recently revised the progress floor targets which means that there are now more than 50 schools below the thresholds. This will have an impact on the capacity of the SSI team to respond to schools’ support needs.

2. Explain how the main aims of the policy, strategy, function or service will demonstrate due regard to the aims of the General Duty?

- 1. Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation?
- 2. Advance equality of opportunity?
- 3. Foster good relations?
- 4. Promote positive attitudes towards disabled people?
- 5. Encourage participation of disabled people?
- 6. Consider more favourable treatment of disabled people?

The current proposal is for the Service to achieve a saving of £98,000 within the financial year 2013/2014.

See section 3 below.

3. What does your current data tell you about who your policy, strategy, function or service may affect:

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Service users | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Employees | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Wider community | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please provide an explanation for your ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ answer

(a) Service users

The team are discussing means of minimising the impact of cuts. It is likely that SSI will work in different ways, such as reviewing current services, commissioning support where appropriate and outsourcing. Working closely with the School Improvement Group (SIG) to determine models of support, monitoring and evaluation, as well as analysis of data and identification of underperformance.

SSI's core purpose, to provide targeted challenge and support for vulnerable schools, remains a statutory function of the local authority. However, the school to school support strategy has been seen to be effective when deployed strategically in conjunction with Local Authority officers. This model will need to be reviewed but the strategic coordination will need to be retained by the LA.

The budget reduction will mean that services will have to be reviewed and, concentrating on identified need and models of delivery to meet Local Authority statutory requirements will have to be developed.

It is not possible to provide specific data related to the make up of the protected groups of service users to be affected because this data is not known and cannot be predicted (this is a gap that should be addressed for the future review). However, data relating to SEN pupils in schools are attached as an appendix. Any reduction in support for school improvement would necessarily impact on these groups but the exact nature of the impact cannot be predicted accurately.

(b) Employees

Note, a full list of employees by the protected characteristics such as: ethnicity, age, employer, etc is being collated for addition to a full equality analysis.

A breakdown of data of the protected groups to be affected for employees is as follows:

Female – 7

Disabled – 1

Ethnic minority – 1

It is clear that the largest protected group to be adversely affected would be on the grounds of gender.

SSI will need to continue to provide a range of services to meet statutory requirements. Funding will need to be allocated to facilitate working with partner agencies to ensure that statutory functions are maintained. A school improvement budget will be needed to provide support to schools causing concern and to support schools in Ofsted categories prior to academisation. However, valuable experience, school intelligence and expertise will be lost as a result of budget cuts. Any new model developed will have to provide an infrastructure to mitigate against this loss. Staff may be asked to work strategically rather than operationally, for example, by commissioning support and carrying out quality assurance processes. This would also involve working increasingly through other vehicles such as the SIG and the Birmingham Education Partnership.

For some staff there may a need to develop new skills for example in commissioning. Overall, the number of posts currently contained within SSI is likely to reduce as efficiencies are pursued under the new delivery arrangements. A Business Case for SSI will provide the detail on the number and types of posts included. The impact of such changes has already been cushioned by holding current vacancies during the current financial year pending final decisions about budgets and staffing structures.

(c) The wider community

The intention of the model is to provide greater opportunities for working collaboratively with the wider community with increased integrated working alongside other agencies such as the SIG, the IFST, schools, health, police and other delivery partners across each locality.

A range of other teams within CYPF work closely with SSI colleagues on a regular basis. There is likely to be an impact on these teams and their relationships with schools if the SSI team no longer exists.

1. Access to Education Teams

In January 2013 the acting Head of Service met with SSI colleagues to discuss proposals for the new model of service, although detailed proposals were not yet available. It was agreed that she would be invited to attend future team meetings where this was discussed. Access to Education and IFSTs teams have raised concerns about who they would approach if they had concerns about a school in future.

2. **The Data and Statistics team** work closely with SSI to provide relevant and meaningful data to schools. There are concerns that, without the input from SSI colleagues, it will be more difficult to deliver what schools need in terms of data analysis. This will need to be partially commissioned in future.

Comments from a wide range of staff across the directorate about the proposed model will be sought once a draft business plan is available.

3. Early years teams

The early years team works closely with SSI and has adopted many of the review practices we use in schools and adapted them for children's centres.

4. Schools and governors

Governors have been informed of the planned changes and head teachers have been informed via the schools fora. A common concern has been how the planned changes will affect the Co-operative Partnership, if at all. Governors have been reassured that there are currently no plans to change the service provided by School and Governor Support as this is a traded service which enjoys a 90%+ buy-back from schools.

Concerns raised include issues about identification of vulnerable schools, on-going support for school improvement and who would be the link person with the local authority and whether existing contacts for consortia meetings would continue.

Concerns have also been raised about how the LA would meet the recently-implemented requirement for the LA to meet with inspectors at section 5 inspections of maintained schools and to attend feedback at school inspections.

5. (SIG)

The SIG relies on SSI colleagues to identify vulnerable schools and to broker relationships for school to school support. We work closely with National Leaders of Education (NLEs) and Local Leaders of Education (LLEs) to provide support for vulnerable schools, schools in category and those judged to be 'requiring improvement'. This is consistent with the LA's statutory responsibility to ensure that schools provide an education that is at least good and is outlined in the School Improvement Strategy.

6. Pupil Admissions and Appeals

We work closely with the Admissions team to ensure that schools comply with their statutory obligations to provide school places.

4. Are there any aspects of the policy, strategy, function or service, including how it is delivered, or accessed, that could contribute to inequality? (including direct or indirect discrimination to service users or employees)

Yes

No

Please provide an explanation for your 'Yes' or 'No' answer

The performance of some schools may deteriorate as a result of a diminished service and reduction in vital intelligence and expertise. SSI may not be able to deliver the full range of current services to which schools have become accustomed. To mitigate against this, the current models of support have already been revised to incorporate school to school support and commissioned expertise. Further reduction in budgets may impact on the LA's role in monitoring and evaluating school improvement and this may have a detrimental effect on equalities in the following ways:

- Reduction in the LA capacity to promptly identify underperformance and address needs
- Increase in underachievement of specific groups of pupils
- Increase in the number of schools judged to be inadequate or requires improvement by Ofsted

To mitigate against this, BCC will need to:

- Make a commitment to provide sufficient resources to meet statutory requirements
- This should include access to a good knowledge of schools and their local communities and needs
- Commit to developing more effective working relationships between the SIG, schools, teaching schools and other support providers or agencies.
- Ongoing monitoring of performance and identification of need.

A reduction in funding may mean that BCC has a reduced ability to meet the needs of service users and its statutory requirements. To mitigate this, SSI will need work in partnership with the SIG to monitor the effect of the new delivery models and co-ordinate/adjust services as appropriate.

School to school support has been widely consulted upon and in operation since autumn 2010. An evaluation was undertaken in summer 2012 and a report produced by Warwick University. It is recommended that additional consultation with schools consultative groups is undertaken once the detail of the proposed service distribution and impact upon staffing levels is determined. A Consultation Plan will be available with the Full EIA as required.

5. Will the policy, strategy, function or service, have an adverse (negative) impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?

Yes

No

Please provide an explanation for your 'Yes' or 'No' answer

The proposed reduction in SSI budgets may have an adverse and negative impact on schools, children and their families. This will depend on the detailed arrangements for the new delivery model as it may be a possibility that some children may not achieve their full potential and local schools may deteriorate thereby disadvantaging youngsters.

In implementing a reduction in the citywide budget, decision-makers must consider data and needs across the city and who pays for the provision of statutory responsibilities if undertaken by external agencies and the quality assurance of such services. It must also ensure that in reallocating budgets, schools with the greatest need, where a higher proportion of users could be discriminated against, receive a higher level of support compared with those with less need.

In examining how to manage budget reductions in such a way as to minimise any adverse effects upon service users, SSI will be looking to reduce duplication, improving efficiencies and reducing services, which may in turn impact upon staffing levels in some areas. Some staff in SSI will be affected by reductions in personnel and new ways of working, along with concerns around job losses.

Once the detailed proposals are determined, SSI officers will need to assess the groups of staff which could potentially be adversely affected by these changes. It is evident that the majority of staff in SSI are female so any reduction in staffing would have an adverse and negative effect upon this group. It is therefore necessary for employers to obtain legal and human resource advice before beginning any selection for redundancy. Employers would also have to have similar considerations to the potential risk of an adverse impact to staff from other protected characteristic groups, for example black and minority ethnic backgrounds and for those with disabilities.

Consultation

Plans are being made to consult on the equality analysis of the proposed budget reduction, in addition to the statutory need to consult if there are major changes for individuals with SSI. Meetings are to be held with SSI and other colleagues to discuss the budget reductions and the implications for the service and individuals. Further meetings are planned to include representation from HR. Consultation is also a standing item on the SSI team meeting agenda.

6. Is an Equality Assessment required?

If your answer to question 2 has identified potential adverse impact and you have answered 'yes' to any of the following questions 3, 4, or 5, then you should carry out a Full Equality Assessment.

Does the Policy, Strategy, Function or Service require a Full Equality Assessment? **Yes** **No**

If a Full Equality Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the assessment with service managers in your service area as well as the Directorate Contact Officer.

If a Full Equality Assessment is **Not** required, please sign the declaration and complete the Summary statement below, then forward a copy of the Initial Screening to your Directorate Contact Officer

If a Full Equality Assessment **Is** required, you will need to sign the declaration and complete the

Summary statement below, detailing why the Policy, Strategy, Function or Service is moving to a Full Equality Assessment. Then continue with your Assessment

DECLARATION

A Full Equality Assessment not required, the Initial Screening has demonstrated that the Policy, Strategy, Function or Service is robust; there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact. All opportunities to promote equality have been taken.

Chairperson:

Summary statement:

Sign-off Date:

Quality check: The screening document has been checked using the agreed audit arrangements in the Directorate:

<p>Name: (Officer/Group carrying out the Quality Check)</p> <p>Directorate:</p> <p>Contact number:</p>	<p>Date undertaken:</p>	<p>Screening review statement:</p>
--	-------------------------	------------------------------------

Equality Assessment Task Group Members

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Role on Task Group</u> (e.g. service user, manager or service specialist)	<u>Contact Number</u>
1.	Chairperson David Bridgman	School Support Manager, SGS	0121 303 8394
2.	Jenny Bartley	Locality Team Leader SSI	07500882976
3.	Helen Miles	Locality Team Leader SSI	07974708505
4.	Alicia Welsh	Locality Team Leader SSI	07974708515
5.	Jane Spilsbury	Locality Team Leader SSI	07967581542
7.	Nasreen Hussain	Head of Service, PPS	07917811261
9.	Veronika Quintyne	CYPF Directorate	0121 4643073

FULL EQUALITY ASSESSMENT– STAGE 2

Step 1– Scoping the Equality Assessment

Building on the material included at the Initial Screening stage, you should begin the Equality Assessment by determining its scope. The Equality Assessment should consider the impact or likely impact of the policy, strategy, function or service in relation to all areas of our remit. The Equality Assessment should be proportionate to the significance and coverage of the policy, strategy, function or service.

1. What data, research and other evidence or information is available which will be relevant to this Equality Assessment? Please tick all that apply

Service Targets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Performance Targets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Service Take-up	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
User Satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>	Press Coverage	<input type="checkbox"/>	Census Data	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workforce Monitoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community Intelligence	<input type="checkbox"/>	Previous Equality Impact Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Complaints & Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	Information from Trade Unions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff Survey	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ofsted inspection evidence			

Please provide details on how you have used the available evidence/information you have selected as part of your Assessment?

Relevant information:

- Equality data relating to employees who are potentially affected by the change to a new model of service

Schools and Settings Improvement Equality Information Commentary

Gender

A breakdown of data of the protected groups to be affected for employees is as follows:

Female – 7

Male - 1

Disabled – 1

Ethnic minority – 1

It is clear that the largest protected group to be adversely affected would be on the grounds of gender.

There are significantly more females than male.

Disability

The total number of employees who have declared a disability is 1.

Age

The age group band which has the highest number of employees is the 45 years+ band. 7 members of staff fall into this category out of a total of 16.

Ethnic Origin

1 members of staff are from ethnic minority groups.

Age by Salary

Overall, 100% of all advisory staff in SSI earn more than £40,000.
7 of these employees are 45-59.

2. Feedback from various consultations on the proposals – see section 3.

3. Initial Screening

2. Have you identified any gaps in relation to the above question? Yes No
If 'Yes' please detail including what additional research or data is required to fill these gaps? Have you considered commissioning new data or research?

If 'No' proceed to Step 2.

Clarity around the new model of commissioning – details re the school improvement function of the Birmingham Cooperative.

Step 2 – Involvement and Consultation

Please use the table below to outline any previous involvement or consultation with the **appropriate** target groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested with this policy, strategy, function or service. (See Appendix 2 - for details on each target group)

Target groups

3. Describe what you did, with a brief summary of the responses gained and links to relevant documents, as well as any actions

Age

Age

The age group band which has the highest number of employees is the 45 years+ band. 7 members of staff fall into this category out of a total of 7.

Disability	<p>Disability</p> <p>The total number of employees who have declared a disability is 1</p>
Gender reassignment	none
Marriage and Civil partnership	none
Pregnancy and maternity	
Race	<p>Ethnic Origin</p> <p>1 member1 of staff represent ethnic minority groups.</p>
Religion and belief	Not known
Sex	<p>Gender</p> <p>A breakdown of data of the protected groups to be affected for employees is as follows:</p> <p>Female – 7</p> <p>Male - 1</p> <p>Disabled – 1</p> <p>Ethnic minority – 1</p> <p>It is clear that the largest protected group to be adversely affected would be on the grounds of gender.</p> <p>There are significantly more females than male.</p>
Sexual orientation	None

4. Who are the main stakeholders and what are their requirements?

The main stakeholders for these proposals are:

1. Employees – need to understand how proposals will affect them and have an opportunity to provide their views.
2. Managers – need to understand how it affects how they manage their staff (if any different).
3. Cabinet and Scrutiny – need to be satisfied that the proposals will meet the business needs of cabinet in terms of reports on school standards for example and the capacity to inform BCC policy re education. There will also be financial implications in relation to employee contracts that need to be taken into account by cabinet.
4. Trade Unions – Directorate needs to consult meaningfully and consider the amendments and alternative proposals as necessary.
5. Partners e.g school staff, the School Improvement Groups, Schools Fora, parents and governors need to understand the impact on services
6. Other teams within CYPF – see appendix B.

5. Amongst the identified groups in the previous question, what does your information tell you about the potential take-up of resulting services?

“Take up of resulting services” is not relevant to these proposals.

It will be important to ensure effective communication about and promotion of service provision so that the remodelled services are known about and accessible. The need for school improvement support will still exist so schools will commission support from various private providers. BCC will need to ensure that adequate quality assurance mechanisms are carried out by governing bodies to ensure value for money. Strategic and statutory functions of the LA will still need to be carried out so any ‘resulting service’ will need to cover these elements and an increased budget for school improvement will need to be enhanced to compensate.

Step 3 – Assessing Impact and Strengthening the Policy

6. What will be done to improve access to, and take-up of, or understanding of the policy, strategy, function or service?

NB: These are the measures you will take to mitigate against adverse impact.

A description of the potential impact of reduced budgets on school performance and the necessary mitigating actions have been outlined in sections 3 and 4 of the initial assessment document and are outlined here.

The proposed reduction in SSI budgets may have an adverse and negative impact on schools, children and their families. This will depend on the detailed arrangements for the new delivery model as it may be a possibility that some children may not achieve their full potential and local schools may deteriorate thereby disadvantaging youngsters.

Cllr Brigid Jones is working with schools via the School Improvement Groups to establish the Birmingham Education Partnership which may include a school improvement offer or framework. Access to future provision for school improvement will need to be clarified and agreed with schools through this mechanism.

In implementing a reduction in the citywide budget, decision-makers must consider data and needs across the city and who pays for the provision of statutory responsibilities if undertaken by external agencies and the quality assurance of such services. It must also ensure that in reallocating budgets, schools with the greatest need, where a higher proportion of users could be discriminated against, receive a higher level of support compared with those with less need.

In examining how to manage budget reductions in such a way as to minimise any adverse effects upon service users, SSI will be looking to reduce duplication, improving efficiencies and reducing services, which may in turn impact upon staffing levels in some areas. Some staff in SSI will be affected by reductions in personnel and new ways of working, along with concerns around job losses.

Once the detailed proposals are determined, SSI officers will need to assess the groups of staff which could potentially be adversely affected by these changes. It is evident that the majority of staff in SSI are female so any reduction in staffing would have an adverse and negative effect upon this group. It is therefore necessary for employers to obtain legal and human resource advice before beginning any selection for redundancy. Employers would also have to have similar considerations to the potential risk of an adverse impact to staff from other protected characteristic groups, for example black and minority ethnic backgrounds and for those with disabilities.

Consultation

Plans are being made to consult on the equality analysis of the proposed budget reduction, in addition to the statutory need to consult if there are major changes for individuals with SSI. Meetings are planned to include representation from HR. Consultation will be a standing item on the SSI team meeting agenda.

The action plan in step 7 draws together these points and allocates personnel to monitor the impact.

See action plan at Step 7

Step 4 – Procurement and Partnerships

7. Is this project due to be carried out wholly or partly by contractors?

Yes

No

If 'yes', have you done any work to include equality considerations into the contract already? Specifically you should set out how you will make sure that any partner you work with complies with equality legislation (employment practice/service provision)

Not currently applicable

Step 5 – Making a Decision

8. Summarise your findings and give an overview of whether the policy, strategy, function or service will meet the authority's responsibilities in relation to equality and support the council's strategic outcomes?

With reference to the authority's responsibilities in relation to equality, from the available information we conclude there will be a disproportionate negative impact of the proposals on women as an identified group of employees within the Schools and Settings Improvement Team.

Analysis of the age profile also shows there are a number of employees over 50. We are anticipating a small number will take early retirement and voluntary redundancy so they may not consider themselves to be adversely affected. There is a risk of loss of intelligence and experience with the loss of more long-serving staff. There is also a risk to LA-school relationships where relationships have built up over time. It will be necessary to ensure that processes are in place to transfer knowledge and to manage handover successfully.

Step 6 – Monitoring, Evaluating and Reviewing

Before finalising your action plan you must identify how you will go about monitoring the policy/function or the proposals, following the assessment, and include any changes or proposals you are making.

9. What structures are in place to monitor and review the impact and effectiveness of the new policy, strategy, function or service?

There is a need for a corporate response here.

The Birmingham cooperative partnership will need to establish clear protocols for monitoring and evaluation of the impact of support brokered for vulnerable schools. Possible performance indicators might include:

- Attainment and progress data across the city and for individual schools, compared with national, statistical neighbours and core cities
- Decrease in the number of schools in category (special measures or serious weaknesses) according to Ofsted
- Increase in the % of schools achieving good or better judgements from Ofsted.
- Customer satisfaction surveys for key stake holder groups
- Feedback from Primary and secondary School Improvement Groups, as well as Primary and Secondary Fora.

Step 7 – Action Plan

Any actions identified as an outcome of going through the Steps 1 – 6, should be mapped against the headings within the Action Plan.

NB: summarise/evidence actions taken to mitigate against adverse impact.

10. Taking into consideration the responses outlined in the Initial Screening Stage and Steps 1-6 of the Full Assessment, complete the action plan below.

	Ref (if appropriate)	Actions	Target date	Responsible post holder and directorate	Monitoring post holder and directorate (if appropriate)
Involvement and Consultation	Initial assessment section 5 Full assessment section 4	Consult with major stake holders including employees, schools, parents, SIG, schools fora	Dec 2013 – Feb 2014	Sally Taylor Service Director Children's Services (Education & Commissioning) Children, Young People & Families	CYPF Strategic Director Peter Duxbury
Data Collection					
Assessing Impact					
Procurement and Partnership	Initial assessment section 2. i	Maintain access to school improvement support through commissioning of support and/or signposting	September 2014	Sally Taylor Service Director Children's Services (Education & Commissioning) Children, Young People & Families	CYPF Strategic Director Peter Duxbury
	Initial assessment section 2.iii	Identification of and support for underperforming schools - ensure adequate arrangements are maintained to fulfil this function.			
	Initial Assessment section 3b	Support the work of the SIG and the Birmingham Cooperative Establish an infrastructure to mitigate against loss of valuable			

Monitoring, Evaluation and Reviewing	Initial Assessment section 3c	experience, school intelligence and expertise. Provide greater opportunities for working collaboratively with the wider community with increased integrated working alongside other agencies.			
	Initial assessment section 4	Ongoing monitoring of performance and identification of need	September 2014 onwards	Sally Taylor Service Director Children's Services (Education & Commissioning) Children, Young People & Families	CYPF Strategic Director Peter Duxbury

Step 8 – Sign-Off

The final stage of the Equality Assessment process is to formally sign off the document as being a complete, rigorous and robust assessment

The policy, strategy or function has been fully assessed in relation to its potential effects on equality and all relevant concerns have been addressed.

Chairperson of Equality Assessment Task Group

Name: David Bridgman	Job Title: School and Governor Support Manager	Directorate CYPF	Sign-off Date:
-------------------------	---	---------------------	----------------

Concluding statement:
This analysis of potential impact has been undertaken using available information. This EINA will be used to inform the implementation of the new model of service to improve outcomes for children, young people and families.

Quality Check and Review by the Directorate Contact Officer:

Name: Veronika Quintyne	Directorate Team: CYPF Directorate	Review Date:
----------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------

Summary of strengths and area(s) for improvement:

Strengths

The potential adverse impacts on service users and employees are clearly stated.
An action plan is in place to help develop mitigations to address potential adverse impacts.

Area(s) for improvement:

Provision of more detailed Information around the proposed commissioning model and impact of the model on staff and service users. Particularly as women and children are noted as one of the protected characteristic groupings which may suffer adverse impact due to the change

A proposed start date is needed for consultation activity for the budget reduction with all stakeholders.

Service Director or Senior Officer (sign-off)

Name:

Job Title:

Date: